

# **Local Plan Preferred Options Feedback Report**

June 2012

## **Appendices**

- i) Summary of representations
- ii) Full response to BAG standard letter representation
- iii) Full response to Blair, Rattray & Bjork representations (920, 1070 & 1071)
- iv) Index of respondent names / representation numbers

# **Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation 2012**

## **Summary of representations and responses**

**Chapter/Policy Number: 1.1**

**Title: The West Lancashire Local Plan**

---

**ID** 38  
**Consultee name** MR PETER TOWNLEY  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** I support the policies and proposals for Edge Hill University (S).  
**Outcome** Support noted  
**Officer recommendation** No Action

---

**ID** 479  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Para 1.8 - Proposals maps should have been supplied with this document. The Individual settlement plans are too small in scale, miss out important details and give no picture of the rural areas. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted - a full proposals map will be provided with the Publication version of the Local Plan  
**Officer recommendation** No Action

---

**ID** 480  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Concerns about Scott Wilson undertaking the SA / SEA and HRA (s)  
**Outcome** Scott Wilson (now part of URS) are a global firm able to provide a wide range of consultancy advice. While a group of landowners in Lathom are represented by Scott Wilson, entirely separate individuals within Scott Wilson, based in a separate part of the company, prepared the SA / SEA and HRA. The Council are satisfied that no conflict of interest has arisen in this situation for two key reasons. Firstly, the Scott Wilson employees undertaking the SA / SEA and HRA are professionals in their fields employed by Scott Wilson to give impartial, professional advice, and Scott Wilson are a leading consultancy on SA / SEA and HRA. For Scott Wilson to offer biased advice would damage the reputation of the company and potentially lead to legal proceedings against the company. Secondly, the Local Plan does not propose development in the area of Lathom where a group of landowners employ Scott Wilson to represent them and, crucially, the SA / SEA and HRA therefore do not assess this land as part of their assessments of the Local Plan and no recommendation of those assessments could be interpreted to favour an allocation of the land in Lathom that is in question.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 481  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Introduction page 10 para 1.20 - Since these assessments have already "been prepared and are available" they should have been taken into account in preparing this document. (F)  
**Outcome** The technical assessments run parallel to the preparation of the Local Plan, and at each stage of the Local Plan preparation the technical assessments are updated to reflect what has changed since the last stage. Also, the technical assessments are available for comment during consultation, and such comments may result in changes to the recommendations of the assessments. Therefore, the recommendations of the current assessments will be reflected within the Publication version of the Local Plan, and a final version of the assessments (of the Publication version) will be prepared to be submitted alongside the Local Plan for Examination.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 792  
**Consultee name** Mr Robert W. Pickavance  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Other  
**Summary** All the local views have been expressed at the recent LDF meetings. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 904  
**Consultee name** Jamie Fletcher  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Concerns over consultation methods and misleading information (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No Action

---

**ID** 907  
**Consultee name** MR gavin rattray  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Other  
**Summary** Building Houses at Yew Tree Farm is about a developers need to make money. There is nothing wrong with that in itself. However, the council still has a duty to make sure that the development is sustainable. Because the key evidence appears to be inadequate in the case of the traffic report, or supplied by the developer and used unchecked by WLBC, we cannot rely on assurances from WLBC that the development is or can be made sustainable. (s)  
**Outcome** Affordable housing - it is acknowledged that there is a great need for affordable housing in Ormskirk with Aughton, as there is across the Borough. However, the Local Plan must balance a range of factors, of which affordable housing need is only one. The Local Plan does a great deal to deliver affordable housing in the Borough as a whole, but cannot always deliver it where individuals may prefer it due to other factors. Consultation - the Council has exceeded the requirements in relation to consultation set by national legislation and its own Statement of Community Involvement. Planning is not determined by the number of objections or number of supportive representations, it must be based on sound planning justification. While there has been a large number of objections to the Yew Tree Farm proposals in Burscough, the vast majority have not raised new evidence that the Council had not already considered. The proposed Local Plan is sustainable, as demonstrated by the SA / SEA Report and has been informed by a wide range of robust evidence.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action required

---

**ID** 915  
**Consultee name** Ms Barton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Council's strategy for communication the plans and the public consultation period has failed to inform residents about there ability to shape their own future. (s)  
**Outcome** The consultation exercise was well publicised through press notices, press releases, Champion cover sheet, posters in libraries, post offices and some local shops, information in libraries and post offices as well as through the Council website. There were also drop-in exhibitions held at numerous locations around the Borough. Therefore it is felt that the Council have used sufficient methods with which to promote the consultation process.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 959  
**Consultee name** Mrs L Clayton South Lathom Residents Association  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Complaint that not all documents informing the Local Plan were set out and listed on the Council website clearly and in one place (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted The evidence behind the Local Plan is wide ranging and extensive and, because of the amount and technical nature of it, is quite complicated. The website tries to keep it as simple as possible, having a clear section where all the relevant evidence is provided, and this page is updated whenever a new study is finalised, not just for consultation purposes, so many of the documents have been available on the website for more than a year.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action

---

**ID** 1009  
**Consultee name** Mr Stephen Barron  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Concerns that timetable favouring Skelmersdale is unrealistic and that a Plan B will be implemented sooner rather than later. (S)  
**Outcome** Observations noted.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action

---

**ID** 1081  
**Consultee name** Ms Christine Taylor  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Concerns over consultation process. (S)  
**Outcome** Consultation was undertaken in accordance with regulations and that stipulated within the Statement of Community Involvement. It included information distributed and available through press, website, parish councils, posters, post offices and libraries, forums and exhibitions, providing sufficient opportunity for people to get involved.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 1098  
**Consultee name** Mr Keith Williams Burscough Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Concerns over size of development and why it is necessary. It is an almost unanimous view among Burscough residents that past growth has happened without regard to the infrastructure needed to support it. In particular, the provision of sewage and surface water facilities, highway capacity and public transport are sadly lacking even before any additional development occurs. Concerns that comments from last consultation have been ignored (S)  
**Outcome** Scale of Development - The Local Plan cannot be determined solely by what is "needed" in any given settlement. However, CLG Household Projections do give a clear indication of what the housing need for the whole Borough will be over any given period. The Local Plan then needs to consider how this Borough-wide need is met and which locations are most suitable and sustainable to meet it. The fact that Burscough is a Key Service Centre, coupled with the suitability of the Yew Tree Farm site for Green Belt release, have ultimately led to the allocation of that site for a substantial number of new houses. Policy SP3 also ensures that adequate infrastructure improvements are implemented before development will be allowed. Previous Consultation - the Petition referred to was not submitted to the Council until after the Local Plan Preferred Options paper had been prepared, so could not influence the preparation of this document. Even so, planning is not determined by the number of objections or number of supportive representations, it must be based on sound planning justification. While there has been a large number of objections to the Yew Tree Farm proposals in Burscough, the vast majority have not raised new evidence that the Council had not already considered.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action required

---

**ID** 1108  
**Consultee name** Mrs Carolyn Cross Wrightington Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** The Parish Council support the Local Plan in general however feel that some of the provisions may be based on generic evidence rather than being site or area specific and therefore may not be truly reflective of the actual situation. (s)  
**Outcome** Observations noted  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 1111  
**Consultee name** Chris Henshall  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** The HCA is keen to ensure that the vision and policies of the Local Plan provide an appropriate framework for locally agreed development and regeneration in West Lancashire, and regards the Local Plan as a key document to support a sustainable policy environment for future growth within the Borough. (S)  
**Outcome** Support noted  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 1126  
**Consultee name** Mr J Fillis  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Use Council-owned land within settlement areas to deliver housing rather than release Green Belt and build more homes in Skelmersdale. (s)  
**Outcome** The Council's Strategic Asset Management Review (SAMR) is still in the early stages, but where suitable sites have emerged from it, these have been accounted for in the Local Plan. It is unclear how many other sites, and where, will come forward from the SAMR given that each ward is different but it is not expected that any large sites would come forward that have not already been considered in the Local Plan preparation process prior to the SAMR. Therefore, Green Belt release will still be required. In relation to Skelmersdale specifically, the housing target proposed for Skelmersdale is seen to be an ambitious but deliverable target, but it is not considered that a higher target would be deliverable in the realities of the housing market.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 1156  
**Consultee name** Mr Roger Clayton South Lathom Residents Association  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** We are disappointed, both by the quality of the evidential base for this plan and by the disjointed nature of the conclusions reached, when compared with the situation that has been set out. We consider the plan as currently constituted to be unsound.(F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted - specific points of concerns about the soundness of the Local Plan submitted by this consultee are dealt with in subsequent reps.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 1161  
**Consultee name** Mr Steve Matthews Sefton Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service note that the document has not incorporated the recommendations of your Habitats Regulations Assessment in your policy wording. I would request that you incorporate these recommendations at the next stage of your Local Plan. (S)  
**Outcome** The HRA, along with the SA and all other assessments, is an assessment of the Local Plan Preferred Options document (the version put out to consultation) and these assessments are also made available for consultation and comment alongside the LPPO document. Therefore, the recommendations made in the HRA of the Local Plan would not have been implemented in the LPPO document itself yet. However, any recommendations from the previous iteration of the HRA (on the Core Strategy Preferred Options, March 2011) should have been reflected in the LPPO document. If this is not the case, they will be implemented as we move forward with the Local Plan.  
**Officer recommendation** Review HRA recommendations and ensure that they are implemented in the Local Plan as it is refined.

---

**ID** 1182  
**Consultee name** Mr Jonathan Clarke Knowsley MBC  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Overall, the Local Plan Preferred Options document is well presented and structured; it achieves a high level of clarity and this greatly assists in focusing upon core issues to be addressed. The maps are particularly clearly presented and there is a clear spatial focus throughout the document. (f)  
**Outcome** Noted  
**Officer recommendation** No Action

---



<b>ID</b>	1187	
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr John Gardner	
<b>Agent Name</b>		
<b>Nature of response</b>	Support	
<b>Summary</b>	I am in agreement with much of your paper. (f)	
<b>Outcome</b>	Support noted	
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No action	
<hr/>		
<b>ID</b>	1206	
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Roger Clayton	South Lathom Residents Association
<b>Agent Name</b>		
<b>Nature of response</b>	Observations	
<b>Summary</b>	Typographical errors and general comments (s)	
<b>Outcome</b>	1) Page 119, 121, 144, 156, 161, 163, 164, 173, 224, 227, 236 (ii) - agree Page 147 - 100 sqm is the threshold set by national CIL legislation and guidance Page 236 (i) - disagree 2) Unsure which policy statements are being referred to 3) A full draft Proposals Map will be prepared to accompany the Publication version of the Local Plan	
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	Correct relevant typo / drafting errors	
<hr/>		
<b>ID</b>	1214	
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Andrew Taylor	David Wilson Homes
<b>Agent Name</b>	Ms Lorraine Davison	DPP
<b>Nature of response</b>	Other	
<b>Summary</b>	David Wilson Homes wish to withdraw the comments in DPP's letter 12 December 2011, apart from the section commenting on proposed Local Plan policy coverage. In the Local Plan, there is considered to be insufficient detail on: · Design principles in development · Historic environment · Provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities · Transport / highway policy This move back to the Local Plan documents of the former planning regime could curtail the flexibility associated with the LDF system in terms of updating individual policies. (S)	
<b>Outcome</b>	Comments noted Of those areas highlighted as having insufficient detail, design and open space are covered by separate SPDs, and historic environment and transport / highway policy are covered in sufficient detail by national policy. It is recognised that we still await the final NPPF, but the draft NPPF contained sufficient detail on these latter two matters. We also await details of transitional arrangements on LDF / Local Plans, but we are given to understand there will be flexibility to review and amend aspects of Local Plan documents (e.g. DM Policies) in isolation after adoption.	
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change required	
<hr/>		

**ID** 1220  
**Consultee name** Mrs Margaret Wiltshire CPRE (West Lancs Group)  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** The principles listed omit any mention of protection of the Environment. It seems that we have to wait until the last two sentences of chapter two before there is any explicit reference to it. (F)  
**Outcome** While protection of the environment is implicit in the principles of sustainable development and addressing climate change, it would be helpful to specifically identify the principle of protecting the environment here given that this is a key element of the Local Plan.  
**Officer recommendation** Add Principle to para 1.3 of "Preserving and enhancing the natural and built environment"

---

**ID** 1230  
**Consultee name** Mr PF McLaughlin  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** I attended one of the consultation forums at Ormskirk Civic Hall and found the consultation process fair and gave all who attended the opportunity to give their views and question the councils decision. This comment would also apply to the whole consultation process. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments acknowledged  
**Officer recommendation** No response required.

---

**ID** 1249  
**Consultee name** Mr Andrew Thorley Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd  
**Agent Name** Miss Caroline Simpson Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Taylor Wimpey UK Limited welcomes the publication of the Local Plan Preferred Options Paper and appreciates the extensive background work and analysis undertaken by the Council. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments Noted Linked to subsequent reps from same consultee  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: 1.4**

**Title: Planning Policy on Minerals & Waste Developments**

---

**ID** 60  
**Consultee name** Mr Anthony Northcote Plannig and Local Authority Liason, The Coal Authority  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support proposal (S).  
**Outcome** Support noted  
**Officer recommendation** No Action

---

**ID** 673  
**Consultee name** Mr David Cheetham  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Clarification sought on mineral safeguarding (S)  
**Outcome** Mineral safeguarding is a matter for the Joint Lancashire Minerals & Waste Development Framework. The West Lancs Local Plan is merely making reference to it to ensure readers realise that there is further planning policy available on Minerals & Waste. More detail on mineral safeguarding is available at [www.lancashire.gov.uk/mwdf](http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/mwdf)  
**Officer recommendation** No Action required

---

**ID** 856  
**Consultee name** Mr Philip Carter Environment Agency  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Should plan consider shale gas extraction? (S)  
**Outcome** Consideration of the implications of shale gas extraction, and dealing with any waste from it, is a matter for LCC as Minerals & Waste Planning Authority and, given the uncertainty over proposals for shale gas extraction at this time, the Local Plan cannot plan for the wider implications of this extraction and allocate / sterilise land in a rural part of the Borough for associated development that may never materialise. However, if shale gas extraction does gain permission in the future, there are sites within the settlement areas of the Northern Parishes that may be considered suitable for associated development.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

<b>ID</b>	1297
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mrs Margaret Wiltshire CPRE (West Lancs Group)
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Observations
<b>Summary</b>	This diagram is too small to be able to read it accurately. On my copy I cannot even read the words! (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	Comment noted
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	Enlarge Fig 1.2 in next version of Local Plan

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: 2.1**

**Title: Spatial Portrait**

---

**ID** 482  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Chapter 2 Spatial Portrait page 16 para 2.9 (Population) - These changes should be quantified. (S)  
**Outcome** Information is provided as an overview with further details available through the evidence papers.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required.

---

**ID** 483  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Chapter 2 Spatial Portrait Page 16 para 2.10 (Population) Given the demographic changes described above, why is the development being skewed towards Skelmersdale? Such an approach can only result in extra housing being supplied where it is not needed to serve the population of West Lancashire. The result could only be either more empty housing or an influx of population from outside the borough, leaving the needs of the resident population unmet. (F)  
**Outcome** Explanation as to why development is being directed to Skelmersdale is explained in Policy SP1.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 484  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The proposed provision of affordable housing is especially weak in the rural areas. Development is being weighted towards large estates in towns. the proposed developments in Burscough, Ormskirk and some rural areas are constrained by infrastructure problems over at least the first half of the plan period. The most pressing needs are therefore either not being addressed at all or left to grow over the first half of the plan period. (S)  
**Outcome** Distribution of housing levels, including affordable housing, are explained in the main policies (SP1, RS1). Some affordable housing will be supported in rural areas (RS2).  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 485  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** This is a completely irrelevant statement, since the target was effectively abandoned long ago. In any case, demographic changes point to stabilisation, not growth. (S)  
**Outcome** This paragraph provides a brief history of the development of Skelmersdale since 1961 to set the background. Therefore, the statement about planned capacity is relevant. The Local Plan evidence base shows a forecast increase in demographics and housing need, indicating growth is required, and the Local Plan responds to this.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 487  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Chapter 2 Spatial Strategy page 25 para 2.45 (table) Affordable Housing - The plan is especially weak with regard to provision of affordable housing in a timely fashion, in the areas of greatest need (see later comments on housing and affordable housing). This makes the plan UNSOUND.(F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Explanation of affordable housing can be found in Policy RS2.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 488  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Chapter 2 Spatial Strategy page 25 para 2.45 (table) Infrastructure - The limitations imposed by infrastructure (and areas subject to flooding) create such a problem with regard to timing of development that the plans put forward in this document are unrealistic. This makes the plan UNSOUND.(F)  
**Outcome** Infrastructure is an issue in West Lancs and the Council recognises that infrastructure issues need to be resolved in some areas before development can occur. The Local Plan acknowledges this through its proposals for the timing of development. This is explained in more detail through the Infrastructure policies.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 489  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Chapter 2 Spatial Portrait page 25 para 2.45 (table) Employment - Whilst the plan contains a few statements covering these issues, the actions proposed are weak and ineffectual. We agree the need for this statement but want more focused and determined actions in the plan. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 675  
**Consultee name** Mr David Cheetham  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** More careful positive style needed in relation to Skelmersdale (S)  
**Outcome** Comments acknowledged. Whilst it is not the intention of the spatial portrait to portray Skelmersdale in a negative light, it does have to give an accurate reflection of the town and the issues it contains. Indeed, the Local Plan aims to tackle these issues through its policies. In relation to 2.12, the 'poorer choice of housing' relates to the type of housing that can be found in the town. Council tax banding information is a useful way of highlighting areas of the borough where particular bands of housing are concentrated, implying a less mixed and balanced community. The majority of housing in Skelmersdale is Band A illustrating a poor quality housing stock, particularly in comparison to the rest of the Borough where greater proportions of Band B-D can be found. More detailed illustrations of the quality of housing in Skelmersdale can be found through the thematic profile (housing) available on the Council's website as Local Plan evidence. In response to Para 2.13 - Skelmersdale is a deprived area, with the majority of its wards featuring in the top 20% most deprived areas of the country. Whilst the ward of Ashurst is an exception to this, Skelmersdale as a whole is still afflicted by high deprivation rates and so the statement still stands. In response to para 2.15 - the lifestyle choices listed are examples only, and it is acknowledged that there will be other contributory factors that could play their part like poverty and poor education. The portrait has to highlight the difference in life expectancies between Skelmersdale and other areas of the Borough and recognise the causes of this so that the Local Plan may work to address them.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 744  
**Consultee name** Mrs Alison Truman British Waterways  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** British Waterways is pleased to note the references to the contribution of the Leeds and Liverpool Canal to the heritage and character of West Lancashire throughout Chapter 2, and supports the inclusion of the inland waterway network on the Spatial Portrait diagram (Figure 2.2). BW also supports the Vision set out at 3.1 where the canal in Burscough and the rural areas is recognised as a focus for sustainable tourism and recreation. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 768  
**Consultee name** Mr Alan Hubbard The National Trust  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Para 2.8 The specific references to Rufford Old Hall are a welcome and warranted addition to the natural and built environment portion of the Spatial Portrait. (f)  
**Outcome** Comments noted.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 771  
**Consultee name** Mr Alan Hubbard The National Trust  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** Para 2.38 The review of the key features in respect of Rufford should make specific reference to Rufford Old Hall, for example in the same way that the description of Burscough identifies Martin Mere (para 3.4), having regard to its importance both as a key heritage asset and an attraction of importance to the local and wider tourist economy - as previously identified it also has a wider role in the local community, for example in providing many opportunities for volunteering and through its important educational programme. (f)  
**Outcome** Rufford Old Hall to be included in spatial portrait for Rufford.  
**Officer recommendation** To add line 'Rufford also contains the tourist attraction and heritage asset of Rufford Old Hall'.

---

**ID** 772  
**Consultee name** Mr Alan Hubbard The National Trust  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** it is surprising that environmental issues do not figure more prominently especially given their wider economic and social contributions to the lives of residents, employees and visitors. A particular example remains landscape. Environmental considerations identified. (S)  
**Outcome** These issues are of great importance to West Lancashire. However, the level of detail for each issue would be better suited to the actual policy areas and in particular Policies EN2, 3 and 4.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---



**ID** 793  
**Consultee name** Mr Robert W. Pickavance  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Rufford has a good number of facilities and services. The site at New Road is not at risk of flooding, and is capable of accommodating 69 dwellings. (S)  
**Outcome** 2.7 - Information from the EA confirms that the flood maps are NOT incorrect but are being updated. They also confirm that the latest version of the EA Flood Map shows that the southern part of the site is within Flood Zone 2. The model upon which the flood map has recently been reviewed and the extent of Flood Zone 2 affecting the site has increased very recently. Furthermore, while the site may never have flooded in the past, that does not mean it never will - the Flood Map shows those areas likely to be affected during a 1 in 100 year and 1 in 1000 year event and to date Rufford has not been subject to a flood event of this magnitude. 2.18 - Comments noted. 2.37 - The only housing allocated in Banks is on existing brownfield land (Greaves Hall) to enable the regeneration of this previously developed land. 2.38 - The Sustainable Settlement Study informs the settlement hierarchy within the Local Plan. Whilst there are some facilities that located here the level of provision is not on a par with other Key Sustainable Villages such as Tarleton and Hesketh Bank.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required.

---

**ID** 810  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Parbold Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** There is limited housing for elderly residents in Parbold and it is not obvious where those who wish to stay in the village will live without 'blocking' larger homes. Older residents tend to require more medical care. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The need to provide accommodation for the elderly is recognised as an important issue in West Lancashire. It is agreed that forcing elderly out of their homes is not appropriate, and, ideally, some suitable accommodation should be provided in Parbold. However, there are not many suitable development sites in the village, and expansion into the Green Belt is not supported, so this problem is by no means straightforward.  
**Officer recommendation** No change (It is not considered that we could reasonably "allocate" one of the SHLAA sites as a site for elderly accommodation.)

---

**ID** 857  
**Consultee name** Mr Philip Carter Environment Agency  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** We are aware that a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) is being prepared and we are satisfied that it will be in place to support the publication version of the Local Plan. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Level 2 SFRA is now available on Councils website.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 880  
**Consultee name** Mr Bob Coventry  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** I find it extremely disappointing to see that South Lathom has not been recognized within the West Lancashire Local Plan, yet the document acknowledges Downholland, Great Altcar & Bickerstaffe. (S)  
**Outcome** Parishes are acknowledged in the spatial portrait as a geographical reference only. Planning is not determined by administrative boundaries but by functional spatial areas. However, South Lathom can be referenced alongside Lathom and the other Eastern Parishes in the Spatial Portrait.  
**Officer recommendation** Add reference to South Lathom in paragraph 2.41 of the Spatial Portrait

---

**ID** 881  
**Consultee name** Mr Bob Coventry  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The spatial portrait paints a very bleak and negative image of Skelmersdale using such terms as deprivation, high unemployment, low value property, poor facilities, no rail link, poor public transport & lesser level of educated persons within the borough as a mechanism to justify building houses. SKelmersdale needs an employment base (S).  
**Outcome** The spatial portrait is an accurate description of Skelmersdale, based on the evidence collated for the Local Plan. Skelmersdale does have a wide range of issues that need to be tackled, including deprivation, health and education. The Local Plan aims to work to try and resolve these issues through the delivery of development and the regeneration of the town.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1002  
**Consultee name** Mr Francis Williams                      Ormskirk Friends of the Earth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Query over population and housing demand (S)  
**Outcome** Justification and explanation of housing figures are explained in supporting evidence papers. The Council would dispute the figures suggested here.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 1003  
**Consultee name** Mr Francis Williams Ormskirk Friends of the Earth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Pattern of movement flows are over ten years old and should not be used as a sound basis for projecting future action (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Information is derived from the 2001 census. Until the results of the 2011 census are published, no more up-to-date information is available on movement flows.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 1142  
**Consultee name** Mr Alan Hubbard The National Trust  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Para 2.8 The specific references to Rufford Old Hall are a welcome and warranted addition to the natural and built environment portion of the spatial portrait. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1146  
**Consultee name** Mr Roger Clayton South Lathom Residents Association  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The plan should consider more strategic options for population growth and co-operate with Liverpool. The plan fails to meet the needs of the population as it does not address housing needs in Skelmersdale, nor does it recognise South Lathom Parish identity as it proposes to divide the parish into two halves through development. References to RSS terminology are made even though the Plan acknowledges this no longer defines the development plan. S)  
**Outcome** 1. Para 2.25 provides a brief introduction into the recent history of development in Skelmersdale and is designed to 'set the scene'. 2. The spatial portrait provides an overview of the current situation in each area, based on collated evidence. Provision of housing, including affordable and specialised accommodation is dealt with through the residential policies. 3. Parishes are administrative areas. The Local Plan addresses issues that cross administrative areas and are often more related to functional economic or spatial areas. It is not necessary for the Local Plan to list all Parish Council areas. 4. Regional towns and City Regions are still in effect and relevant.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 1284  
**Consultee name** St Modwen Properties PLC  
**Agent Name** John Francis  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** It would be helpful to expand the description of the inadequacies of Skelmersdale Town Centre as this will assist future efforts designed to bring about the sustainable regeneration of the centre. Change suggested to wording. (S)  
**Outcome** Spatial Portrait should provide an overview of the Borough and its areas based on evidence. Justification for regeneration in Skelmersdale is explained in Policy SP2.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1298  
**Consultee name** Mrs Margaret Wiltshire CPRE (West Lancs Group)  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** p 16 para 2.9 Demographic changes: 60+ age-group increases from 14,000 to 39,000 and their needs must be considered. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Elderly accommodation is dealt with under policy RS2.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 1299  
**Consultee name** Mrs Margaret Wiltshire CPRE (West Lancs Group)  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** para 2.21 Why do we have "a weakening agricultural sector" ? Our agricultural land is still a valuable resource, largely "best and most versatile" and much of it grade 1 and 2a. There is a growing demand for locally sourced food. (F)  
**Outcome** The Rural Economy Study and West Lancashire Economy Study both point to a productive agricultural sector, but one which is vulnerable, as exemplified by the loss of jobs in the sector since 2001.  
**Officer recommendation** Para 2.21 - change "weakening" to "vulnerable"

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: 2.2**

**Title: Key Issues**

---

<b>ID</b>	486
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad      Lathom South Parish Council
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Observations
<b>Summary</b>	Chapter 2 Spatial Strategy page 24 para 2.45 (table) Key Issues – Skelmersdale Town Centre - The plan shows confusion over the role of the Town Centre regeneration project and fails to identify the “ different ways of delivering regeneration” that are contemplated. Contrast this approach with the Plan B for Ormskirk and Burscough (or is there a link between the two?) (F)
<b>Outcome</b>	The purpose of the table at 2.45 is to identify the key issues for the Borough. Therefore, the information should be more factual than detailed discussion or consideration of alternatives. However, having reviewed the comments in relation to Skelmersdale Town Centre, there is scope for the text to be amended to make it clear what the issue is and the process in place to resolve this. Plan B relates to the delivery of housing Borough wide and secures land for housing in the event any part of the plan fails to deliver including Skelmersdale.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	Reword the Skelmersdale Town Centre Key Issue to the following: A Masterplan is in place to guide the regeneration of the Town Centre, which could kick-start the wider regeneration of the town. The Local Plan must build on the principles of the Masterplan

---

<b>ID</b>	683
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr David Cheetham
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Observations
<b>Summary</b>	More positive style and minor corrections sought (s)
<b>Outcome</b>	This section of the document Key Issues as well as Policy IF2: Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice seek to identify the current transport deficiency in Skelmersdale in order that the Local Plan is in a better position to be able to address these deficiencies. The wording about accessible public transport refers to transport that can be easily accessed by the public. One of the aims of the Local Plan is to try and provide a much needed link between residential and employment areas within Skelmersdale. One of the key aims of the Local Plan is to support walking and cycling across the Borough and where appropriate this will be done to link employment areas . Given the length of this policy only limited wording about each policy can be added. Many of the comments made and listed above are based on factual evidence and have been put into relevant sections of the Local Plan in order to help identify needs that the Local Plan is trying to address.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No action required.

---

**ID** 909  
**Consultee name** Mr Peter Banks  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** I agree in general with the Key Issues identified, but there should be greater emphasis particularly in the areas of Traffic Congestion and Public Transport.(S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Comments addressed through transport policies and Skelmersdale town centre (SP2)  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1215  
**Consultee name** Mr Andrew Taylor David Wilson Homes  
**Agent Name** Ms Lorraine Davison DPP  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Add a specific key issue:"Housing – There is a need to support and maintain a wide choice of high quality homes, both affordable and market housing, to address the needs of the community." (F)  
**Outcome** While the need to provide new housing is seen as a key issue at a national level, it is not a key issue specifically in West Lancashire and certainly not as important as those issues which have been identified as key issues in 2.2. The issue in relation to housing is best expressed by Objective 5, which talks about providing "a range of new housing types", and its inclusion in the Objectives ensures that the issue is covered in the Local Plan.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1285  
**Consultee name** St Modwen Properties PLC  
**Agent Name** John Francis  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** The text dealing with the town Centre needs to be more focused on demonstrating support for the key party expected to lead on it, i.e., the Council's and HCA's preferred developer. Change to wording suggested (S)  
**Outcome** The Local Plan must remain strategic and flexible and the level of detail that has been suggested in neither necessary nor suitable for this type of document.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Chapter 3**

**Title: A Vision for West Lancashire 2027**

---

<b>ID</b>	1351	
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Roger Bell	OPSTA
<b>Agent Name</b>		
<b>Nature of response</b>	Support with conditions	
<b>Summary</b>	OPSTA have made a number of comments in support of the Local Plan but have also raised a number of concerns - see reps 1350 and 1352-1358 for detailed comments from OPSTA. (s)	
<b>Outcome</b>	Detailed responses to individual sections of the letter have been set out within reps 1350 and 1352-1358.	
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No action required	

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: 3.1****Title: Vision**

---

**ID** 15

**Consultee name** Mr Howard Courtley Courtley Consultants Ltd

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** The Vision should state its commitment to meet the areas current and future housing needs in relation to mix, type and tenure. Give significant weight to meet and support economic growth through the Local plan. Ensure an appropriate strategy is put in place to deliver this vision. (F)

**Outcome** Comments noted. The Vision provides a summary of how West Lancashire should be in 2027. Details of mix, type and tenure and economic growth are detailed through the planning policies. The Local Plan is the strategy with which to deliver this vision.

**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 88

**Consultee name** Church Commissioners For England

**Agent Name** Miss Jennifer Hadland Smiths Gore

**Nature of response** Support with conditions

**Summary** The Vision for the Borough states that "West Lancashire's rural and urban communities will be stronger and more sustainable. They will maintain their individual identity and offer residents better access to services, facilities and the housing market". The Church Commissioners for England support this statement, however, question how much support the rural settlement will have for future growth. The Western Parishes rural areas should benefit from some future development and this should be identified in the Vision. Development in villages such as Halsall and Haskayne will allow the settlement to grow, whilst sustaining and conserving the community and natural environment. (F)

**Outcome** Comments noted.

**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 490

**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** Chapter 3 A Vision for West Lancashire 2027 section 3.1 page 27 Vision statement, 3rd paragraph - West Lancashire's rural and urban communities ....will maintain their individual identity... Except in the case of Lathom South Parish areas, apparently. (F)

**Outcome** Comments noted.

**Officer recommendation** No action required

---



<b>ID</b>	491
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad      Lathom South Parish Council
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Observations
<b>Summary</b>	There is little sign in the proposed actions of a proper plan to regenerate and renew housing estates or to bring empty housing back into use. (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	The Vision is long term and must incorporate the Council's long term aspirations. The detail of the plan itself focuses on the regeneration of the housing located to the north east of the town centre (Findon and Firbeck). However, regeneration of the wider housing stock would be a focus of other Council functions such as the Regeneration Team. It is hoped that the Town Centre Regeneration policy acts as the catalyst and draws inward investment to assist with the aspiration of wider regeneration.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change required
<hr/>	
<b>ID</b>	492
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad      Lathom South Parish Council
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Observations
<b>Summary</b>	Whilst an improved range of offerings would benefit Skelmersdale it is unrealistic to say that the proposed new facilities would serve the whole borough. The location of Skelmersdale at the extreme south-east of the borough, coupled with the poor transport links from much of the rest of the borough, makes this assertion extremely unlikely. (F)
<b>Outcome</b>	Comments noted. The Council would hope that the regeneration of Skelmersdale town centre will improve the services and facilities available, improve the availability of public transport services and improve the image of the town, bringing additional residents and visitors into the town from within and outside of West Lancashire. The Council do not consider that these aims are unrealistic.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No action required
<hr/>	
<b>ID</b>	493
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad      Lathom South Parish Council
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Support
<b>Summary</b>	Chapter 3 A Vision for West Lancashire 2027 section 3.2 page 31 Objective 5 - Housing - We fully support this objective but the plan details do not. (F)
<b>Outcome</b>	Acknowledged
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No action required
<hr/>	

**ID** 494  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Chapter 3 A Vision for West Lancashire 2027 section 3.2 page 31 Objective 5 - Housing - Locations for development do not match the needs of West Lancashire's population and provision for affordable/special needs (elderly) housing is inadequate, relying far too heavily on the willingness of developers to co-operate. (F)  
**Outcome** Housing development should be located in the most sustainable areas, and so will be focused on the key service centres within the Borough. In those rural areas, housing will be delivered to meet local need. The residential policies explain this in more detail.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 532  
**Consultee name** Mrs Rita McAleavey  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to new homes being built in Up Holland. What has happened to the Skelmersdale Vision? (S)  
**Outcome** The plans for the regeneration of Skelmersdale town centre are still in place and ongoing. Progress has been slowed due to the current economic difficulties in the market. The Chequer Lane site has been allocated to meet housing requirements. The Mill Lane site, Up Holland has been allocated housing under a Plan B scenario, meaning that IF we cannot deliver the required number of houses in the set period, then we have the option to release additional sites for development to meet the need. The housing figures have been based on an assessment of need, informed by population and housing forecasts. Your details will be added to our database and you will be contacted when further consultation events occur.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 533  
**Consultee name** Mr Bryan Pready  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** I broadly support this statement. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 684  
**Consultee name** Mr David Cheetham  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** It may be that the electrification of Kirkby-Wigan and a Station for Skelmersdale is a prerequisite to meeting most of the sustainability objectives and the development of the town (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The Local Plan hopes to achieve this, and will work with development partners and service providers to try and deliver improvements to rail. However, progress and success is dependent on funding and partnership work.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 1244  
**Consultee name** Mr Alan Hubbard                      The National Trust  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** The fifth and sixth paragraphs are particularly apt in respect to the management and enhancement of West Lancashire's distinctive environmental assets and the imperative of addressing climate change. One potential area for improvement would be to acknowledge, and support, the tourism role and potential of the Northern Parishes in the penultimate paragraph. (f)  
**Outcome** The tourism potential of the Northern Parishes must be considered carefully because tourism can bring severe impacts as well as benefits, especially when there are infrastructure constraints in the area. Therefore, it would not be appropriate to include the Northern Parishes' potential for tourism in the Vision without further consideration of this sector.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1300  
**Consultee name** Mrs Margaret Wiltshire                      CPRE (West Lancs Group)  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** p 29 top paragraph. Support. There is considerable scope for specialist diversification and niche-market produce in the food industry - cottage-style industries, developing the theme of made/grown in Lancashire. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. This specialist diversification is covered by the statement 'providing a more diverse and adaptable economy'.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 1315  
**Consultee name** Mr Duncan Gregory Gladman  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Whilst we support the intention to monitor the Local Plan through the preparation of an Annual Monitoring Report, we suggest that housing supply would be more appropriately reported by a Housing Delivery Statement. The document would show the delivery of market and affordable housing in context with the identified 6 year supply on a site by site basis. It is considered that a Housing Delivery Statement would be a more robust tool to monitor the provision of housing. (S)  
**Outcome** The Council already produce a Housing Land Supply document on an annual basis containing information in relation to the supply and delivery of housing.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 1339  
**Consultee name** Ms Yana Bosseva RenewableUK  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** We have the following comments on the draft vision: □ It refers to reducing reliance on carbon-based technologies in favour of renewable technologies – this is welcomed by RenewableUK. □ A reference to the development of the green economy and the creation of jobs through renewable energy deployment should be included. □ A reference to achieving security of electricity supply including through the deployment of renewable energy should be included. (S)  
**Outcome** The significant detail referred to in relation to the benefits of renewable energy are more suited to a detailed SPD or guidance note aimed at supporting developers. This is something the Council hopes to produce once the Local Plan has been adopted. Reference to the Green Economy is in 2 of the 4 Economic policies so does not need to be duplicated here. Reference to energy security is made within Policy EN1 and so need not be duplicated.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required.

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: 3.2**

**Title: Spatial and Strategic Objectives**

---

**ID** 16  
**Consultee name** Mr Howard Courtley Courtley Consultants Ltd  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Replace 1st sentence in current Objective 5 with alternative wording. (S)  
**Outcome** Whilst it is accepted that the RSS requirement currently stands, it is expected that this will soon cease to have legal weight. In the light of the most recent population information, the housing target of 310 dwellings per annum is considered most appropriate for the Borough. The reasoning behind the housing target (4,650) is set out in Technical Paper 2: Housing. See also the response to Rep. 17 for comments on the timing of making up the RSS deficit.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 89  
**Consultee name** Church Commissioners For England  
**Agent Name** Miss Jennifer Hadland Smiths Gore  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** Objective 5 of the Local Plan is significant as 300 new homes a year are required within the Borough to meet the Council's housing targets. It is also important for the Council to continue to acknowledge that there are very limited Brownfield sites left in the Borough for future development, as set out in paragraph 4.25 of the Local Plan Preferred Options consultation paper. Although the preference would be to develop on more Brownfield sites, this is not always achievable in the long term. Although we accept that some development should take place on previously developed land for sustainability reasons, Brownfield land does not always provide a deliverable or viable development site due to the cost associated with developing out a Brownfield site. With the economic downturn still present, the Council should accept that some Greenfield sites will need to be delivered to ensure that housing and other development targets are met. One example is Moor Farm, Haskayne.  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The priority to deliver housing on brownfield sites is already in Objective 5.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 495  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Chapter 3 A Vision for West Lancashire 2027 section 3.2 pages 31 and 32 Objective 7 - ... is appropriate for its locality, maximising efficiency in the use of land and resources... There is a contradiction between these two requirements. We suggest changing "maximising" to "optimising". (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The Council consider it is appropriate to maximise efficiency in the use of land, rather than optimise.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 496  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Chapter 3 A Vision for West Lancashire 2027 para 3.2 page 32 Objective 9 Skelmersdale - Where would these people come from? What categories of new people? How does this satisfy the requirement to meet the needs of West Lancashire's population, as described in Objective 5? (F)  
**Outcome** Housing needs for West Lancashire have been informed by population and housing forecasts. This includes a growth in the population and changes to household compositions, such as single occupants, splitting households from divorce etc, as well as hidden households (eg adults living with parents who cannot afford to rent/buy by themselves). By providing housing in the regional town (Skelmersdale), the most sustainable town in West Lancs, housing and residents can be supported by services and facilities and housing need can be accommodated.  
**Officer recommendation** no change required

---

**ID** 546  
**Consultee name** Edge Hill University  
**Agent Name** Mr Graham Love Turley Associates  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Objective 2 : Education, Training and the Economy Edge Hill University fully supports the strategic aim to create more and better quality, training and job opportunities in West Lancashire in order to get more people into work, and the role that improved facilities at the University will play in helping to provide a highly trained workforce. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 732  
**Consultee name** Mr Martin Ainscough  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** Encourage innovative housing schemes that do not 'ghetto-ise' elderly, family and starter homes but seek a mixed approach to encourage a vibrant community. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. This is supported by the residential policies.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 839  
**Consultee name** Anglo International Up Holland Ltd  
**Agent Name** Ms Lorraine Davison DPP  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The Council should give consideration to allocating the St Joseph's site in the emerging plan. Objective 5: General support, but should recognise that this objective can be met in what might otherwise be regarded as inappropriate locations for housing. Propose revised wording: 'To provide a range of new housing types wherever possible in appropriate locations...' Objective 7: There will be instances where heritage assets can only be conserved through development that might otherwise be regarded as inappropriate because of its effects on the settings of the assets in question. Propose revised wording: '.....Heritage assets and where appropriate their settings will, wherever possible, be conserved and enhanced.' (S)  
**Outcome** 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. (This would not automatically mean that it would be granted permission because the specific justification for the particular enabling development proposed would need to be assessed.) As with other objections on behalf of Anglo International, the Council does not consider it appropriate or necessary to add the requested wording to the Local Plan objectives to refer to this specific scenario. With regard to Objective 5, the phrase "in appropriate locations" could encompass a location where, taking into account all relevant factors (including the need to save an important heritage asset), development is considered appropriate on its merits. Similar reasoning applies to Objective 7 and the term "where appropriate".  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 957  
**Consultee name** Skelmersdale Limited Partnership  
**Agent Name** Mr Paul Singleton Turley Associates  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The omission of a strategic objective to protect the vitality and viability of town centres could lead to the harm of Skelmersdale Town Centre. It should be reinstated. (S)  
**Outcome** Objective 6 – Service and Accessibility has not been omitted from the Local Plan Preferred Options Document. It is included in Chapter 3 (Page 31) and continues to support protection of the vitality and viability of town centres in the Borough. As does Policy IF3  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1005  
**Consultee name** Mr Francis Williams Ormskirk Friends of the Earth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Suggested amendments to wording of objectives (S)  
**Outcome** Objective 2 - the Council consider that 'training' covers both education and qualifications. Secondary schools are only referred to in relation to the need to improve results. Therefore, primary and pre-school education does not need to be specified. Objective 4 - comments noted.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 1006  
**Consultee name** Mr Francis Williams Ormskirk Friends of the Earth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Comments on housing provision (S)  
**Outcome** The evidence informing and justifying the Councils housing figures can be found in the supporting evidence papers. The calculations and revisions suggested are considered to be incorrect.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 1007  
**Consultee name** Mr Francis Williams Ormskirk Friends of the Earth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Observations about objective 6 & 7. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. These views are contained within the planning policies.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 1008  
**Consultee name** Mr Francis Williams Ormskirk Friends of the Earth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Suggested amendments to objectives (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---



**ID** 1145  
**Consultee name** Mr Nick Jacobs Ormskirk Rugby Club  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** ORUFC would help meet objective 3. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1216  
**Consultee name** Mr Andrew Taylor David Wilson Homes  
**Agent Name** Ms Lorraine Davison DPP  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Objective 5 – Housing (page 31) Change housing figure from 300 to 310. Add sentence after the second sentence to read; "Where brownfield sites are unavailable greenfield sites will be supported where they adjoin existing urban areas and will support sustainable development objectives." (S)  
**Outcome** It is agreed that the housing requirement should be changed from 300 to 310 dwellings per annum. The additional sentence suggested is not considered appropriate or necessary to add to Objective 5. The term "in appropriate locations" can be understood to encompass greenfield sites where brownfield sites are unavailable.  
**Officer recommendation** Change housing figure from 300 to 310 new homes a year in Objective 5.

---

**ID** 1247  
**Consultee name** Mr Alan Hubbard The National Trust  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Objective 7 The National Trust welcomes reference to the wider settings of heritage assets in this Objective. However, the words "where appropriate" should be removed. This implies that there are cases where it is not appropriate to protect the settings of heritage assets, a stance to which the National Trust would object, and one that is contrary to advice in PPS5. (F)  
**Outcome** agreed  
**Officer recommendation** amend wording of 2nd sentence in Objective 7 to read "Heritage assets and their settings will be conserved and enhanced."

---

**ID** 1252  
**Consultee name** Mr Andrew Thorley Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd  
**Agent Name** Miss Caroline Simpson Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Spatial Strategic Objective 5 needs updating to reflect the latest housing target. Objection to Spatial Strategic Objective 8 as a requirement for all development to use carbon neutral technology as this could burden development and render it unviable.  
**Outcome** Suggested change to Objective 5 is agreed, to reflect the updated housing target. In terms of Objective 8 ... Objective 8 requires that new development rise to the challenges of climate change and incorporate low carbon technologies. Policy EN1 sets out how this can be achieved viably and is not considered to be too onerous. Furthermore, the Policy sets out a commitment to providing additional guidance on delivery within a subsequent SPD. This Objective should remain.  
**Officer recommendation** Change housing figure from 300 to 310 new homes a year in Objective 5. No change in relation to Objective 8.

---

**ID** 1286  
**Consultee name** St Modwen Properties PLC  
**Agent Name** John Francis  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** Changes of wording are proposed to better reflect the importance of seeking to make the District's centres vital and viable and capable of capturing greater levels of locally generated expenditure for spending in there. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Objective 6 relates to the Borough as a whole, not just Skelmersdale and it would be inappropriate to make direct reference to parties such as the "Council's Preferred Developer". Furthermore, the Objectives were produced through the issues and options consultations and have been subject to significant public consultation so far.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1287  
**Consultee name** St Modwen Properties PLC  
**Agent Name** John Francis  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** Changes of wording are proposed to emphasise the importance of regenerating Skelmersdale Town Centre as soon as possible and through the partnership established by the Council (S)  
**Outcome** The Objectives were produced through the issues and options consultations and have been subject to significant public consultation so it would not be appropriate to amend these significantly at this stage. However, there is merit in including the reference to making Skelmersdale an attractive place to work.  
**Officer recommendation** Add the words "and work" after place to live.

---

**ID** 1301  
**Consultee name** Mrs Margaret Wiltshire CPRE (West Lancs Group)  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Section 3.2 We support the main points of the nine Objectives.  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1341  
**Consultee name** Ms Yana Bosseva RenewableUK  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** In our view, the Spatial and Strategic Objectives should contain a reference to sustainable development and renewable energy. (F)  
**Outcome** Renewable energy is covered by Objective 8. Sustainable development is recurrent through all objectives and the Local Plan policies.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1343  
**Consultee name** Mr David Dunlop The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester & North Merseyside  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** To protect and improve the natural environment, including biodiversity and green infrastructure, in West Lancashire. Seems initially OK to me  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Table 3.1**

**Title: Policies achieving the Objectives**

---

<b>ID</b>	106	
<b>Consultee name</b>	Ms Julie Hotchkiss	Ashton, Leigh & Wigan Primary Care Trust
<b>Agent Name</b>		
<b>Nature of response</b>	Support	
<b>Summary</b>	I support these objectives, particularly the provision of affordable housing and specialist housing, including for younger disabled people. (S)	
<b>Outcome</b>	Comments noted	
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No action required.	

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Chapter 4**

**Title: Strategic Policies**

---

<b>ID</b>	1354
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Roger Bell OPSTA
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	OPSTA's view is that the development of the Grove Farm site in Ormskirk, although sound in transport planning terms, raises issues of wider community interest, in particular the need to sustain the integrity of Burscough and Ormskirk as separate settlements (s)
<b>Outcome</b>	The development of Grove Farm, as proposed, would not diminish the integrity of Burscough and Ormskirk as separate settlements. The strategic gap between the two settlements would remain the same as the development of Grove Farm would only round-off the Ormskirk built-up area. Yew Tree Farm in Burscough could not take more development during the Local Plan period in place of Grove Farm because annual delivery rates on a site the size of Yew Tree Farm coupled with the waste water treatment infrastructure not being expected to be in place to allow development of the site until 2020 would only allow 500 units on Yew Tree Farm in the Local Plan period. The suggestion of integrating the Grove Farm site with the rest of Ormskirk via a segregated pedestrian and cycle route is supported by the Local Plan, potentially as part of improved cycle linkages between Ormskirk and Burscough.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No Action Required

---

**Chapter/Policy Number:** 4.1

**Title:** A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire

---

**ID** 13

**Consultee name** Ms Jill Cavan Downholland Parish Council

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** Downholland Parish Council wishes to advise of its concerns that the paper does not contain any contingency plans for the increased incidence and severity of flooding should the Lower Alt with Crossens Pumped Drainage Catchment Draft Flood Risk Management Strategic Plan be approved. (F)

**Outcome** The Environment Agency's (EA's) proposals for the Lower Alt with Crossens Pumped Drainage Catchment are still at an early stage and no final decisions have been made regarding the Flood Risk Management Strategic Plan. The Local Plan Preferred Options document accounts for the EA's proposals as best it can given that there is still uncertainty regarding these proposals. In particular, no new development is allocated in areas which may be affected by the maximum potential extent of flooding in the EA's proposals.

**Officer recommendation** Given that the Environment Agency's proposals are still at an early stage, the Local Plan cannot plan for the implications of those proposals at this time. Therefore, no change to Local Plan.

---

**ID** 14

**Consultee name** Mr Ed Dickinson

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** The Ormskirk Option should be pursued, (S)

**Outcome** The option for a Strategic Development Site to the south-east of Ormskirk ("Option A") was considered and assessed previously and consulted upon alongside two other options during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation in May / June 2011. Ultimately, the Council took the decision that, while a strategic development in such a location would bring significant benefits, the severe and negative impacts on traffic, Green Belt and landscape views outweighed the potential benefits. Despite the rejection of "Option A", Ormskirk will still deliver 750 new dwellings (including 250 on Green Belt) and Policies EC4 and RS3 address provision for Edge Hill University and student accommodation. On traffic issues, analysis of potential traffic impact shows that impact of development at Grove Farm, Ormskirk would be less than that of "Option A". Also, while the Local Plan (and the Council) supports an Ormskirk Bypass, it will be extremely challenging to deliver the bypass during the Local Plan period and so it is unlikely that any traffic benefit from the bypass will be realised during the Local Plan period.

**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

<b>ID</b>	86	
<b>Consultee name</b>		Church Commissioners For England
<b>Agent Name</b>	Miss Jennifer Hadland	Smiths Gore
<b>Nature of response</b>	Support with conditions	
<b>Summary</b>	<p>It is therefore considered that, although there will not be any major expansion of any of the smaller settlements, it is important that the Council does not restrict development in the Western Parishes, especially in Halsall and Haskayne, or prevent development taking place with regard to conversions of unused agricultural buildings. In conclusion, the importance of small scale development should be acknowledged and supported in rural settlements and in locations with good access to services and facilities. Rural conversions are considered suitable to enable residential, employment, or live/work units to take place on sites such as old farms where buildings already exist. This is seen to have limited, if any, detrimental impact on surrounding areas as the buildings already exist. It also makes the most out of previously built structures – non designated historical assets as set out in PPS5. (S)</p>	
<b>Outcome</b>	<p>The Local Plan Preferred Options does enable development within the existing villages around the Borough (including Haskayne and Halsall), although it does restrict development in the least sustainable villages. However, expansion of these villages into the Green Belt is resisted in order to retain the rural character of those villages and locate the release of Green Belt to the most sustainable locations.</p>	
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No Action Required	

---

<b>ID</b>	87	
<b>Consultee name</b>		Church Commissioners For England
<b>Agent Name</b>	Miss Jennifer Hadland	Smiths Gore
<b>Nature of response</b>	Support with conditions	
<b>Summary</b>	<p>It is now widely recognised that many urban fringe areas of Green Belt no longer meet the purposes of the Green Belt and we welcome the Council's recognition of the need to review such land. However, most agricultural buildings in the borough are within Green Belt. It is currently considered that the Replacement Local Plan is too restrictive with regard to conversions of farm buildings in the Green Belt. The forthcoming Local Plan (2012 - 2027) therefore provides an opportunity to revise Policy DS2 'Protecting the Green Belt'. This would provide 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 to take place. (S)</p>	
<b>Outcome</b>	<p>The Local Plan Preferred Options does mark a move away from Policy DS2 in the Replacement Local Plan (2006) in that it is proposed that the re-use of buildings in the Green Belt for residential or employment use is not precluded. Therefore, flexibility with regard to small scale conversions of under-utilised farm buildings is provided in the proposed Local Plan.</p>	
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No Action Required	

---

**ID** 177  
**Consultee name** Mr Ed Dickinson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Residents have never been given a proper forecast of the benefits and disadvantages of the various options for development, or how Ormskirk may be affected. We were not given a chance to give view on the original option A. The consultations have been designed to explain the plans decided by the Borough Council and restrict any real opposition. Common sense suggests that for the future of Ormskirk we need targeted, large scale development and that it should be adjacent to the University, along with a continued fight for the Ormskirk Bypass, which LCC/WLBC councils and all parties claim to support. No vested interests or pressure groups should be allowed to prevent this. (S)  
**Outcome** All information on all options and aspects of the Local Plan (and previously the Core Strategy) have been made publicly available for residents and members of the public to read and all consultation events have encouraged debate on all options and aspects of the Plan. Edge Hill University - Policy EC4 sets out the Local Plan's proposals to cater for the existing and anticipated needs of the University. The Green Belt has 5 purposes (set out in PPG2), none of which refer to the prevention of linear development. The allocation of Grove Farm to the north of Ormskirk and Yew Tree Farm to the west of Burscough will not close the strategic Green Belt gap between Ormskirk and Burscough. While the Local Plan (and the Council) supports an Ormskirk Bypass, it will be extremely challenging to deliver the bypass during the Local Plan period and so it is unlikely that any traffic benefit from the bypass will be realised during the Local Plan period.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 497  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Chapter 4 Strategic Policies Section 4.1 page 37 paragraph 4.1 - City Regions - These are a concept from RSS and reference to them should be deleted, since the plan now recognises that RSS is no longer relevant (F)  
**Outcome** While the phrase "city region" was used in the RSS, it's meaning is still relevant. There have been several functional economic and spatial areas within the North West for many decades, and will continue to be. West Lancashire's location on the edge of three of them is central to how the Borough functions, therefore it is vital that the Local Plan acknowledges these economic and spatial areas in reference to its key strategic policy.  
**Officer recommendation** No change necessary

---



**ID** 502  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Chapter 4 Strategic Policies justification page 41 paragraph 4.10 Ormskirk, although not the largest Key Service Centre, is the administrative centre of West Lancashire and has the widest range of services and facilities. By comparison, Skelmersdale comes a poor second and will continue to do so, even if the Town Centre Regeneration is delivered in full compliance with the SPD, which seems extremely unlikely. (F)  
**Outcome** Ormskirk and Skelmersdale have comparable provision of services and infrastructure, and this will be improved markedly in Skelmersdale by the proposals within the Local Plan. In addition, Skelmersdale clearly has greater employment opportunities within the town. However, the wording in the justification at para 4.10 perhaps overstates the current situation by particularly singling out Skelmersdale.  
**Officer recommendation** Delete "particularly in the case of Skelmersdale" from 2nd sentence of Para 4.10

---

**ID** 503  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Chapter 4 Strategic Policies page 42 paragraph 4.16 (third bullet point) - The assessment that greenfield land serves little environmental purpose is pejorative. It could be said of almost any area of greenfield land by city- based consultants looking to justify development. Also, it relegates best and most versatile farm land to the same level as the lowest grade, i.e. not a factor worthy of consideration (F)  
**Outcome** Para 4.16 is in reference to the Skelmersdale with Up Holland urban area, as designated on Map G1 in Appendix G and the 3rd bullet point refers to greenfield land that is suitable for development, not greenfield land in general. Greenfield land within this urban area is, almost exclusively, not agricultural land or, if it has been in the past, is not used for that purpose now.  
**Officer recommendation** No change necessary

---

**ID** 504  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Chapter 4 Strategic Policies page 42 paragraph 4.19 - In some cases they extend the existing edge of the built up area by taking in ribbon development, behind which are open fields on both sides of the road. This creates urban sprawl. (F)  
**Outcome** No land proposed for release from the Green Belt, or that was previously covered by Policies DS3 or DS4 in the Replacement Local Plan 2006, that would now fall within the settlement boundaries defined in Policy GN1 of the LPPO will create ribbon development and the sites selected for Green Belt release have been selected because they minimise urban sprawl. Where ribbon development already exists in the Borough and is not in the Green Belt, there is no change in the effect of its designation - it would remain within a settlement boundary.  
**Officer recommendation** No change necessary

---

**ID** 505  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Chapter 4 Strategic Policies page 43 paragraphs 4.24 and 4.25 (table) - We fully agree with the statement.  
**Outcome** support noted  
**Officer recommendation** no action

---

**ID** 506  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Chapter 4 Strategic Policies page 43 paragraphs 4.24 and 4.25 (table)  
Unfortunately there are prime examples of the plan failing to do this and there is a lack of positive action to prioritise development of brownfield sites for housing. (F)  
**Outcome** comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** no action

---

**ID** 507  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Chapter 4 Strategic Policies page 43 paragraphs 4.24 and 4.25 (table) - Although the Skelmersdale figures in the table at 4.25 include 800 dwellings which are supposedly being built on brownfield land, we believe that these relate to the town centre, where many of the proposed 800 houses would be built on greenfield land. (F)  
**Outcome** The 800 dwellings on brownfield land would involve some of the housing planned for the town centre (that which would be on previously developed land) but would also involve other sites around the wider town, as identified in the SHLAA.  
**Officer recommendation** no action

---

**ID** 534  
**Consultee name** Mr Bryan Pready  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** I broadly support Policy SP1, including the development of the three sites to be released from the Green Belt. I am concerned, however, that these developments will increase traffic congestion in and around Ormskirk. Without a bypass, delays in Ormskirk Town Centre will become longer. I support the hierarchy of settlements and the intention to prohibit development outside the Key Service Centres, Key Sustainable Villages and Rural Sustainable Villages. Para 4.12 Development should only be permitted in locations that are within walking distance either of a railway station or of a frequent bus service. (F)  
**Outcome** Support noted. The Council support the Ormskirk bypass proposal but if it were not to come forward, developers, in conjunction with the Highways Authority, will be required to do as much as possible to limit the impact of further traffic on the highway network. Ideally, development should only be permitted where there is access to a sustainable mode of transport. However, in a rural borough such as West Lancs, to require this would rule out much-needed small-scale development in some villages.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 603  
**Consultee name** Mrs Jackie Liptrott  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** This preferred options strategy is not sound in that it is not effective. The policy options are not deliverable. There is no explanation of how the key economic policies will be delivered or any indication of realistic timescales. There is no indication of delivery mechanisms or of any infrastructure delivery planning. There is scant evidence of action by the local authority to bring forward land for employment or of a committed strategy to co-operate with landowners to deliver Plan options. (S)  
**Outcome** Delivery of the Local Plan is ultimately reliant on the private sector to deliver new housing, employment premises and other development. The Council have liaised with a wide range of stakeholders in considering the deliverability of the Local Plan and will continue to do so throughout the lifetime of the Plan to encourage delivery. However, in the main, the Council will not have a role in bringing forward land for development other than this enabling role, and the Council will not actually deliver new development itself. Issues around delivery and risk are covered in Appendix E of the LPPO. Issues of infrastructure delivery planning are covered in the accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).  
**Officer recommendation** No Action required

---

**ID** 727  
**Consultee name** Mr Ed Dickinson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Would like to see the former "Option A" for a strategic site to the south-east of Ormskirk return. (s)  
**Outcome** See response to Representation 14 from same consultee.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 733  
**Consultee name** Mr Martin Ainscough  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Review the allocation of 100 dwellings mostly in Appley Bridge for the Eastern Parishes over the next 15 years. Re-visit the possibility of development on green belt land in the most sustainable village in the Eastern Parishes - the village of Parbold in the part of PAR03 that is nearest to Parbold. .(S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The LPPO seeks to, as far as possible, limit any impact on the rural character of places such as Parbold and, as stated, there are few opportunities for development within the existing village. In considering where to release Green Belt, the focus was on where would be the most sustainable locations for Green Belt release.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 794  
**Consultee name** Mr Robert W. Pickavance  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** The New Road site is not in the green belt, so should be allocated for residential development before the release of any Green Belt land. (S)  
**Outcome** The Local Plan does not allocate every single housing site but relies on Policy SP1, GN1 and RS1 to guide where new residential development could take place, which includes within the existing village boundary of Rufford.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 851  
**Consultee name** mr steven hopkin  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Consultation process flawed and disappointing 4650 is too many properties 750 homes for Ormskirk would be a disaster The expansion of Edge Hill University should be properly controlled as it is detrimental to people of Ormskirk Planners should dictate to property developers Don't mention Ormskirk by-pass ever again Well done regarding restriction of HMO's in Ormskirk and dropping previous option A (s)  
**Outcome** The housing target has necessarily increased slightly to take account of the latest guidance on setting local housing targets, but the Council has proposed a lower target than may have requested in order to do all it can to preserve the character and environment of the Borough. However, the target cannot be lowered further without being seen to ignore the evidence available to the Council. The Council has made great effort to explain in both this consultation and previous consultations that the target must be based on reasonable evidence and cannot be lowered arbitrarily just because of public objection. Based on the total target for the Borough, 750 new dwellings in Ormskirk with Aughton is very reasonable for a town of the size and sustainability of Ormskirk. Unfortunately, even taking into account sites within the town, this does involve the release of a small amount of Green Belt, but this was necessary somewhere in the Borough and it is better in a sustainable location such as Ormskirk than in a very rural location. The LPPO proposes expansion of the campus at Edge Hill University because there are sound planning reasons for it. The housing target for Skelmersdale with Up Holland has been reduced because it became clear that the previous target was too high and would not be delivered given the effect of the current housing market on the early years of the Plan. Based on historic delivery of housing in the Skelmersdale and Up Holland area, the new target is considered realistic, but still ambitious. While the Council recognise that the Ormskirk Bypass may be challenging to deliver, it is prudent to keep it in the plan in case funding does become available for it. Support for the student accommodation policy and the rejection of "Option A" is noted.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 852  
**Consultee name** mr steven hopkin  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Consultation process flawed and disappointing 4650 is too many properties 750 homes for Ormskirk would be a disaster The expansion of Edge Hill University should be properly controlled as it is detrimental to people of Ormskirk Planners should dictate to property developers Don't mention by-pass ever again Well done regarding restriction of HMO's in Ormskirk and dropping previous option A (s)  
**Outcome** see rep 851  
**Officer recommendation** see rep 851

---

**ID** 876

**Consultee name** Messrs R & J Pickavance                      Messrs R & J Pickavance

**Agent Name** Mr Glyn Bridge    McDyre & Co.

**Nature of response** Support with conditions

**Summary** We are happy with the policy in principle, but some of the details need refining. (S)

**Outcome** Support noted. New development in Rufford is permitted in the LPPO. The Council have been advised by the Environment Agency that they do not favour on-site sewerage works as potential solutions to the strategic waste water treatment issue in West Lancashire because such an approach is at the bottom of the hierarchy for waste water treatment in Circular 10/99. As such, before such an approach is considered, an applicant would need to demonstrate why the other methods of foul sewerage disposal are not acceptable, i.e. why improvements to the United Utilities waste water treatment infrastructure are not acceptable.

**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 925

**Consultee name** Mr Peter Banks

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** Development in Burscough should be incremental and in smaller developments. The Yew Tree Farm site should therefore not be a strategic site, but parts of it, adjacent to existing developments, should be included as smaller incremental developments totalling perhaps 70 dwellings. The Red Cat Lane site should be transferred from 'Plan B' to the main plan and the shortfall of 430 made up by including the three Plan B sites at or near Halsall. Some of the remaining Yew Tree Farm site could then be moved to Plan B. (F)

**Outcome** An option whereby Green Belt release was spread around several smaller sites in different parts of the Borough was considered but would not deliver the critical mass of developer funding required to resolve some of the key infrastructure constraints created by development. Such an option would also spread impact on Green Belt around the Borough, impacting several different locations (most of which would fulfil the purposes of the Green Belt) rather than just one or two (which no longer fulfil the purposes of the Green Belt).

**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 987

**Consultee name** Mr RP Sears    North Meols Parish Councils

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Support

**Summary** The sites below are mentioned in the Local Plan. Policy GN2 - Safeguarded Land, Guinea Hall Lane/Greaves Hall Avenue. Policy EC2 - The Rural Economy, Greaves Hall Avenue/Southport New Road . Policy EC3 - Rural Development Opportunities, Greaves Hall Hospital Site. The Parish Council has no objections to these sites but would wish to see as an alternative to Item 1, the former school site in Hoole Lane, which is rapidly becoming an eyesore in the centre of the village. (F)

**Outcome** Support noted. The former school site in Hoole Lane is within the existing village boundary and comes under the existing and proposed "village centre" designation. Therefore, redevelopment of this site would be permissible in principle if it helped to recreate the village centre that has fallen into decline.

**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 1004  
**Consultee name** Mr Francis Williams Ormskirk Friends of the Earth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Definition of sustainable development needed (S)  
**Outcome** The proposed definition of sustainable development is that which is widely used and also the one utilised in the draft National Planning Policy Framework. Given that it is the clear intention that the NPPF will define sustainable development and given that the Local Plan must be consistent with the NPPF, it would not be appropriate for the Local Plan to set its own definition.  
**Officer recommendation** No action

---

**ID** 1010  
**Consultee name** Mr Francis Williams Ormskirk Friends of the Earth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Change of wording. (S)  
**Outcome** Mitigate was the intended word  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1011  
**Consultee name** Mr Francis Williams Ormskirk Friends of the Earth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The need for a minimum of 4650 new dwellings over the period 2012 – 2027 is questioned. Land in Skelmersdale should be used for housing before other sites in the Borough. Agricultural land needs considering and protecting. The Plan should be aiming to meet the energy needs of our homes, workplaces, education and community centres through local renewable sources consistent with averting the dangers of climate change as defined by international experts. all new developments should be provided with on-site SUDs. (S)  
**Outcome** The Housing target is based upon CLG Household Projections plus the need to make-up the "unmet need" in relation to the Borough's undersupply of housing over recent years compared to the current housing target in the RSS. These projections and targets do not just take account of increasing population, but also changing trends in household formation (i.e. that the occupancy ratio is gradually decreasing). All the evidence assessed by the Council shows that the target proposed is the minimum target that should be set. All available land within existing built-up areas has been taken into account in considering how much Green Belt is required to ensure the housing target is delivered, thereby minimising the amount of Green Belt proposed for release. In assessing which sites in the Green Belt to release, agricultural land quality was one of the factors considered, and so the impact on such land has been minimised. Policy EN1 addresses the Local Plan's approach to delivering low carbon development that addresses the issues raised by climate change.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1012  
**Consultee name** Mr Francis Williams Ormskirk Friends of the Earth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** Whilst re-use of brownfield land is to be welcomed, it should always be developed before any greenfield land is used. Greenfield land that is not in use may have been left deliberately so in order to encourage its development by virtue of its untidiness. All greenfield land should be assessed in terms of its agricultural productivity, or potential contribution to biodiversity.(F)  
**Outcome** Brownfield redevelopment is encouraged in priority to greenfield in the Local Plan, but greenfield land will be required for development during the Local Plan period. In assessing which Green Belt sites to release for development, agricultural land quality was one factor considered.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1014  
**Consultee name** Mr Francis Williams Ormskirk Friends of the Earth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** 4.21 The residential dwellings target deficit, which the borough built up between 2003 and 2012 is not relevant. What is relevant is the borough's current and future needs, and the deficit should not be added.(F)  
**Outcome** Advice in relation to what is expected by Government with regard the historic deficit is that it is relevant and should be made-up as early as possible. Therefore, the proposed Local Plan housing target includes the deficit.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1015  
**Consultee name** Mr Francis Williams Ormskirk Friends of the Earth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The use of employment land for warehousing and distribution centres should be avoided, as it has such a low yield of jobs. Again, employment land should be directed away from sites of high agricultural potential. (F)  
**Outcome** The Local Plan does not completely rule out large-scale warehousing and distribution developments, but the type of employment land allocated means that there is limited scope for such development in the existing employment areas of West Lancashire.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---



**ID** 1016  
**Consultee name** Mr Francis Williams Ormskirk Friends of the Earth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** We believe that there should be a presumption in favour of renewable energy developments, even in the green belt, and they should be prevented only where it can be shown that other factors outweigh that presumption. (F)  
**Outcome** Policy EN1 provides the more detailed proposed Local Plan policy on this topic. Part 2 (iv) of Policy EN1 provides a similar policy as that proposed above.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 1020  
**Consultee name** Mr Francis Williams Ormskirk Friends of the Earth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** We agree that the borough's biodiversity, landscape, heritage and green infrastructure assets should be protected and enhanced wherever possible. We believe that an increase in biodiversity could be managed easily by a move away from maintaining open spaces in the borough as ryegrass monocultures, and that new developments, even industrial, should be used to enhance biodiversity. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** no action

---

**ID** 1023  
**Consultee name** Mr D Rimmer  
**Agent Name** Mr Chris Cockwill Cockwill & Co  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** We support the increase in dwellings proposed for the Northern Parishes, but restraining development due to insufficient infrastructure is counter productive. Development should be allowed provided it does not place undue pressure on infrastructure unless it can be shown that mitigation measures can be introduced to relieve that pressure. (F)  
**Outcome** Essentially, given that the housing target is a minimum figure, new development within the village boundaries in the Northern Parishes will be permitted (even if the housing target has already been met) as long as it can be demonstrated that the local infrastructure can cope with the development or that mitigation will be delivered to off-set any impact of the development on infrastructure.  
**Officer recommendation** no action required

---

**ID** 1129  
**Consultee name** Mr Ed Dickinson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Reconsider the Ormskirk option (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Representation 14 from same consultee.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1225  
**Consultee name** Mr PF McLaughlin  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support the plan. (S)  
**Outcome** Support noted  
**Officer recommendation** No Action

---

**ID** 1238  
**Consultee name** Ms Karen Martindale  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Query housing figures. Lower figures suggested (S)  
**Outcome** The housing target proposed in the Local Plan Preferred Options is considered the minimum target that can be proposed and that a Planning Inspector would consider "sound". The CLG Household Projections (260 a year) are widely considered the minimum basis for housing targets and there has been clear guidance from Inspectors at Examinations that the historic undersupply in relation to the RSS must also be taken account of. Guidance on housing targets is also clear that they should be minimum targets. However, the Council have taken into account infrastructure constraints and the need to regenerate Skelmersdale, and so over half of the housing target will be delivered in the Skelmersdale with Up Holland spatial area.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

<b>ID</b>	1257
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Gareth Jones                      N W Skelmersdale Landowners
<b>Agent Name</b>	Mr Gareth Robert Jones              Scott Wilson
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	The spatial approach promoted in the 'Preferred Options' is considered to be fundamentally flawed. Consequently the proposed policy concept must be 'unsound'. (s)
<b>Outcome</b>	Green Belt release on the edge of Skelmersdale was ruled out for two connected reasons. Firstly, given feedback in the previous consultation, it is even more evident that the market can only deliver so much residential development in the Skelmersdale with Up Holland spatial area. Therefore, the housing target for Skelmersdale with Up Holland does not require Green Belt land to be released to be delivered. Secondly, given the first point, if Green Belt was released on the edge of Skelmersdale, it would create a very real risk that such easy to develop greenfield land would be delivered by the market instead of brownfield sites in need of regeneration. Therefore, maintaining the Green Belt around Skelmersdale with Up Holland ensures that one of the five purposes of the Green Belt is fulfilled - to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Based on discussions with landowners and developers in the areas where Green Belt release is proposed and with infrastructure providers, the Council are confident that the necessary infrastructure can be provided as part of development proposals for those sites or by the statutory providers of that infrastructure. Whilst the majority of employment opportunities based in the Borough are located in Skelmersdale, travel to work patterns in the Borough show only a very small percentage of residents in other parts of the Borough commute to Skelmersdale with Up Holland. Based upon the available evidence, the Council believes that its proposals within the Local Plan Preferred Options are both deliverable and sustainable. The land to the North West of Skelmersdale proposed as an alternative location wholly fulfils several purposes of the Green Belt and is less sustainable than the options proposed. Given anticipated need over this plan period, and in the absence of a strategic sub-regional Green Belt review, there is no need to take further land out of the Green Belt for safeguarding at this time.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change

---

**ID** 1258

**Consultee name** Mr Andrew Thorley Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Agent Name** Miss Caroline Simpson Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners

**Nature of response** Support with conditions

**Summary** Broad support for the housing target and distribution across the Borough as set out in SP1 and support for the recognition of the need to release Green Belt land. However, objections to: a) only including Grove Farm (south) as a housing allocation b) the restriction of development at Grove Farm until 2020 due to waste water infrastructure requirements c) the delay of housing delivery in Ormskirk to allow sites within built-up areas to be built first d) the over-reliance on Skelmersdale for delivering housing supply

**Outcome** Support noted a) see rep 1259 against Policy RS1 b) The restriction on development on greenfield sites in Ormskirk, Burscough, Rufford and parts of Scarisbrick because of the waste water treatment infrastructure constraint is caveated in Policy SP1 by stating that such development sites could be brought forward in advance of 2020 "subject to the provision of the appropriate infrastructure required for the development proposals". However, the Council have been advised by the Environment Agency that they do not favour on-site sewerage works as potential solutions to the strategic waste water treatment issue in West Lancashire because such an approach is at the bottom of the hierarchy for waste water treatment in Circular 10/99. As such, before such an approach is considered, an applicant would need to demonstrate why the other methods of foul sewerage disposal are not acceptable, i.e. why improvements to the United Utilities waste water treatment infrastructure are not acceptable. c) Ultimately, the Council would prefer to see housing delivered within built-up areas first, and this coincides with the waste water treatment infrastructure constraint. However, if the constraint is resolved sooner, then allocated development on the edge of the built-up area would not be prevented. d) The Council have reduced the target for Skelmersdale with Up Holland by 600 dwellings since the last consultation on the Core Strategy Preferred Options and believe that this reduction accounts for the slow housing market that is anticipated at the start of the Local Plan period. Looking over the last 20 years, housing delivery in Skelmersdale with Up Holland has been above 160 dwellings per annum on several occasions, even exceeding 200 dwellings on one occasion. Therefore, while development rates may be lower than 160 dwellings a year initially, they have the potential to rise above 160 dwellings a year in the latter part of the Plan period, especially with the encouragement of a regenerated town centre and opportunities to develop both within and on the edge of the town.

**Officer recommendation** No change required except recommendation for rep 1259 against Policy RS1

---

**ID** 1302

**Consultee name** Mrs Margaret Wiltshire CPRE (West Lancs Group)

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Observations

**Summary** para 4.1 Should we still be talking about City Regions ? Have not L.E.P.s superceded them ? [Also p 41, para 4.13 ] (F)

**Outcome** Even though the RSS is due to be revoked and LEPs have come into existence, the term City Region is still appropriate as a description of the three functional areas that West Lancashire is strategically located on the edge of. However, reference to the LEPs may be beneficial here.

**Officer recommendation** Add reference to LEPs in to para 4.1

---

<b>ID</b>	1349
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Roger Bell
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Support
<b>Summary</b>	In terms of Skelmersdale, we believe strongly that regeneration of the town centre is fundamental to making the town an attractive place to live. Further, the provision of much better transport links to Liverpool and Manchester is essential. It is vital that at the end of this Plan period, Skelmersdale is regarded in a much more positive light and that subsequent Local Plans are not handicapped by house builders' reluctance to build there. (f)
<b>Outcome</b>	Comments noted
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change required

---

<b>ID</b>	1350	
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Roger Bell	OPSTA
<b>Agent Name</b>		
<b>Nature of response</b>	Support	
<b>Summary</b>	OPSTA supports the concept of these developments, together with ancillary lesser developments elsewhere in the borough. (s)	
<b>Outcome</b>	Support noted	
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No action required	

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Policy SP1**

**Title: A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire**

---

**ID** 17

**Consultee name** Mr Howard Courtley Courtley Consultants Ltd

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** Framework fails to identify Southport as a Regional Town. Change housing figure. Review exclusion of Plan B sites from the main strategy. Objectio to housing backlog being spread over plan period, instead it should be pre-loaded to the first 5 years of the plan. Fine Janes Farm should be taken from the Plan B sites and moved to the main part of the plan, as it is brownfield land and fits in with the priorities to regenerate sites first before using greenfield sites. (S)

**Outcome** The Local Plan has been prepared with the full knowledge that Southport (along with other parts of Sefton) is a significant provider of services for the western parts of West Lancashire and this has informed the Local Plan strategy. However, despite proximity to Southport, the Western Parishes are still rural in nature and so development must be carefully planned and limited to protect the rural character of the area. The Local Plan Preferred Options proposes a distinction between its preferred development strategy / allocations and its "Plan B" to limit the amount of Green Belt land to be developed and encourage the development of brownfield sites in the urban areas and existing villages. If there was no distinction between the preferred strategy and "Plan B", more Green Belt land would be lost to development than may be needed to satisfy local housing targets, possibly instead of brownfield sites in urban areas. The Local Plan Preferred Options proposes to spread delivery of the 750 dwelling "backlog" over the entire Plan period to set realistic targets, especially for the first 5 years of the Local Plan. The Council acknowledges the need to make up this "backlog" but do not believe that the housing market, in its current condition, would be able to deliver 260 + 150 dwellings per year over the first 5 years of the Plan, especially when compared to what has been delivered in the Borough over the last 5 years. In relation to the Fine Jane's Farm site specifically, the Council consider it to be a "greenfield" site (as well as being in the Green Belt) because its former use was agricultural. The edge of Southport was considered as a location for Green Belt release for the preferred strategy, but it was felt that more strategic developments on the edge of the Borough's Key Service Centres would bring more benefits to the Borough and better meet West Lancashire needs (see Technical Paper 1).

**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 61

**Consultee name** Mr Anthony Northcote Plannig and Local Authority Liason, The Coal Authority

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Support with conditions

**Summary** Recommendation for change of wording to acknowledge surface coal resources are present in West Lancs but otherwise supported. (S)

**Outcome** Proposed wording in SP1 requires all development proposals to be assessed as to whether they would cause sterilisation of mineral resources and for any such issues to be mitigated prior to development. Therefore, any such issues relating to coal resources under greenfield sites around Skelmersdale would be addressed by this wording in SP1.

**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 75

**Consultee name** Alan Syder

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** No land should be released from Green Belt. This land should be protected for future food production and central government housing targets should recognise this and balance growth with the need for agricultural land. All brownfield sites should be used first before greenfield sites, even those that are deemed undesirable.

**Outcome** The Local Plan needs to be compliant and consistent with national planning policy in order to be found "sound". Therefore, the Local Plan needs to ensure it delivers sufficient housing to be considered consistent with national planning policy and household projections. The Local Plan does include all brownfield sites within existing towns and villages, but even taking these into account, a small amount of Green Belt is still required to meet the housing targets for the Local Plan period. Other than the small amount of land to be released from Green Belt, the remainder of Green Belt and agricultural land (over 90% of the Borough) will remain protected from development for the Local Plan period.

**Officer recommendation** No Action required

---

**ID** 90

**Consultee name** Church Commissioners For England

**Agent Name** Miss Jennifer Hadland Smiths Gore

**Nature of response** Support with conditions

**Summary** The Church Commissioners for England support the identification of Halsall and Haskayne as Rural Sustainable Villages in the Settlement Hierarchy. However, there is concern regarding the restricted development potential in such settlements. In addition, there is no proposed new development for employment sites within the Western Parishes. This leads to the risk of the settlements within the Western Parishes declining further. As such, we question whether the proposed underdevelopment will have an adverse risk on the future of the settlements within the Western Parishes and their communities. (S)

**Outcome** The Local Plan Preferred Options does enable development within the existing villages around the Borough (including Haskayne and Halsall), although it does restrict development in the least sustainable villages. However, expansion of these villages into the Green Belt is resisted in order to retain the rural character of those villages and locate the release of Green Belt to the most sustainable locations. Policies EC1, EC2 and EC3 do encourage employment developments in rural areas and, although there is not a specific allocation for employment in the Western Parishes, the principle of employment development within an existing village would be permitted as long as it was consistent with other proposed Local Plan policies.

**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 108  
**Consultee name** Ms Julie Hotchkiss Ashton, Leigh & Wigan Primary Care Trust  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support the strategic aims and think the plan is sound. Support new housing, including affordable, specialised and elderly accommodation. Need to consider ways of adapting to climate change, including reducing the dependence on cars. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 243  
**Consultee name** Ms Judith Nelson English Heritage  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** We note that the policy includes the protection and enhancement of heritage assets and suggest that where sites are allocated which have potential impacts upon heritage assets appropriate mitigation measures are specified in the document (S).  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** Amend SP3 to include reference for development to consider impact on heritage assets and implement appropriate mitigation measures.

---

**ID** 312  
**Consultee name** J Briethaupt  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** I oppose any release of Green Belt land . the Local Plan should not attempt to change the present Green Belt boundaries around Ormskirk, Burscough or UpHolland and it should instead seek to divert to Skelmersdale (S)  
**Outcome** All available and suitable land within the existing built-up areas of the Borough have been considered but there is insufficient land within the built-up areas to deliver the housing and employment land targets. Therefore, unfortunately, a small amount of Green Belt release somewhere in the Borough is necessary.  
**Officer recommendation** no action

---



**ID** 376  
**Consultee name** Mr Andy Pringle ICD / Maharishi Community  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** The release of green belt as part of managing the developemnt of settlements is a necessary process and we fully support the policy. (S)  
**Outcome** Land at Victoria Park, Burscough (the football ground) is not within the Green Belt, but land to the west and north of the football ground is. Assuming a mixed-use redevelopment in this location involved the release of some Green Belt land, the Council would have concern as to whether this site would be the most appropriate location for Green Belt release. Green Belt in this location was appraised as a potential "Plan B" site (see Technical Paper 1) but was found to be less suitable than other sites even for "Plan B". This was due to a lack of strong boundary to amend the Green Belt boundary to, the fact that the land fulfils at least one purpose of the Green Belt and concerns over highway access. However, it is recognised that the site is in a sustainable location. The principle of redeveloping land in this location for a mixed-use development without utilising Green Belt land is not ruled out by the Local Plan Preferred Options (because it is in the settlement boundary) but there would need to be certainty regarding where the Football Club and the Leisure facilities would be relocated to and development would need to ensure that it did not impact negatively on the vitality of Burscough town centre.  
**Officer recommendation** Without new evidence to justify Green Belt release in this location and without certainty on potential proposals for redevelopment within the settlement boundary, this land should not be allocated in the Local Plan for mixed-use redevelopment.

---

**ID** 498  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Chapter 4 Policy SP1 Table page 38 -Regional Towns are a concept from RSS. See also para 4.15 and 4.16 on page 42. (F)  
**Outcome** While the phrase "regional town" was used in the RSS, it's meaning is still relevant - Skelmersdale is a town that has significance within the North West region and this should be acknowledged within, and inform policy within, the Local Plan.  
**Officer recommendation** No change necessary

---

**ID** 499  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Chapter 4 Policy SP1 Table page 38 - Skelmersdale is a relatively small town which has little importance beyond West Lancashire. It does not rank highly alongside neighbouring large towns Wigan, St Helens and Southport. Its need for regeneration is not disputed but that does not qualify the town for an inflated position. (F)  
**Outcome** It is the Council's view, and also the view of 4NW and NWDA until they ceased to exist, that Skelmersdale is a town of regional significance. Clearly, it is not of the same significance as towns such as Southport, Wigan or St Helens at this time, but with regeneration may come to compete on a more even basis with those towns. Crucially, the distinction being made in the Table with Policy SP1 is that, compared to the other Key Service Centres of Ormskirk with Aughton and Burscough, Skelmersdale has greater regional significance and is the most appropriate location for new development in the Borough.  
**Officer recommendation** No change necessary

---

**ID** 500  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Chapter 4 Policy SP1 Table page 38 - The lists are inconsistent and incomplete. They omit areas of Lathom (including Lathom South PC) completely but include very small settlements such as Stanley Gate. (F)  
**Outcome** Lathom South Parish is not a settlement, but an administrative area. Settlements listed in the Table in SP1 were limited to those not washed over by the Green Belt. The only area of land not washed over by the Green Belt in Lathom and Lathom South is the land directly adjacent to the western edge of Skelmersdale bounded by Spa Lane, Firwood Road and Ormskirk Road (A577), including those properties on the south side of Ormskirk Road. This land is contiguous with the Skelmersdale urban area and includes XL Business Park (a functioning part of the wider Stanley Industrial Estate in Skelmersdale), the land proposed to be allocated between Firwood Road and Neverstitch Road for housing (and which may well have its primary access onto Neverstitch Road in Skelmersdale) and the existing residential properties on Ormskirk Road and Firwood Road. Therefore, while virtually all this land may, administratively, be within Lathom South, functionally and spatially it is a part of the Skelmersdale urban area and not an independent settlement.  
**Officer recommendation** No change necessary

---

**ID** 501  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Chapter 4 Policy SP1 page 40 1st paragraph - The "appropriate infrastructure improvements" referred to for Edge Hill are highways improvements already approved by the council in planning application 2011/0504. However, expansion of the campus includes the provision of over 800 units of student accommodation (including 384 units approved under planning application 2011/1079). These 800+ units of accommodation use the same waste water infrastructure as the rest of Ormskirk, so why are they being allowed to go ahead, when housing developments are to be held back? (F)  
**Outcome** A condition on the planning permissions relating to Edge Hill University require the plans for drainage of the site to be approved by United Utilities and the Environment Agency prior to development commencing.  
**Officer recommendation** No action

---

**ID** 551  
**Consultee name** Mr Simon Artiss Bellway Homes Ltd  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Concern about ability to deliver target for Ormskirk without further allocations, and that further Plan B sites around Ormskirk are required. Support for a Strategic Site at St Helens Road / Alty's Lane, Ormskirk. (s)  
**Outcome** The 750 dwelling target for Ormskirk with Aughton includes for known sites within the existing built-up area of Ormskirk with Aughton, as identified by the SHLAA or that already have planning permission. The Local Plan deliberately does not allocate every single housing site within the the settlement boundaries, but relies on Policy GN1, which, read together with SP1 and RS1, clearly accepts the principle of residential development within the settlement boundaries of the more sustainable settlements. The "Plan B" addresses a borough-wide issue of flexibility in housing delivery and only seeks to ensure that the borough-wide housing target is ultimately met. It does not seek to ensure each individual target for each spatial area is met. Therefore, in identifying "Plan B" sites, there was no requirement to ensure each spatial area had a certain number of sites, but simply to identify the best sites available and ensure a degree of distribution around the Borough. A Strategic Site to the south-east of Ormskirk has been explored previously and consulted upon. It is the Council's view that the potential severity of the negative impacts associated with this option outweigh the potential positive impacts.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 552  
**Consultee name** Mr Simon Artiss Bellway Homes Ltd  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** There should be an extra 20% on top of the housing allocation and Plan B sites. (S)  
**Outcome** With regard to the emerging National Planning Policy Framework, the extra 20% applies only to the 5-year housing land supply, and latest guidance from CLG has made it explicitly clear that this 20% does not apply to the full 15-year target, nor should it mean that said target should increase.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action required

---

<b>ID</b>	582
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Robin Buckley                      Redrow Homes (Lancs) Ltd
<b>Agent Name</b>	Mr Tony McAteer
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	<p>a) Paragraph 4.5 must make clear that all opportunities to maximise the use of non Green Belt land have been made and that GB release is in the most appropriate location. b) Less GB should be released at Burscough, more at Ormskirk, and non-GB land should be released at Banks. c) Policy SP1 is overly long and complicated. It should be split into three policies. d) Support for Banks as a Key Sustainable Village. It can accommodate new development within its boundaries. e) The overall housing figure is unsound. Based on RSS figures plus 20% slippage allowance, it should be 6,480 dwellings over the life of the Plan. f) The figure for Skelmersdale should be reduced to 140 per annum (2100 dwellings). g) There should be more development in the N Parishes in the early part of the plan period. h) The housing requirement should not be staggered. (S)</p>
<b>Outcome</b>	<p>a) In arriving at the preferred strategy, the desire to minimise release of Green Belt was a key consideration, but it was not the only consideration. Sustainability, infrastructure provision and the environment were key factors, as was preserving and enhancing the Borough's rural character wherever possible. Therefore, the preferred strategy does maximise opportunities to use non-Green Belt land first, but only where good planning in terms of sustainability, infrastructure, the environment and maintaining the character of the Borough allow. To this end, there are large areas of non-Green Belt land in the Northern Parishes around Tarleton, Hesketh Bank and Banks that have not been considered suitable as allocations for development because of these other factors. b) The reason why more non-Green Belt land in Banks has not been included in the preferred strategy has been addressed in (a) above. In relation to whether less Green Belt land should be released at Burscough in favour of more Green Belt land being released around Ormskirk, both these settlements are Key Service Centres and are sustainable locations for Green Belt release and so, while it is acknowledged that Ormskirk with Aughton is clearly a larger town, both have the capacity to take significant Green Belt release. Therefore, in identifying which specific sites should be released from the Green Belt, the debate became focused around site-specific matters, rather than a debate between Ormskirk and Burscough in general. From a site-specific perspective, the Yew Tree Farm site in Burscough was found to be the most suitable site for Green Belt release, followed by the Grove Farm site in Ormskirk. c) Observations noted and duly considered. SP1 will be reviewed to consider whether it could be simplified or split into two or more policies. d) Support for Banks as a Key Sustainable Village is noted. The Council are keen to see an appropriate level of development within the village given its status in the settlement hierarchy. However, this level of development must be managed due to the severe constraints on the village. Aside from flood risk, the village is constrained by severe drainage issues, has few local services and poor access by public transport. Therefore, the Local Plan is purposefully formulated such that the focus of new development in Banks should be the brownfield former Greaves Hall Hospital sites in the south of the village but limits significant levels of development over and above this due to the various constraints affecting the village. e) While the RSS is currently still a part of the Development Plan for the Borough, it is widely expected to be revoked by the Government in the near future, and before this Local Plan will be submitted for Examination. Therefore, with this in mind, the Council deemed it prudent to explore other evidence as well as that used in setting the RSS housing target to identify the "right" target for West Lancashire over the next 15 years. In setting this target, the Council had regard to wanting to see a sustainable level of growth in the Borough, that delivers what is needed to meet the projected increase in households, as well as that perceived unmet need from the RSS period. It is the Council's view that it is right to set a more realistic and achievable target than that set by the RSS (which was set in anticipation of sustained economic growth at pre-2007 levels). However, given that the housing target is a minimum target, if the market can deliver more housing than the target, development will be supported as long as it adheres to other aspects of the Local Plan. With regard to the emerging National Planning Policy Framework, the 20% "slippage" applies only to the 5-year housing land supply, and latest guidance from CLG has made it explicitly clear that this 20% does not apply to the full 15-year target, nor should it mean that said target should increase. f) The Council have reduced the target for Skelmersdale with Up Holland by 600 dwellings since the last consultation on the Core Strategy Preferred Options and believe that this reduction accounts for the slow housing market that is anticipated at the start of the Local Plan period. Looking over the last 20 years, housing delivery in Skelmersdale with Up Holland has been above 160 dwellings per annum on</p>

several occasions, even exceeding 200 dwellings on one occasion. Therefore, while development rates may be lower than 160 dwellings a year initially, they have the potential to rise above 160 dwellings a year in the latter part of the Plan period, especially with the encouragement of a regenerated town centre and opportunities to develop both within and on the edge of the town. g) While the town centre regeneration in Skelmersdale will undoubtedly improve much-needed service provision, actual infrastructure provision in Skelmersdale is better than elsewhere in the Borough. The Northern Parishes, as already discussed above, do suffer from severe infrastructure and service constraints and therefore should not be targeted for more development. However, what levels of development that have been proposed in the Northern Parishes in the LPP0 could come forward in the early part of the Plan period, as long as necessary infrastructure improvements are made prior to development. h) Much as with (e) above, the Council propose to stagger the housing target over the Plan period in order to set a realistic target against which to measure the Local Plan. It is anticipated that housing delivery will remain slow over the early part of the Local Plan and gradually rise over the Plan period. Therefore, the Council proposes a lower annual target initially that then rises to an above average annual target in the latter part of the Plan period. This gradual rise in housing targets also allows for the time needed to rectify the key infrastructure issues in the Borough, such as the waste water treatment issue which precludes development on large greenfield sites in the Ormskirk and Burscough areas. Again, as with (e) above, these annual targets are minimum targets. If the market can deliver at higher rates than the initial annual targets, development will still be permitted as long as it adheres to the rest of the Local Plan.

**Officer recommendation** Detail on specific issues in SP1 that are covered elsewhere in the Local Plan will be reduced to avoid duplication and to simplify SP1.

**ID** 749

**Consultee name** Mr William Robinson

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Observations

**Summary** Support Green Belt release for housing development and propose new site for Green Belt release for housing development off School Lane, Up Holland (s)

**Outcome** No Green Belt release around Skelmersdale with Up Holland is required for the preferred strategy because there is sufficient land not within the Green Belt in this urban area to meet the housing target set. School Lane site was not considered specifically for either preferred strategy or "Plan B" because the Green Belt in this location forms an important function to help distinguish between the settlements of Up Holland and Orrell.

**Officer recommendation** No change

**ID** 795  
**Consultee name** Mr Robert W. Pickavance  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** 1) Rufford should be classified as a Key Sustainable Village; 2) Development should be encouraged in the New Road site, which is not greenbelt, and is a suitable housing site; 3) The Preferred Option should include "dispersal" (Option 4 from the Issues and Options stage). (S)  
**Outcome** Based upon the sustainability and size of the village of Rufford, it is correctly designated as a Rural Sustainable Village in SP1. The Local Plan does not allocate every single housing site but relies on Policy SP1, GN1 and RS1 to guide where new residential development could take place, which includes within the existing village boundary of Rufford. Such sites have already been taken into account in calculating how much Green Belt land is required. The Dispersal Option at Issues & Options stage of the Core Strategy was not widely supported, nor was it especially sustainable.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 840  
**Consultee name** Anglo International Up Holland Ltd  
**Agent Name** Ms Lorraine Davison DPP  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Ask that the main developed areas of St Joseph's College and related areas of land be taken out of Green Belt, so as to facilitate new residential development that would enable the conversion and reuse of the listed building. An alternative would be to give consideration to designating the site a major developed site in Green Belt or similar. (S)  
**Outcome** 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. However, this would not automatically mean that it would be granted permission because the specific justification for the particular enabling development proposed would need to be assessed. Even though the special circumstances discussed above have been shown to justify exceptional circumstances for 'enabling' development in the Green Belt, the land still fulfils the purposes of being within the Green Belt and so it is not considered appropriate to release the land at St Joseph's college from the Green Belt. This is especially the case given that the removal of the college from the Green Belt would create an isolated area of land inset into the Green Belt, physically separate from the rest of Up Holland. This would leave a relatively small area of Green Belt between Up Holland and St Joseph's College enclosed on two and half sides and so not really fulfilling the purposes of the Green Belt.  
**Officer recommendation** No Change

---

**ID** 860  
**Consultee name** Mr Philip Carter Environment Agency  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** The fourth paragraph of this policy states that development on Greenfield sites in Ormskirk, Burscough, Rufford and Scarisbrick will be restricted by a waste water treatment infrastructure issue until 2020. If this restriction would apply to Brownfield sites in the same area, the word 'Greenfield' should be deleted from this paragraph in the submission version of the Local Plan. (F)  
**Outcome** Development in general within the New Lane WWTW drainage catchment is clearly restricted until improvements have been made. The distinction between greenfield and brownfield relates to the surface water runoff improvements likely on brownfield sites that could result in betterment through less overall waste water in the system. However, foul from development will always result in additional pressure on treatment capacity. The issue is that other legislation allows for this to be remedied and the Local Plan should not be overly restrictive in this sense. However, the need for the Plan to be realistic and deliverable has resulted in the policy essentially prioritising development on brownfield sites in general and in particular within the New Lane WWTW catchment. It is hoped that this restriction will limit the impact on the waste water infrastructure to allow time and funding to remedy this issue.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 862  
**Consultee name** Mr Philip Carter Environment Agency  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Propose new wording in Policy SP1 in relation to flood risk. (s)  
**Outcome** Proposed new wording noted.  
**Officer recommendation** Amend wording on flood risk policy as proposed. Flood risk policy will be relocated to Policy GN3 as part of simplifying Policy SP1, based on other recommendations.

---

**ID** 866  
**Consultee name** Escalibur Ltd  
**Agent Name** Mr Alban Cassidy CA Planning  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The plan fails to take into account the constraints on the main settlements in the Borough over the next 5-10 years. To off set this, the figure for development in the Eastern Parishes should be increased to take advantage of the opportunities for sustainable development in villages such as Appley Bridge where there are local services and sustainable transport options available. (S)  
**Outcome** The Council have taken into account constraints across the Borough in preparing the Local Plan. The strategy proposed reflects all such constraints. Appley Bridge has several sites within the existing village, including the allocated rural development opportunity at East Quarry (Policy EC3), that can contribute toward delivering the 100 dwelling target for housing in the Eastern Parishes, as well as delivering employment development. Given the rural nature of Appley Bridge, and its lack of services, Green Belt release in this location would not be sustainable.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

<b>ID</b>	958
<b>Consultee name</b>	Wainhomes Developments
<b>Agent Name</b>	Mr Stephen Harris
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	1. The Plan period should extend to 2029, as the Plan should cover at least 15 years from the date of adoption. 2. Generally support the settlement hierarchy, although consideration should be given to designating Rufford a Key Sustainable Village. 3. The housing distribution has an over-reliance on Skelmersdale. 4. The housing requirement should be higher: 310 dwellings per annum must be a minimum, and 620 added for 2027-2029. 5. The RSS shortfall should be made up at the beginning of the Plan period, not the end. The proposed phasing of the housing requirement (260, 320, 350) is not considered appropriate. (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	1) While it is recognised that, ideally, the start date of the Local Plan should coincide with the adoption of the document, given a slippage in timescales for preparation due to the need to reconsult on strategic changes to the proposed policies following the previous consultation, this will not happen for the Local Plan DPD. However, to alter the Plan period (and so add to the housing and employment land targets and therefore increase the release of Green Belt for new development) would constitute yet another strategic change, resulting in an other delay to the preparation of the Local Plan DPD. 2) Support noted. Based upon the sustainability and size of the village of Rufford, it is correctly designated as a Rural Sustainable Village in SP1. 3) The Council have reduced the target for Skelmersdale with Up Holland by 600 dwellings since the last consultation on the Core Strategy Preferred Options and believe that this reduction accounts for the slow housing market that is anticipated at the start of the Local Plan period and provides a realistic target for Skelmersdale with Up Holland. Looking over the last 20 years, housing delivery in Skelmersdale with Up Holland has been above 160 dwellings per annum on several occasions, even exceeding 200 dwellings on one occasion. Therefore, while development rates may be lower than 160 dwellings a year initially, they have the potential to rise above 160 dwellings a year in the latter part of the Plan period, especially with the encouragement of a regenerated town centre and opportunities to develop both within and on the edge of the town. 4) While the RSS is currently still a part of the Development Plan for the Borough, it is widely expected to be revoked by the Government in the near future, and before this Local Plan will be submitted for Examination. Therefore, with this in mind, the Council deemed it prudent to explore other evidence as well as that used in setting the RSS housing target to identify the "right" target for West Lancashire over the next 15 years. In setting this target, the Council had regard to wanting to see a sustainable level of growth in the Borough, that delivers what is needed to meet the projected increase in households, as well as that perceived unmet need from the RSS period. It is the Council's view that it is right to set a more realistic and achievable target than that set by the RSS (which was set in anticipation of sustained economic growth at pre-2007 levels). This realism is demonstrated by the gradual decrease in figures for West Lancashire in the household projections over the past decade. The proposed target is only reflecting the recent trend shown by the household projections and which demonstrates that the RSS target is now out-of-date. However, given that the housing target is a minimum target, if the market can deliver more housing than the target, development will be supported as long as it adheres to other aspects of the Local Plan. 5) the Council propose to stagger the housing target over the Plan period in order to set a realistic target against which to measure the Local Plan. It is anticipated that housing delivery will remain slow over the early part of the Local Plan and gradually rise over the Plan period. Therefore, the Council proposes a lower annual target initially that then rises to an above average annual target in the latter part of the Plan period. This gradual rise in housing targets also allows for the time needed to rectify the key infrastructure issues in the Borough, such as the waste water treatment issue which precludes development on large greenfield sites in the Ormskirk and Burscough areas. Again, as above, these annual targets are minimum targets. If the market can deliver at higher rates than the initial annual targets, development will still be permitted as long as it adheres to the rest of the Local Plan. Sites such as Chequer Lane, Up Holland and Sluice Lane, Rufford, if they conform with all policies in the Local Plan, would not be held back.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No action necessary



**ID** 962

**Consultee name** Wainhomes Developments

**Agent Name** Mr Stephen Harris

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** 1. The Plan period should extend to 2029, as the Plan should cover at least 15 years from the date of adoption. 2. Generally support the settlement hierarchy, although consideration should be given to designating Rufford a Key Sustainable Village. 3. The housing distribution has an over-reliance on Skelmersdale. 4. Ormskirk should have at least 1,150 dwellings. 5. The housing requirement should be higher: 310 dwellings per annum must be a minimum, and 620 added for 2027-2029. 6. The RSS shortfall should be made up at the beginning of the Plan period, not the end. The proposed phasing of the housing requirement (260, 320, 350) is not considered appropriate. (S)

**Outcome** See response to Rep 958 for comments 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6. 4) The size of the existing settlement cannot be the main determining factor in where development should go. While Ormskirk is a sustainable settlement and a Key Service Centre, so is Burscough (which also suffers from less negative traffic issues). Therefore, site-specific assessment of different locations around Ormskirk with Aughton and Burscough informed which sites should be released from the Green Belt for the preferred strategy. Parr's Lane in Aughton was assessed as a potential location but its semi-rural location and remoteness from the town centre counted against it, together with potential impact on unclassified roads unsuitable for high volumes of traffic, and so other sites were found to be more suitable. However, the site has been proposed for Plan B.

**Officer recommendation** no change required

---

**ID** 965

**Consultee name** Skelmersdale Limited Partnership

**Agent Name** Mr Paul Singleton Turley Associates

**Nature of response** Support with conditions

**Summary** SLP considers that it is both important and appropriate that the Local Plan 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, subject to the need for a development to support the existing town centre/Concourse Centre, rather than creating a new centre being made clear.(S)

**Outcome** Support noted. Through Policy SP2, the Local Plan seeks to deliver an integrated masterplan for Skelmersdale town centre that not only creates new retail and leisure opportunities but supports the existing facilities, such as the Concourse. However, it is agreed that Policy SP1 would be more robust if it makes reference to improvements to the Town Centre rather than a new town centre.

**Officer recommendation** Delete the second bullet of paragraph 4.16 and replace with: The existing town centre needs to be radically improved and expanded to provide modern and accessible retail, leisure and entertainment facilities in the District's only Regional Town (see Polic

---

**ID** 967  
**Consultee name** Strategy and Policy Group Lancashire County Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** The expansion of Edge Hill University is supported subject to the provision of appropriate infrastructure improvements (and Policy EC4). Within this policy, the potential release of land from greenbelt (10ha) at Edge Hill for new university buildings, car parking and a new access road is supported given the context of the economic importance of the University. (F)  
**Outcome** support noted  
**Officer recommendation** no action

---

**ID** 980  
**Consultee name** Strategy and Policy Group Lancashire County Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** The County Council, as the education provider, supports the need to provide good quality education. It is important that the plan recognises that planned increased housing provisions will need to be matched with an appropriate amount of education provision. (F)  
**Outcome** The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) has been prepared with input from County Council in their role as education provider, and the need to deliver new education facilities in certain parts of the Borough as development takes place is acknowledged.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 982  
**Consultee name** Mr Andy Pringle Ideal Community Developments  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** To include Victoria Park, Burscough in the green belt release for mixed use residential development in conjunction with Burscough Football Ground for approximately 100 units. This on the basis that the sports and recreation will be relocated to an alternative suitable location. o This will strengthen the commercial centre of Burscough and improve the throughput of retail in the town centre. It will enable an improved sports facility at Abbey Lane with better access and facilities. (F)  
**Outcome** See response to rep 376 from same consultee  
**Officer recommendation** Without new evidence to justify Green Belt release in this location and without certainty on potential proposals for redevelopment within the settlement boundary, this land should not be allocated in the Local Plan for mixed-use redevelopment.

---

**ID** 984  
**Consultee name** Clerk to Aughton Parish Council Irene Roberts Aughton Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Aughton Parish Council's comments in respect of the above: \*PLAN B POLICY SP1 – A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire ' Should monitoring of residential and employment completions show that development targets for the Local Plan period are not being delivered due to unforeseen circumstances or if new evidence emerges that demonstrates a need to increase development targets, the Council may choose to enact all or part of the 'Plan B' set out in the Local Plan by releasing land for development that has been removed from the GREEN BELT and \*\*SAFEGUARDED for this purpose.' (F)  
**Outcome** Consultee Response to be read in conjunction with rep 985 (relating to Policy GN2)  
**Officer recommendation** See Rep 985 (relating to Policy GN2)

---

**ID** 1017  
**Consultee name** Sainsburys Supermarkets Ltd  
**Agent Name** Ms Anna Noble Turley Associates  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Sainsbury's support Preferred Policy SP1 which seeks to ensure that new development takes place within the defined settlement boundaries and in accordance with the settlement hierarchy. Sainsbury's also support the aim to direct new development towards the Key Service Centres of Skelmersdale with Up Holland, Ormskirk with Aughton and Burscough. (F)  
**Outcome** Support noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action

---

<b>ID</b>	1072
<b>Consultee name</b>	Centre Model Developments
<b>Agent Name</b>	Mr Paul Sedgwick Sedgwick Associates
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	The Local Plan housing requirement is contrary to the RSS as it stands. Under the 'Duty to Co-operate', the Council should look at meeting Sefton's need. The housing figure should be higher, and more sites included. The land west of Hoole Lane at Banks would be a suitable housing site and can fund infrastructure improvements. (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	The Council have cooperated fully with neighbouring authorities, including Sefton, in preparing the Local Plan. Sefton have made no objection to the Local Plan Preferred Options, nor have they requested that the Council consider whether some of Sefton's housing target could be met in West Lancashire. The Council are confident that delivery in locations such as Skelmersdale with Up Holland and on the larger strategic sites can be delivered in a timely manner over the Local Plan period and have based this on historic delivery rates and anticipated site-based annual delivery rates in different locations across the Borough. With regard to the emerging National Planning Policy Framework, the 20% extra applies only to the 5-year housing land supply, and latest guidance from CLG has made it explicitly clear that this 20% does not apply to the full 15-year target, nor should it mean that said target should increase. It is recognised that there are potential benefits of the development of land at Station Road in Banks. However, at this time, Banks is a village that has few services and poor infrastructure. Brownfield sites in the south of the village that would have less impact on the wider village infrastructure are already proposed for residential and employment redevelopment. To allocate further sites in Banks would be inappropriate given the current infrastructure and the potentially severe negative impacts of over-development. The former school site in Hoole Lane (part of the wider Station Road site proposed) is within the existing village boundary and comes under the existing and proposed "village centre" designation. Therefore, redevelopment of this site would be permissible in principle if it helped to recreate the village centre that has fallen into decline, but any development outside the village boundary would not be supported.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No action required

---

<b>ID</b>	1073
<b>Consultee name</b>	MR ANDREW LAING
<b>Agent Name</b>	Mr Paul Sedgwick                      Sedgwick Associates
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	The Local Plan housing requirement is contrary to the RSS as it stands. Under the 'Duty to Co-operate', the Council should look at meeting Sefton's need. The housing figure should be higher, and more sites included. Land at Nursery Avenue would be a suitable housing site; it should not have been rejected on access grounds. (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	The Council have cooperated fully with neighbouring authorities, including Sefton, in preparing the Local Plan. Sefton have made no objection to the Local Plan Preferred Options, nor have they requested that the Council consider whether some of Sefton's housing target could be met in West Lancashire. The Council are confident that delivery in locations such as Skelmersdale with Up Holland and on the larger strategic sites can be delivered in a timely manner over the Local Plan period and have based this on historic delivery rates and anticipated site-based annual delivery rates in different locations across the Borough. With regard to the emerging National Planning Policy Framework, the 20% extra applies only to the 5-year housing land supply, and latest guidance from CLG has made it explicitly clear that this 20% does not apply to the full 15-year target, nor should it mean that said target should increase. The Nursery Avenue site in Ormskirk has been assessed as a potential location for Green Belt release in preparing the Local Plan, but it was found that there were more suitable sites that should be released in preference. The final Green Belt study corrected an error in the draft Green Belt study and so the Nursery Avenue site has been found to fulfil at least one purpose of the Green Belt. The Council is also not convinced that access to the site could be dealt with satisfactorily through development management and shares the concern of local residents that any access to this site would create safety issues on local roads.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No action required

---

<b>ID</b>	1090
<b>Consultee name</b>	Bickerstaffe Trust
<b>Agent Name</b>	Mr Graham Love                      Turley Associates
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	a) The housing target should be higher, taking into account the draft NPPF, and should be a minimum figure. b) The distribution of housing does not reflect the settlement hierarchy; more development should be assigned to Ormskirk and less to Burscough. c) The proposed phasing of the target is unjustified. (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	a) The housing target is based on the latest evidence in the CLG Household Projections and is a minimum target. Therefore, if the market can deliver at higher rates than the initial annual targets, development will still be permitted as long as it adheres to the rest of the Local Plan. With regard to the emerging National Planning Policy Framework, the 20% extra applies only to the 5-year housing land supply, and latest guidance from CLG has made it explicitly clear that this 20% does not apply to the full 15-year target, nor should it mean that said target should increase. b) Both Ormskirk and Burscough are sustainable settlements and Key Service Centres, although both are affected by infrastructure constraints (waste water treatment and, especially Ormskirk, traffic issues). While Ormskirk is clearly a larger settlement, this alone cannot be a reason for allocating housing to a settlement. Given that both Burscough and Ormskirk are sustainable locations for new development, the selection of sites for Green Belt release was determined on site-specific assessments. Other sites in the existing built-up areas of the two towns are not allocated but the SHLAA identifies sufficient land, together with existing planning permissions, to deliver the 500 dwellings and 350 dwellings respectively within the towns. c) The Council propose to stagger the housing target over the Plan period in order to set a realistic target against which to measure the Local Plan. It is anticipated that housing delivery will remain slow over the early part of the Local Plan and gradually rise over the Plan period. Therefore, the Council proposes a lower annual target initially that then rises to an above average annual target in the latter part of the Plan period. This gradual rise in housing targets also allows for the time needed to rectify the key infrastructure issues in the Borough, such as the waste water treatment issue which precludes development on large greenfield sites in the Ormskirk and Burscough areas. It should also be noted that these annual targets are minimum targets. If the market can deliver at higher rates than the initial annual targets, development will still be permitted as long as it adheres to the rest of the Local Plan.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No action required

---

<b>ID</b>	1112
<b>Consultee name</b>	Chris Henshall
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Support
<b>Summary</b>	The HCA welcomes the policy of focusing the majority of development on Key Service Centres, including allocating over half of all proposed new development within Skelmersdale. (F)
<b>Outcome</b>	Support noted
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	no action

---

**ID** 1127  
**Consultee name** Mr Roger Bell  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** We suggest below that the Grove Farm site in Ormskirk should not be developed unless and until the proposed Ormskirk by-pass is built. The proposed number of houses for Grove Fram should be added to the Yew Tree Farm allocation. (s)  
**Outcome** Both the Grove Farm and Yew Tree Farm sites are restricted by a waste water treatment constraint and so it is not anticipated that either would be delivered before 2020. This limits how many dwellings could be built on each site in the remaining 7 years of the Plan. Therefore, it is unlikely that more than 500 dwellings could be built at Yew Tree Farm during the Local Plan period. While the Ormskirk Bypass would obviously create a great deal of benefit, the development of the Grove Farm site is not precluded on it. If was to be precluded on this basis, so would Yew Tree Farm.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1138  
**Consultee name** Adrian James  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Greenbelt land should only be released after greenfield and brownfield sites have been developed. The main reason for the Greenbelt is to prevent coalescence between settlements, including Ormskirk and Burscough. This point is as valid now as when Grove Farm was originally designated Greenbelt. If Greenbelt is to be lost, original Option A would have been a better option, involving development between St Helens Road and the railway line, all in an area less than 0.9 of a mile from the town centre, bus / rail station and well away from Ruff Wood. (S)  
**Outcome** In order to deliver the housing and employment land targets in the Local Plan, all available and appropriate land within the existing built-up areas (both brownfield and greenfield land) will be required for development. Even then, a small amount of Green Belt land will be required as well. Given that over 90% of the Borough is designated as Green Belt, the land released will only represent less than 0.5% of the Green Belt in West Lancashire. Grove Farm in Ormskirk has been selected as one Green Belt site for release because it is in a sustainable location and was found to no longer fulfil the purposes of Green Belt. In particular, by removing the Grove Farm site from the Green Belt, the strategic gap between Ormskirk and Burscough is retained as the development of Grove Farm would only "round-off" the settlement area to the north of Ormskirk. It would not cause Ormskirk to sprawl out towards Burscough."Option A", which was consulted upon in May / June 2011, was ruled out because, even though it included some positive benefits, it also caused the most severe negative impacts of the options considered and consulted upon, including impacts on traffic, open landscape views and the Green Belt.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---





greenfield sites in the Ormskirk and Burscough areas. Again, as with (d) above, these annual targets are minimum targets. If the market can deliver at higher rates than the initial annual targets, development will still be permitted as long as it adheres to the rest of the Local Plan.

**Officer recommendation** Detail on specific issues in SP1 that are covered elsewhere in the Local Plan will be reduced to avoid duplication and to simplify SP1.

---

**ID** 1157  
**Consultee name** Mr Roger Clayton South Lathom Residents Association  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The Council should focus development in areas not constrained by waste water infrastructure and should be considering innovative solutions to resolve these issues. The reliance on large sites within the plan is a risk. (S)  
**Outcome** The Council undertook an extensive assessment (documented in Technical Paper 1) of options for Green Belt release, including looking across the Borough for suitable locations. Waste water treatment infrastructure is managed by United Utilities as the statutory provider. The Council are working with UU to see improvements happen as quickly as possible. Major developers will deliver the vast majority of all development in the Borough whether it is to be located on a few larger sites or many smaller sites. The Local Plan only allocates and guides development - the Council does not deliver the development set out in the Local Plan themselves.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1165  
**Consultee name** Mr Roger Clayton South Lathom Residents Association  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Parishes are not treated consistently in the plan and Lathom South Parish is disregarded as a separate settlement area. Listing them in SP1 would remove this error. (S)  
**Outcome** Parishes are administrative areas. The Local Plan addresses issues that cross administrative areas and are often more related to functional economic or spatial areas. It is not necessary for the Local Plan to list all Parish Council areas.  
**Officer recommendation** No action

---

<b>ID</b>	1169
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Leslie Connor The Jean and Leslie Connor Charitable Foundation
<b>Agent Name</b>	Mr Tony McAteer
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	a) Less GB should be released at Burscough, more at Ormskirk / Aughton. b) Land at Bold Lane, Aughton, edged "red" on the attached plan, should be identified as a housing allocation. c) Support for Aughton as part of a Key Service Centre. d) The overall housing figure is unsound. Based on RSS figures plus 20% slippage allowance, it should be 6,480 dwellings over the life of the Plan. e) The figure for Skelmersdale should be reduced to 140 per annum (2100 dwellings). f) There should be more development in Ormskirk / Aughton in the early part of the plan period. g) The housing requirement should not be staggered. (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	a) Both Ormskirk and Burscough are sustainable settlements and Key Service Centres, although both are affected by infrastructure constraints (waste water treatment and, especially Ormskirk, traffic issues). While Ormskirk is clearly a larger settlement, this alone cannot be a reason for allocating housing to a settlement. Given that both Burscough and Ormskirk are sustainable locations for new development, the selection of sites for Green Belt release was determined on site-specific assessments. b) Land at Bold Lane, Aughton, was not considered for Green Belt release because the Green Belt study found that it fulfilled a purpose of the Green Belt and its development would close the already narrow strategic gap between Aughton and the small village of Holt Green. c) Support for Aughton as part of a Key Service Centre is noted. d) While the RSS is currently still a part of the Development Plan for the Borough, it is widely expected to be revoked by the Government in the near future, and before this Local Plan will be submitted for Examination. Therefore, with this in mind, the Council deemed it prudent to explore other evidence as well as that used in setting the RSS housing target to identify the "right" target for West Lancashire over the next 15 years. In setting this target, the Council had regard to wanting to see a sustainable level of growth in the Borough, that delivers what is needed to meet the projected increase in households, as well as that perceived unmet need from the RSS period. It is the Council's view that it is right to set a more realistic and achievable target than that set by the RSS (which was set in anticipation of sustained economic growth at pre-2007 levels). However, given that the housing target is a minimum target, if the market can deliver more housing than the target, development will be supported as long as it adheres to other aspects of the Local Plan. With regard to the emerging National Planning Policy Framework, the 20% "slippage" applies only to the 5-year housing land supply, and latest guidance from CLG has made it explicitly clear that this 20% does not apply to the full 15-year target, nor should it mean that said target should increase. e) The Council have reduced the target for Skelmersdale with Up Holland by 600 dwellings since the last consultation on the Core Strategy Preferred Options and believe that this reduction accounts for the slow housing market that is anticipated at the start of the Local Plan period. Looking over the last 20 years, housing delivery in Skelmersdale with Up Holland has been above 160 dwellings per annum on several occasions, even exceeding 200 dwellings on one occasion. Therefore, while development rates may be lower than 160 dwellings a year initially, they have the potential to rise above 160 dwellings a year in the latter part of the Plan period, especially with the encouragement of a regenerated town centre and opportunities to develop both within and on the edge of the town. f) While Skelmersdale with Up Holland will be able to deliver a fair proportion of development in the early part of the Plan period, other parts of the Borough will be able to as well. The key restriction to development in the first half of the plan period applies to greenfield development in Ormskirk, Burscough, Rufford and parts of Scarisbrick due to the waste water treatment constraint. Brownfield development in these areas will still be permitted if development reduces surface water run-off by half. Therefore, there are many sites in Ormskirk with Aughton, Burscough, the Northern Parishes and other rural areas that can come forward in the first half of the plan period as well as sites in Skelmersdale with Up Holland. g) Much as with (d) above, the Council propose to stagger the housing target over the Plan period in order to set a realistic target against which to measure the Local Plan. It is anticipated that housing delivery will remain slow over the early part of the Local Plan and gradually rise over the Plan period. Therefore, the Council proposes a lower annual target initially that then rises to an above average annual target in the latter part of the Plan period. This gradual rise in housing targets also allows for the time needed to rectify the key infrastructure issues in the Borough, such as the waste water treatment issue which precludes development on large greenfield sites in the Ormskirk and Burscough areas. Again, as with (d) above, these annual targets are minimum

targets. If the market can deliver at higher rates than the initial annual targets, development will still be permitted as long as it adheres to the rest of the Local Plan.

**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1177

**Consultee name** Vernon Property LLP

**Agent Name** Charlotte McKay

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** The Local Plan Preferred Options document does not allocate enough sites for housing to cover the plan period. The Plan should therefore be amended to provide to allocate sufficient sites to meet the identified requirement in the Borough; (S)

**Outcome** The Local Plan deliberately does not allocate every single housing site within the settlement boundaries, but relies on Policy GN1, which, read together with SP1 and RS1, clearly accepts the principle of residential development within the settlement boundaries of the more sustainable settlements. Those sites that have been allocated (as purely residential or mixed-use) have been specifically identified because they are key to the delivery of the housing target, address an important rural development opportunity or represent a large greenfield site on the edge of an existing settlement. The "Plan B" sites are not allocated as part of the preferred strategy to deliver the housing land supply required. They are safeguarded (under Policy GN2) to only come forward if absolutely required because the preferred strategy has failed to deliver.

**Officer recommendation** No change necessary

---

**ID** 1178

**Consultee name** Vernon Property LLP

**Agent Name** Charlotte McKay

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** The settlement boundary of Rufford should be extended to the east to incorporate Land at the Manor House, Station Road, Rufford. site identified as RUFF.06 in the Council's Green Belt study should be allocated for a modest housing site (S)

**Outcome** Comments noted. Whilst the relative sustainability of this site is recognised, it has not been considered appropriate to recommend its removal from the Green Belt. Rufford is a relatively small settlement, and currently suffers from waste water infrastructure constraints. In addition, there is no requirement to release Green Belt in the Northern Parishes to meet the 400 dwelling target for that spatial area. Full reasoning for the proposed allocation / non-allocation of specific sites are set out in the Council's Green Belt study and Strategic Options and Green Belt release Technical Paper.

**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

<b>ID</b>	1211
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Andrew Taylor                      David Wilson Homes
<b>Agent Name</b>	Ms Lorraine Davison                      DPP
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	There is too much uncertainty in the early Plan period due to market constraints in Skelmersdale and infrastructure constraints in Ormskirk and Burscough. Skem town centre needs to be regenerated first. The Plan should plan positively for growth, e.g. by targeting housing development to areas with the ability to deliver. The lower targets in the first five years are not supported, neither is restraint generally: it becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. Plan B is not enough to deal with uncertainty: Plan A should be better. Aughton is a suitable location for more deliverable development (S).
<b>Outcome</b>	The Council have reduced the target for Skelmersdale with Up Holland by 600 dwellings since the last consultation on the Core Strategy Preferred Options and believe that this reduction accounts for the slow housing market that is anticipated at the start of the Local Plan period. Looking over the last 20 years, housing delivery in Skelmersdale with Up Holland has been above 160 dwellings per annum on several occasions, even exceeding 200 dwellings on one occasion. Therefore, while development rates may be lower than 160 dwellings a year initially, they have the potential to rise above 160 dwellings a year in the latter part of the Plan period, especially with the encouragement of a regenerated town centre and opportunities to develop both within and on the edge of the town. While Skelmersdale with Up Holland will be able to deliver a fair proportion of development in the early part of the Plan period, other parts of the Borough will be able to as well. The key restriction to development in the first half of the plan period applies to greenfield development in Ormskirk, Burscough, Rufford and parts of Scarisbrick due to the waste water treatment constraint. Brownfield development in these areas will still be permitted if development reduces surface water run-off by half. Therefore, there are many sites in Ormskirk with Aughton, Burscough, the Northern Parishes and other rural areas that can come forward in the first half of the plan period as well as sites in Skelmersdale with Up Holland. The Council propose to stagger the housing target over the Plan period in order to set a realistic target against which to measure the Local Plan. It is anticipated that housing delivery will remain slow over the early part of the Local Plan and gradually rise over the Plan period. Therefore, the Council proposes a lower annual target initially that then rises to an above average annual target in the latter part of the Plan period. This gradual rise in housing targets also allows for the time needed to rectify the key infrastructure issues in the Borough, such as the waste water treatment issue which precludes development on large greenfield sites in the Ormskirk and Burscough areas. However, these annual targets are minimum targets. If the market can deliver at higher rates than the initial annual targets, development will still be permitted as long as it adheres to the rest of the Local Plan. The concept of a "Plan B" has been proposed in order to ensure that the Local Plan has sufficient flexibility to deal with a worst-case scenario for housing delivery. Plan B sites have not been included within a larger Plan A to enable a greater degree of control on where development takes place. The concern would be that releasing more greenfield / Green Belt sites than strictly necessary would take away development from urban areas where it is needed, such as Skelmersdale.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change required

---

**ID** 1212  
**Consultee name** Mr Andrew Taylor David Wilson Homes  
**Agent Name** Ms Lorraine Davison DPP  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** There should be a new Policy SP4, allocating land east of Aughton for housing. (S)  
**Outcome** The Local Plan Preferred Options set out a sustainable and deliverable strategy for residential development over the plan period. The alternative location proposed at Parr's Lane, Aughton for a strategic site involving Green Belt release is not considered to be as sustainable (given its semi-rural location) and would involve the release of Green Belt that has been found to continue to fulfil the purposes of the Green Belt, unlike the sites that have ultimately been proposed for Green Belt release in the Local Plan Preferred Options.  
**Officer recommendation** No change necessary

---

**ID** 1217  
**Consultee name** Mr Andrew Taylor David Wilson Homes  
**Agent Name** Ms Lorraine Davison DPP  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Add to the table of housing delivery a figure for the proposed (by DPP) allocation of land at Parr's Lane for housing, local centre, etc. Add bullet point and additional paragraph to Policy SP1 to refer to this proposed allocation. Add sentence to para 4.17 to refer to a lack of waste water constraints. Delete paragraphs 4.22, 4.23 and Table 4.1 (phasing of targets). Amend Table 4.2 to reflect housing at Parr's Lane. Add new Policy SP4 concerned with housing allocation at Parr's Lane. (S)  
**Outcome** see response to rep 1212 - alternative site is not considered as sustainable as those already proposed in the Local Plan Preferred Options.  
**Officer recommendation** No change necessary

---

**ID** 1251  
**Consultee name** Mr Alan Hubbard The National Trust  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** The National Trust supports the approach based on focussing development on larger settlements and within settlement boundaries. However, it is disappointing that Policy SP1 does not include a prioritisation of brownfield land. It would be useful if the Policy or supporting text offered more detail on the different roles between, and the general levels of development within, the settlement hierarchy. The National Trust welcomes reference to considerations such as climate change, flood risk, waste water treatment infrastructure, protection and enhancement of biodiversity, landscape, heritage and green infrastructure. (s)  
**Outcome** Support noted. Brownfield land - SP1 does not prioritise brownfield land because it is not necessary - all brownfield land will be required to deliver the Local Plan anyway. Settlement hierarchy - it is not felt necessary to provide further differentiation between different tiers of the hierarchy and general levels of development are more appropriately divided between spatial areas than tiers of the hierarchy.  
**Officer recommendation** no change

---

**ID** 1268  
**Consultee name** Mr Alexis De Pol  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Not enough housing has been focused in the Northern Parishes. As a result, the plan does not fully utilise non-Green Belt land which is available around Tarleton, Hesketh Bank and Banks.  
**Outcome** The Local Plan Preferred Options would see 86% of residential development located in the three Key Service Centres of the Borough. This is considered appropriate and sustainable given that it locates new housing nearer to key services. In the Northern Parishes, whilst Tarleton and Hesketh Bank do have good access to some services, Banks and Rufford are not as sustainable given the lack of access to many services. In addition, the Northern Parishes do suffer from critical infrastructure and environmental constraints, including drainage and flood risk. Therefore, it is not considered appropriate or sustainable to locate large amounts of new housing in the Northern Parishes while these constraints remain and given the relative sustainability of the villages compared to the Key Service Centres in the Borough. As a result of these factors, it is considered more appropriate and sustainable to release a small amount of Green Belt on the edge of the Key Service Centres rather than over-develop rural parts of the Borough such as the Northern Parishes.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 1288  
**Consultee name** St Modwen Properties PLC  
**Agent Name** John Francis  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** Changes of wording suggested to better reflect priorities and opportunities and the location the Council sees as offering the best potential to regenerate the town centre (S)  
**Outcome** Whilst some of the proposed wording could add value to SP1, part of what is proposed goes too far and is overly prescriptive. The strategic development site is handled at SP2 and need not be replicated within SP1. In addition, as part of the simplification of Policy SP1, this paragraph has been removed from the policy, as it is similar to that included in Policy SP2.  
**Officer recommendation** Tenth paragraph in SP1 has been removed. Paragraph 4.16 bullet 2, delete and replace with: The existing town centre needs to be radically improved and expanded to provide modern and accessible retail, leisure and entertainment facilities in the Borough's

---

**ID** 1303  
**Consultee name** Mrs Margaret Wiltshire CPRE (West Lancs Group)  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Are we to assume that "village" is a technical term used in order to classify the scope for development? Why not use "settlement" ? These labels are also stretching the meaning of "sustainable", which has normally been defined by the proximity of various amenities. Has Bickerstaffe fallen off your map ? (S)  
**Outcome** The settlements listed in the hierarchy are only those that are not washed over by the Green Belt and so, in planning terms, there is some flexibility in what development can take place in them (i.e. there is a need for the Council to be clear on what the planning policy is for these settlements). The term village has been used to distinguish between the larger settlements (Key Service Centres) and those that are smaller, which does include the examples given above. The designation "sustainable rural village" was used to distinguish between the even less sustainable "small rural villages" and those that do have access to some services. The likes of Brown Edge / Pool Hey does have access to services at Kew across the Borough boundary. Bickerstaffe is not an individual settlement - it is a Parish which includes small hamlets, of which the only one not washed over by the Green Belt is Stanley Gate.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1304  
**Consultee name** Mrs Margaret Wiltshire CPRE (West Lancs Group)  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** We recognise that the problem with waste-water treatment is causing delay in the developments at yew tree Farm and Grove Farm. Have we to assume that Edge Hill sends its effluent to Hoscar rather than to New Lane ? [If not, why are they free of the delays that affect other Ormskirk/Burscough/Western parishes developments ?] We did consider it premature for EHU to have put in their planning application to build on the Green belt, and for the Council to have approved it, before the Local Plan is finalised and the Green belt release made official. (F)  
**Outcome** While the EHU applications have clearly come in ahead of the Local Plan, the proposals within those applications are in line with the proposed policies in the Local Plan Preferred Options document. The Council also have a duty to make a decision on any application that is submitted in a timely manner and so it would not have been appropriate for the Council to delay any decision on these applications for 18 months until the Local Plan is adopted. With regard to waste water treatment, the decision on the Edge Hill University applications include a condition that requires the plans for drainage of the site to be approved by United Utilities and the Environment Agency prior to development commencing.  
**Officer recommendation** No action

---

**ID** 1305  
**Consultee name** Mrs Margaret Wiltshire CPRE (West Lancs Group)  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** "All new built development will be within settlement boundaries....." We are pleased to see this statement several times in this document. (F)  
**Outcome** Support noted  
**Officer recommendation** no action

---

**ID** 1306  
**Consultee name** Mrs Margaret Wiltshire CPRE (West Lancs Group)  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** para 4.24 We strongly support the prioritisation of development on brownfield land and applaud the council's target of 65% in the table on page 199. Thus we are surprised to read, in para 4.16, the greenfield land so easily dismissed - and that by a policy team who write so enthusiastically about green Infrastructure and agriculture on other pages. (F)  
**Outcome** observations noted  
**Officer recommendation** no action

---

**ID** 1307  
**Consultee name** Mrs Margaret Wiltshire CPRE (West Lancs Group)  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** We are relying on the Council to ensure that the new settlement/Green Belt boundaries are robust and defensible. In particular, we expect the Council to require any further built extension of E.H.U. to be firmly inside the boundary of the 10ha they have been granted or in their existing curtilage. (S)  
**Outcome** observations noted  
**Officer recommendation** no action

---



<b>ID</b>	1317
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Duncan Gregory Gladman
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	a) The Core Strategy should positively manage growth in order to facilitate a step change in increased housing delivery as promoted by the NPPF. b) Whilst the key service centres should accommodate the majority of new development this should not prevent sustainable development coming forward in lower order settlements. c) Meeting the housing needs of West Lancashire through an informed housing target is fundamental to securing growth in accordance with the NPPF. d) Housing targets should be treated as a minimum. e) The Local Authority needs to positively manage growth and grant more planning permissions in order to meet housing need. f) If the Local Authority identify through annual monitoring that there is a shortfall, additional land would have to be identified to prevent the housing strategy being compromised. g) A Contingency Policy should be included within the Core Strategy in order to provide for and manage the delivery of housing during the plan period.
<b>Outcome</b>	a) The LPPO sets out the Council's favoured approach to delivering sustainable growth in the Borough. b) The Local Plan Preferred Options do support sustainable development coming forward in lower order settlements, as long as they are within the settlement boundaries set by Policy GN1. c) The housing target in the LPPO is informed by a thorough analysis of housing need and the ability of the Borough to deliver new housing whilst remaining within the Borough's environmental limits. d) The housing target in the LPPO is a minimum target, as stated in Policy SP1. e) The Council will maintain a presumption in favour of sustainable development that is in line with the Local Plan. f) The "Plan B" safeguards additional land to be used if there is a shortfall in housing supply. g) The "Plan B" is the contingency policy - such a policy has to safeguard land as it will inevitably involve the release of land from Green Belt, which can only take place when preparing a Local Plan.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No Action required

---

<b>ID</b>	1342
<b>Consultee name</b>	Ms Yana Bosseva RenewableUK
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Support with conditions
<b>Summary</b>	This policy should include a reference to renewable energy as a key element of sustainable development, as well as a reference to the economic and social benefits of renewable energy. We welcome the reference to energy security to be achieved by encouraging renewable energy deployment in Paragraph 4.30. The reference to renewable energy in the Green Belt in this paragraph is also supported (F)
<b>Outcome</b>	Comments noted - more detail on Renewable Energy is provided in Policy EN1
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	no action required

---

<b>ID</b>	1346	
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Roger Clayton	South Lathom Residents Association
<b>Agent Name</b>		
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object	
<b>Summary</b>	Terminology used to distinguish between key service centres is inaccurate. Existing social problems within Skelmersdale not addressed through the plan. The plan wrongly favours greenfield land on the western fringe of Skelmersdale and quality agricultural land. Brownfield land and vacant properties should be considered first.(S)	
<b>Outcome</b>	There is an incorrect reference to Burscough as a "Market Town" and this will be corrected. However, reference to Skelmersdale as a "Regional Town" is appropriate. Ormskirk and Burscough should simply be labelled Key Service Centres. The Local Plan proposes to locate over half of new housing within Skelmersdale with Up Holland and the majority of this development will take place in the existing built-up area. The vast majority of available and deliverable brownfield sites in Skelmersdale will be required to deliver this target, hence the need to deliver some housing on greenfield sites. While the Council would like to see empty properties brought back into active use, and is encouraging this through other services in the Council, the re-occupation of empty properties cannot count toward the delivery of housing targets.	
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	Re-label Ormskirk with Aughton and Burscough as Key Service Centres only within the settlement hierarchy.	

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: 4.2**

**Title: Key Diagram**

---

**ID** 18  
**Consultee name** Mr Howard Courtley Courtley Consultants Ltd  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Figure 4.1 should identify Southport.  
**Outcome** Key Diagrams do not normally show settlements in neighbouring authorities as this is not WLBC's jurisdiction. However, the Local Plan does make frequent reference to West Lancashire's relationship to Southport and other neighbouring settlements.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action

---

**ID** 968  
**Consultee name** Strategy and Policy Group Lancashire County Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The Key Diagram (Figure 4.1) does not show the proposed transport infrastructure improvements identified in Policy IF2b. It is noted that the schemes are shown in Figure 8.1 It is advised that both "Key Sustainable" and "Rural Sustainable", listed in the legend, should have "villages" added. (F)  
**Outcome** In order to ensure that the Key Diagram is easy to understand, proposed transport infrastructure was not included as it made the Key Diagram too confusing. However, Fig 8.1 was included so that there was a map reference for these proposals in the document. Drafting error in relation to Legend noted  
**Officer recommendation** "Key Sustainable" and "Rural Sustainable", listed in the legend, should have "villages" added.

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: 4.3**

**Title: Skelmersdale Town Centre**

---

**ID** 3

**Consultee name** Mr Paul Stanley

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Support

**Summary** Support for the regeneration of Skelmersdale town centre but plans need to be realistic. Support for improved retail and walking/cycling paths and better rail links. Support for the Ormskirk bypass. (s)

**Outcome** • Whilst Skelmersdale as a centre of excellence may appear to be aspirational, this principle is included to guide development rather than be used to strictly manage development. • Retail studies carried out by White Young Green in 2007 and by Roger Tym and Partners in 2011 both indicate that there is capacity for an additional food store in Skelmersdale. • The plans for the Town Centre are still evolving but would seek to produce a mixed offer focusing particularly on leisure to fill the existing void with some retail to complement the current facilities. Control on rent would be outside of the remit of the Local Plan. • Cycling and walking are a priority within Skelmersdale within the Local Plan Preferred Option and the Local Transport Plan 3 (Produced by Lancashire County Council (LCC)). Work is underway to review the best way to improve these links through development in the proposed new Local Plan, planning contributions and other streams of funding. • The Council supports the delivery of a rail link into Skelmersdale and is assisting the responsible authorities i.e. Merseyrail, Network Rail and LCC, with their investigations into the feasibility and delivery of such a scheme. There are several possible ways to ensure delivery including a link that would be on the periphery of the town. However, it is early days in terms of planning and investigation so no detail or assurances regarding delivery are known. • The Ormskirk Bypass is a scheme that has been around for many, many years. Current government funding would suggest that it is unlikely to be delivered anytime soon. The Highways Authority (LCC) are currently considering possible softer measures to try and alleviate some of the pinch points on the A570 route.

**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 62

**Consultee name** Mr Anthony Northcote Plannig and Local Authority Liason, The Coal Authority

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Support

**Summary** The Coal Authority supports the text in paragraph 4.33 which sets out the context for issues relating to the issues of ground conditions including unstable land in support of Policy SP1 (F)

**Outcome** Comments noted

**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 174  
**Consultee name** Patricia McKenzie  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to building of supermarket in town centre. Need more affordable housing (S).  
**Outcome** Policy SP2 clearly states that a supermarket should be integrated with either the Concourse or the new high street and that most importantly it should form part of an integrated regeneration scheme and facilitate the delivery of such a scheme. As such a supermarket in the town centre would provide an "anchor role" to the major redevelopment of the area that would be critical to the regeneration plans. Whilst it is recognised that the Concourse forms a crucial part to the town centre, the purpose of the regeneration plans has always been to bring forward shops, restaurants, bars and a cinema to link the Concourse with the Asda and College and to introduce a stronger leisure and retail offer within Skelmersdale. Therefore, rather than being considered as "out of centre" the area of land to the west of the Concourse will become a focal point of the town centre, linking the key uses either end of the high street (the College and Asda with the Concourse). The Council recognises the need for affordable housing and an increased housing offer in general and has therefore designated land around the town centre area positioned close to existing residential areas where there is potential to develop links through these currently open areas into the town centre.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 380  
**Consultee name** Mr Steve Openshaw  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Could larger retail companies be attracted to Skelmersdale as they have done to Warrington? (S)  
**Outcome** The Local Plan has the opportunity to direct development types and the Council's regeneration team works hard to encourage inward investment. However, the locating of particular brands of stores is largely open to free market. Policy SP2, as a guiding principle, seeks to "make Skelmersdale a leisure, recreational and retail centre of excellence".  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 508  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Chapter 4 Strategic Policies Policy SP2 page 49 sub paragraph 2.i - How is this statement consistent with the reduction in proposed dwellings to be provided within the extended town centre development area ? (F)  
**Outcome** The reduction in housing targets for Skelmersdale is based on the need to disaggregate the borough-wide housing target based on environmental and infrastructure capacity and viable delivery rates. The Council's aspirations to deliver retail, leisure, office space and green space in the town centre, as detailed in Policy SP" (2.i) remain.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 509  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Chapter 4 Strategic Policies Policy SP2 Page 50 sub paragraph xiii - Such fence-sitting is unnecessary and damaging to the Town Centre redevelopment plan . The need to provide housing close to the proposed High Street is fundamental to the creation of a town centre that does not die in the evening. This site should be designated as a (brownfield!) housing site. (S)  
**Outcome** Restricting this site to one particular use risks limiting the opportunity that other uses which may be more viable coming forward. The purpose of SP2 is to encourage growth and economic development. Flexibility within the plan, where this is possible, will assist in achieving development delivery.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 750  
**Consultee name** Mr William Robinson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** The number of dwellings expected to be provided in Skelmersdale town centre is around 800 in the Plan period. Development in School Lane could help to ensure these dwellings are delivered. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments Noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1093  
**Consultee name** Mr Karl Vella MBE  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** As a resident of Burscough and business owner in Skelmersdale I wish to comment on the above document as follows: - In general terms I support the preferred option for future development where the majority of development is concentrated in Skelmersdale but with substantial development proposed for Burscough - With regard to Skelmersdale it is of vital importance to the future of the town that the town centre is redeveloped to give it a commercial and retail centre with appropriate night-time leisure uses - Regeneration of the town centre is a pre-requisite for attracting further large scale housing development - Public transport from the town centre to all the outlying residential and employment areas must also be improved as part of the regeneration proposals - It is accepted that it is not feasible or desirable for all future development to be allocated to Skelmersdale and that other areas must be allowed to grow so that the area generally can prosper and attract investment (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

<b>ID</b>	1192
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr John Gardner
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Observations
<b>Summary</b>	Much is made of the ideal for the development of Skelmersdale Town Centre and the provision of a railway station / link. Much has been promised to the residents of Skelmersdale over the last 60 years including a hospital but quite a lot has not materialised. (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	Comments noted
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No action required

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Policy SP2**

**Title: Skelmersdale Town Centre - A Strategic Development Site**

---

**ID** 2

**Consultee name** Mr Ron Webster

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Observations

**Summary** Skelmersdale Town Centre development should be built around the railway station, and the station should be built now. (s)

**Outcome** A rail link into Skelmersdale is clearly something the Council would very much wish to see come forward at the earliest opportunity. However, the delivery of such a large piece of infrastructure and the necessary funds to secure this are something which the Council recognises will not be realised in the short term. The planning stage for the rail link is currently focused on demand and costs and so there is no specific line or route that could be designated on the plan. The Network Rail study has identified the potential for a case to be made and suggested that further work be carried out. This is currently underway. In answer to your question, building the rail link first and now is unfortunately not an option due to the lack of significant funding which would be required to deliver such a scheme. The Council shares the desire to see a rail link into Skelmersdale, making it a more sustainable and accessible location and will continue to champion this scheme.

**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 19

**Consultee name** Mr Howard Courtley                      Courtley Consultants Ltd

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** The role of SKelmersdale in delivering the Councils housing strategy should be reviewed in light of the Councils failure to meet its housing needs across the Borough, and its reliance on Skelmersdale to meet its needs (S).

**Outcome** • The backlog of housing referred too is known as un-met need in terms of housing delivery and has been accounted for when setting the housing targets for the Local Plan period. • As a result of the last consultation, the target for Skelmersdale has been reduced by 20% from 200 dwellings per year to 160. Whilst the Council recognises that this is still a relatively high figure in terms of past delivery rates, we are confident that the quality of the housing land supply in Skelmersdale coupled with the town centre improvements will assist in achieving this target. • The different housing scenarios in the SHMA have been considered in the Housing Technical Paper. Our view is that the assumptions behind the higher development scenarios (in particular, the assumptions related to economic growth, jobs and commuting) are not realistic, and that the Borough's environmental assets, including its prime agricultural land, would suffer unacceptable harm if the higher housing requirements were adopted. • By incorporating both the household projections and the RSS backlog, the Council considers its housing requirement, if achieved, will meet the Borough's current and future housing needs.

**Officer recommendation** No action required

---



**ID** 586  
**Consultee name** Mr Robin Buckley Redrow Homes (Lancs) Ltd  
**Agent Name** Mr Tony McAteer  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** 800 dwellings is too many for Skelmersdale Town Centre - the number should be halved and reallocated elsewhere. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Whilst it is agreed that development of 800 dwellings in Skelmersdale Town Centre will be a challenge, this challenge is by no means insurmountable over the lifetime of the Local Plan. The town centre area is one of the most sustainable parts of the Borough, and thus appropriate for housing, and there is developer interest in the site. Furthermore, as one function of the housing is as enabling development, it is considered that halving the number of units would adversely affect the town centre regeneration's deliverability.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 864  
**Consultee name** Mr Philip Carter Environment Agency  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Policy SP2 refers to a Design Code that all new residential development should conform to. The Design Code, which is to be developed by the Council, should require that the Tawd Valley is incorporated into the layout of new residential developments as a feature. Dwellings and public spaces should face and overlook the valley; it should not be hidden behind rear gardens and enclosed spaces. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

<b>ID</b>	966
<b>Consultee name</b>	Skelmersdale Limited Partnership
<b>Agent Name</b>	Mr Paul Singleton                      Turley Associates
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	<p>The Skelmersdale Limited Partnership has a long-standing and substantial interest in the future of Skelmersdale town centre and has sought to engage with the Council and influence the policy framework to ensure the continued and long term success of the Concourse Centre and the town centre as a whole. 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 Local Plan 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. SLP has significant objections to Policy SP2 as currently worded and considered that it is fundamentally flawed, to the extent that it, and therefore the Local Plan as a whole, is unsound and should not be progressed without significant amendments to address this fundamental issue.(S)</p>
<b>Outcome</b>	<p>It is agreed that reference to the requirement of development to integrate with and protect the Concourse will strengthen the Policy. Regarding the concerns relating to integration, it is not considered necessary to include significant additional wording as this lengthens the policy without adding value and it is important to remember that integration within the Town Centre is about more than just the Concourse, it also extends to Asda, the college and the Tawd Valley. Integration with the Concourse can be achieved through SP2, particularly with the inclusion of reference to protect the Concourse at Criterion 2 (i) To ensure the Policy remains flexible the reference to retail floorspace figures will be removed and the justification will require proposals to accord with the latest available evidence. The reference to a new high street is no longer appropriate and will be amended. The location and timing of a supermarket is clearly linked within Policy SP2 (ii) to the need for integration into the Concourse, Asda and the College and the need for it to facilitate and deliver the regeneration scheme needed for the Town Centre. Therefore, the suggested risk of a supermarket delivered in isolation could not happen. Furthermore, it is not considered that any integration between the existing key town centre uses (the Concourse, Asda and the College) will be lost by allowing for flexibility in the location of the food store. Policy SP2 clearly sets out the parameters for in which the food store must be delivered and these include ensuring the delivery of the wider regeneration scheme which will create the required connectivity and ensure integration of all uses in the town centre. Whilst the Council may agree to some extent that the replacement of these civic buildings would provide benefit to the overall regeneration of the Town Centre, a certain degree of pragmatism must be applied. Delivery and viability of the much needed connectivity within the town centre, additional retail offer and introduction of a leisure offer is essential. The Council has given careful consideration to the comments and points put forward by SLP. In many cases it is considered that the provisions of SP2 in its current form does provide for the integration to the Concourse and other existing uses within the Town Centre. However, where the comments have suggested this could be strengthened these have been taken on board and will be carried forward in the latest version of the Policy.</p>
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<p>Criterion 2 (i) Delete the last sentence relating to floor space and replace with "Any scheme should not harm the viability and vitality of the Concourse Centre. Incorrect retail floorspace is also picked up by other reps (1289, 1179, 1335) and is propose</p>

**ID** 969  
**Consultee name** Strategy and Policy Group Lancashire County Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** The intentions of this policy to take forward and expand the master plan for Skelmersdale Town Centre are broadly supported. (F)  
**Outcome** Comment noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1021  
**Consultee name** Mr Francis Williams Ormskirk Friends of the Earth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** 1 v The figure of 10% for affordable housing to meet local needs seems particularly low. 1 x We endorse the proposal that the River Tawd should be a major feature of Skelmersdale Town Centre, and also suggest a that it should be unculverted where it runs underground. Skelmersdale should celebrate its greenness. (F)  
**Outcome** The level of affordable housing is set at a level that is considered can be delivered without stifling development and is based on financial evidence. Comments regarding the Tawd Valley noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1113  
**Consultee name** Chris Henshall  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** The HCA notes and welcomes the priority given to the Town Centre in the Plan, particularly the emphasis on high quality design and the aim to locate a new food store close to the Concourse or the proposed new high street. We are also pleased to note the continued commitment to redevelopment or remodelling of the Firbeck estate and to link this with a high quality housing scheme on the Findon site. In respect of affordable housing, the HCA support the policy in the Town Centre of restricting the requirement to 10%. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1148  
**Consultee name** Mr Robin Buckley Redrow Homes (Lancs) Ltd  
**Agent Name** Mr Tony McAteer  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** 800 dwellings is too many for Skelmersdale Town Centre - the number should be halved and reallocated elsewhere. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Whilst it is agreed that development of 800 dwellings in Skelmersdale Town Centre will be a challenge, this challenge is by no means insurmountable over the lifetime of the Local Plan. The town centre area is one of the most sustainable parts of the Borough, and thus appropriate for housing, and there is developer interest in the site. Furthermore, as one function of the housing is as enabling development, it is considered that halving the number of units would adversely affect the town centre regeneration's deliverability.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1158  
**Consultee name** Mr Roger Clayton South Lathom Residents Association  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** SP2 is not up to date and coherent with the true picture. The creation of new offices for the Co-op would be supported if they commit to support jobs in Skelmersdale. (S)  
**Outcome** With regard to the SPD, whilst the situation in terms of financial viability and delivery of some of the elements of the town centre scheme has changed since 2008, the main thrust and guiding principles within the SPD Master Plan remain. Paragraph 4.46 acknowledges this. Comments regarding the new offices are noted but are outside of the remit of this Local Plan.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

<b>ID</b>	1179
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Jonathan Clarke                      Knowsley MBC
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Support with conditions
<b>Summary</b>	As you will be aware Knowsley Council has been working with partners to formulate a deliverable regeneration strategy for Kirkby town centre. The regeneration of Kirkby is a key priority for Knowsley Council and we would be extremely concerned if the proposals for the regeneration of Skelmersdale were of a nature and/or scale which would prejudice this. As the regeneration of Skelmersdale town centre is central to the delivery of West Lancashire's emerging Local Plan it is agreed that the town centre should be designated as a Strategic Site. However, it is important to ensure that the need for growth and its scale are clearly identified, and that any potential adverse impacts on nearby centres such as Kirkby are prevented. Knowsley is not objecting to the quantum of additional retail development (33,440m <sup>2</sup> ) proposed within Skelmersdale Town Centre in principle. However, the Council would welcome greater clarity in relation to how the overall figure relates to comparison and convenience retail provision and also gross or net sales floor space. West Lancashire's strategy states that in the event the town centre regeneration stalls, then different ways of delivering the scheme will be sought. While Knowsley appreciates the need to provide flexibility in the strategy, this approach appears very broad and open to a degree of interpretation. Therefore it does not give much certainty to developers or neighbouring authorities such as Knowsley. The Council would welcome further clarification of what West Lancashire's approach would be in this situation. (F)
<b>Outcome</b>	The overall figures relating to additional retail floor space and capacity have now been up dated through recent evidence. In order to allow the plan to remain flexible it has been decided to remove the reference to a figure and instead require proposals to be in accordance with the most up to date retail evidence relating to retail capacity within the Borough and to take account of the impact of any proposals on the retail centres in the sub-region. The Key Issues is a place for setting out exactly that rather than exploring possible viable alternatives to delivery of the strategy. Notwithstanding this, the wording will be altered to remove any uncertainty from this section of the document about what this means.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	Remove reference in SP2 (2.i) to quantity of floorspace and replace with wording within the justification that states "proposals to be in accordance with the most up to date retail evidence relating to retail capacity within the Borough and to take account

<b>ID</b>	1253
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Alan Hubbard                      The National Trust
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Observations
<b>Summary</b>	Policy SP2 If it is determined that this potential major development site should be developed then it is considered that it will be essential to ensure it is well integrated in a number of ways. Not least of these is provision of, and connection to, West Lancashire's strategic green infrastructure network. Whilst the proposed new park would be a significant resource in itself, it does not appear to be related to other, existing, green infrastructure. There is a particular opportunity, given the proximity, to link the site to the Leeds-Liverpool canal corridor and towpath which would be a significant benefit for existing and new residents and employees, as well as for wildlife. Reference is made in the suggested policy to improving pedestrian and cycle connections but at present the wider opportunity to improve and extend the Borough's strategic green infrastructure network is missing. (F)
<b>Outcome</b>	Policy SP2 (ii) ensures that new green infrastructure is integrated into existing communities through new development. Furthermore, Policy EN3 point 1 (ii) requires that new development be integrated into the existing green infrastructure network. Therefore, additional wording is not considered necessary to ensure new proposals for the Town centre and green infrastructure are fully integrated.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No action required.

**ID** 1289  
**Consultee name** St Modwen Properties PLC  
**Agent Name** John Francis  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Given its role as the Council's and HCA's preferred developer it is not surprising that St Modwen is keen to ensure that this critical policy maximises prospects of its preferred masterplan succeeding, including in the short term. We have some concerns that as drafted the policy does not create the maximum degree of support it could for St Modwen's proposals. We also have some concerns that the policy in parts is too detailed and unnecessarily prescriptive about uses and floorspace targets particularly given that the targets are not supported by the recently published West Lancashire Retail Study (by RTP). There are also some ambiguities between the policy's title and its key aims and aspirations, including what the key focus of new development is and where it should take place. In this respect a key concern relates to the 2008 SPD which is referred to in the justification. Changes to wording suggested (S)  
**Outcome** Some of the comments suggested within the representation add value to the purpose of SP2 and where this is the case clearly these should be incorporated into the final version of the policy. However, many of the suggestions simply limit the flexibility of the policy which, in its current form, is considered to provide an effective framework to allow the current scheme to come forward. Specifically, it is not considered entirely appropriate or flexible to continue to refer to the Strategic Development Site as being north west of the Concourse when it is the wider town centre area as set out in 4.2 that is allocated as the SDS.  
**Officer recommendation** Criterion 2 (i) Delete "A new high street" and replace with "Development". Delete Skelmersdale College and replace with West Lancashire College. Delete the last sentence relating to floor space and replace with "Any scheme should not harm the viability an

---

**ID** 1334  
**Consultee name** Mr David Cheetham  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** We support with reservations the intentions of the policy, particularly key principles i, ii, iv and v. We welcome the proposed new offices and leisure facilities. (F)  
**Outcome** Comment noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1335  
**Consultee name** Mr David Cheetham  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Amendments needed to policies and figures (S)  
**Outcome** •Key principle iii should remain as Lancashire County Council supports the view that possible new links can be made in Skelmersdale, in particular, to the network of footpaths and cycleway's. •Figure 4.2 is indicative and shows the extent of the town centre and key main features. It is not intended to be a detailed master plan and any conflict with Figure 1 .1 of the SPD Masterplan is due to progression of the scheme since the adoption of the SPD in 2008. However, the location of the wet and dry leisure centre does require updating and amendment to the land allocation adjacent to Asda is also required. •Comments relating to retail viability noted. However, additional retail is not the only purpose of the redevelopment of the Town Centre. Connecting all of the Town Centre components, providing a leisure offer and an improved retail offer are amongst the key drivers for this strategic policy. •The retail target will be removed to ensure the policy remains flexible, wording will be included to state proposals should be in accordance with the most up to date evidence. •The development opportunity site at the former college has been identified for housing amongst other uses.  
**Officer recommendation** Amend figure 4.2 to show correct location for wet and dry leisure centre and change retail and leisure opportunity to the west of Asda to Leisure development opportunity to reflect the current situation regarding the development of the scheme. Remove reta

---

**ID** 1336  
**Consultee name** Mr David Cheetham  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** We welcome the proposal to make "Major Improvements" to the Tawd Valley Park and link it to the Town Centre by creating a Formal Park.  
**Outcome** Comment noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

<b>ID</b>	1337
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr David Cheetham
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	Opposed to increase of the town centre. Development of housing in the Tawd Valley is inconsistent with Objective 4. More housing in the town centre is questionable (S).
<b>Outcome</b>	A) The extension to the Town Centre site within the LPPO is to ensure the underutilised and poorly managed green spaces can be included within a comprehensive scheme that seeks to reconnect this green lung within Skelmersdale to the surrounding areas and maximise its functionality in terms of access to open space and its variety of uses. Whilst some of this space would be required for housing development, this would be offset by the improvements made to the remaining valley area. The findings of the SHLAA and the justification for parking these sites relates to the fact they were considered against the current policy framework. This document proposes a change to the policy framework. B) Policy EN3 is clear that the Council will protect all biological heritage sites (which the Cloughs are). Their inclusion within Policy SP2 is to ensure that delivery of new development within the Town Centre accounts for this natural asset and maximises their ecological and aesthetic value in line with criterion 2.x of the Policy.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change required

---



**Chapter/Policy Number:** 4.4

**Title:** Yew Tree Farm, Burscough

---

<b>ID</b>	4
<b>Consultee name</b>	Gavin Rattray
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	Object to Burscough option.
<b>Outcome</b>	<p>Response to each of the above bullets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• All brownfield sites in West Lancs have been taken into account and the vast majority will be required for development in the Local Plan period – Green Belt release has only been considered because there is insufficient brownfield land to meet the housing and employment land targets. Policy SP1 sets out the approach to brownfield land and that it will be favoured over delivery of green field sites with the recognition that delivery of development targets is also important.</li><li>• Any development of the Yew Tree Farm site, whether for residential or employment uses, would be required to meet standard planning and building regulations in relation to distances between residential and employment uses, and so an appropriate and safe buffer between residential and employment areas would be maintained. The land at Yew Tree Farm as it currently stands provides a far larger buffer than is required to maintain the safety of residents.</li><li>• The Council, together with Lancashire County Council (as highways authority), have undertaken analysis of the potential increase in traffic associated with all new developments proposed in the Local Plan, and the three separate options previously consulted upon. While new development in Burscough will add more vehicles onto the road network around the settlement, the capacity of the road network can adequately support the increased number of vehicles, when taken together with improvements to junctions and the management of traffic.</li><li>• The Council has no evidence of land instability at the Yew Tree Farm site that would inhibit development. There is no fluvial flood risk associated with the site and surface water flooding may be addressed through new development as the engineering work that must be put in place by a developer or landowner to ensure that the surface water infrastructure can cope with the additional development will also improve the existing situation. Such improvements must be made before any development proposals on Yew Tree Farm are delivered.</li><li>• The agricultural land quality of the Yew Tree Farm site, which was assessed by professional consultants, was only one factor used in assessing the potential sites for Green Belt release. In comparison to the other sites assessed (including some which had been assessed in more detail for agricultural land quality), the Yew Tree Farm site generally did not have as good quality agricultural land.</li><li>• The information presented within the consultation report was factual and local objection and support to development in each locality is something which occurs across the Borough. Point regarding the interpretation of results is acknowledged. However, whilst community consultation is important to the process to ensure the plan has the opportunity to be shaped and respond to local communities, it is not the only factor to be considered. Technical evidence demonstrating West Lancashire's housing and employment needs along with evidence base studies to guide development must be given equal weight.</li></ul>
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No action required

---

**ID** 5

**Consultee name** Mr Brian Sillett

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** Question suitability of locating development in Burscough.

**Outcome** The Local Plan Preferred Options (LPPO) document supersedes what was previously called the Core Strategy Preferred Options. The document is very similar but shows a progression in terms of, amended development targets and broad locations for development and now includes allocated land for some of the largest housing and employment sites. Once finalised and found sound by the independent Planning Inspectorate the document will then supersede the existing West Lancashire Replacement Local Plan (July 2006). The Infrastructure Delivery Plan supports the LPPO and sets out how it will be delivered. The consultation exercise was publicised and the material associated with the Local Plan Preferred Options made available in Council offices, Post Offices, Libraries and online to allow the public to review the document and consider the contents. The purpose of the forums and exhibitions was to allow the public to meet officers, ask questions and discuss the proposals. Neither event was a pre-requisite for the other just a different way to get involved. Yew Tree Farm is not and never has been a listed a building. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out which infrastructure is required, to support development proposals within the LPPO. It also identifies who will deliver it, when it will be required, the cost and possible funding mechanisms. The Transport Technical Paper sets out the likely implications of development on traffic and transport links. Once the Preferred Option for development has been finalised more detail can be established to ensure the necessary highway infrastructure improvements are delivered in conjunction with the development. Planning for development and economic growth across the Borough will assist in ensuring West Lancashire has an opportunity to recover from the recession. However, austerity measures and market influences are outside of the control of the planning system.

**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 10

**Consultee name** Dr Annemarie Mullin

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals. (S)

**Outcome** • Whilst community consultation is important to the process to ensure the plan has the opportunity to be shaped and respond to local communities, it is not the only factor to be considered. Technical evidence demonstrating West Lancashire's housing and employment needs along with evidence base studies to guide development must be given equal weight. • In terms of highways infrastructure and traffic congestion, whilst new development in Burscough will add more vehicles onto the road network around the settlement, the Highways Authority (Lancashire Count Council) has not raised any objections to the plans. • Owing to a shortage of suitable sites within areas excluded from the Green Belt, it has been necessary to propose Green Belt release in this Local Plan to meet development requirements. • The amount of housing proposed forms part of a borough-wide target for housing which is needed to meet the projected growth of the West Lancashire population. The role of the Local Plan is to direct this development proportionally to areas and settlements within the Borough based on infrastructure and environmental capacity to ensure the development is delivered as sustainably as possible.

**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 11  
**Consultee name** Linda Topping  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** i wish to object to the local plan to build 850 New Houses in Burscough (F)  
**Outcome** Objection noted.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 22  
**Consultee name** Margaret Whitfield  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals on the basis of green belt, traffic, character and wildlife.(S)  
**Outcome** Points 1,2 and 3 are all addressed with the Councils response to the Burscough Standard Template Letter. 4. All development will be subject to full ecological assessment and must mitigate any possible impacts on wildlife.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 28  
**Consultee name** Mr Martin Gilchrist  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The present planning application that has been submitted by Burscough Football Club has this land identified on Victoria Park for car parking, which is a form of development. The natural greenbelt boundary would not include this land, therefore lending itself to some form of alternative development, i.e., commercial or residential use. (F)  
**Outcome** This is outside of the Local Plan Preferred Option consultation  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 30  
**Consultee name** Mr Brian Sillett  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to the Burscough proposals (S).  
**Outcome**

- Existing empty homes in the Borough cannot be counted toward the housing target for the Local Plan and WLBC have never stated that it can. A 3% vacancy is typical in any housing market and is required to ensure an appropriate level of “churn” in the housing market.
- The planning permission at Ainscough (Burscough) Mill does contribute to the 850 dwellings assumed for the Burscough area.
- Vacancy rates within Burscough Industrial Estate are relatively low and must be tempered with the existing market conditions. Projected employment development takes account of historic take-up rates and should therefore be typical of what the Borough has achieved in the past.
- Comments regarding the planning process noted. However, the Council considers the Local Plan Preferred Option sets out the most sustainable plan for development in the Borough to support growth that is projected and must be provided for.
- The Council are looking at releasing Green Belt land for development only as a last resort in order to meet housing and employment needs over the next 15 years. The total area of Green Belt release proposed in the Local Plan is for approximately 135 ha, which constitutes only 0.39% of the Borough’s Green Belt.

**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 31  
**Consultee name** Mr Phil Stott  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** I object to the Burscough proposals. (S)  
**Outcome**

- The role of the Local Plan is to direct this development proportionally to areas and settlements within the Borough based on infrastructure and environmental capacity to ensure the development is delivered as sustainably as possible. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out the provision of roads, sewage system, public transport, schools, hospital and G.P. services etc. Where a possible shortfall in infrastructure may occur as a result of growth, it then identifies what infrastructure is likely to be required, who will deliver it, the cost and possible funding streams.
- Addressing the constraints of the existing waste water treatment infrastructure that serves Ormskirk, Burscough, Rufford and parts of Scarisbrick is not a constraint that the Council can resolve independently. United Utilities are the sewerage undertaker for West Lancashire and as such they have a duty to upgrade and improve the network to support growth and development. However, the Council have regular dialogue with both United Utilities and the Environment Agency to assist in delivering these improvements in order to support development and growth within the Borough.
- Development of the Yew Tree Farm site offers the opportunity to address some of the heavy goods and large farm vehicular traffic that currently uses the Pippin Street junction with the A59 and at times, Higgins Lane. Detailed junction improvements directly associated with the Yew Tree Farm site would be assessed and identified through a separate master planning exercise for the site in the future, in close consultation with the local community.
- The Council are working closely with transport providers to encourage improvements to rail and bus services / infrastructure that serve Burscough. However, given that the responsibility for implementing any public transport or highway improvements does not lie with the Council, all the Local Plan can do is support proposals the Council believes would be beneficial and cost-effective and encourage those organisations responsible for that infrastructure to deliver improvements. This would include the Burscough Curves.

**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 34  
**Consultee name** Mr Nick Eckersley Hurlston Brook  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support the Burscough policy (S).  
**Outcome** Comments noted regarding support for this allocation and renewable energy initiatives. Given the uncertainty regarding viability and feasibility of certain technologies it is not appropriate to be over prescriptive in Policy SP3 as this would limit this development to particular renewable energy types. Comments relating to the delivery of the land within your ownership are noted and consideration will be given to the implications of allowing these parts of the development to be brought forward at an earlier time.  
**Officer recommendation** Consideration given to the timing of delivery for the eastern portion of the employment allocation of the Yew Tree Farm site.

---

**ID** 56  
**Consultee name** Mr Thomas Rawlinson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough YTF development (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 57  
**Consultee name** Mrs M J Rawlinson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to the YTF development proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 65  
**Consultee name** Mr Ralph Rawsthorne  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Another viable alternative for West Lancs 2027 is for each parish to be allocated so many affordable houses. This would be more fair to everyone and people would be happier with this vast development. (S)  
**Outcome** The amount of housing proposed forms part of a borough-wide target for housing which is needed to meet the projected growth of the West Lancashire population. The role of the Local Plan is to direct this development proportionally to areas and settlements within the Borough based on infrastructure and environmental capacity to ensure the development is delivered as sustainably as possible. Local need for affordable housing is considered within the Housing Needs Assessment which informs the Local Plan and this is assessed on a parish basis.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 66  
**Consultee name** Mr Ralph Rawsthorne  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 67  
**Consultee name** Ms G O'Neill  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 71  
**Consultee name** Mr John F Clarke  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S).  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 78  
**Consultee name** Mr Mike Riding  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to proposed plans for housing in Burscough area (S).  
**Outcome** Comments relating to highways infrastructure and congestion are addressed in the Councils full response to the Burscough Standard Template Letter. • The consultation was well publicised and structured to allow as many residents as possible to interact in different ways. The purpose of the forums was to facilitate useful discussion and capture feedback. Therefore, numbers at all forums across the Borough were restricted to ensure the groups were manageable and the discussion was useful. Notwithstanding this, an additional forum was organised and all those who expressed an interest in attending any previous forums that were full were accommodated at the additional event. Furthermore, exhibitions were held to allow the public to “drop-in” and discuss the plans with officers.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 79  
**Consultee name** Mrs MARIA RIDING  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** I write to state my objection to the development proposed in Burscough at Yew Tree Farm (S)  
**Outcome** Objection Noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 80  
**Consultee name** Dr. Harald Braun  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** We are still somewhat apprehensive about the Yew Tree Farm development. This is not because we do not see or do not appreciate the need and the benefits of developing Burscough, but rather because of lack of detail about the development. Still, due provision for ensuring environmental and infrastructural sustainability appear to have been made and we look forward to receiving more detailed information from West Lancs Borough Council and to further consultation in the near future. Of particular concern to working parents who have to combine a commute with "school runs" is the flow of traffic on the A59 (S)  
**Outcome** The Council understands the concerns residents may have in terms of the need for detail. However, the Local Plan process requires that a variety of options must be considered and in doing so it would not be practical to establish the finer detail regarding all of the possible options for future development. Notwithstanding this, the options presented within the Local Plan Preferred Options have all been assessed to some degree and evidence confirms that they are all fundamentally deliverable. If the Yew Tree Farm option remains the Council's "preferred option" significant further assessment work will be required to ensure the development is delivered in the most sustainable way. The master planning process would also include extensive community consultation to ensure the wider benefits of the development are of real use to the residents, for example a park or the location of new facilities.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 82  
**Consultee name** Ms Anne Porter  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 83  
**Consultee name** Laura Porter  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 84  
**Consultee name** Mr Mike Marshall  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 85  
**Consultee name** Karen Williams  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 104  
**Consultee name** Mr Peter Bamber  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Development in Burscough should not be at the cost of ruining grade 1 arable land due to drainage problems (S).  
**Outcome** Surface water flooding is the responsibility of United Utilities, who have a duty to maintain and upgrade the sewers, and landowners, who have a duty to maintain culverts on their land, along with the Environment Agency. New development provides a potential opportunity to address some of these issues as the engineering work that must be put in place by a developer or landowner to ensure that the surface water infrastructure can cope with the additional development will also improve the existing situation. Such improvements must be made before any development proposals on Yew Tree Farm are delivered.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---



**ID** 109  
**Consultee name** Davean Kerr  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S).  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 110  
**Consultee name** F J Hannon  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 112  
**Consultee name** Mr Davies  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Concerns over flooding. Object to Burscough proposals unless all promises to tackled drainage are fulfilled (S).  
**Outcome** The responsibility for addressing the surface water flooding issues in Burscough lies with United Utilities, who have a duty to maintain and upgrade the sewers, and landowners, who have a duty to maintain culverts on their land. New development provides a potential opportunity to address some of these issues as the engineering work that must be put in place by a developer or landowner to ensure that the surface water infrastructure can cope with the additional development will also improve the existing situation. Such improvements must be made before any development proposals on Yew Tree Farm are delivered.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 113  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs D Pope  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 114  
**Consultee name** Mr Brian Sillett  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 115  
**Consultee name** CJ Bolton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 116  
**Consultee name** Janine Fleming  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 117  
**Consultee name** Mr J Bagnall  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 118  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs Knowles  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 119  
**Consultee name** Mrs C Sylvester  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 120  
**Consultee name** E Barrie  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 121  
**Consultee name** Mr Gordon Forshaw  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 122  
**Consultee name** Mr Anthony Martin  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 123  
**Consultee name** P Etherbridge  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 124  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs A Rawsthorne  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 125  
**Consultee name** Lynda Prendergast  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals based on traffic impacts (S)  
**Outcome** Comments relating to the impact of this development on the highway and traffic congestion, along with concerns relating to the rural nature of Burscough have all been addressed within the Councils response to the Burscough Standard Template Letter.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 126  
**Consultee name** F. D. Bligh  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome**

- The amount of housing proposed forms part of a borough-wide target for housing which is needed to meet the projected growth of the West Lancashire population. The role of the Local Plan is to direct this development proportionally to areas and settlements within the Borough based on infrastructure and environmental capacity to ensure the development is delivered as sustainably as possible.
- Development on both brown and greenfield land may have equal impacts on the road network, depending on the actual location of the site. The use of local labour and local supplies equally applies to green field sites and is at the discretion of the developer and largely outside of the planning system.
- Comments relating to housing market noted.
- The size of the site is substantially large enough to deliver 500 dwellings, associated road infrastructure, parks and if required, a school. Through the planning process, any direct infrastructure required as a result of development will be secured through a legal obligation.
- Comments relating to highways, congestion, sustainable transport and agricultural land have all been addressed in detail within the Councils response to the Burscough Standard Template Letter.

**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 127  
**Consultee name** Mr MS Keen  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** Comments relating to highways and the loss of Green Belt are addressed in some detail within the Councils response to the Burscough Standard Template Letter. • In terms of how the infrastructure will cope, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out which infrastructure is required, to support development proposals within the LPPO. It also identifies who will deliver it, when it will be required, the cost and possible funding mechanisms. The Transport Technical Paper sets out the likely implications of development on traffic and transport links. Once the Preferred Option for development has been finalised more detail can be established to ensure the necessary highway infrastructure improvements are delivered in conjunction with the development. • Community consultation is important to the process to ensure the plan has the opportunity to be shaped and respond to local communities. However, it is not the only factor to be considered when producing a new local plan. Technical evidence demonstrating West Lancashire's housing and employment needs along with evidence base studies to guide development must be given equal weight. Unfortunately, the impact of development on local house prices is not something the planning system can consider.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 129  
**Consultee name** Mrs BM Fearn  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** • The proposals are not for Council houses, the plan is for development in general and will include a mixture of market and affordable housing. • Comments relating to the impact on the highway are addressed in some detail within the Councils response to the Burscough Standard template Letter. • The amount of housing proposed forms part of a borough-wide target for housing which is needed to meet the projected growth of the West Lancashire population. The role of the Local Plan is to direct this development proportionally to areas and settlements within the Borough based on infrastructure and environmental capacity to ensure the development is delivered as sustainably as possible.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 133  
**Consultee name** Mrs Jan Clintworth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 134  
**Consultee name** Mr Daniel Robinson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 135  
**Consultee name** Mr George Harrison  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 136  
**Consultee name** J Crombleholme  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 137  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs JA Finch  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 138  
**Consultee name** N Smith  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 139  
**Consultee name** Karen Senior  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 140  
**Consultee name** Mr John Baker  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 141  
**Consultee name** John Kenny  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** no action required

---

**ID** 142  
**Consultee name** Mr J G Marriott  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 143  
**Consultee name** F Johnson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 144  
**Consultee name** Mr K Hunter  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 145  
**Consultee name** Mr J Brown  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 146  
**Consultee name** WA Bleasdale  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 147  
**Consultee name** Stephanie Horridge  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 148  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs F Lyon  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---



**ID** 149  
**Consultee name** Mr G Martin  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 150  
**Consultee name** Mr Geoff Murray  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 151  
**Consultee name** Mr James Kenyon  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 152  
**Consultee name** Lawrence and Janice McNabb  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 153  
**Consultee name** Mrs M Pritchard  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 154  
**Consultee name** RJ Kerrison  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 155  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs T Doran  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 156  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs Langton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 157  
**Consultee name** Dr A Mullin  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See the Council's response to Burscough template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 158  
**Consultee name** Mrs P Francis  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 159  
**Consultee name** Mr Chris Taylor  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 160  
**Consultee name** Mr Stephen Beaumont  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 161  
**Consultee name** Ms Carolyn Malone  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 162  
**Consultee name** DR Gadsby  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 163  
**Consultee name** Mrs BM Fearn  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 164  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs T Hayes-Sinclair  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 165  
**Consultee name** Mr Chris Gandun  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 166  
**Consultee name** Mr Ashcroft  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 167  
**Consultee name** I Johnson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** No action required  
**Officer recommendation** See response to Burscough standard template letter

---

**ID** 168  
**Consultee name** Cherry North  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 169  
**Consultee name** Ms L Orme  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 170  
**Consultee name** Mrs S Brandreth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 171  
**Consultee name** Mr Barry Welsh  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 172  
**Consultee name** Joan Liggett  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 173  
**Consultee name** Ms B Fleming  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 182  
**Consultee name** Mr John McCloskey  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 183  
**Consultee name** S J McCloskey  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 187  
**Consultee name** Mr George Devenish  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 188  
**Consultee name** Mrs Vivien Devenish  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 189  
**Consultee name** Miss Jennifer Prescott  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 190  
**Consultee name** Mrs Angela Prescott  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 191  
**Consultee name** Mr Andrew Devenish  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 192  
**Consultee name** Mr William Prescott  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 196  
**Consultee name** Mr Mike Williams  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** In response to the first question, the justification for the number of homes proposed for Burscough is based on the Borough wide requirement to meet housing targets based on the projected growth in households and population over the Plan period. The Local Plan apportions this development to areas which are capable of meeting this need in environmental and infrastructure capacity terms and focuses on the 3 main settlement areas of Skelmersdale, Ormskirk and Burscough. Secondly, whilst community gains through development are a consideration of the planning process in terms of ensuring the existing and proposed communities are able to function once development is built; specific benefits to existing residents as a result of development are not. With regard to traffic comments, the suggestions for easing traffic have been noted. This level of detail and master planning will be applied once the Local Plan has been found sound and adopted and the land has been allocated for development. The key point at this stage is that the proposals are not fundamentally undeliverable. Further details regarding the Councils position in relation to highways are set out in the Councils detailed response to the Burscough Standard Template Letter.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 198  
**Consultee name** Mr Andrew Chapman  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** All brownfield sites in West Lancs have been taken into account and the vast majority will be required for development in the Local Plan period. The Council supports in principle the bringing back into use of vacant properties. However, vacancy levels in West Lancashire are in the nationally accepted normal range (3-4%) required for the housing market to function efficiently. As we must demonstrate that our housing land supply is "deliverable", the contribution from vacant properties has not been taken into account in terms of meeting our housing requirement (although each vacant property brought back into use can count as part of our housing land supply). Issues relating to waste water and highways have been addressed in detail in the Councils response to the Burscough template letter. The Local Education Authority (Lancashire County Council) has confirmed that the additional development is likely to lead to the requirement for additional primary school places in the region of 1 full class per year. This is subject to fluctuating birth and migration rates and will be monitored ongoing. The LEA has confirmed that capacity of secondary school places is good and can accommodate the projected growth.

**Officer recommendation**

---

**ID** 202  
**Consultee name** Ms Brenda McDonald  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 203  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs DB Lowman  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 204  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs Kirby  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---



**ID** 205  
**Consultee name** JF Clarke  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 206  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs K LeMarinel  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 207  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs A Fyles  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 208  
**Consultee name** Mr M Moss  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 209  
**Consultee name** Mr Ian Clements  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 210  
**Consultee name** R McDonald  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 211  
**Consultee name** Elaine Bellamy  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 212  
**Consultee name** Steve McDonald  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 213  
**Consultee name** Mr R Lambert  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 214  
**Consultee name** Mr J Greenall  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 215  
**Consultee name** Maureen Sheehah  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 216  
**Consultee name** Mr K Connell  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 217  
**Consultee name** Mr A Maher  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 218  
**Consultee name** Mrs J Caunce  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 219  
**Consultee name** M Rawsthorne  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 220  
**Consultee name** Claire Birchall  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 221  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs Disley  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 222  
**Consultee name** Mr Allen Ward  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 223  
**Consultee name** E Norris  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 224  
**Consultee name** Mr L Jones  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 225  
**Consultee name** Mr SC Boreham  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 226  
**Consultee name** D Williams  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 227  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs Holker  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 228  
**Consultee name** Mrs J Downey  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 229  
**Consultee name** Alan Burdett  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 230  
**Consultee name** Mrs O Russell  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 231  
**Consultee name** Derek Dillon  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 232  
**Consultee name** SM Cranness  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 233  
**Consultee name** J & L Fyles  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 234  
**Consultee name** TR Bowen  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 235  
**Consultee name** Will Farley  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 236  
**Consultee name** Mrs B Atkinson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 264  
**Consultee name** S Martland  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 265  
**Consultee name** MT Trigg  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 266  
**Consultee name** Mrs E Trigg  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 267  
**Consultee name** M Parle  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 268  
**Consultee name** Mr Sutcliffe  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 269  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs A Ditchfield  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 270  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs EP Jones  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 271  
**Consultee name** DA Briggs  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---



**ID** 272  
**Consultee name** Paul Shepherd  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 274  
**Consultee name** Mr Richard Norris  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 275  
**Consultee name** JN Bampton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 276  
**Consultee name** Mr M Ireland  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 277  
**Consultee name** Mr Ivan Long  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 278  
**Consultee name** Mr HC Massie  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 279  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs Burke  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to proposals  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 280  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs Topping  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 281  
**Consultee name** David Brown  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 282  
**Consultee name** AA Baxter  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 283  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs J Barge  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 284  
**Consultee name** Mr R Lowe  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 285  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs Suggett  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 286  
**Consultee name** Mrs Lisa Wilson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 287  
**Consultee name** Mrs B White  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 288  
**Consultee name** Dave Lea  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 289  
**Consultee name** Margaret James  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 290  
**Consultee name** TM Bridge  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 291  
**Consultee name** JS Dutton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 292  
**Consultee name** Mrs A Fitness  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 293  
**Consultee name** David Heaton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 294  
**Consultee name** A Sylvester  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 295  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs Killeen  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 296  
**Consultee name** Mr S Cheung  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 297  
**Consultee name** Mrs J Fisher  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 298  
**Consultee name** Mrs HM Powell  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 299  
**Consultee name** Eric Bellingall  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 300  
**Consultee name** Mr D Booth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 301  
**Consultee name** David Fairclough  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 302  
**Consultee name** James Downey  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 303  
**Consultee name** Nicola Moore  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 304  
**Consultee name** Mr Smith  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 305  
**Consultee name** A Blythin  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 306  
**Consultee name** Margaret Whitfield  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 307  
**Consultee name** Ms B Physick  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 308  
**Consultee name** Elaine Merrick  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 309  
**Consultee name** Dr C Stott  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 310  
**Consultee name** P Stott  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 321  
**Consultee name** Mr G Ries-Birchall  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 322  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs Lyon  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---



**ID** 323  
**Consultee name** B Difonzo  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 324  
**Consultee name** Mr WS Lee  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 325  
**Consultee name** Miss P Harrison  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 326  
**Consultee name** N Rollins  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 327  
**Consultee name** Mrs Walker  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 328  
**Consultee name** Lucille Connolly  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 329  
**Consultee name** Miss Ruth Wareing  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 330  
**Consultee name** Mrs Barbara Orme  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 331  
**Consultee name** Elaine O'Neill  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 332  
**Consultee name** Diane Williams  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 333  
**Consultee name** Jill Swift  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 334  
**Consultee name** Elaine Wood  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 335  
**Consultee name** Nicholas Swift  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 336  
**Consultee name** Mrs J Ashcroft  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 337  
**Consultee name** Mr G Thorman  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 338  
**Consultee name** Mr RJ Davies  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 339  
**Consultee name** Karen Hampson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 340  
**Consultee name** Mrs Lynn Gill  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 341  
**Consultee name** Mr and Mrs Fairclough  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 342  
**Consultee name** J Mackintosh  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 343  
**Consultee name** T&G Milliken  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 344  
**Consultee name** Patricia Cork  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 345  
**Consultee name** Mrs D Earnshaw  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 346  
**Consultee name** Mr Bryan Perrett  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 347  
**Consultee name** Mrs S Dawson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 348  
**Consultee name** Mrs F Hall  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 349  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs RL Bunting  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 350  
**Consultee name** JM Even  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 351  
**Consultee name** Dr Harald E Brown  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 352  
**Consultee name** J Harrison  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** Comments relating to population growth are noted. In terms of infrastructure, consideration has been given to the impact of development on transport, waste, water problems and congestion and the findings do not suggest that the delivery of this site would be fundamentally flawed as a result of these issues. In relation to flooding, use of brownfield sites, spreading development more widely and waste water issues and improvements, see standard Burscough Template Letter Response where these issues are all addressed in detail.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 353  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs J Graham  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** Comments relating to Burscough as a village, the use of brownfield land and highways congestion have all been addressed in detail in the Councils response to the Burscough template letter. Skelmersdale with Up Holland is proposed to take over half the new housing in the Borough over the next 15 years. The market cannot deliver any greater than this in any one area and the needs of the entire Borough must be met by spreading the development across other main settlements.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 373  
**Consultee name** Reg Porter  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Concerns over the potential impact on traffic flows through Newburgh, including effects on pedestrians. (S)  
**Outcome** The results of the Councils Traffic Impact Assessment Tool have now been completed and a report published showing the findings of this work. This report can be found on the Borough Council's website. This report shows that the local road network should be able to cope with the expected levels of development provided appropriate mitigation measures are put in place.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 378  
**Consultee name** Mr Martin Webber  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** In response to comments relating to traffic, the loss of Green Belt, waste water constraints and Burscough as a village the Councils response to the Burscough template letter addressed these concerns in detail. In response to comments relating to infrastructure – Close consultation has taken place with the NHS through the Primary Care Trust and also the GP Consortium. Feedback suggests that there is likely to be a need for improved health facilities in Burscough which would be resolved at the time of a planning application through a legal obligation which the developer would have to agree too before the granting of any planning consent. The cost of new infrastructure will be borne by both the developer and infrastructure provider where they have a statutory duty to provide infrastructure to support population growth e.g. United Utilities, Local Education Authority. The process of developing the Local Plan differs from determining individual planning applications (such as Heathfields). It allows for master planning and high level principles, such as the need for community facilities within large scale developments, to be engrained within the plan and subsequently a firm requirement of development assessed against the plan. In response to comments relating to housing demand – The amount of housing proposed for both Burscough and Ormskirk forms part of a borough-wide target for housing which is needed to meet the projected growth of the West Lancashire population. The role of the Local Plan is to direct this development proportionally to areas and settlements within the Borough based on infrastructure and environmental capacity to ensure the development is delivered as sustainably as possible.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 381  
**Consultee name** Mr Carl Munnelly  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** The Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out which infrastructure is required, to support development proposals within the LPPO. It also identifies who will deliver it, when it will be required, the cost and possible funding mechanisms. Following liaison with the various infrastructure providers, any requirements as a result of projected growth have been identified and will be a requirement of both the developer and the statutory infrastructure provider at the time the growth occurs. All other points are addressed in the response to the Burscough Standard Template Letter.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 382  
**Consultee name** Mrs B Cronin  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---



**ID** 383  
**Consultee name** Mr D Cronin  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 384  
**Consultee name** Mr A Beaham  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** I wish to protest about the renewed housing development in the local plan at Yew Tree Farm, Burscough. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 385  
**Consultee name** Ms Gillian Bjork  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Petition objected to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** Attached is the Councils formal response to the submitted petition. Points 1, 2, 3 and 4 have all been addressed in the Councils response to the Burscough template letter. The Council is satisfied that the evidence base studies used to support the LPPO are reliable and up to date.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 410  
**Consultee name** RJ Lock  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 411  
**Consultee name** Mr L Jackson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 412  
**Consultee name** Chris Whitehead  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 413  
**Consultee name** L Brough  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 414  
**Consultee name** D&K Dean  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 415  
**Consultee name** Margaret Scarisbrick  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 416  
**Consultee name** Lisa Farrington  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 417  
**Consultee name** Mr and Mrs R Thompson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 418  
**Consultee name** Mr ES King  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 419  
**Consultee name** Mrs A James  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 420  
**Consultee name** F. D. Bligh  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 421  
**Consultee name** M Roughley  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 422  
**Consultee name** M Connolly  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 423  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs R Burke  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 424  
**Consultee name** G McDougall  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 425  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs R Christie  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 426  
**Consultee name** Keith Neale  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 427  
**Consultee name** Mr W Jones  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 428  
**Consultee name** S Denovan  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 430  
**Consultee name** AD Warden  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 431  
**Consultee name** Mrs N Davies  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 432  
**Consultee name** Miss D Owen  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 433  
**Consultee name** EH Jeffries  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 434  
**Consultee name** JD Cartwright  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 435  
**Consultee name** Gordon Anderson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 436  
**Consultee name** Kathryn Morley  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 437  
**Consultee name** Mr A Baybutt  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 438  
**Consultee name** Mr and Mrs Holker  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 439  
**Consultee name** Ian Craven  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 440  
**Consultee name** Sheila Oldfield  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 441  
**Consultee name** Lee Wallbank  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 442  
**Consultee name** Joyce Hopson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 443  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs Stannard  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 444  
**Consultee name** Mr R Dawson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 445  
**Consultee name** T Butterworth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 446  
**Consultee name** Jean Medway  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---



**ID** 447  
**Consultee name** Gary Ennis  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 448  
**Consultee name** Mrs Karen Ennis  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** no action required

---

**ID** 457  
**Consultee name** Brian Woods  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 458  
**Consultee name** J & N Roby  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 459  
**Consultee name** MC Rimmer  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 460  
**Consultee name** Mr Robert Young  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 461  
**Consultee name** Mrs Mary Price  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See the Council's response to Burscough template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 462  
**Consultee name** Ms G O'Neill  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 463  
**Consultee name** Mr J Mudd  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 464  
**Consultee name** Mrs Gill Burnside  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 465  
**Consultee name** NM Lunn  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 466  
**Consultee name** AR Allen  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 467  
**Consultee name** Mrs CA Hillman  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 468  
**Consultee name** Mr J Nicholson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 469  
**Consultee name** Dr Cox  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 470  
**Consultee name** Mr D Spencer  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 471  
**Consultee name** Mrs Maureen McKenzie  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 535  
**Consultee name** Mr Bryan Pready  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Policy SP3 The Yew Tree Farm site in Burscough offers an excellent opportunity to develop land for housing, employment and community facilities (including a new community primary school) in a way that will enhance Burscough, linking the present straggle of ribbon development at the south of the settlement into a coherent whole. The land to be developed is not of such high agricultural value as other land in the Borough and the site does not really fulfil the Green Belt function of keeping settlements separate. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 555  
**Consultee name** Mr David Cain  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 556  
**Consultee name** Jennifer Duffy  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 557  
**Consultee name** Catherine Cain  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 558  
**Consultee name** David Cain  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 559  
**Consultee name** Michael Duffy  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 560  
**Consultee name** Mr Carl Maxfield  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 561  
**Consultee name** Marcus Maxfield  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 562  
**Consultee name** Morven Mitchell  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 563  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs Morley  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 564  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs Dean  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 565  
**Consultee name** Mr and Mrs Humphries  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 566  
**Consultee name** P Birch  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 567  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs Billington  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 568  
**Consultee name** EJ Leet  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 569  
**Consultee name** Mrs E Cook  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 570  
**Consultee name** Mr and Mrs T J Clancy  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 571  
**Consultee name** Mrs Ann Lea  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 572  
**Consultee name** E Molyneux  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 573  
**Consultee name** Mr D Jean  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 574  
**Consultee name** Mr G Lawson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 575  
**Consultee name** Mr and Mrs K Suppell  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---



**ID** 576  
**Consultee name** Thomas Birney  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 577  
**Consultee name** KM Bryant  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals ((S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 578  
**Consultee name** L Formby  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 579  
**Consultee name** M Welham  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 580  
**Consultee name** W Beesley  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 581  
**Consultee name** Mr MF Voller  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 583  
**Consultee name** Mr L Carberry  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 584  
**Consultee name** P Marshall  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 585  
**Consultee name** Victoria Forshaw  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 587  
**Consultee name** Mr A Cocks  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 588  
**Consultee name** Mrs Susan Bold  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 589  
**Consultee name** Mr S Miller  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 591  
**Consultee name** Mrs S Wallace  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 592  
**Consultee name** Shelly Roche-Walker  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 594  
**Consultee name** Joy Murray  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 597  
**Consultee name** I Martin  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 599  
**Consultee name** Mr and Mrs F Hayton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 600  
**Consultee name** K Newton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See the Council's response to Burscough template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 601  
**Consultee name** Mr DR Newton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The 'alternative option' which proposed a policy of a large development site (see 7.28) has been specifically and resolutely rejected in the local plan (see 7.29), but the local plan specifically identifies and endorses a large development site at Yew Tree Farm (see 4.53) There appears to be a substantive conflict. Surely a development of 500 houses and aexpansion of Burscough to the magnitude of 50% is a true (and dreadful) 'significantly expanded settlement '(sic).  
**Outcome** In relation to comments regarding extracts 7.28 and 7.29, this Local Plan does not propose to allocate all of the development needs for the Borough in one place as is suggested in the representation. The LPPO directs 18% of the total development needs of the Borough to Burscough as a whole, of which 10% would be located at the Yew Tree Farm site. In relation to comments about extract 4.53, Burscough is the Borough's third largest settlement, is considered a Key Service Centre that residents from a wide surrounding area use for services and amenities and is a far more sustainable settlement than the next largest settlement in the Borough (Tarleton) with comparably better infrastructure than the rural areas of the Borough. Whilst it is understandable that residents do not wish to see the local area change, planning for large scale development through the Local Planning process is considered to be appropriate to the Burscough settlement, the wider Borough and in tune with the guidance of the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 52).  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 606  
**Consultee name** Mr JM Parker  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 607  
**Consultee name** Mrs E McMillan  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 608  
**Consultee name** Michelle Bull  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposal (S)  
**Outcome** See the Council's response to Burscough template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 609  
**Consultee name** Judy Musson-Christie  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 610  
**Consultee name** George Stevenson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 611  
**Consultee name** Mr DE Lucas  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 612  
**Consultee name** Mr/Mrs Birch  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 613  
**Consultee name** Mr and Mrs J Day  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 614  
**Consultee name** C Beesley  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 615  
**Consultee name** Jackie Coyle  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 616  
**Consultee name** Christine Moore  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 617  
**Consultee name** Hopwells Frozen Foods  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 618  
**Consultee name** Mr Scott David Ashton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 619  
**Consultee name** Mr Peter Finch  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 620  
**Consultee name** Ms LM Greene  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 621  
**Consultee name** Mr Stephen Jepson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 622  
**Consultee name** Mr and Mrs L Saunders  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---



**ID** 625  
**Consultee name** Mr K Dundersale  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals on grounds of green belt, other available brownfield sites, inproportionate sizze, road system, local services (S).  
**Outcome** 1. The Council values the Green Belt and is only considering a release due to the shortage of non Green Belt land to deliver future housing and employment growth for the Borough. 2. Comments relating to brownfield sites are addressed in detail in the Councils response to the Burscough template letter. 3. Burscough is the third largest settlement in the Borough and in total is allocated 18% of the overall development needs of West Lancashire. The Council considers this to be proportionate. 4. Comments relating to highways and congestion are addressed in detail in the Councils response to the Burscough template letter. 5. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out which infrastructure is required, to support development proposals within the LPPO. It also identifies who will deliver it, when it will be required, the cost and possible funding mechanisms. Following liaison with the various infrastructure providers, any requirements as a result of projected growth have been identified and will be a requirement of both the developer and the statutory infrastructure provider at the time the growth occurs  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 629  
**Consultee name** Mr F Delaney  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 630  
**Consultee name** Stephanie Morley  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 631  
**Consultee name** Carol and Thomas Brown  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 632  
**Consultee name** Chris Clarke  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 633  
**Consultee name** B Hounslea  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 634  
**Consultee name** Jayne Shacklady  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 635  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs P Beaumont  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 636  
**Consultee name** John Starkie  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposal (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 637  
**Consultee name** Mr S Garrett  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 638  
**Consultee name** Amanda Hesketh  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 639  
**Consultee name** Stuart Garrett  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 640  
**Consultee name** Mrs JA Munro  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 641  
**Consultee name** Frank Shaw  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 642  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs S Roberts  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 643  
**Consultee name** Gemma Lewis  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 644  
**Consultee name** Joe Garrett  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 645  
**Consultee name** Lynn Garrett  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 646  
**Consultee name** Ron Beaton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 647  
**Consultee name** Mr Stevenson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 648  
**Consultee name** John Garrett  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 649  
**Consultee name** Mr Luke Garrett  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 650  
**Consultee name** Mr MJ Wareing  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 651  
**Consultee name** Mrs B Glaysher  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 652  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs G Kingston  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 653  
**Consultee name** Mrs C Newton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 654  
**Consultee name** Paul Forshaw  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 655  
**Consultee name** Mark Forshaw  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 656  
**Consultee name** Mrs Janet Forshaw  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 657  
**Consultee name** Laura Clarke  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 658  
**Consultee name** Mr Josh Rolf  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 659  
**Consultee name** Lynne Jepson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

<b>ID</b>	723
<b>Consultee name</b>	Ms Gillian Bjork
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	Objection to proposed development at Yew Tree Farm, Burscough on a variety of grounds including size of development, inaccurate information, inaccurate assessments of land, sustainability assessment, loss of agricultural land, insufficient assurances of drainage and traffic issues being resolved, a vague traffic study, ignoring objections from previous consultations, queries over housing targets and the rejection of earlier options. (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	<p>1) Comments relating to brownfield sites are addressed in detail in the Council's response to the Burscough template letter. 2) Burscough is the third largest settlement in the Borough and a Key Service Centre. The LPPO apportions 18% of the total housing development needs for the Borough to Burscough as a whole. The Council considers this is reasonable given that Burscough is a Key Service Centre. 3) Comments relating to the use of Green Belt land are addressed in detail in the Council's response to the Burscough template letter. However, in addition to these comments, the suggestion to use the former airstrip (land to the west of Tollgate Road) has been considered and ruled out by the Council. This land, also within the Green Belt, is only enclosed by development to the north and east and could constitute further sprawl into the open countryside. Furthermore, whilst it would not directly affect the residential properties on Liverpool Road, the issues that might impact Burscough as whole as a result of development of the airstrip site would be similar to that at Yew Tree Farm. 4) The inaccuracy regarding a swimming pool within the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan is a misprint of a dot in a column where one should not be and will be corrected in the next version of the IDP. This factor played little or no influence in allocating the Yew Tree Farm site. 5) Burscough's railway stations offer existing connections both east to west and north to south. Whilst the frequency of services is currently limited on the Ormskirk to Preston line, the basic infrastructure offers potential to improve this facility for the good of the existing and future community. This is something which the Council supports and the Local Plan may plan positively to improve. The NPPF is clear that significant development should be focused on locations that are or can be made sustainable. Burscough is both sustainable in terms of its key service centre status and has potential to be made more sustainable. 4.55 – The Green Belt Study included site visits and the information recorded was as accurate as was visible and available at that time. The process of consultation identified one or two instances where incorrect information had been recorded and this was then subsequently amended before the final study was published. No submissions were made in relation to such inaccuracies relating to the parcels at the Yew Tree Farm Site. The Study was independently validated by Lancashire County Council and not self regulated as is suggested. The Council is not in a position to financially support independent assessments of all parcels of land in relation to soil quality and so usually utilises the most up to date and available information from DEFRA. However, if more up to date information has been presented to the Council then this cannot be ignored. The assessment was carried out by independent professionals and the Council has no justification to suspect it is inaccurate. 4.56 – This is incorrect. The Sustainability Appraisal concluded that whilst there were variances in the individual criteria assessing the sustainability, both Options A and B were broadly equal in terms of overall sustainability. 4.59 – The planning system has a duty to contribute to achieving sustainable development. This includes supporting strong, vibrant, healthy communities through provision of facilities that reflect their needs. The IDP sets out any infrastructure deficiencies and through the masterplanning and planning application process, any deficiencies identified must be rectified by the development in order to make it acceptable. However, the system must ensure that development remains deliverable and viable and cannot overburden developments with community gains above and beyond what is required to make the development acceptable. The delivery of improved utilities is outside of the planning system and regulated by other means. However, the Council, through continued liaison with the utility provider, remains optimistic that these improvements will be achieved. 4.61 – This issue has been addressed within the Council's detailed response to the Burscough template letter. However, no area of land was entirely removed from consideration based on the agricultural land classification. 4.62 – See response to 4.59 above. 4.63 / 4.64 - This issue has been addressed within the Council's detailed response to the Burscough template letter. 4.68 – Paragraph 4.68 clearly states that 51% of people who took part in the consultation objected to the proposal. 4.70 – This sentence states a fact. The petition was received by the Council long after the document had been written,</p>



finalised and printed so could not have been included. Council resources prevent the Planning Policy Team of five officers from approaching all residents in all areas across the Borough, directly affected by the plan. However, the consultation exercise was publicised and the material associated with the Local Plan Preferred Options made available in Council offices, Post Offices, Libraries and online to allow the public to review the document and consider the contents. The purpose of the forums and exhibitions was to allow the public to meet officers, ask questions and discuss the proposals. 4.71 – The size of the parcel at Yew Tree Farm remains the same and the likely density of development has never changed so the “potential” amount of housing that could be delivered there has not altered. However, the LPPO is clear about how much housing is expected to be delivered, based mainly on how many the market will allow in the time period in which this parcel may come forward. The last round of consultation suggested the site would deliver 600 dwellings in the plan period. This has been reduced to 500 to account for feedback regarding delivery within this plan period. 4.72 / 4.73 / 4.74 – This is answered above in point 2. 4.76 – Comment noted

**Officer recommendation**

No Action Required

**ID**

741

**Consultee name**

Mrs Jeannie Pritchard

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response**

Object

**Summary**

Object to Burscough proposals on grounds of drainage, traffic and insufficient numbers of schools and GPs. (S)

**Outcome**

Concerns regarding various strands of infrastructure are noted. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out which infrastructure is required, to support development proposals within the LPPO. It also identifies who will deliver it, when it will be required, the cost and possible funding mechanisms. Following liaison with the various infrastructure providers, any requirements as a result of projected growth have been identified and will be a requirement of both the developer and the statutory infrastructure provider at the time the growth occurs. Addressing the constraints of the existing waste water treatment infrastructure is not a constraint that the Council can resolve independently. United Utilities are the sewerage undertaker for West Lancashire and as such they have a duty to upgrade and improve the network to support growth and development. However, the Council have regular dialogue with both United Utilities and the Environment Agency to assist in delivering these improvements in order to support development and growth within the Borough. Whilst new development in Burscough will add more vehicles onto the road network around the settlement, the Highways Authority (Lancashire County Council) has confirmed the capacity of the road network can adequately support the increased number of vehicles, when taken together with improvements to junctions and the management of traffic.

**Officer recommendation**

No change required

**ID** 742  
**Consultee name** Mrs Cynthia Dereli  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Questions as to statements received on earlier planning application in relation to traffic and access from the Yew Tree Farm site and its relevance to Local Plan proposals. Question in relation to ownership of land. (S)  
**Outcome** The Council understands the concerns residents may have in terms of the need for detail and how access may be taken to the Yew Tree Farm site. However, the Local Plan process requires that a variety of options must be considered and in doing so it would not be practical to establish the finer detail regarding all of the possible options for future development. Notwithstanding this, the options presented within the Local Plan Preferred Options have all been assessed to some degree and evidence confirms that they are all fundamentally deliverable. If the Yew Tree Farm option remains the Council's "preferred option" significant further assessment work will be required to ensure the development is delivered in the most sustainable way. The master planning process would also include extensive community consultation to ensure the wider benefits of the development are of real use to the residents, for example a park or the location of new facilities. Land ownership is irrelevant to the planning process.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 743  
**Consultee name** Diane Abram  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals on grounds of traffic, loss of agricultural land, insufficient parking in the centre, insufficient facilities and services to cope with the population, water issues, drainage. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments regarding congestion are noted. The Council, together with Lancashire County Council (as highways authority), have undertaken analysis of the potential increase in traffic associated with all new developments proposed in the Local Plan, and the three separate options previously consulted upon. While new development in Burscough will add more vehicles onto the road network around the settlement, the capacity of the road network can adequately support the increased number of vehicles, when taken together with improvements to junctions and the management of traffic. The Council values Green Belt and is only considering its release as a last resort. Policies within the Local Plan will continue to protect the remaining Green Belt (over 90% of the Borough) as has been the case in the past. In relation to parking, travel plans will be required through the master planning and planning application process to support all development sites proposed within the Local Plan. It is the Council's intention that development should seek all opportunities to promote sustainable transport links such as walking and cycling. However, parking will need to be considered where proposals to upgrade facilities in the centre are submitted. The responsibility for addressing the surface water flooding issues in Burscough lies with United Utilities, who have a duty to maintain and upgrade the sewers, and landowners, who have a duty to maintain culverts on their land. New development provides a potential opportunity to address some of these issues as the engineering work that must be put in place by a developer or landowner to ensure that the surface water infrastructure can cope with the additional development will also improve the existing situation. Such improvements must be made before any development proposals on Yew Tree Farm are delivered. Yew Tree Farm is not considered a "flood area" as is suggested in the representation. Burscough is the third largest settlement in the Borough and in total is allocated 18% of the overall development needs of West Lancashire. The Council considers this to be proportionate and the distribution of development is akin with spreading it rather than consolidating it in one location.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

<b>ID</b>	748
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Peter Link
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	Object to Burscough proposals on grounds of highway safety, traffic, loss of green belt, loss of identity, excessive scale, loss of agricultural land, inadequate swers, flooding risk, insufficient demand for housing. smaller pockets development spread out over Lancashire which encourage green living would be more beneficial for future generations. (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	<p>Highway Safety and Additional Traffic The Council, together with Lancashire County Council (as highways authority), have undertaken analysis of the potential increase in traffic associated with all new developments proposed in the Local Plan, and the three separate options previously consulted upon. While new development in Burscough will add more vehicles onto the road network around the settlement, the capacity of the road network can adequately support the increased number of vehicles, when taken together with improvements to junctions and the management of traffic Loss of Greenbelt The Council are looking at releasing Green Belt land for development only as a last resort in order to meet housing and employment needs over the next 15 years. The total area of Green Belt release proposed in the Local Plan is for approximately 135 ha, which constitutes only 0.39% of the Borough's Green Belt. This relatively small quantity of land, not all of which is used for agriculture, represents a very small proportion of the Borough's agricultural land and will have little effect on the agricultural economy in the Borough. Identity of Burscough Burscough is the Borough's third largest settlement and is considered a Key Service Centre that residents from a wide surrounding area use for services and amenities. Whilst it is understandable that residents may not wish to see the local area change, the Yew Tree Farm development site would be located between existing developed areas (Liverpool Road and the Industrial estate). This reduces the likely impact development would have on the rural nature of the Borough and in particular the impact that development would have if it was located in proximity to some of the smaller villages that do not have the scale of urban area that Burscough has. Excessive Scale The amount of housing proposed forms part of a borough-wide target for housing which is needed to meet the projected growth of the West Lancashire population. The role of the Local Plan is to direct this development proportionally to areas and settlements within the Borough based on infrastructure and environmental capacity to ensure the development is delivered as sustainably as possible. Loss of High Quality Agricultural Land Although the council values agricultural land, the quality of the land at the Yew Tree Farm site, which was assessed by professional consultants, was only one factor used in assessing the potential sites for Green Belt release. In comparison to the other sites assessed (including some which had been assessed in more detail for agricultural land quality), the Yew Tree Farm site generally did not have as good quality agricultural land. Public Sewers Inadequate Addressing the constraints of the existing waste water treatment infrastructure that serves Ormskirk, Burscough, Rufford and parts of Scarisbrick is not a constraint that the Council can resolve independently. United Utilities are the sewerage undertaker for West Lancashire and as such they have a duty to upgrade and improve the network to support growth and development. However, the Council have regular dialogue with both United Utilities and the Environment Agency to assist in delivering these improvements in order to support development and growth within the Borough. Risk of Flooding The responsibility for addressing the surface water flooding issues in Burscough lies with United Utilities, who have a duty to maintain and upgrade the sewers, and landowners, who have a duty to maintain culverts on their land. New development provides a potential opportunity to address some of these issues as the engineering work that must be put in place by a developer or landowner to ensure that the surface water infrastructure can cope with the additional development will also improve the existing situation. Such improvements must be made before any development proposals on Yew Tree Farm are delivered.</p>
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change required

**ID** 751  
**Consultee name** Mr William Robinson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Development in School lane has good infrastructure to cope with expansion both in terms of in out-commuting to satisfy the retail and community requirements of the future occupiers, via the M58 and M6. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 767  
**Consultee name** Mr L Richardson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** The Mill has planning permission and can be developed at anytime. The Council has taken this into account when considering how we will meet future housing requirements. Regarding all other points, see the Council's response to the Burscough template letter.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 769  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs Morley  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See the Council's response to the Burscough template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 770  
**Consultee name** Jake Norris  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See the Council's response to the Burscough template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 773  
**Consultee name** Mr and Mrs Spencer  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 774  
**Consultee name** Mrs J Allen  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 775  
**Consultee name** Christine Frith  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 776  
**Consultee name** A Walmsley  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 777  
**Consultee name** Harold Barlow  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 778  
**Consultee name** Mr and Mrs L Abram  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 779  
**Consultee name** Mr and Mrs G Jones  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See the Council's response to the Burscough template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 780  
**Consultee name** Karen Morris  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 781  
**Consultee name** Craig Rood  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 782  
**Consultee name** Stuart Rood  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 783  
**Consultee name** PM Norbury  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 784  
**Consultee name** Michelle Killen  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 785  
**Consultee name** Gill Chadburn  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 786  
**Consultee name** K McClennon  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 820  
**Consultee name** Mr Edward Ainscough  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Comments on traffic issues.  
**Outcome** Comments relating to Pinfold Garage and (1) speed restrictions are outside the remit of this plan and consultation. 2) Comments noted, development of the Yew Tree Farm site offers the opportunity to address some of the heavy goods and large farm vehicular traffic that currently uses the Pippin Street junction with the A59 and at times, Higgins Lane. Detailed junction improvements directly associated with the Yew Tree Farm site would be assessed and identified through a separate master planning exercise for the site in the future, in close consultation with the local community. 3) See above point regarding prospect of upgrading existing junctions. 4) Skelmersdale remains the focus for employment development throughout the plan and will deliver almost 70% of the total employment needs for the Borough.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required.

---

**ID** 826  
**Consultee name** Mr Mark James  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** I write to object to the building of houses and industrial units in Burscough on green belt at Yew Tree Farm. It is quite frankly a preposterous idea giving the problems already with congestion and flooding in the area. I feel that there must be further solutions that must be looked into in particular Option 3. (F)  
**Outcome** Objection noted. Both traffic and flooding have been considered in defining this "preferred option" and details setting out the Councils understanding of these issues is available within the response to the Burscough template letter. The main issues relating to Option 3 where the greater impacts of traffic that would be felt on Ormskirk Town Centre and the quality of the Green Belt in terms of how well it fulfils the purposes of including land within the Green Belt as set out in the NPPF.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required.

---

**ID** 827  
**Consultee name** Mr and Mrs AT Jones  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S).  
**Outcome** Comments relating to traffic, building on green belt land, infrastructure, waste water problems are noted. Burscough is the Borough's third largest settlement and is considered a Key Service Centre that residents from a wide surrounding area use for services and amenities. Whilst it is understandable that residents may not wish to see the local area change, the Yew Tree Farm development site would be located between existing developed areas (Liverpool Road and the Industrial estate). This reduces the likely impact development would have on the rural nature of the Borough and in particular the impact that development would have if it was located in proximity to some of the smaller villages that do not have the scale of urban area that Burscough has.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---



**ID** 836  
**Consultee name** Mrs JA Munro  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to proposals in Burscough and Grove Farm. Concerns over loss of character, flooding, loss of greenbelt, infrastructure. (S)  
**Outcome** All points relating to the use of brownfield land, release of Green Belt, Burscough as a village, surface water flooding and empty properties have been addressed in detail in the Council's response to the Burscough template letter.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 850  
**Consultee name** Mrs Pauline Parker  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** I object to proposed development at Yew Tree Farm, Burscough due to the size of development, loss of greenbelt, insufficient assurance regarding infrastructure concerns, the effect on the village and the withdrawal of earlier options. (S)  
**Outcome** All points relating to the use of brownfield land, release of Green Belt and impact on transport and infrastructure in general have been addressed in detail in the Council's response to the Burscough template letter. The consultation exercise was publicised and the material associated with the Local Plan Preferred Options made available in Council offices, Post Offices, Libraries and online to allow the public to review the document and consider the contents. The purpose of the forums and exhibitions was to allow the public to meet officers, ask questions and discuss the proposals. This was limited to ensure the groups were manageable by the officers. In any event, the small amount of residents turned away where offered and alternative event to attend.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

<b>ID</b>	859
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mrs Cynthia Dereli
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	<p>•The Yew Tree Farm site at Burscough is too large in relation to the scale of the village and should never have been selected as it is contrary to the Council's own criteria and that of Green Belt policy. •The Green Belt Study that supports the allocation is flawed. •There is no need for up to 1200 homes locally to Burscough so this housing should go elsewhere. •There is no local support for Yew Tree Farm and this is not reflected in the plan. •Infrastructure constraints are misrepresented, the waste water treatment issue is not fully addressed in the document and there is no easily identifiable solution to the traffic congestion on the A59, also not dealt with by the Plan. •The arguments made within the plan in relation to infrastructure delivery are inaccurate and misleading. •Safeguarding of land should not only be in Burscough it should be in other settlements, including Skelmersdale. •Affordable housing is a major need and the Council should be using publicly owned land to deliver it. •Environmental issues are not properly addressed in the plan including no reference to a brook at YTF which could flood and renewable energy should be applied to all sites not just YTF. •The infrastructure delivery plan does not relate to the Local Plan.(S)</p>
<b>Outcome</b>	<p>Burscough is the third largest settlement in the Borough and a Key Service Centre. In total, 18% of the overall development needs of West Lancashire are directed to Burscough. The Council considers this to be proportionate. In response to 5.22 - Yew Tree Farm is largely enclosed and so in Green Belt terms no longer fulfils the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. The National Planning Policy Framework is clear that plans should identify 'safeguarded land' in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period. Land at Yew Tree Farm achieves this. 2) The Green Belt Study has been independently validated and is accepted by the Council as evidence to inform the Local Plan. The Study went through its own round of consultation and was subject to some changes as a result of feedback. Assessing the Green Belt is inevitably a subjective process. National guidance is not so prescriptive as to result in an entirely objective method of assessing Green Belt, and so the interpretation of different purposes and of different boundaries will vary somewhat even between planning professionals. In particular, the character of the Yew Tree Farm site makes it more difficult than most to divide into parcels and indeed, some planning professionals would consider it as one whole parcel due to the strongest boundaries in the area being the roads and built-lines that make up the boundary of the strategic development site. However, it is unlikely that a change to how the site was divided into parcels would have resulted in a different outcome. 3) The consultation exercise was publicised and the material associated with the Local Plan Preferred Options made available in Council offices, Post Offices, Libraries and online to allow the public to review the document and consider the contents. The purpose of the forums and exhibitions was to allow the public to meet officers, ask questions and discuss the proposals. The information presented within the consultation report was factual and local objection and support to development in each locality is something which occurs across the Borough. Point regarding the interpretation of results is acknowledged. However, whilst community consultation is important to the process to ensure the plan has the opportunity to be shaped and respond to local communities, it is not the only factor to be considered. Technical evidence demonstrating West Lancashire's housing and employment needs along with evidence base studies to guide development must be given equal weight. Relevant sections comments on various pages and paragraphs – P46 – noted P58 - includes the quote that 51% of people taking part in the consultation objected to the Burscough option. 4.70 – noted 4.76 – noted.</p>
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change required

**ID** 865  
**Consultee name** Mr Simon Bjork  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals on grounds of: highway safety/traffic generation; loss of green belt land; loss of agricultural land; excessive development; inadequacy of sewerage system; drainage; environment study. (S)  
**Outcome** Points 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 have all been addressed in detail in Council's response to the Burscough template letter. 6) Plans for the stream and any other site specific features will be considered in detail at master planning stage in the event that Yew Tree Farm remains within the Councils "preferred option" for development. 7) Initial environmental assessment has been carried out on the entire plan through the Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment. More detailed surveys may be conducted at master planning stage and would be required as part of a planning application.  
**Officer recommendation**

---

**ID** 874  
**Consultee name** Mrs Patricia King  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals on grounds of loss of character, traffic, loss of agricultural land, poor infrastructure. Other brownfield sites should be investigated and used for development. The Council are ignoring the views of residents. (S)  
**Outcome** Issues relating to 1) Burscough as a village, 2) traffic and congestion, 3) use of agricultural land, 4) infrastructure capacity are addressed in detail in the Councils response to the Burscough template letter. Comments in points 5 and 6 are noted. Point 7) relating to the use of brownfield land is also addressed in the Councils response to the Burscough template letter.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 899  
**Consultee name** Sharon Rawsthorne  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals on following grounds: highway safety, traffic generation, loss of greenbelt, identity of Burscough, overdevelopment, excessive scale, loss of high quality agricultural land, inadequate sewers, flood risk, loss of open space, better sites available locally. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments relating to 1) Highway safety, 2) traffic and congestion, 3) loss of Green Belt and 4) Burscough as a village are addressed in detail in the Councils response to the Burscough template letter. In response to comments at points 5 and 6, Burscough is the third largest settlement in the Borough and a Key Service Centre. The LPPO apportions 18% of the total housing development needs for the Borough to Burscough as a whole. The Council considers this is proportionate. Comments relating to Point 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 are also addressed in the Councils response to the Burscough template letter.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 900  
**Consultee name** Laura Porter  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals on grounds of: loss of village character, development scale, traffic, insufficient infrastructure, sewage problems, loss of green belt, loss of wildlife, availability of brownfield sites. Support previous Ormskirk option. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments relating to Burscough as a village, traffic congestion, infrastructure, sewage, flooding, development of Green Belt land, use of brown field land and property vacancy are all addressed in detail in the Councils response to the Burscough template letter.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 901  
**Consultee name** Mr Mervyn King  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals based on traffic, loss of greenbelt land, loss of agricultural land, effects on ecology, excessive scale, other viable alternatives available. Concern that Council have already made their mind up and are ignoring resident views (S)  
**Outcome** Comments relating to traffic, Green Belt, Burscough as a village and the level of development and viable alternatives have all been addressed in the Council's response to the Burscough template letter.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 908  
**Consultee name** Mrs & Mr Glyn & Pat Blackledge  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals on following grounds: traffic, sewage and drainage, loss of green belt, loss of wildlife,  
**Outcome** Comments relating to traffic drainage, the use of brown field land and Green Belt and infrastructure capacity are addressed in detail in the Councils response to the Burscough template letter. The land at Ainscough Mill has planning permission and has been counted towards meeting the future housing need of the Borough. As and when this comes forward is at the discretion of the land owner. All other comments noted.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required.

---

**ID** 910  
**Consultee name** Mrs & Mr Glyn & Pat Blackledge  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals on following grounds: traffic, sewage and drainage, loss of green belt, loss of wildlife,  
**Outcome** Comments relating to traffic drainage, the use of brown field land and Green Belt and infrastructure capacity are addressed in detail in the Councils response to the Burscough template letter. The land at Ainscough Mill has planning permission and has been counted towards meeting the future housing need of the Borough. As and when this comes forward is at the discretion of the land owner. All other comments noted.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 916  
**Consultee name** BJ Taylor  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals on grounds of: traffic, flood, infrastructure, excessive scale, (S)  
**Outcome** Comments regarding the consultation are noted. The consultation exercise was publicised and the material associated with the Local Plan Preferred Options made available in Council offices, Post Offices, Libraries and online to allow the public to review the document and consider the contents. The purpose of the forums and exhibitions was to allow the public to meet officers, ask questions and discuss the proposals. Whilst the feedback gave a good first hand understanding of local opinion, it is not the only aspect considered in taking the LPPPO forward.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 920  
**Consultee name** Michelle Blair  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposal on grounds of 1. Surface water flooding 2. Waste water 3. School places 4. Traffic 5. Green belt 6. Amenities, wildlife habitat and heritage 7. Housing See attached 23 page document also. (S)  
**Outcome** no change required as raises no new evidence not already considered by the Council that changes the assessment of options for the Local Plan – see separate full response  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 970  
**Consultee name** mr john colbourn  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object on grounds of traffic. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments relating to traffic concerns have been addressed in detail in the Council's response to the Burscough template letter. Whilst it would be an ideal situation to present the proposals with detailed worked up traffic solutions, this is impractical at this stage due to the level of detail this would require and the cost of such work. The Local Plan is still at preferred options so there is only a limited degree of certainty that can be afforded to the proposals at this stage. This makes significant investment in such works unfeasible.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 999  
**Consultee name** Diane Bjork  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1000  
**Consultee name** Carl Bjork  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1022  
**Consultee name** Mr Francis Williams Ormskirk Friends of the Earth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The A59 through Burscough is prone to congestion, and very long traffic delays are a certainty when any roadworks begin. Without a great improvement of the A59, rather than just traffic mitigation measures, any significant development will make the congestion much worse. No assessment appears to have been made of the agricultural potential of the site. This is regrettable set against a background of rising food prices and increasing population. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments relating to both agricultural land and traffic congestion at Yew Tree Farm have been addressed in detail in the Council's response to the Burscough template letter.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1032  
**Consultee name** Peter O'Connor  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 1033  
**Consultee name** L O'Connor  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals on grounds of roads, infrastructure and development scale (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1034  
**Consultee name** Mr Derek Mellor  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1035  
**Consultee name** PM Woods  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1036  
**Consultee name** Rosalie Sullivan  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1037  
**Consultee name** TJ & BS O'Brywd  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1038  
**Consultee name** Deborah Murray  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1039  
**Consultee name** Elizabeth Galma  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1040  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs G Birchall  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1041  
**Consultee name** Mrs J Disley  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---



**ID** 1042  
**Consultee name** Mr Martin Williams  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1043  
**Consultee name** Mrs M Mellor  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposal (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1044  
**Consultee name** Penny Price  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1045  
**Consultee name** Lara Thompson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1046  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs P Stubbings  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1047  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs G Hayton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1048  
**Consultee name** Graham Moreton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1049  
**Consultee name** Mal Scott  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1050  
**Consultee name** Patricia Brierly  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1051  
**Consultee name** Corinne Drury  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1052  
**Consultee name** David Drury  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1053  
**Consultee name** Katie Marley  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1054  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs Critchley  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1055  
**Consultee name** Peter & Gwen Stevenson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1056  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs J Basterra  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1057  
**Consultee name** Alan & Pam Roberts  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1058  
**Consultee name** Simon Walisley  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1059  
**Consultee name** Sharon Rawsthorne  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1060  
**Consultee name** Mr John McCloskey  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1061  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs Frank & Beryl Johnson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1062  
**Consultee name** Mrs HJ Barclay  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1063  
**Consultee name** WC Slowey  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1064  
**Consultee name** Jess E Parker  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1065  
**Consultee name** MJ Parker  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1066  
**Consultee name** PA Parker  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1067  
**Consultee name** Mary Connell  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1068  
**Consultee name** Joanne Rawsthorne  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1069  
**Consultee name** Michael Dawson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1070  
**Consultee name** Ms Gillian Bjork  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposal on grounds of 1. Surface water flooding 2. Waste water 3. School places 4. Traffic 5. Green belt 6. Amenities, wildlife habitat and heritage 7. Housing See attached document also. (S)  
**Outcome** no change required as raises no new evidence not already considered by the Council that changes the assessment of options for the Local Plan – see separate full response  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1071  
**Consultee name** Gavin Rattray  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposal on grounds of 1. Surface water flooding 2. Waste water 3. School places 4. Traffic 5. Green belt 6. Amenities, wildlife habitat and heritage 7. Housing See attachment. (S)  
**Outcome** no change required as raises no new evidence not already considered by the Council that changes the assessment of options for the Local Plan – see separate full response  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1075  
**Consultee name** Mrs Sheena Rawsthorne  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object on grounds of flooding, public sewers and traffic. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments relating to points 1, 2 and 3 have all been addressed in the Council's response to the Burscough template letter.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 1076  
**Consultee name** Julie Dale  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object on grounds of traffic, infrastructure, agricultural land, excessive scale (S)  
**Outcome** Comments relating to traffic, Green Belt and the scale of development are all addressed in detail in the Council's response to the Burscough template letter.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 1078  
**Consultee name** Judith Birchall  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object on grounds of traffic, infrastructure, drainage, agricultural land (S)  
**Outcome** Comments relating to the scale of development, agricultural land, wildlife, traffic and drainage are all addressed in detail in the Council's response to the Burscough template letter.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 1085  
**Consultee name** Ms Jane Thompson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** I personally would like to see houses built near Higgins Lane in Burscough. It is derelict land and has been for years and years. It is not top class green belt land - in fact far from it. I think it would help to regenerate Burscough if affordable homes were built there. This area needs regenerating. (S)  
**Outcome** comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 1087  
**Consultee name** Susan Dunn West Lancashire Civic Trust  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support Burscough development due to benefits it brings and use of lesser grade agricultural land (S)  
**Outcome** comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1094  
**Consultee name** Mr Karl Vella MBE  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support the proposals for Bursough to enable employment expansion and provision, protect better quality green belt areas elsewhere in the Borough, and bring money into the area through spending. Flooding and traffic issues will be addressed before development commences. (S)  
**Outcome** comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** no change required

---

**ID** 1099  
**Consultee name** Mr Keith Williams Burscough Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to loss of green belt and agricultural land. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments relating to Green Belt and agricultural land are addressed in detail in the Council's response to the Burscough template letter.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---



**ID** 1102  
**Consultee name** Mr Keith Williams Burscough Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object on grounds of inadequate infrastructure (S)  
**Outcome** Comments relating to infrastructure, drainage, sewage and traffic are set out within the Council's response to the Burscough template letter. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out greater available detail relating to the specifics of infrastructure delivery.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 1110  
**Consultee name** Mr David Mansell  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object on grounds of traffic, scale and loss of green belt (S)  
**Outcome** Detailed comments relating to traffic concerns are set out in the Council's response to the Burscough template letter.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1121  
**Consultee name** Julie Higson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1122  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs Purcell  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1123  
**Consultee name** R Lason  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1124  
**Consultee name** Catherine and Paul Shiel  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough standard template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1125  
**Consultee name** Mr Roger Bell  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** We believe the proposed Local Plan offers several benefits for a large housing development at Yew Tree Farm but a number of infrastructure improvements are essential for this development to go ahead. (s)  
**Outcome** Comments noted - all infrastructure issues have been considered in allocating the Yew Tree Farm site and, where infrastructure providers have informed the Council of potential improvements that are required, Policy SP3 has addressed these.  
**Officer recommendation** no change required

---

**ID** 1185  
**Consultee name** Joe Lewis  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** I wish to object to the planned housing development on Yew Tree Farm proposed in the local plan. There are objections based on the loss of farm land, the effect of congestions in Burscough, the many other changes that would be forced through in the face of strong local objection. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments relating to agricultural land and Green Belt and congestion have been addressed in the Councils response to the Burscough template letter.  
**Officer recommendation** no change

---

**ID** 1197  
**Consultee name** RDM Bligh  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** I object to the latest development plan for the following reasons: a) sustainable development b) WLBC plan for development Object to loss of agricultural land. (S)  
**Outcome** Until such a time as Central Government places national importance on our local resource (farmland) this must be tempered with other needs of the Borough including those for economic growth, jobs and housing. Comments relating to the use of agricultural land, brownfield sites, have been addressed in detail in the Councils response to the Burscough template letter. The consultation exercise was publicised and the material associated with the Local Plan Preferred Options made available in Council offices, Post Offices, Libraries and online to allow the public to review the document and consider the contents. The purpose of the forums and exhibitions was to allow the public to meet officers, ask questions and discuss the proposals. The restriction of numbers helped the groups to remain informative and manageable. Notwithstanding this, any residents or interested parties not able to attend the Burscough forum where offered an alternative event.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required.

---

**ID** 1198  
**Consultee name** Mr John Crawford  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to proposals on grounds of traffic, sewage/drainage, scale, public transport, loss of green belt, loss of agricultural land, scrapping of option 3, public objection (S).  
**Outcome** Comments relating to the impact on the Village, transport, infrastructure Green Belt, congestion and brownfield sites are all addressed in the Council's response to the Burscough Template letter.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1201  
**Consultee name** Mr ST Thompson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals on grounds of loss of green belt land, loss of agricultural land, no demand for industrial space, waste water / sewage problems, traffic problems, rejection of earlier options - particularly Ormskirk (S)  
**Outcome** Comments relating to agricultural land, Green Belt, waste water, surface water flooding, traffic, viable alternatives, are all addressed in the Councils response to the Burscough template letter. Vacancy rates within Burscough Industrial Estate are relatively low and must be tempered with the existing market conditions. Projected employment development takes account of historic take-up rates and should therefore be typical of what the Borough has achieved in the past. The information presented within the consultation report was factual and local objection and support to development in each locality is something which occurs across the Borough. However, whilst community consultation is important to the process to ensure the plan has the opportunity to be shaped and respond to local communities, it is not the only factor to be considered. Technical evidence demonstrating West Lancashire's housing and employment needs along with evidence base studies to guide development must be given equal weight.  
**Officer recommendation**

---

**ID** 1209  
**Consultee name** Cain Cunningham  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals on grounds including traffic, environment, green belt, agricultural land, drainage, (S)  
**Outcome** Comments relating to traffic, the environment and Burscough as a village have all been addressed in the Councils response to the Burscough template letter. Whilst the Council has had a long standing desire to see the development of the Ormskirk bypass, financial resources and other Government priorities mean that this will be unlikely in the near future. The consultation exercise was publicised and the material associated with the Local Plan Preferred Options made available in Council offices, Post Offices, Libraries and online to allow the public to review the document and consider the contents. The purpose of the forums and exhibitions was to allow the public to meet officers, ask questions and discuss the proposals. The meetings were limited to allow for meaningful discussion in groups of a manageable size. Notwithstanding this, any residents who were unable to attend where offered an alternative meeting. Affordable housing would be a required element of any housing development in the Burscough area. Furthermore, housing supply also directly relates to the affordability of houses.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 1226  
**Consultee name** Mr PF McLaughlin  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** The Yew Tree Farm development will bring many benefits to Burscough, with new amenities, school and park. It is essential for all developments, especially Burscough, that services and infrastructure are in place. (F)  
**Outcome** comment noted  
**Officer recommendation** no change

---

**ID** 1232  
**Consultee name** Mr J Maddocks  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support the Burscough proposals. Problems can be resolved and Burscough needs houses and employment (S).  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1233  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs JA Dobson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support for Burscough proposals on grounds of improvements it will bring to Burscough, new housing and new employment (S)  
**Outcome** comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1236  
**Consultee name** Mrs Erika Price  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Page 58, bullet point 9 Satisfaction should not only be for the Environment Agency but also for local population (the victims). Similar attention by United Utilities re waste disposal and treatment is essential. Please insist on a landscape design being submitted with every planning application for houses, offices case versions and similar. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No chaneg required

---

**ID** 1245  
**Consultee name** Robert J. & K. ADA Travis  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals. Development should be located in Skelmersdale (S)  
**Outcome** Officer note: letter refers to reps made in June 2011. See earlier reps. comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

<b>ID</b>	1294	
<b>Consultee name</b>	Kate Wheeler	Natural England
<b>Agent Name</b>		
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object	
<b>Summary</b>	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 (S)	
<b>Outcome</b>	Whilst the Council fully appreciates the value of conserving and enhancing biodiversity, landscape, recreation opportunities and access to green spaces through well planned GI, we are confident that the broader plan as a whole will guide all development in delivering these requirements and will assist in the master planning of the site at a later stage, should this remain the Council's preferred option for development.	
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change	

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Policy SP3**

**Title: Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site**

---

**ID** 7

**Consultee name** Mrs Elaine Lea

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** Burscough does not require any further expansion to do so would be detrimental to the area and local community. (S)

**Outcome**

- All brownfield sites in West Lancs have been taken into account and the vast majority will be required for development in the Local Plan period – Green Belt release has only been considered because there is insufficient brownfield land to meet the housing and employment land targets.
- The Council, together with Lancashire County Council (as highways authority), have undertaken analysis of the potential increase in traffic associated with all new developments proposed in the Local Plan, and the three separate options previously consulted upon. While new development in Burscough will add more vehicles onto the road network around the settlement, the capacity of the road network can adequately support the increased number of vehicles, when taken together with improvements to junctions and the management of traffic.

**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 8

**Consultee name** Ms Claire Rimmer

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S).

**Outcome**

- The Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out which infrastructure is required, to support development proposals within the “plan”. It also identifies who will deliver it, when it will be required, the cost and possible funding mechanisms. The Transport Technical Paper sets out the likely implications of development on traffic and transport links. Once the Preferred Option for development has been finalised more detail can be established to ensure the necessary highway infrastructure improvements are delivered in conjunction with the development.
- The Council, together with Lancashire County Council (as highways authority), have undertaken analysis of the potential increase in traffic associated with all new developments proposed in the Local Plan, and the three separate options previously consulted upon. While new development in Burscough will add more vehicles onto the road network around the settlement, the capacity of the road network can adequately support the increased number of vehicles, when taken together with improvements to junctions and the management of traffic.
- Growth for the Borough includes economic growth to ensure West Lancashire does not become entirely reliant on sources of employment in other Local Authority areas. However, existing strong travel to work patterns with Merseyside and Wigan must be acknowledged and are likely to continue due to the largely rural nature of the Borough.

**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 9  
**Consultee name** Mrs Doreen Williams  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S).  
**Outcome** • The Council, together with Lancashire County Council (as highways authority), have undertaken analysis of the potential increase in traffic associated with all new developments proposed in the Local Plan, and the three separate options previously consulted upon. While new development in Burscough will add more vehicles onto the road network around the settlement, the capacity of the road network can adequately support the increased number of vehicles, when taken together with improvements to junctions and the management of traffic. • Development of the Yew Tree Farm site offers the opportunity to address some of the heavy goods and large farm vehicular traffic that currently uses the Pippin Street junction with the A59 and at times, Higgins Lane. Detailed junction improvements directly associated with the Yew Tree Farm site would be assessed and identified through a separate master planning exercise for the site in the future, in close consultation with the local community. • Whilst community consultation is important to the process to ensure the plan has the opportunity to be shaped and respond to local communities, it is not the only factor to be considered. Technical evidence demonstrating West Lancashire's housing and employment needs along with evidence base studies to guide development must be given equal weight.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required .

---

**ID** 20  
**Consultee name** Mr Howard Courtley Courtley Consultants Ltd  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Selection of Yew Tree Farm in preference of the Plan B sites is not justified or consistent with PPG2 or their own policies. Fine Janes Farm is sustainable, brownfield, deliverable and meets the sequential test. Alternative sites set out in Plan B have not been properly assessed. Phasing Plan B sites beyond 2027 will not meet the Councils 5 year supply (S).  
**Outcome** PPG2 includes a provision for Green Belt boundaries to be reviewed and Green Belt land to be released where exceptional circumstances exist. The significant amount of land within the Borough designated as Green Belt (over 90%) and lack of existing brownfield land, coupled with the need to deliver housing and economic growth to support the growing population within West Lancashire, we consider to be exceptional circumstances. Whilst Fine Janes Farm can potentially assist in meeting development needs in the event of a housing delivery shortfall, the size and location of the site means it would only meet a small amount of housing need which is more likely to be associated with need located within Sefton.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---



**ID** 21  
**Consultee name** Mr Howard Courtley Courtley Consultants Ltd  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Paragraph 5.58 suggests that " no other substantial site or combination of sites can deliver the level of development needed. This clearly incorrect. The reserve/ plan B sites identify a supply of 760 dwellings, they are evenly spread around the Borough. They offer choice, spread supply and in general are likely to be at a scale which will facilitate delivery. Given West Lancs BC past record on housing delivery, concentrating development at only one or two locations outside Skemsdale is not a robust or sound strategy. Fine Janes Farm offers a site which already satisfies the criteria for its release from the GB. The site is brownfield, has now waste or surface water issues and has no demonstrable highway problems. The site is on the urban edge of Southport with excellent connections to schools, shops, services and employment. (F)  
**Outcome** • Paragraph 5.58 of the Local Plan Preferred Options document makes reference to suitability of sites in general when applying the sequential test. • Technical Paper 1 in the supporting evidence base sets out how all sites were assessed and the relative merits of each site which lead to categorising them as "preferred" or "Plan B". • Whilst Fine Janes Farm can potentially assist in meeting development needs in the event of a housing delivery shortfall, the size and location of the site means it would only meet a small amount of housing need which is more likely to be associated with need located within Sefton.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 107  
**Consultee name** Ms Julie Hotchkiss Ashton, Leigh & Wigan Primary Care Trust  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** West Lancashire needs more housing and particularly more specialist housing for people with specific needs, for instance due to disabilities. Young people need to be able to get on the housing ladder, and older people need suitable housing. Burscough would be an ideal site and is well connected to facilities. Local businesses would be supported (S).  
**Outcome** comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change required.

---

**ID** 184  
**Consultee name** L McCloskey  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Burscough proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See response to Burscough template letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 375  
**Consultee name** Mr Andy Pringle ICD / Maharishi Community  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** The selection of Yew Tree Farm for green belt release and major residential and employment development will strengthen Burscough and result in improved infrastructure in the town. Burscough has excellent transport links and is well suited to a sustainable development as proposed.(S)  
**Outcome** comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 590  
**Consultee name** Mr Robin Buckley Redrow Homes (Lancs) Ltd  
**Agent Name** Mr Tony McAteer  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The suitability, achievability and appropriateness of the proposed Green Belt release at Yew Tree Farm is questioned. (S)  
**Outcome** The Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out which infrastructure is required, to support development proposals within the LPPO. It also identifies who will deliver it, when it will be required, the cost and possible funding mechanisms. Following liaison with the various infrastructure providers, any requirements as a result of projected growth have been identified and will be a requirement of both the developer and the statutory infrastructure provider at the time the growth occurs. The Council has developed a effective relationship with the utility provider (United Utilities) and considers that communication with the provider along with the broader legislative requirements placed on United Utilities, offers a great deal of comfort in relation to the delivery of upgraded waste water treatment works. Comments relating to highways infrastructure and traffic congestion are addressed in detail in the Councils response to the Burscough template letter. Spreading Green Belt release across several smaller sites around the Borough was considered as a potential option early on in the preparation of the Local Plan, but was rejected because it would impact on more areas of Green Belt (many of which actually fulfil the purposes of Green Belt), it would spread the impact on infrastructure around the Borough without raising sufficient developer contributions to address the infrastructure issues created by those developments in several different places, and even a small amount of development on the edge of a rural village can have a much greater impact than on a small town like Burscough.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 796  
**Consultee name** Mr Robert W. Pickavance  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** 1. Development at Rufford should not be delayed by the New Lane WWTW issues. 2. No objections were received to the New Road site during the last consultation period. 3. If the Yew Tree Farm /Grove Farm and Banks sites were reduced slightly, the New Road site could be accommodated. This site should be allocated for development ahead of any Green Belt release. (S)  
**Outcome** 1. Sites at Rufford should be treated the same way as sites at Burscough, as they use the same WWTW. 2. Point noted, but bear in mind the previous version of the Plan (like this one) did not highlight New Road as a potential development site. 3. There is no need to reduce capacities on other sites - housing targets are minima. It is agreed that non-Green Belt sites should preferably be developed before Green Belt sites.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 867  
**Consultee name** Mr Philip Carter Environment Agency  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** The policy clearly recognises the problem of sewerage capacity affecting the Yew Tree Farm strategic site. The policy will ensure that no development can commence until the sewerage capacity issue is resolved, and we strongly support this. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 928  
**Consultee name** Mr Peter Banks  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Yew Tree Farm should not be a strategic development site. Development in Burscough should be incremental and in smaller developments. The Yew Tree Farm site should therefore not be a strategic site, but parts of it, adjacent to existing developments, should be included as smaller incremental developments totalling perhaps 70 dwellings. The Red Cat Lane site should be transferred from 'Plan B' to the main plan and the shortfall of 430 made up by including the three Plan B sites at or near Halsall. Some of the remaining Yew Tree Farm site could then be moved to Plan B. (F)  
**Outcome** In relation to Yew Tree Farm, when removing land from the Green Belt, the new boundary must be set to a robust and defensible boundary which is logical and will withstand into the future. There are no such boundaries within the Yew Tree Farm site so the most logical solution is to remove the entire parcel and safeguard to remaining land for future needs. This is in line with National Guidance. In relation to Red Cat Lane, the site is considered to be less deliverable than Yew Tree Farm as access to the main through route (A59) is not as direct as the Yew Tree Farm site.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 944  
**Consultee name** Ms Michelle Blair  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Reason for objection to 1. Surface water flooding (plus notes on fluvial flooding). Comments available through Rep 920 and the supporting documentation attached. (S)  
**Outcome** no change required as raises no new evidence not already considered by the Council that changes the assessment of options for the Local Plan – see separate full response  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 945  
**Consultee name** MR gavin rattray  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** There is insufficient capacity in Burscoughs secondary school for the planned increase in the population. There is no provision in the plan for the developer to provide funds to expand the current school or build an additional school and if the money to do this is not provided it will result in Burscough children being bused to schools in Ormskirk and Skelmersdale. (S)  
**Outcome** The Local Education Authority (LEA) has raised no issue in relation to the capacity and provision of secondary school places within West Lancashire as a result of the growth plans set out within the LPPO. However, the LEA forecasts for school provision on a much shorter time frame than the Local Plan period (5 years). The process of infrastructure planning is ongoing and the LEA will continue to work closely with the Council on all planning matters. In the event a need for additional secondary school capacity is identified then the Council, through either the Community Infrastructure Levy or Section 106 agreement may secure financial recompense to ensure this deficiency is resolved in order to make the planning permission acceptable.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 946  
**Consultee name** Ms Michelle Blair  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Reason for objection 2. Waste water Comments available through Rep 920 and the supporting documentation attached. (S)  
**Outcome** no change required as raises no new evidence not already considered by the Council that changes the assessment of options for the Local Plan – see separate full response  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 947  
**Consultee name** Ms Michelle Blair  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Reason for objection 3. School places Comments available through Rep 920 and the supporting documentation attached. (S)  
**Outcome** no change required as raises no new evidence not already considered by the Council that changes the assessment of options for the Local Plan – see separate full response  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 948  
**Consultee name** Ms Michelle Blair  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Reason for objection 4. Traffic Comments available through Rep 920 and the supporting documentation attached. (S)  
**Outcome** no change required as raises no new evidence not already considered by the Council that changes the assessment of options for the Local Plan – see separate full response  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 950  
**Consultee name** Ms Michelle Blair  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Reasons for objection 5. Green belt  
**Outcome** no change required as raises no new evidence not already considered by the Council that changes the assessment of options for the Local Plan – see separate full response  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 952  
**Consultee name** Ms Michelle Blair  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Reasons for objection 6. Loss of amenities, wildlife habitat and heritage  
**Outcome** no change required as raises no new evidence not already considered by the Council that changes the assessment of options for the Local Plan – see separate full response  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 954  
**Consultee name** Ms Michelle Blair  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Reason for objection 7. Housing  
**Outcome** no change required as raises no new evidence not already considered by the Council that changes the assessment of options for the Local Plan – see separate full response  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 1024  
**Consultee name** Mr Francis Williams Ormskirk Friends of the Earth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The Yew Tree Farm site consists mostly of highly productive agricultural land, and although there are derelict farm buildings on the site, there is no reason why the buildings could not be restored or replaced and the farmland be put back to productive use, otherwise this will give an incentive to developers to purchase farmland on the urban edge and leave it fallow in the hope it will be developed. (F)  
**Outcome** Use of Green Belt, infrastructure capacity and agricultural land have all been addressed in the Council's response to the Burscough template letter. The council sets out clearly within the Green Belt Study how the land at Yew Tree Farm is considered to no longer fulfil the purposes of the Green Belt. However, in response to the comments made, the parcel as a whole is contained by development on 3 sides. Whilst the Council considers it regrettable to have to release land from Green Belt designation, this parcel is likely to have a lesser impact on the openness of the Green Belt and countryside in West Lancashire than any other parcel as there are no other locations which are surrounded on 3 sides by development. Comments relating to the Environment Agency's views on development in Aughton will be further investigated as to date this view has not been shared with the Council, despite the EA's continued engagement in the process.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 1095  
**Consultee name** Bickerstaffe Trust  
**Agent Name** Mr Graham Love Turley Associates  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Justified (i.e. exceptional) green belt release should only take place in the most appropriate (i.e. sustainable) locations and not necessarily simply where green belt land is no longer considered to be performing one or more of its statutory purposes. Yew Tree Farm is not considered an appropriate site. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 1149  
**Consultee name** Mr Robin Buckley Redrow Homes (Lancs) Ltd  
**Agent Name** Mr Tony McAteer  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The suitability, achievability and appropriateness of the proposed Green Belt release at Yew Tree Farm is questioned. (S)  
**Outcome** Infrastructure and drainage comments are addressed in detail in the Councils response to the Burscough template letter. However, the LPPO focuses development in the most sustainable locations within the Borough, as per National Guidance. The existing infrastructure in many aspects has basic capacity and where there are deficits, these have been identified to ensure improvements are made in line with development. To spread development more broadly to less sustainable non-Green Belt locations would not be in keeping with the purpose of the planning system to assist in the delivery of sustainable development  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 1167  
**Consultee name** Crompton property developments David Crompton  
**Agent Name** Mr Simon Pemberton JASP Planning Consultancy Ltd  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support for Policy SP3 and the approach taken to develop the Policy  
**Outcome** comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 1170  
**Consultee name** Mr Leslie Connor The Jean and Leslie Connor Charitable Foundation  
**Agent Name** Mr Tony McAteer  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The suitability, achievability and appropriateness of the proposed Green Belt release at Yew Tree Farm is questioned. (S)  
**Outcome** Infrastructure and drainage comments are addressed in detail in the Councils response to the Burscough template letter. However, the LPPO focuses development in the most sustainable locations within the Borough, as per National Guidance. The existing infrastructure in many aspects has basic capacity and where there are deficits, these have been identified to ensure improvements are made in line with development. To spread development more broadly to less sustainable non-Green Belt locations would not be in keeping with the purpose of the planning system to assist in the delivery of sustainable development  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

<b>ID</b>	1210
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr JG Murray
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	Object to Burscough proposals on grounds including traffic, drainage, infrastructure, loss of green belt, loss of agricultural land, non-consideration of Ormskirk option, loss of habitat (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	<p>Response to each point in turn. 1. Burscough is the Borough's third largest settlement and is considered a Key Service Centre that residents from a wide surrounding area use for services and amenities. Whilst it is understandable that residents may not wish to see the local area change, the Yew Tree Farm development site would be located between existing developed areas (Liverpool Road and the Industrial estate). This reduces the likely impact development would have on the rural nature of the Borough and in particular the impact that development would have if it was located in proximity to some of the smaller villages that do not have the scale of urban area that Burscough has. 2. Up to 35% would be required to affordable housing which would not necessarily be entirely made up of social housing. Addressing housing affordability is vital to ensure the boroughs settlements maintain an economically active population. Burscough is allocated a total of 18% of housing development over the plan period. As the third largest settlement the Council considers this is proportionate and that the assertion that Burscough is taking the burden is inaccurate. 3. Traffic issues are addressed in detail in the Council's response to the Burscough template letter (points 6 and 7). 4. It would be unreasonable and unproductive for the Council to refuse to build any more development until the Ormskirk bypass is funded. Feedback from our infrastructure providers suggests that development can be accommodated subject to some upgrades and improvements as set out within the IDP. Without a delivery strategy, a new Local Plan would not be found sound leading to a planning policy vacuum which could result in pressure for development in even less appropriate locations. 5. Control over environmental concerns during construction phase may be managed through planning conditions and other legislation (Environmental Health). 6. Securing of financial planning obligations may be through either Section 106 agreements which must meet strict tests or through the collection of a Community Infrastructure Levy if and when the Council establishes one. Both mechanisms are transparent and would apply to new developer regardless of its site. 7. Unfortunately property value is not a planning consideration. 8. Comments relating to traffic are addressed in detail within the Councils response to the Burscough template letter (points 6 and 7). The concerns relating to the site to the east of Ormskirk were also related to the impact on Green Belt as this parcel of land is entirely open to the countryside to the east whereas the Yew Tree Farm site is already surrounded on three side by development. 9. Design of development through the master planning stage would allow for the necessary buffers to be included within the site ensuring no negative impacts arise from conflicting land uses. Use of this site would limit the impact of urban sprawl for the reasons set out in point 9. 10/11. Concerns relating to agricultural land and wildlife are addressed in detail in the Council's response to the Burscough template letter (point 8). 12. The Local Plan includes a strategy to deliver development to meet the needs of the existing and future needs of the residents of the Borough as a whole.</p>
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change required

---



**ID** 1250  
**Consultee name** Bickerstaffe Trust  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Agrees with the principle of Green Belt release. However, believes that Ormskirk is a more sustainable and suitable settlement for a strategic site than Burscough. (s)  
**Outcome** comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** no change required

---

**ID** 1278  
**Consultee name** Mr David Grimshaw  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Development of this land (Red Cat Lane) would be a significant assistance to West Lancashire District Council in complying with Policy GD1. The land considered in this application is also on the Public Transport bus routes 1,2,3,4 which ensure journeys to the main places of employment adjacent to Burscough centre are within easy travelling distance. It is for this reason that we believe the application is consistent with Policy GD1 3.5 19:  
**Outcome** comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** no change

---

**ID** 1356  
**Consultee name** Mr Roger Bell OPSTA  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** OPSTA supports the development of the Yew Tree farm site but would have concerns if the site was not integrated into the local transport infrastructure. (s)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Electrification of the rail line between Ormskirk and Burscough and the reopening of the Burscough Curves is supported by the Local Plan and the relationship between development at Yew Tree Farm / Burscough generally and these potential improvements is recognised.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action required

---

**Chapter/Policy Number:** 5.1

**Title:** Settlement Boundaries

---

**ID** 12  
**Consultee name** Mr Alastair Caird  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Green Belt land should be untouched until all brownfield land is used up. (S)  
**Outcome** The Council agrees with the general principle of developing brownfield land before greenfield / Green Belt land. There are a number of brownfield sites already with applications or permission for housing and other uses, and it is hoped these developments will take place. Much of the remaining brownfield land is employment land, and is required for employment uses. Green Belt has been looked at as a last resource, as there is a lack of suitable sites within areas excluded from the Green Belt to meet development needs for 2012-2027.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 536  
**Consultee name** Mr Bryan Pready  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** I support the Policies in this Chapter, including the 'Plan B' sites identified in Policy GN2. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Policy GN1**

**Title: Settlement Boundaries**

---

**ID** 91

**Consultee name** Church Commissioners For England

**Agent Name** Miss Jennifer Hadland Smiths Gore

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** 1. Some boundaries of small settlements should be reconsidered to allow enough development for them to avoid decline; 2. Development on greenfield land within settlements should not be restricted; 3. The feasibility and viability of small-scale affordable housing developments is questioned; 4. Market housing and employment development are needed within settlements to ensure viability. (S)

**Outcome** 1. It is considered that the proposed settlement boundaries allow for development in future. The SHLAA shows there is sufficient land within the proposed settlement boundaries to meet the development targets for the smaller settlements. 2. Policy GN1 allows for development of greenfield land within settlements, subject to other policies being satisfied. Development targets for these settlements are minimum figures, and can be exceeded, although constraints such as infrastructure need careful attention. 3. Comments noted. A number of small-scale affordable housing schemes have been delivered in West Lancashire over recent years. 4. Policy GN1 allows for market housing and employment development within settlements. (Please also see response to representation 96.)

**Officer recommendation** No change to Policy GN1.

---

**ID** 178

**Consultee name** Mr Andrew Watt

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Support

**Summary** Proposed changes to the Settlement Boundary at Burscough detailed in Appendix G of the Local Plan Preferred Options are welcomed and supported by Timetoken Limited. (S)

**Outcome** Comments noted

**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 244  
**Consultee name** Ms Judith Nelson English Heritage  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** It is suggested that section a) also covers impact on the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings and the contribution of the area/open space to local character. (S)  
**Outcome** Section (a) of the policy refers to "all relevant policies applying to the site", and makes it clear that the list of considerations is not exhaustive. The suggested text is not considered necessary in the policy, given impact on historic environment / heritage assets / their settings can be covered by the above phrase, and also by Policy EN4. Text could be added to the policy justification (paragraph 5.8 bullet points) to refer to impact on the character and appearance of the settlement and the setting of heritage assets and the contribution of the area/open space to local character.  
**Officer recommendation** Add text to paragraph 5.8 to cover impacts on the character and appearance of the settlement and the setting of heritage assets, and the contribution of the area/open space to local character.

---

**ID** 510  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Changes have been made to settlement boundaries at Blaguegate Lane / Firwood Road, in contravention of the Inspector's findings. (F)  
**Outcome** No boundary change has been made at Blaguegate Lane / Firwood Road: this land is marked as being within a settlement area in the 2006 West Lancashire Replacement Local Plan, and it remains so in the emerging plan. There is no contravention with regard to the findings of the 2006 WLRLP Inspector's Report.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 511  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Chapter 5 General Development Policies page 64 paragraph 5.13 - Comments about matters not covered by the LDF Preferred Options document were discouraged by the Council, with the assurance that Site Allocations would form a later part of the process. It is not equitable (sic), therefore to use comments from people who ignored that advice in advance of the rest having an opportunity to comment on these matters. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Whilst views during the 2011 CSPO consultation were taken into account in assessing potential sites for allocation, they were a minor consideration. Other matters, for example policy considerations and settlement sustainability, had much greater weight.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 593  
**Consultee name** Mr Robin Buckley Redrow Homes (Lancs) Ltd  
**Agent Name** Mr Tony McAteer  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Redrow Homes support the principle that all development should be within defined settlement boundaries, and the recognition that greenfield development will contribute to the development needs of settlements. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 797  
**Consultee name** Mr Robert W. Pickavance  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Being part brownfield, and given its characteristics, the development of the New Road site would be in line with Policy GN1. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 828  
**Consultee name** Ms June Iddon  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Settlement boundaries in Tarleton: the boundary around the Objector's property has been incorrectly drawn, and needs to be correct in the forthcoming plan. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Not all of the land in the Objector's ownership (as described in the objection) should be part of the 'building zone' (in this case, the settlement area). However, the settlement boundary will follow existing features on the ground, e.g. property boundaries. The settlement boundary at the south east of the Objector's plot will be subject to a minor amendment to make it consistent with the Objector's land.  
**Officer recommendation** Amend settlement boundary between 174/176 Hesketh Lane so that it coincides with the boundary between these two curtilages.

---

**ID** 841  
**Consultee name** Anglo International Up Holland Ltd  
**Agent Name** Ms Lorraine Davison DPP  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The policy would benefit from amendment to reflect the fact that there will be circumstances where new development that is unable to satisfy the broad thrust of the policy as drafted would secure other plan objectives, e.g. enabling development. Change to policy wording suggested. (S)  
**Outcome** 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. (This would not automatically mean that it would be granted permission because the specific justification for the particular enabling development proposed would need to be assessed.) As with other objections on behalf of Anglo International, the Council does not consider it appropriate or necessary to add wording to this Local Plan policy to refer to this specific scenario.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 913  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs E Ramsbottom  
**Agent Name** Mr Michael Cunningham Cunningham Planning  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The wording of Policy GN1 is accepted and appropriate, however, the identification of the settlement boundary around Chapel Lane is incorrect in that it excludes 2 sites which form part of the settlement and should be included.  
**Outcome** It is not considered appropriate or necessary to amend the Green Belt / settlement boundary at this location. The reasoning set out in the 2006 WLRLP Inspector's Report with regard to the Green Belt boundary is considered to remain applicable at this juncture.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 919  
**Consultee name** Mr Ian Ramsbottom  
**Agent Name** Mr Michael Cunningham Cunningham Planning  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The Green Belt / settlement boundary identified on map G2 should be amended to include the area bounded by Ruff Lane / Wellfield Lane and Vicarage Lane within the settlement area, in order to comply with National Policy contained in PPG2 and accurately reflect the true settlement boundary. (S)  
**Outcome** PPG paragraph 2.11 allows for built-up areas to be washed over. In previous local plans, it has been judged appropriate for the Vicarage Lane area to be washed over. The Council considers that this remains the case. Green Belt policy allows for reasonable extensions to existing dwellings, so there is not considered to be undue restriction with regard to the existing properties in this area being kept in the Green Belt.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 921  
**Consultee name** Estate of Mr J Travis Estate of John Travis  
**Agent Name** Mr Michael Cunningham Cunningham Planning  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The Orrell Lane site should be identified on the Proposals Map as part of the settlement area of Burscough and appropriate for residential / employment / community uses. The site is a more appropriate location for development than the site at Yew Tree Farm which has been the subject of significant public opposition. Whilst the Orrell Lane site is not as large as the strategic development site at Yew Tree Farm, it should form part of a provision for residential / employment / community uses in this part of the Borough with other areas currently designated as safeguarded land in Ormskirk/Aughton being brought forward as development land. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. For the reasons set out in the Green Belt Study and the Strategic Options and Green Belt Release Technical Paper, it is considered preferable to release the site at Yew Tree Farm from the Green Belt, rather than the land at Orrell Lane.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 922  
**Consultee name** Mr T Dickinson  
**Agent Name** Mr Michael Cunningham Cunningham Planning  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The Green Belt boundary in the area around Elm Place should be altered to exclude the overgrown and derelict area of land identified as proposed new children's play area. The area of land in question should therefore be designated as forming part of the main settlement area. (S)  
**Outcome** Sport and recreation are appropriate uses in the Green Belt. The land is considered inappropriate for incorporation into the settlement (and therefore for development) as access to it is poor. There are not considered to be any special circumstances that would suggest this site should be removed from the Green Belt.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 1025  
**Consultee name** Mr Francis Williams Ormskirk Friends of the Earth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Greenfield land within settlements if not suitable for farming, may still be useful for community food production. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 1107  
**Consultee name** Mr Andy Pringle Ideal Community Developments  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Land south west of Abbey Lane has potential to be developed as a central sports facility. This will strengthen the town Burscough as a Key Service Centre, provide excellent sporting facilities, and enhance employment opportunities, thus helping to maximize Burscough's tourism and recreational potential. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The land is in the Green Belt and currently designated as recreational land. It is considered that the appropriateness of the specific proposals for this site would need to be tested through the planning application process, rather than a Local Plan allocation.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 1150  
**Consultee name** Mr Robin Buckley Redrow Homes (Lancs) Ltd  
**Agent Name** Mr Tony McAteer  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Redrow Homes support the principle that all development should be within defined settlement boundaries, and the recognition that greenfield development will contribute to the development needs of settlements. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1162  
**Consultee name** Mr Roger Clayton South Lathom Residents Association  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The Blaguegate Lane / Firwood Road area is rural and should not be considered with the wider Skelmersdale urban area. The land is safeguarded in the 2006 Local Plan for development beyond 2016, and only if there are no longer any other suitable sites within the urban area to meet any identified development needs. 17. The Blaguegate Lane/Firwood Road area does not even meet the description set out under the heading "Defining settlement boundaries" in paragraph 5.5 (S)  
**Outcome** The land at Blaguegate Lane / Firwood Road is contiguous with the Skelmersdale urban area and includes XL Business Park (a functioning part of the wider Stanley Industrial Estate in Skelmersdale), the land proposed to be allocated between Firwood Road and Neverstitch Road for housing (and which may well have its primary access onto Neverstitch Road in Skelmersdale) and the existing residential properties on Ormskirk Road and Firwood Road. Therefore, while this land may, administratively, be within Lathom South, functionally and spatially it is a part of the Skelmersdale urban area and not an independent settlement. In terms of "Section 17" of the SLRA representation, the land at Firwood Road is currently safeguarded under WLRLP Policy DS3, and is not "Open Land" as referred to in WLLP 5.5 (Open Land is under WLRLP Policy DS4). Given development requirements and housing land supply, the land at Firwood Road is needed to help meet the development requirements for the new Plan period 2012-2027, also taking into account potential housing sites within Skelmersdale and other settlements.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---



**ID** 1218  
**Consultee name** Mr Andrew Taylor David Wilson Homes  
**Agent Name** Ms Lorraine Davison DPP  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The settlement boundary relating to Aughton should be revised to exclude from the Green Belt all land proposed for development as part of the proposed Parr's Lane, Aughton Strategic Housing Allocation. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Please see response to Representation 1212.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 1255  
**Consultee name** Mr Alan Hubbard The National Trust  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** The National Trust supports the approach of not proposing any new designations, settlement boundary changes or Green Belt boundary changes in Rufford. This is of particular importance in ensuring there are no adverse impacts upon Rufford Old Hall and in safeguarding its character and the openness of its rural setting - a key part of its special significances. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1269  
**Consultee name** Mr Alexis De Pol  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Open land on the Urban Fringe in the Northern parishes should be considered for development within the settlement boundaries.  
**Outcome** Land designated under WLRLP Policy DS4 ("Protected Land") was considered as one of the sources of land supply to meet development targets. One piece of DS4 land at Chequer Lane has been allocated as a housing site. However, much of the DS4 land is in areas subject to constraints (e.g. Northern Parishes, subject to wastewater, drainage, highways, flood risk, etc. constraints) and such locations were not generally judged appropriate for allocating new development. Therefore it has been considered preferable to exclude much of the DS4 land from settlements, and to meet development needs on safeguarded land and, exceptionally, on a number of Green Belt sites.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1308  
**Consultee name** Mrs Margaret Wiltshire CPRE (West Lancs Group)  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** We support the principles of this policy, trusting that the published NPPF will re-assert the Government's concern to protect the Green Belt and emphasise its purposes. (P38 paras 133, 134 in the draft version). Then the Council will be able to "plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt" (Para 135). (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1309  
**Consultee name** Mrs Margaret Wiltshire CPRE (West Lancs Group)  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Para 5.8, 7th bullet point We appreciate the Council's concern to minimise the loss or sterilisation of agricultural land. This, especially the extensive "best and most versatile" land is one of the Borough's most valuable resources. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: 5.2**

**Title: Safeguarded Land**

---

**ID** 128  
**Consultee name** Mrs Sheila Hart  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** Unfortunately, a small proportion of Green Belt land is required for development or the "Plan B" in the Local Plan in order to meet housing and employment land needs in the Borough over the 15-year plan, and to ensure that there is flexibility in housing land supply, as per the latest Government guidance on planning for housing. The Mill Lane site was found to be one of the more suitable sites for release from the Green Belt and, should it be required as part of the "Plan B" would not place undue stress on local infrastructure and services. It is the Council's understanding that the planning permission previously granted on appeal for the development of apartments at the St Joseph's College site is no longer viable and deliverable and is not anticipated to be implemented during the Local Plan period. Moreover, this site is more remote and less accessible and sustainable than sites such as Mill Lane, which is only 200m from the village centre and a Quality Bus Route.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 130  
**Consultee name** Mr Peter Fairhurst  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** Future use of Green Belt land - Mill Lane is the only site currently in the Green Belt proposed for release, so no other sites will be considered for release of Green Belt at least for the lifetime of this Local Plan. Up Holland is not considered to have any significant infrastructure deficiencies and the Mill Lane site in particular is only within 200m of the Village Centre and a Quality Bus Route. In relation to highways impacts associated with Mill Lane, highways access to the site could be designed such that it makes Mill Lane safer for pedestrians and vehicular traffic alike. Should development be required at Mill Lane, it would not affect the vast majority of the open space at Mill Lane. The only change would likely be the need to provide a highways access across the north-west corner of the recreation area, and so the need to replace the Play Area elsewhere in the open space. The selection of Plan B sites is set out in the Strategic Options and Green Belt Release Technical Paper, available on the Council's website - all evidence presented above was considered as part of this process. Policy GN3 and other aspects of national planning policy provides for the need for new development not to impact unduly on the amenity of neighbouring properties and uses. Therefore, any detailed design of development on the Mill Lane site would have to minimise impact on the amenity of neighbours. Consultation process - all households received information on the consultation event either via a "wraparound" feature on the Champion Newspaper or via a leaflet sent to any addresses that do not receive the Champion.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 131  
**Consultee name** Mrs Sheila Hart  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals. (S)  
**Outcome** The Childrens Play Area, if it were affected, would be replaced elsewhere on the Mill Lane open space. The Local Plan Preferred Options and accompanying evidence base documents show that there is not sufficient brownfield land to deliver the Borough's housing targets over the 15-year Local Plan period.  
**Officer recommendation** No action

---

**ID** 179  
**Consultee name** Mr Colin R Gardiner  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals on the basis of traffic (S)  
**Outcome** In relation to highways impacts associated with Mill Lane, highways access to the site could be designed such that it makes Mill Lane safer for pedestrians and vehicular traffic alike.  
**Officer recommendation** No action

---

**ID** 181  
**Consultee name** Julie Haeger  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals on a number of grounds including roads, facilities and the need to protect green belt (S)  
**Outcome** Up Holland is not considered to have any significant infrastructure deficiencies and the Mill Lane site in particular is only within 200m of the Village Centre and a Quality Bus Route. In relation to highways impacts associated with Mill Lane, highways access to the site could be designed such that it makes Mill Lane safer for pedestrians and vehicular traffic alike. With regard to housing demand, due to the slow economic recovery from the recent recession, the housing market has not yet picked up as well as hoped. However, the Local Plan covers a 15-year period and it is expected that the market will recover over the coming few years. With specific reference to St Joseph's College (which is also in the Green Belt), the recent planning permission has proven unviable because there is no demand for apartments in Up Holland.  
**Officer recommendation** No action

---

**ID** 193  
**Consultee name** Mr Ian Ramsdale  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 194  
**Consultee name** Mr Roy Richardson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 195  
**Consultee name** Mr George Bradley  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 197  
**Consultee name** Mr Michael Corcoran  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to development at Parrs Lane (S)  
**Outcome** a) The Council are only considering Green Belt release as a last resort and are minimising how much is released in order to limit the loss of agricultural land. b) While it is recognised that Parr's Lane is in many ways a semi-rural location, it is on the edge of the Borough's second largest built-up area and the site has been found to no longer fulfil the purposes of the Green Belt. c+d) While new development would inevitably increase traffic to a degree, Parrs Lane and the associated junctions are able to cope with the increase traffic and junction improvements could actually make the junctions safer despite the increase in traffic. e) Any new development would be required to put in place measures to ensure that surface water run-off was not made worse by the development. Such improvements often help resolve existing issues as well.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 199  
**Consultee name** Mrs Gillian Cottell  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** In relation to highways impacts associated with Mill Lane, highways access to the site could be designed such that it makes Mill Lane safer for pedestrians and vehicular traffic alike. With regard to houses available on the market, they cannot be counted toward meeting the housing targets for the Borough. With specific reference to St Joseph's College (which is also in the Green Belt), the recent planning permission has proven unviable because there is no demand for apartments in Up Holland.  
**Officer recommendation** no action required

---

**ID** 200  
**Consultee name** Mr Marcus Hart  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals on a number of grounds, including traffic (S).  
**Outcome** 1+4) Planning Permission was refused for the erection of two three-storey buildings comprising 32 affordable apartments at 26 Mill Lane in 2006 because "the buildings by reason of their scale, orientation and design would be an incongruous development within the street scene", not because of concerns over traffic congestion or safety. In relation to potential highways impacts associated with Mill Lane Plan B site, highways access to the site could be designed such that it makes Mill Lane safer for pedestrians and vehicular traffic alike. 2) Should development be required at Mill Lane, it would not affect the vast majority of the open space at Mill Lane. The only change would likely be the need to provide a highways access across the north-west corner of the recreation area, and so the need to replace the Play Area elsewhere in the open space. 3) An application relating to St Joseph's College was granted on appeal in 2006, but has not been delivered because there is not a market for apartment developments in Up Holland. Green Belt land is proposed for release in several locations across the Borough in the Local Plan Preferred Options because there is insufficient land within the built-up areas of the Borough to deliver the full housing target for the 15-year Local Plan period. 5) The information the Council has indicates that no sewerage disposal pipes or works are under the Mill Lane site. If there were, any development proposals would need to adequately relocate these at the cost of the developer to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency and United Utilities prior to development. 6) All brownfield sites across the Borough have been considered and accounted for in proposals for delivering the Local Plan housing target. That is why Green Belt is required for development. Consultation process - all households in the Borough received information on the consultation event either via a "wraparound" feature on the Champion Newspaper or via a leaflet sent to any addresses that do not receive the Champion.  
**Officer recommendation** no action required

---

**ID** 201  
**Consultee name** Sharon Caffery  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** The Council are only considering Green Belt release as a last resort and are minimising how much is released in order to limit the loss of open land. Should development be required at Mill Lane, it would not affect the vast majority of the open space at Mill Lane. The only change would likely be the need to provide a highways access across the north-west corner of the recreation area, and so the need to replace the Play Area elsewhere in the open space. In relation to potential highways impacts associated with Mill Lane Plan B site, highways access to the site could be designed such that it makes Mill Lane safer for pedestrians and vehicular traffic alike. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan accompanying the Local Plan does not identify any deficiency in school places in Up Holland (based on information from the Education Authority).  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 249  
**Consultee name** Pamela Beer  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 250  
**Consultee name** Mr W Hollingsworth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 251  
**Consultee name** Karen McGathan  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 252  
**Consultee name** Mr John Gaskell  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 253  
**Consultee name** Joyce K Tweedie  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 254  
**Consultee name** Mrs M Train  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 255  
**Consultee name** Ms L Skelly  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---



**ID** 256  
**Consultee name** Mr David McGathan  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 257  
**Consultee name** Mr G Swift  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 258  
**Consultee name** Mrs A Davies  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 259  
**Consultee name** Mrs LJ Glover  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 260  
**Consultee name** Brenda Clarke  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 261  
**Consultee name** J Glover  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 262  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs R Frampton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 263  
**Consultee name** Frank Higham  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 355  
**Consultee name** Marion Phythian  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 356  
**Consultee name** Mr Michael Entwistle  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 357  
**Consultee name** JB Tyrer  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 358  
**Consultee name** Maureen Tyrer  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 359  
**Consultee name** Dorothy M Bond  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 360  
**Consultee name** Mrs Joan Taberner  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 361  
**Consultee name** JR Dean  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 362  
**Consultee name** Mrs A Hurst  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 363  
**Consultee name** Mrs LM Clark  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 364  
**Consultee name** Mr Christopher Hesketh  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 365  
**Consultee name** Mrs Sylvia Farnworth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 366  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs Hedley  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 367  
**Consultee name** Jennifer Gerrard  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 368  
**Consultee name** Eileen Peet  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 369  
**Consultee name** Barbara McCoy  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 370  
**Consultee name** Catherine Winstanley  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

<b>ID</b>	371
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr & Mrs K Roxburgh
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No action required

---

<b>ID</b>	379
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Frank Dawber
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	Object to Mill Lane and Chequer Lane proposals in Up Holland. (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	<p>1) Section 6.0 of the Strategic Options and Green Belt Release technical paper addresses which areas may be suitable locations for "Plan B" sites. Up Holland is one of several locations in the Borough that is considered potentially suitable because it is not limited by infrastructure or strategic environmental constraints and, while the Skelmersdale housing market area could not deliver more development than is already proposed in the preferred strategy, there is some potential for the Up Holland housing market to deliver more than just the single allocated housing site at Chequer Lane. 2) While the St Joseph's College site does have an outstanding permission for an apartment development, it is the Council's understanding that this permission is not viable in the foreseeable future. In relation to any subsequent application on the site for housing, this application would be determined on its own merits, and planning permission for housing on this site is far from certain to be granted. 3) The Mill Lane site is in a sustainable location given that Up Holland is not considered to have any significant infrastructure deficiencies and the Mill Lane site in particular is only within 200m of the Village Centre and a Quality Bus Route. In relation to highways impacts associated with Mill Lane, highways access to the site could be designed such that it makes Mill Lane safer for pedestrians and vehicular traffic alike. Any safety issues potentially raised by construction would be dealt with through conditions on any planning permission, if the site were to even come forward for development in the plan period. 4) No concerns have been expressed by the Highways Authority as to the capacity of this double mini-roundabout, but if the development of the Mill Lane site were to create an issue at this junction, the developer would be required to address this issue through junction improvements. 5+6) It is not appropriate to count empty properties or properties for sale towards the delivery of the housing targets in a Local Plan. These properties are already a part of the housing market and it is normal to have a certain amount of empty properties or properties for sale in the housing market at any given time. West Lancashire has lower than average levels of vacant homes compared to the rest of the country. 7) These expected completions are accounted for in the delivery of the housing target proposed in the Local Plan. 8) See answers to 5, 6 + 7. 9) The Chequer Lane site is proposed as a housing allocation, but no number of dwellings has been stipulated in draft policy. However, the Council have assumed that approximately 175 dwellings could be delivered on the site. While the Council recognise that the location of the site would involve a fair walk to access to local services, it is on the edge of a sustainable village (Up Holland) and in close proximity to the largest Key Service Centre in the Borough (Skelmersdale). The site is also not currently within the Green Belt and so if it were not to be included as an allocation, an alternative site in the Green Belt on the edge of Skelmersdale or Up Holland (e.g. Mill Lane) would need to be released as a preferred allocation. 10+11) The new Local Plan would replace the previous Local Plan (including Policy DS4), and so the allocation of the Chequer Lane site for residential development would supercede the previous Policy DS4 covering the site. While the Council would prefer not to have to release land currently protected by Policy DS4 or Green Belt land, there is a need to release a small amount of such land in the Borough to meet the housing targets. 12) see answer to 7+8 13) see answer to 10+11</p>
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change required

---



**ID** 389  
**Consultee name** Mr Philip Banks  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** 1) While the Council would rather that Green Belt did not have to be released, given the lack of available and suitable land within the built-up areas of the Borough, a small amount of Green Belt land will be required for development in order to meet housing targets for the Borough. However, it should be noted that the Mill Lane site is only to be safeguarded for the "Plan B", and will by no means be certain to be developed during the 15-year plan period. Although the St Joseph's college proposals do have planning permission, it is the council's understanding that those proposals are unlikely to be delivered in the foreseeable future because they are not viable. 2) The Mill Lane site is in a sustainable location given that Up Holland is not considered to have any significant infrastructure deficiencies and the Mill Lane site in particular is only within 200m of the Village Centre and a Quality Bus Route. 3) In relation to highways impacts associated with Mill Lane, highways access to the site could be designed such that it makes Mill Lane safer for pedestrians and vehicular traffic alike. 4) Comment noted, but there is an ongoing need for new housing in the Borough, based on Government Household Projections for West Lancashire. 5) Planning decisions cannot have regard to any potential impact on value of property, only on whether a new development would significantly impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. This would not include loss of long distance views from an individual property.  
**Officer recommendation** no action required

---

**ID** 390  
**Consultee name** CD Whalley  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 391  
**Consultee name** Mr Martin Green  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 392  
**Consultee name** Mr RE Hannah  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** While the Council would rather not release land from the Green Belt for development, there is a need to to meet the housing targets for the Borough. In relation to highways impacts associated with Mill Lane, highways access to the site could be designed such that it makes Mill Lane safer for pedestrians and vehicular traffic alike. Up Holland does not suffer from any significant infrastructure constraints and so it is a suitable and sustainable location for new development.  
**Officer recommendation** no action required

---

**ID** 393  
**Consultee name** R Stokes  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 394  
**Consultee name** B & I Eaton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 395  
**Consultee name** Marie-Therese Hill  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 396  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs Sankey  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 397  
**Consultee name** C Woods  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 398  
**Consultee name** G Train  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 399  
**Consultee name** Mr R Hampson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 400  
**Consultee name** Mrs Julia Richardson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 401  
**Consultee name** T Sutton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 402  
**Consultee name** David Noble  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 403  
**Consultee name** J Johnston  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposal (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 404  
**Consultee name** Chris Ackers  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 405  
**Consultee name** N Seddon  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill lane proposal (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 406  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs Prentice  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 407  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs K Grimshaw  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 408  
**Consultee name** M Simpkin  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 409  
**Consultee name** Mrs K Dainty  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposal (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 451  
**Consultee name** Mrs DH Higgins  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 452  
**Consultee name** Doris Ramsdale  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 453  
**Consultee name** Mr Denis John Green  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 454  
**Consultee name** Brian Coates  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 455  
**Consultee name** Mr K Phythian  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S0)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 456  
**Consultee name** Sydney Ball  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

<b>ID</b>	478
<b>Consultee name</b>	Rev Margaret Jennings
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	Objection to Mill Lane proposals on the grounds of poor notification about consultation, use of village green for release, use of Green Belt for release, traffic and highways issues, other sites being more suitable (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	<p>Consultation process - the Council have gone above and beyond what is required by our own Statement of Community Involvement and Government legislation on consulting on Local Plans and all residents were made aware of the key proposals in the Local Plan and the 8 consultation events held across the Borough through the "wrap-around" feature on the Champion Newspaper. It was also made clear that residents could contact Council Officers at any time during the consultation to discuss the proposals."Village Green" - Should development be required at Mill Lane, it would not affect the vast majority of the open space at Mill Lane. The only change would likely be the need to provide a highways access across the north-west corner of the recreation area, and so the need to replace the Play Area elsewhere in the open space. Infrastructure and services - Up Holland is not considered to have any significant infrastructure / service deficiencies and the Mill Lane site in particular is only within 200m of the Village Centre and a Quality Bus Route. Properties for Sale - It is not appropriate for properties for sale to be counted towards meeting Local Plan housing targets as these properties are already a part of the housing market and it is normal to have a number of properties for sale in an area at any given time. In addition, properties for sale are usually still occupied and so meeting an existing housing need. Traffic / Highway Safety concerns - In relation to highways impacts associated with Mill Lane, highways access to the site could be designed such that it makes Mill Lane safer for pedestrians and vehicular traffic alike. It is the Council's understanding that the capacity of Mill Lane and the double mini-roundabout junction can take the additional traffic potentially generated by the Mill Lane site, but if such development were anticipated to create a traffic or safety issue, the developer would be required to resolve these issues prior to development. Green Belt, Agricultural land quality and wildlife habitat - the vast majority of land in the Borough is agricultural land (often of the highest quality) or has value for wildlife habitat and is in the Green Belt and fulfils at least one purpose of the Green Belt. Therefore, while these factors were considered, virtually all sites assessed were affected by these issues, and this doesn't remove the fact that a small amount of such land is required somewhere in the Borough to meet development targets. Brownfield land - all available and suitable brownfield land in the Borough is already proposed for inclusion within the Local Plan, but some greenfield / Green Belt land is still required to deliver development targets. Affordable housing - no sites are allocated solely for affordable housing in the Local Plan, but all housing sites would be expected to deliver a proportion of affordable housing (35% in Up Holland)."Plan B" - the process as to how the Plan B could be implemented (if triggered) is set out in the justification to Policy GN2 and Chapter 10 of the Local Plan Preferred Options document. Alternative sites suggested: Land bound by Ormskirk Road, Newgate Road, Windmill Road, Stannanought Road - this land is public open space and used for playing fields. Land bounded by Tower Hill Road, Wellcross Road, Cinnamon Brow - this very large area of land is in the Green Belt, is not as well enclosed as the Mill Lane site, nor as sustainably located, and would have a severe impact on wide, open landscape views to and from the south. Land at Whalley Road and St James Primary School - this land is already allocated or located within settlement boundaries so could be developed as part of the preferred strategy.</p>
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No action required



**ID** 624  
**Consultee name** Miss Sarah Jones  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill lane proposals on grounds of losing a community park, the village character, traffic and safety, loss of agriculture, loss of views (S)  
**Outcome** Should development be required at Mill Lane, it would not affect the vast majority of the open space at Mill Lane. The only change would likely be the need to provide a highways access across the north-west corner of the recreation area, and so the need to replace the Play Area elsewhere in the open space. In relation to highways impacts associated with Mill Lane, highways access to the site could be designed such that it makes Mill Lane safer for pedestrians and vehicular traffic alike. The loss of a small amount of agricultural land is an unfortunate necessity in order to meet the Local Plan development targets, and the Local Plan Preferred Options proposals keep this loss to an absolute minimum.  
**Officer recommendation** no action required

---

**ID** 627  
**Consultee name** Mr Peter Finch  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to development at Red Cat Lane, Burscough. (S)  
**Outcome** Traffic issues - Were development to be permitted on the Red Cat Lane site, any anticipated impact on the junction with the A59 would need to be mitigated for by junction improvements funded by the developer. While it is acknowledged that the A59 can get busy through Burscough town centre, this is to be expected given it is a town centre. Ultimately, however, the capacity of the A59 is not a concern and any impacts from increased levels of traffic can be mitigated for through junction improvements. Waste water and surface water infrastructure - improvements to this type of infrastructure is the responsibility of United Utilities (waste water) and landowners (on-site surface water infrastructure), with oversight from the Environment Agency. The Council have no control over this key aspect of infrastructure or its delivery but are working with United Utilities to see improvements to waste water infrastructure made as soon as possible. Ultimately, this means that greenfield sites in the Burscough area cannot come forward until UU resolve this issue. On surface water drainage, unless landowners improve on-site infrastructure, existing issues cannot be resolved. As part of new developments, developers are required to improve surface water infrastructure on-site to ensure that the situation is not made worse. This often leads to a wider benefit as the existing situation is actually improved by the new infrastructure put in place by the developer. Martin Mere - the Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) on the Local Plan Preferred Options did not identify any impact on Martin Mere that could not be satisfactorily mitigated for. Brownfield land - all available and suitable brownfield sites in the existing built-up areas of the Borough has been considered and included in the preferred strategy for the Local Plan. However, to meet the development targets, a small amount of Green Belt land is also required.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action required

---

**ID** 628  
**Consultee name** Graham and Betty Hall  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Up Holland proposals. Question over housing figures and brownfield land availability. Concerns over traffic and infrastructure constraints. (S)  
**Outcome** Traffic concerns on Mill Lane - In relation to highways impacts associated with Mill Lane, highways access to the site could be designed such that it makes Mill Lane safer for pedestrians and vehicular traffic alike. It is the Council's understanding that the capacity of Mill Lane and the double mini-roundabout junction can take the additional traffic potentially generated by the Mill Lane site, but if such development were anticipated to create a traffic or safety issue, the developer would be required to resolve these issues prior to development. Infrastructure and services - Up Holland is not considered to have any significant infrastructure / service deficiencies and the Mill Lane site in particular is only within 200m of the Village Centre and a Quality Bus Route. St Joseph's College - Although the St Joseph's college proposals do have planning permission, it is the council's understanding that those proposals are unlikely to be delivered in the foreseeable future because they are not viable. Green Belt release - Green Belt release proposed in the Local Plan essentially falls within two categories: that released as part of the preferred strategy for development between 2012 and 2027 and that released to be safeguarded for the "Plan B". The latter would only be released for development should the preferred strategy fail to deliver the housing targets, otherwise the land would remain as it is until at least 2027. Housing targets and brownfield land - the Council cannot tailor the housing target to limit development just to brownfield sites because the housing target is based on national household projections (i.e. projected housing need) for West Lancashire. All available and suitable brownfield sites in the Borough have been accounted for and there is still a need for additional greenfield / Green Belt land in order to meet the housing targets. National planning policy requires housing targets to be minimum targets, and no maximum is set. However, due to the constraints of Green Belt in West Lancashire, it would be difficult for much more than the minimum target to be delivered.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 660  
**Consultee name** Mrs Imelda Essery  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 661  
**Consultee name** Mr Geoffrey Whitfield  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action required

---

**ID** 662  
**Consultee name** Mrs A Martland  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 663  
**Consultee name** J Parker  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 664  
**Consultee name** Brendan Holland  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 665  
**Consultee name** WH Lown  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 666  
**Consultee name** D Horrocks  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 667  
**Consultee name** Mr M Stephens  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 668  
**Consultee name** Mrs J Horrocks  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 669  
**Consultee name** James O'Brien  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 670  
**Consultee name** Sylvia Johnson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 671  
**Consultee name** Dorothy Smith  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 672  
**Consultee name** KA Brady  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals on basis of wildlife protection, traffic, character of Up Holland and personal reasons. (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 674  
**Consultee name** Patricia Sharples  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 676  
**Consultee name** Mr Hogarth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 677  
**Consultee name** Mr Ian Hedley  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 678  
**Consultee name** David A Liptrot  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposal (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 679  
**Consultee name** Mrs J Liptrot  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 680  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs Rhodes  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 681  
**Consultee name** Tanya Eastwood  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 682  
**Consultee name** Miss Smallshaw  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 686  
**Consultee name** Ann Wilcock  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposal (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 687  
**Consultee name** Elaine Burge  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 688  
**Consultee name** Denis Balmer  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 689  
**Consultee name** Suzanne Moore  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 690  
**Consultee name** J Fitzgibbon  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---



**ID** 691  
**Consultee name** A Spearing  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 692  
**Consultee name** J Ashcroft  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 693  
**Consultee name** L Birch  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 694  
**Consultee name** I Heaton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 695  
**Consultee name** P Scully  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 696  
**Consultee name** Alyson Smith  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 697  
**Consultee name** David Smith  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 698  
**Consultee name** Matthew David Gaskell  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 699  
**Consultee name** V Wynn  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action required

---

**ID** 700  
**Consultee name** William Howarth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 701  
**Consultee name** EA Eaton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 702  
**Consultee name** W Simpkin  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S0)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 703  
**Consultee name** H Ashcroft  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action required

---

**ID** 704  
**Consultee name** Neil Martin  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 705  
**Consultee name** Geoffrey Forrest  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 706  
**Consultee name** A & G Smith  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 707  
**Consultee name** John Hartill  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 708  
**Consultee name** Mrs E Ploughley  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 709  
**Consultee name** J Roughley  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 710  
**Consultee name** Derek Roughley  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 711  
**Consultee name** E Roughley  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 712  
**Consultee name** G Glover  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 713  
**Consultee name** Kathleen Jones  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 714  
**Consultee name** LG Powell  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 715  
**Consultee name** DJ Daniels  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 716  
**Consultee name** Mr Ashley Bailey  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 717  
**Consultee name** Glezel Bailey  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 718  
**Consultee name** Mr Kenneth Bailey  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 719  
**Consultee name** Mrs Pauline Bailey  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 720  
**Consultee name** Mrs ED Pinnington  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 721  
**Consultee name** Mrs Janet Alker  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** I wish to object to the inclusion of the Mill lane site in the proposed Plan B section of the West Lancashire Local Plan preferred options paper. This land in green belt should be protected from development as stated in the current Replacement Local Plan. Up Holland has already lost too much open land to housing developments. The infrastructure cannot take any further housing developments. There are insufficient doctors, dentists, school places, playing areas for children. The roads in Up Holland are already full of cars which causes gridlock during rush hour periods. Parking around Hall Green is scarce. There is no requirement for additional housing development in Up Holland. The adjacent St Josephs College site already has planning permission for more than 300 dwellings. There are also plans submitted for 80 dwellings on Chequer lane. I urge you to remove this site from inclusion in Plan B. (F)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---



**ID** 722  
**Consultee name** Mrs Pam Farrall  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** I wish to object to the inclusion of the Mill lane site in the proposed Plan B section of the West Lancashire Local Plan preferred options paper. This land in green belt should be protected from development as stated in the current Replacement Local Plan. Up Holland has already lost too much open land to housing developments. The infrastructure cannot take any further housing developments. There are insufficient doctors, dentists, school places, playing areas for children. The roads in Up Holland are already full of cars which causes gridlock during rush hour periods. Parking around Hall Green is scarce. There is no requirement for additional housing development in Up Holland. The adjacent St Josephs College site already has planning permission for more than 300 dwellings. There are also plans submitted for 80 dwellings on Chequer lane. I urge you to remove this site from inclusion in Plan B.  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 728  
**Consultee name** JP & M Walsh  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S) on following grounds: use of land as park and recreation area, land subject to probate, safety in relation to traffic and highways, existing empty homes, no infrastructure provision, poor communication and consultation, classing Up Holland as part of Skelmersdale. (S)  
**Outcome** 1) Should development be required at Mill Lane, it would not affect the vast majority of the open space at Mill Lane. The only change would likely be the need to provide a highways access across the north-west corner of the recreation area, and so the need to replace the Play Area elsewhere in the open space. 2) The Council are not aware of any probate on the land and the land owner has not made the Council aware of their intentions for the land. 3) In relation to highways impacts associated with Mill Lane, highways access to the site could be designed such that it makes Mill Lane safer for pedestrians and vehicular traffic alike. Planning Permission was refused for the erection of two three-storey buildings comprising 32 affordable apartments at 26 Mill Lane in 2006 because "the buildings by reason of their scale, orientation and design would be an incongruous development within the street scene", not because of concerns over traffic congestion or safety. 4) Empty homes cannot be counted towards delivery of the Local Plan housing target. These properties are already a part of the housing market and it is normal to have a number of vacant properties in an area at any given time. Available land within Skelmersdale is already proposed for housing development in the Local Plan. 5) All households in the Borough received information on the consultation event either via a "wraparound" feature on the Champion Newspaper or via a leaflet sent to any addresses that do not receive the Champion. 6) The Council recognise that Skelmersdale and Up Holland are, administratively, separate settlements, but in planning terms they are one contiguous built-up area and so are considered as one in spatial terms.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action required

---

**ID** 754  
**Consultee name** Mrs PL Evans  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 755  
**Consultee name** RT Martin  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 756  
**Consultee name** Mrs Joyce King  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 757  
**Consultee name** Joyce Grimes  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 758  
**Consultee name** Charlotte Curran  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 759  
**Consultee name** William Doran  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 760  
**Consultee name** WL Wynn  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 761  
**Consultee name** Mrs Helen Owen  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S0)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 762  
**Consultee name** Rev C Warrilow  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 763  
**Consultee name** Mrs N Whitfield  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 764  
**Consultee name** S Grime  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 765  
**Consultee name** Barry & Violet Madden  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 766  
**Consultee name** Mrs M Hester  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 787  
**Consultee name** Mrs Dawn Kennedy  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 788  
**Consultee name** Mr and Mrs A Cheetham  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals on basis of loss of green belt and agricultural land (S)  
**Outcome** Unfortunately, a small amount of Green Belt land / agricultural land is required to be released in the Local Plan for potential development in order to meet development targets. However, the Council has undertaken a thorough assessment of potential sites to be released and Mill Lane has emerged as a potential "Plan B" site.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action required

---

**ID** 806  
**Consultee name** Barry & Violet Madden  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Concerns regarding Mill Lane, in particular with regard to traffic safety on Mill Lane, especially at the bend. (S)  
**Outcome** The safety concerns associated with Mill Lane are appreciated by the Council and Council officers have been out on-site with Officers from the Highways Authority to consider this, but one of the potential benefits of development at Mill Lane is that it may actually make Mill Lane safer for vehicles and pedestrians alike by adding in a new junction onto Mill Lane, perhaps with a mini-roundabout, that forces cars to slow down as they come down Mill Lane and as they approach the bend.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action required

---

**ID** 807  
**Consultee name** Trevor Monks  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals, on grounds of traffic, safety and green belt. (S)  
**Outcome** In relation to highways impacts associated with Mill Lane, highways access to the site could be designed such that it makes Mill Lane safer for pedestrians and vehicular traffic alike. No concerns have been expressed by the Highways Authority as to the capacity of junction with Ormskirk Road, but if the development of the Mill Lane site were to create an issue at this junction, the developer would be required to address this issue through junction improvements. Any safety issues potentially raised by construction would be dealt with through conditions on any planning permission, if the site were to even come forward for development in the plan period. The vast majority of the open space between Mill Lane and Dingle Road would be retained and so a public footpath between the two would be maintained. In relation to the loss of Green Belt, it is unfortunate that a small amount of Green Belt must be released for potential development during the Local Plan period and the Council has undertaken a thorough assessment of potential sites to be released and Mill Lane has emerged as a potential "Plan B" site.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action required

---

**ID** 829  
**Consultee name** Geraldine Mannix  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals on grounds of green land, previous housing developments, oversubscribed schools, safety, loss of green spaces, (S)  
**Outcome** 1+2) Up Holland is a relatively large village in comparison to most other settlements in the Borough and is well served by infrastructure and local services. Therefore, it is appropriate that a small amount of development should take place in Up Holland. 3) Up Holland is not considered to have any significant infrastructure deficiencies and the Mill Lane site in particular is only within 200m of the Village Centre and a Quality Bus Route. 4+5) Should development be required at Mill Lane, it would not affect the vast majority of the open space at Mill Lane. The only change would likely be the need to provide a highways access across the north-west corner of the recreation area, and so the need to replace the Play Area elsewhere in the open space. 6) Development would not be funded or delivered by the Council and so rate payers would not be charged extra as a result of new development.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 861  
**Consultee name** Norman Leyland  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals on grounds of greenbelt, car parking, traffic, few facilities in Up Holland to support development, St Josephs college. Housing should be located in Skelmersdale (S).  
**Outcome** 1) Green Belt is only being released as a last resort, but is necessary in order to meet development targets. The site at Mill Lane has come out of a thorough analysis of sites across the Borough. 2+3) In relation to highways impacts associated with Mill Lane, highways access to the site could be designed such that it makes Mill Lane safer for pedestrians and vehicular traffic alike. No concerns have been expressed by the Highways Authority as to the capacity of junction with Ormskirk Road, but if the development of the Mill Lane site were to create an issue at this junction, the developer would be required to address this issue through junction improvements. 4) Should development be required at Mill Lane, it would not affect the vast majority of the open space at Mill Lane. The only change would likely be the need to provide a highways access across the north-west corner of the recreation area, and so the need to replace the Play Area elsewhere in the open space. 5) Skelmersdale will take over half of the proposed new dwellings over the Local Plan period and the market could not deliver more than that over the Local Plan period. 6) With specific reference to St Joseph's College (which is also in the Green Belt), the recent planning permission has proven unviable because there is no demand for apartments in Up Holland, and it is not anticipated that such a development would take place at St Joseph's College over the Local Plan period.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action required

---

**ID** 897  
**Consultee name** D E Meredith  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 906  
**Consultee name** Jamie Fletcher  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill lane proposals on following grounds: increased risk to a listed building, inconsistent application of planning rules, site selection based on profit not housing need, failure to address highway safety concerns. (S)  
**Outcome** St Joseph's College - the recent planning permission has proven unviable because there is no demand for apartments in Up Holland, and it is not anticipated that such a development would take place at St Joseph's College over the Local Plan period. The land associated with St Joseph's College fulfils the purposes of the Green Belt as well, if not better, than the land at Mill Lane. Farm on Mill Lane - Only significantly sized planning permission in recent times on Mill Lane was for the erection of two three-storey buildings comprising 32 affordable apartments at 26 Mill Lane in 2006. This was refused because "the buildings by reason of their scale, orientation and design would be an incongruous development within the street scene", not because of concerns over traffic congestion or safety. Site selection based on Council profit - the site is only proposed for "Plan B", so would hopefully not be required for development. Receipt of New Homes Bonus would be the same wherever development takes place. While the open space is owned by the Council, only a small amount would be required to create a highway access and potential profit on this land has not been factored into decision-making. Traffic Safety concerns - The safety concerns associated with Mill Lane are appreciated by the Council and Council officers have been out on-site with Officers from the Highways Authority to consider this, but one of the potential benefits of development at Mill Lane is that it may actually make Mill Lane safer for vehicles and pedestrians alike by adding in a new junction onto Mill Lane, perhaps with a mini-roundabout, that forces cars to slow down as they come down Mill Lane and as they approach the bend. Precise details of highways improvements would be designed at an application stage, if the site were even to come forward for development.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 911  
**Consultee name** Mr Peter Fairhurst  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill lane proposals on following grounds: Loss of open space, traffic, safety, insufficient infrastructure, poor publicity, personal reasons relating to house price / sale (S).  
**Outcome** See Response to Rep 130 from same consultee  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---



**ID** 912  
**Consultee name** Mr Edward James Ormesher  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Upholland does not need want or can cope with further large scale developpment and at the same time maintain a standard of life that we deserve. Examples of the effect of large development based on village communities are evidenced in places like Orrell and Standish. By adopting this plan we are heading for the same problems of traffic, schools, parking, medical services etc'. I appeal to the planners to think again and for our elected representatives to act with the best interest of our communities at heart. The land is there, the infrastrucure is there. We can improve Skelmersdale or destroy Upholland.  
**Outcome** Under the Local Plan proposals, Skelmersdale would deliver more than half of all new housing in the Borough over the next 15 years and the market could not deliver more than this in that time. Therefore, other parts of the Borough must also deliver new housing. Up Holland is a sustainable village with better access to services than most other villages in the Borough and so it is right that a small amount of development is allocated here. Skelmersdale and Up Holland are indeed two settlements with their own identity, much as Ormskirk and Aughton are, but, like Ormskirk and Aughton, Skelmersdale and Up Holland form one contiguous built-up area and so, from a spatial planning perspective can be considered together.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action required

---

**ID** 951  
**Consultee name** Mrs TA Chadwick  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals on grounds of infrastructure, no requirement for additional housing, traffic safety. (S)  
**Outcome** Up Holland is a sustainable village with better access to services than most other villages in the Borough and so it is right that a small amount of development is allocated here. St Joseph's College - the recent planning permission has proven unviable because there is no demand for apartments in Up Holland, and it is not anticipated that such a development would take place at St Joseph's College over the Local Plan period. Traffic Safety concerns - The safety concerns associated with Mill Lane are appreciated by the Council and Council officers have been out on-site with Officers from the Highways Authority to consider this, but one of the potential benefits of development at Mill Lane is that it may actually make Mill Lane safer for vehicles and pedestrians alike by adding in a new junction onto Mill Lane, perhaps with a mini-roundabout, that forces cars to slow down as they come down Mill Lane and as they approach the bend.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action required

---

**ID** 953  
**Consultee name** Mr D Chadwick  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals on grounds of infrastructure, overdevelopment and traffic safety (S)  
**Outcome** See Rep 951  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 964  
**Consultee name** Rev Hilary Hanke  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals on following grounds: loss of green belt, loss of open space, road safety, traffic, infrastructure (S)  
**Outcome** St Joseph's College - the recent planning permission has proven unviable because there is no demand for apartments in Up Holland, and it is not anticipated that such a development would take place at St Joseph's College over the Local Plan period. The land associated with St Joseph's College fulfils the purposes of the Green Belt as well, if not better, than the land at Mill Lane. Should development be required at Mill Lane, it would not affect the vast majority of the open space at Mill Lane. The only change would likely be the need to provide a highways access across the north-west corner of the recreation area, and so the need to replace the Play Area elsewhere in the open space. Traffic Safety concerns - The safety concerns associated with Mill Lane are appreciated by the Council and Council officers have been out on-site with Officers from the Highways Authority to consider this, but one of the potential benefits of development at Mill Lane is that it may actually make Mill Lane safer for vehicles and pedestrians alike by adding in a new junction onto Mill Lane, perhaps with a mini-roundabout, that forces cars to slow down as they come down Mill Lane and as they approach the bend. Precise details of highways improvements would be designed at an application stage, if the site were even to come forward for development. Any impact of construction traffic would be minimised through the use of conditions on any planning permission granted.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 985  
**Consultee name** Clerk to Aughton Parish Council Irene Roberts Aughton Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Significant issues highlighted in relation to Parrs Lane including infrastructure, drainage, visibility, traffic, access, accessibility, design and landscaping. Parish Council wish to be involved in early consultation should this site be developed as part of Plan B. (S)  
**Outcome** a) Parrs Lane is allocated under Plan B and not part of the Preferred Strategy because the Council recognises that access to infrastructure and services is not as good in this semi-rural location as it is at other sites. However, it does have good access to some key services and is on the edge of a Key Service Centre (Ormskirk with Aughton). b) Any development at Parr's Lane would not be allowed to make any existing surface water drainage / flooding problems worse and the measures put in place for a new development could actually help reduce existing issues as well. c,d+e) Council officers reviewed the highway situation at Parrs Lane with officers from the Highways Authority and it was not felt that development would have an unduly negative impact on traffic safety. In fact, junction improvements funded by a development could make the junctions at either end of Parrs Lane safer. f) The site is within walking distance of bus stops for an hourly bus service and a train station g+h) Detailed design of development and landscaping would be addressed at planning application stage or masterplanning stage prior to any application.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action

---

**ID** 989  
**Consultee name** Mrs D Furlong  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 990  
**Consultee name** R McGunigle  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 991  
**Consultee name** Jasmine McGunigle  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 992  
**Consultee name** Mike McGunigle  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 993  
**Consultee name** Lily McGunigle  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 994  
**Consultee name** Joseph McGunigle  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 995  
**Consultee name** Mr Maurice Turner  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 1083  
**Consultee name** Mr Stan Meredith ADGBURM  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Queries over definition of 'safeguarded' land. Object to Mill lane proposals on grounds of loss of green belt. (S)  
**Outcome** The Local Plan is required to show that it can deliver its housing and employment land targets and demonstrate flexibility in this delivery, and in West Lancashire, this can only be done by releasing a small amount of Green Belt for development purposes or safeguarding. The Mill Lane site is proposed to be safeguarded for the "Plan B" and while this designation is somewhat weaker than a Green Belt designation, the way "Plan B" is proposed to be managed, no planning application on a site such as Mill Lane would be successful until the Council find through a formal review process that there is a need to release some of the safeguarded sites. Even then, Mill Lane may not be one of the sites released from the safeguarded designation. Ultimately, the only time that a Green Belt boundary can be amended is when preparing a Local Plan, and there has been no need to amend Green Belt boundaries in the Borough for 20 years. Therefore, it is incorrect to say that the proposed Local Plan dilutes the significance given to Green Belt. The vast majority (over 90%) of the Borough would remain as Green Belt and any development proposals within the Green Belt would still be subject to national Green Belt policy and would be required to demonstrate "very special circumstances". This fact can immediately refute any suspicion of a conspiracy to allow wholesale development of Green Belt to the north of Up Holland, especially as the St Joseph's permission has now been found to be unviable and is not anticipated to be delivered in the Local Plan period.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 1116  
**Consultee name** Marie Hunt  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 1117  
**Consultee name** Jemma Hardaker  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 1118  
**Consultee name** Mr and Mrs Griffin  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 1119  
**Consultee name** Margaret Stubbs  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 1120  
**Consultee name** Lee Holden  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** See Representation No. 128 for standard response to standard Mill Lane objection letter  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

<b>ID</b>	1137
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr David Hughes                      Up Holland Parish Council
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	Object to Mill Lane proposals on grounds of land ownership, road safety, infrastructure, environmental constraints, resident objections and publicity (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	<p>1) Ownership of land is not a primary concern in relation to the Local Plan unless it is clear that a landowner has no intention of selling their land for development (which therefore affects deliverability of the site). Whilst the Parish Council's comments regarding the lease they have on the Open Space are acknowledged, an access road across the open space is not the only option open to any potential developer of this land and so, taking into account all the other factors considered, this land is still considered suitable for safeguarding for the "Plan B". 2) Traffic Safety concerns - The safety concerns associated with Mill Lane are appreciated by the Council and Council officers have been out on-site with Officers from the Highways Authority to consider this, but one of the potential benefits of development at Mill Lane is that it may actually make Mill Lane safer for vehicles and pedestrians alike by adding in a new junction onto Mill Lane, perhaps with a mini-roundabout, that forces cars to slow down as they come down Mill Lane and as they approach the bend. Precise details of highways improvements would be designed at an application stage, if the site were even to come forward for development. 3) Up Holland is a sustainable village with better access to services than most other villages in the Borough and so it is right that a small amount of development is allocated here. Overall, Up Holland is not considered to have any significant infrastructure deficiencies and the Mill Lane site in particular is only within 200m of the Village Centre and a Quality Bus Route. 4) Any development of the Mill Lane site would not have any direct impact on Conservation Areas nearby 5) Technical Traffic Impact Assessment work undertaken for the Council has not identified any concerns about impact on the highway network in Up Holland as a result of the Local Plan proposals. The M58 is a legitimate route option for traffic travelling from either Mill Lane and, especially, Chequer Lane. 6) i) Statement referred to was made in relation to the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation in May / June 2011. At that time, no Green Belt release was proposed in Up Holland and therefore no objections to Green Belt release were received from Up Holland residents. ii) Up Holland is only included with Skelmersdale because, spatially, they are one contiguous urban area - this does not preclude the fact that, administratively, they are two separate settlements. All available and suitable sites within Skelmersdale have been accounted for in terms of their contribution towards development targets. iii) see (3) above iv) St Joseph's College - the recent planning permission has proven unviable because there is no demand for apartments in Up Holland, and it is not anticipated that such a development would take place at St Joseph's College over the Local Plan period. This is informed by the landowners / developers themselves. 7) Consultation process - all households received information on the consultation event either via a "wraparound" feature on the Champion Newspaper or via a leaflet sent to any addresses that do not receive the Champion.</p>
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No Action Required

---

**ID** 1195  
**Consultee name** Mr John Gardner  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Mill Lane is unsafe for traffic. (S)  
**Outcome** The safety concerns associated with Mill Lane are appreciated by the Council and Council officers have been out on-site with Officers from the Highways Authority to consider this, but one of the potential benefits of development at Mill Lane is that it may actually make Mill Lane safer for vehicles and pedestrians alike by adding in a new junction onto Mill Lane, perhaps with a mini-roundabout, that forces cars to slow down as they come down Mill Lane and as they approach the bend.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 1204  
**Consultee name** Stella & Bill Sass  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals on grounds including loss of green belt land, loss of play area, traffic and highways safety, land available in Skelmersdale, (S)  
**Outcome** St Joseph's College - the recent planning permission has proven unviable because there is no demand for apartments in Up Holland, and it is not anticipated that such a development would take place at St Joseph's College over the Local Plan period. Up Holland is only included with Skelmersdale because, spatially, they are one contiguous urban area - this does not preclude the fact that, administratively, they are two separate settlements. Consultation process - all households received information on the consultation event either via a "wraparound" feature on the Champion Newspaper or via a leaflet sent to any addresses that do not receive the Champion. Mill Lane Playing Field - Should development be required at Mill Lane, it would not affect the vast majority of the open space at Mill Lane. The only change would likely be the need to provide a highways access across the north-west corner of the recreation area, and so the need to replace the Play Area elsewhere in the open space. A public footpath across the open space would be retained. Traffic Safety concerns - The safety concerns associated with Mill Lane are appreciated by the Council and Council officers have been out on-site with Officers from the Highways Authority to consider this, but one of the potential benefits of development at Mill Lane is that it may actually make Mill Lane safer for vehicles and pedestrians alike by adding in a new junction onto Mill Lane, perhaps with a mini-roundabout, that forces cars to slow down as they come down Mill Lane and as they approach the bend. Brownfield sites and Skelmersdale - All available and suitable sites within Skelmersdale have been accounted for in terms of their contribution towards development targets, as have all brownfield sites across the Borough.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---



**ID** 1207  
**Consultee name** Mr Kevin McConnell  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals on grounds of landscape/open views, agricultural land, access to the site, dangers to pedestrians, parking, flooding, previous planning decisions (S)  
**Outcome** Landscape Views - comments noted Agricultural land - all available brownfield land would be required for development as well, therefore a small amount of Green Belt land will be required to meet development targets. Traffic Safety concerns - The safety concerns associated with Mill Lane are appreciated by the Council and Council officers have been out on-site with Officers from the Highways Authority to consider this, but one of the potential benefits of development at Mill Lane is that it may actually make Mill Lane safer for vehicles and pedestrians alike by adding in a new junction onto Mill Lane, perhaps with a mini-roundabout, that forces cars to slow down as they come down Mill Lane and as they approach the bend. Parking in Hall Green - givne that the Mill Lane site is only 200m from the village centre at Hall Green, there would be no need for residents of the site to drive to the local centre, and therefore no need for parking. Flooding - Any new development must address surface water run-off on-site through mitigation measures such as SuDS. Therefore, development of the site would actually improve the surface water run-off from the site onto the playing fields. 26 Mill Lane - planning application was for the erection of two three-storey buildings comprising 32 affordable apartments at 26 Mill Lane in 2006. This was refused because "the buildings by reason of their scale, orientation and design would be an incongruous development within the street scene". However, it is accepted that the principle of residential development in this location is reasonable.  
**Officer recommendation** No action

---

**ID** 1208  
**Consultee name** Mrs Gillian Steele  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals on grounds including need, green belt, open space, traffic (S)  
**Outcome** Empty Properties - Empty properties cannot be counted toward the delivery of housing targets in the Local Plan. These properties are already a part of the housing market and it is normal to have a number of vacant properties in an area at any given time. Those sites with planning permission have already been counted toward the delivery of the housing target. 26 Mill Lane - planning application was for the erection of two three-storey buildings comprising 32 affordable apartments at 26 Mill Lane in 2006. This was refused because "the buildings by reason of their scale, orientation and design would be an incongruous development within the street scene", not on the gournds of traffic safety. Traffic Safety concerns - The safety concerns associated with Mill Lane are appreciated by the Council and Council officers have been out on-site with Officers from the Highways Authority to consider this, but one of the potential benefits of development at Mill Lane is that it may actually make Mill Lane safer for vehicles and pedestrians alike by adding in a new junction onto Mill Lane, perhaps with a mini-roundabout, that forces cars to slow down as they come down Mill Lane and as they approach the bend.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1221  
**Consultee name** Dr Leonard Routh  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals on grounds including traffic, safety, loss of green belt and lack of housing need. (S)  
**Outcome** 1,2+5) In order to meet development targets for the Borough and ensure flexibility in the delivery of these targets, a small amount of Green Belt land is required for development or the "Plan B" over the Local Plan period. Mill Lane has been found to be one of the more sustainable sites and is suitable for inclusion in "Plan B". 3) Up Holland is not considered to have any significant infrastructure deficiencies and the Mill Lane site in particular is only within 200m of the Village Centre and a Quality Bus Route. 4) In relation to highways impacts associated with Mill Lane, highways access to the site could be designed such that it makes Mill Lane safer for pedestrians and vehicular traffic alike. 6) St Joseph's College - the recent planning permission has proven unviable because there is no demand for apartments in Up Holland, and it is not anticipated that such a development would take place at St Joseph's College over the Local Plan period. 7) The Mill Lane site is not considered to have particular habitat value, but should an application come forward for the site, a habitat assessment would be required and suitable mitigation put in place if important habitats are found to be on the site.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1276  
**Consultee name** Mr David Grimshaw  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** In our opinion the 'Preferred Option' to develop land at Red Cat Lane/Moss Nook as shown on the attached plan should be ratified as 'Safeguard' thus potentially changing its status from Green Belt. The land has been for many years uneconomic to farm as agricultural land and for the reasons set out in this report would be ideal for development to help meet the stated aims of the 'West Lancashire Local Plan 2012 – 2027'. (S)  
**Outcome** Support noted  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 1347  
**Consultee name** Kevin Swift  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Mill Lane proposals  
**Outcome** Comments on topography of Mill Lane site noted. The outstanding planning permission for St Joseph's College is unlikely to be implemented as it is financially unviable. Hall Green / Up Holland is part of the Skelmersdale with Up Holland built-up area and so does have a role to play in delivering new housing. even if Up Holland is taken on its own, it is one of the larger and more sustainable villages in the Borough and so is an appropriate location for new housing.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

<b>ID</b>	1348
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Roger Bell
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	Objects to the inclusion of Red Cat Lane site in the Plan B. (s)
<b>Outcome</b>	The Red Cat Lane site was found to no longer fulfil the purposes of the Green Belt in the Green Belt Study and, while the new boundary would probably be weaker than the current boundary in some ways, the fact that the new Green Belt boundary would now "round-off" the settlement area could be seen to create a stronger overall Green Belt boundary because any development beyond the new boundary would clearly constitute the sprawl of Burscough. While Red Cat Lane itself is relatively narrow and has traffic calming along it, this does not necessarily restrict new development, especially of only a relatively small number of dwellings as the Plan B suggests for this site. Were development to create additional issues in relation to drainage, the development would need to resolve these issues, possibly to the benefit of existing properties in the area.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change required

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Policy GN2**

**Title: Safeguarded Land**

---

<b>ID</b>	92
<b>Consultee name</b>	Church Commissioners For England
<b>Agent Name</b>	Miss Jennifer Hadland Smiths Gore
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	It is considered that additional sites could be identified as land to be 'safeguarded' for development should there be a requirement. These sites include: • Land to the north of Moor Farm, Haskayne (please see page 3 above for further details); • Land off Carr Moss Lane, Halsall (please refer to Plan 2 attached); • Land north of Rosemary Lane, Haskayne (see Plan 3 attached); and • Land west of Moor Farm, Halsall (See Plan 4 attached). These are discussed in greater detail further on in this response under Delivery and Risk – "Plan B". (f)
<b>Outcome</b>	The 4 sites proposed as alternative Plan B sites are located on the edge of two Rural Sustainable Villages in the Western Parishes. Given the lack of key local services in these villages (or access to) it is not considered sustainable to release Green Belt on the edge of these villages for the "Plan B", and they are certainly not as sustainable as the Plan B sites proposed in Policy GN2.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No action

---

**ID** 595

**Consultee name** Mr Robin Buckley Redrow Homes (Lancs) Ltd

**Agent Name** Mr Tony McAteer

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** a) Green Belt land should not be allocated for housing when development is prevented on non-Green Belt land. b) Objection to 'Plan B' - 'Plan A' should be demonstrably deliverable, but instead it is unsound. c) Objection to manner in which sites are allocated as either 'Plan B' or Post 2027 sites. d) Land at Guinea Hall Lane should be allocated as a housing site. (S)

**Outcome** a) It is important that the Council's preferred spatial strategy for new development in the Local Plan is sustainable and has regard to infrastructure provision and environmental limits in the Borough. In West Lancashire, this means that the vast majority of development should be located in the Key Service Centres of the Borough, whilst protecting the more rural parts of the Borough. In particular, the village of Banks has some severe infrastructure constraints, a lack of access to local services and large parts of the village are in areas at risk of flooding. This therefore means that, while there is non-Green Belt land in and around the village of Banks, it is more sustainable to look at Green Belt land on the edge of the Key Service Centres or adjacent to the Southport urban area. b) The preferred strategy in the Local Plan is deliverable and sound but to ensure flexibility in the Local Plan, the Council proposes a "Plan B" to implement should a part of the preferred strategy fail for some unforeseen reason. c) "Plan B" sites were selected via a thorough assessment process, as set out in the Strategic Options and Green Belt Release Technical Paper. Those sites to be safeguarded for beyond 2027 were generally parts of wider sites released for the preferred strategy or "Plan B" but that are not required for development in the plan period and can therefore be safeguarded for potential future development needs beyond the Local Plan period. The only exception to this was the land at Guinea Hall Lane, Banks. d) The land at Guinea Hall Lane, Banks, is an open field that is within the proposed settlement boundary. Given what is set out in answer to (a) above, the inclusion of this land as a potential housing site would ultimately leave the very real possibility that too many houses would be built in the Northern Parishes (and particularly Banks) where the infrastructure and rural character cannot sustain such levels of development. Therefore, in order to ensure that development remains within the limits of the settlement and that the brownfield sites at Greaves Hall Hospital come forward for development first, the open field site at Guinea Hall Lane has been safeguarded in order to meet potential future housing needs in the Northern Parishes post 2027.

**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 734

**Consultee name** Mr Martin Ainscough

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** Consider other sites in the Eastern parishes, in particular around Parbold. A site north Greenfield Avenue and Lathom Avenue in Parbold should be considered (part of PAR03 in the Green Belt study). (S)

**Outcome** Where land within the village of Parbold is, or becomes, available for development, the principle of new development within the village is acceptable under the new Local Plan. However, it was not considered sustainable to release land from the Green Belt on the edge of Parbold, especially as the Green Belt study found that all land around Parbold fulfilled at least one purpose of the Green Belt.

**Officer recommendation** No Action required.

---

<b>ID</b>	825	
<b>Consultee name</b>		Roger Tym & Partners
<b>Agent Name</b>	Mr John Cookson	Roger Tym & Partners
<b>Nature of response</b>	Support with conditions	
<b>Summary</b>	<p>Our client's site at New Cut Lane represents an excellent opportunity for residential development. The strengths of the site include: • the site is sustainably located, close to shops and services, and the Council clearly accepts that it represents an appropriate location for residential uses (otherwise the site would not be proposed for release from the Green Belt); • the site faces no suitability issues such as the constraints imposed by waste water treatment issues in many locations across the Borough; • the site's owners are willing to see the site come forward for development; • the site faces no achievability constraints and a high-profile developer is keen to take the site on; • the early provision of much-needed housing at the site will help West Lancashire Borough Council to meet its challenging dwelling targets and to increase the delivery of affordable housing; • the site presents a rare opportunity for the expansion of Southport / Birkdale / Ainsdale; and • the site will not have any effect on the Council's strategic regeneration objectives in Skelmersdale, Ormskirk and Burscough, all of which are a considerable distance from New Cut Lane and are completely different housing markets. We therefore welcome the Council's proposal to release the New Cut Lane site from Green Belt designation. However, we are concerned that the Council's proposed approach set out in draft Policy GN2 and in Chapter 10 of the Local Plan Preferred Options is too restrictive, and will needlessly delay this site from coming forward and delivering new dwellings for the benefit of both West Lancashire and Sefton. We consider that, instead, the site should be allocated for residential uses in the Local Plan. If the Council prefers to keep the site as 'Plan B' land, we consider that the Council should examine the possibility of releasing this land at a much earlier stage in the plan period than would be possible under the terms of the 'Plan B' wording as currently drafted, so that sufficient deliverable 'Plan B' sites can be brought forward at the appropriate time to meet identified shortfalls against dwelling targets. Whilst the latter suggestion would be an improvement on the 'Plan B' mechanism as currently drafted, allocating our client's site for residential use would undoubtedly be the best way of capturing the significant benefits offered by the site.</p>	
<b>Outcome</b>	<p>Support noted. Comments on SA/SEA to be considered as SA / SEA is updated at the next stage. To lose any distinction between the preferred strategy and the "Plan B" would undermine the attempts of the Council to limit impact on Green Belt and locate development around the 3 Key Service Centres of the Borough. The New Cut Lane site would be reliant on services and infrastructure in Sefton and would not necessarily contribute economically to West Lancashire. Sefton have not requested that West Lancashire meet any of Sefton's housing need and so it would be inappropriate to allocate a site such as New Cut Lane as a preferred site. However, it is appropriate to include such a site, which no longer fulfils a purpose of the Green Belt, as a "Plan B" site.</p>	
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	<p>Consider comments on SA / SEA as it is updated at the next stage of Plan preparation. No change to LPPO.</p>	

---

<b>ID</b>	868	
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Philip Carter	Environment Agency
<b>Agent Name</b>		
<b>Nature of response</b>	Observations	
<b>Summary</b>	<p>Please see our comments at Appendix G for a list of constraints that would apply to sites allocated under this policy. (F)</p>	
<b>Outcome</b>	See Rep 898	
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	See Rep 898	

---

**ID** 924  
**Consultee name** Lt Coln RAR de Larrinaga  
**Agent Name** Mr Michael Cunningham Cunningham Planning  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The rectangular area of land off Ruff Lane should be allocated on the Proposals Map G2 as residential development under Policy RS1 rather than the Plan B designation, partly due to its location and being surrounded by residential property and partly due to the benefits of being able to bring the development of this land forward in the short term. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. As the site is Green Belt, its release for immediate development is not considered appropriate; other land should be looked at first. This greenfield site is subject to the same wastewater constraints as Grove Farm and Yew Tree Farm, and its development before 2020 is not being assumed. It is thus considered more appropriate to re-examine its suitability for development should Plan B come into operation. The anticipated low yield of the site (10 units in line with the character of Ruff Lane) is another reason for not allocating it as a housing site - all other allocated housing sites are for over 100 units.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 929  
**Consultee name** Mr Peter Banks  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** See my comments on 4.1 and 4.4 for Plan B sites that should be in the main plan, and vice-versa.  
**Outcome** See Reps 925 and 928  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1097  
**Consultee name** Bickerstaffe Trust  
**Agent Name** Mr Graham Love Turley Associates  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Concern that Plan B does not provide certainty, and may require to be implemented early in the Plan period. The way in which sites have been allocated appears arbitrary and inconsistent. Sustainability of location and deliverability also need to be taken into account. The proposed Plan B sites are inappropriate. (S)  
**Outcome** Objections noted. Technical Paper 1 sets out the approach undertaken in identifying "Plan B" sites. This approach balances the need to deliver sites in sustainable locations with the need to protect Green Belt land that actually fulfils the purposes of Green Belt.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 1151  
**Consultee name** Mr Robin Buckley Redrow Homes (Lancs) Ltd  
**Agent Name** Mr Tony McAteer  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** a) Green Belt land should not be allocated for housing when development is prevented on non-Green Belt land or more suitable Green Belt land. b) Objection to 'Plan B' - 'Plan A' should be demonstrably deliverable, but instead it is unsound. c) The Plan fails to identify specific developable sites to meet the Borough's housing requirements over the 15 year Plan period. d) Objection to manner in which sites are allocated as either 'Plan B' or Post 2027 sites. e) Land at Parrs Lane, Aughton should be the subject of a strategic policy, or else allocated as a housing site. (S)  
**Outcome** a) The Council accounts for the majority of available non-Green Belt land in the Borough in the delivery of its development targets, and the only non-Green Belt land not considered suitable for development is in unsustainable locations around villages in the Northern Parishes. In relation to the relative merits of different locations in the Green Belt as to their suitability for release from development, Technical Paper 1 sets out the Council's approach in this assessment and the sustainability of a site / location has been considered as well as quality of the Green Belt. b) The Preferred Strategy in the LPPO is, in the Council's opinion, "demonstrably deliverable" but it is prudent to have a "Plan B" in case an unforeseen circumstance arises that means a key site in the preferred strategy is not delivered as anticipated. c) Policies SP1, GN1 and RS1 collectively steer residential development to the existing settlement areas or specific allocated sites on the edge of them. Based on the SHLAA and outstanding planning permissions, there is sufficient land within the existing settlement areas, plus the specific allocated sites on the edge of settlements, to deliver the housing target for the Local Plan. d) The assessment and consideration of sites for the "Plan B" is set out in Technical Paper 1. e) The Parrs Lane site is clearly deliverable for housing, but is not necessarily the most sustainable site. In comparison with those Green Belt sites selected for the preferred strategy, Parrs Lane is less sustainable, but compared to those sites considered for "Plan B", it was found to be more sustainable than those rejected for "Plan B".  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 1163  
**Consultee name** Mr Steve Matthews Sefton Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** Concerns regarding proposed site GN2(a)(iv) / (b)(iii): - Inadequate consultation with relevant people; - Proposed use of agricultural land for development; - Likely pressure on services in Sefton; - Possible impact on allotments; The allotments should be designated as protected open space. (S)  
**Outcome** Support noted. In relation to allotments, they would be safeguarded from development and it is agreed that they should be designated as an open space and thus protected from development.  
**Officer recommendation** Add Allotments on Moss Road as a designated open space in Policy EN3.

---



**ID** 1219  
**Consultee name** Mr Andrew Taylor David Wilson Homes  
**Agent Name** Ms Lorraine Davison DPP  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** Removal of Parris Lane from Green Belt supported; Site GN2(a) (i) should be safeguarded, but potentially with amended boundaries; Site GN2(b)(ii) should be reallocated for housing development under new Policy SP4, along with land south of Parris Lane. (S)  
**Outcome** see response to rep 1212 - alternative site is not considered as sustainable as those already proposed in the Local Plan Preferred Options.  
**Officer recommendation** no change necessary

---

**ID** 1277  
**Consultee name** Mr David Grimshaw  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** This submission should not just be seen as a change in the boundary of the existing Green Belt but as a new initiative to introduce affordable housing into Burscough. The proposition is for the land owner Mr Brian Mawdsley to work in a profit sharing relationship with a local builder Grimshaw Construction Ltd using the land equity to ensure that completed properties are at a price consistent with them being affordable. There are no other sites available in Burscough offering new houses at affordable prices for first time buyers, retired couples- and the vulnerable. (S)  
**Outcome** Support noted  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 1310  
**Consultee name** Mrs Margaret Wiltshire CPRE (West Lancs Group)  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to concept of Plan B (S)  
**Outcome** Error in labelling noted - will be corrected on final Proposals Map. The Local Plan is required to demonstrate flexibility in the delivery of housing and the Council have proposed the "Plan B" as an approach to demonstrating this flexibility, without releasing more land for development immediately than is absolutely required. The proposed policy means the Council retain control of when "Plan B" sites are actually released for development and so developers will not "wait" for choicest sites if there is no guarantee they will be released. No housing sites are anticipated to be developed by the Council themselves.  
**Officer recommendation** Correct Errors in labels of GN2 sites on Proposals Map

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: 5.3**

**Title: Design of Development**

---

<b>ID</b>	1281
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr David Grimshaw
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Support
<b>Summary</b>	Design of development on Red Cat Lane would be to high standards in accordance with policy (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	Comments noted. However, they appear to be in support of development which at this stage is considered to only be appropriate as Plan B option.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change required

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Policy GN3**

**Title: Design of Development**

---

**ID** 63  
**Consultee name** Mr Anthony Northcote Plannig and Local Authority Liason, The Coal Authority  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support Policy GN3 (S).  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 245  
**Consultee name** Ms Judith Nelson English Heritage  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** It is suggested that Policy GN3 includes a specific section on the design considerations required when developing in historic places (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted, it is recognised that there are some cross-overs between Policy GN3 and other policies in the document. However, rather than increase the duplication these will be reduced before the final version of the Local Plan is produced. Reference is made to the need for development to respect historic character in criterion 1.ii so there is no real need to replicate Policy EN4.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 512  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** We support the policy with one caveat. We do not believe that housing developments should incorporate narrow roads and inadequate space for parking on driveways. Nothing detracts more from the visual amenity of an area than to have cars parked on both sides of the road with their wheels on the pavements and still leaving only a narrow space for moving traffic to pass through. Such arrangements are also dangerous and prevent the passage of larger vehicles, such as those used for deliveries to houses, waste collection and emergencies (especially fire). Also, the Design Guide SPD is flawed and out of date. It needs to be revised. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted relating to Design Guide SPD although this does not form part of the consultation. The Policy sets out how development should prioritise pedestrians and provide adequate parking along with the requirement for suitable safe access and road layout. As such it is unlikely that inappropriately narrow roads and inadequate parking would result from development if this policy was applied.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 798  
**Consultee name** Mr Robert W. Pickavance  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** If the land owner still has a control on the development, it could be more in keeping with what would be acceptable to the village rather than what would be acceptable to a large developer. (S)  
**Outcome** Control of land is outside of the remit of the Local Plan.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 869  
**Consultee name** Mr Philip Carter Environment Agency  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Part 4 of Policy GN3 considers drainage & sewerage. We have no objection to the proposed requirements, but has the Council defined the critical drainage areas as referred to in the policy? If not, how and when will they be defined? Critical drainage areas need to be defined and mapped to ensure the policy will be effective. This could be an element of the Level 2 SFRA, but advice from your drainage engineer will be required. (F)  
**Outcome** Comment regarding critical drainage areas noted, the justification will include clarification of where these are defined. Comment relating to the inclusion of a buffer zone at criterion 5 (v) noted. It is recognised that there are some cross-over's between Policy GN3 and other policies in the document. However, rather than increase the duplication these will be reduced before the final version of the Local Plan is produced. Comments relating to water quality and contaminated land noted.  
**Officer recommendation** Clarify (possibly in the SFRA L2) where the critical drainage areas are. Include wording relating to a buffer at criterion 5(v). Consideration of the wording of Policy GN3 to ensure no duplication with other LP policies and to ensure inclusion of a) the p

---

**ID** 1027  
**Consultee name** Mr Francis Williams Ormskirk Friends of the Earth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** 5 ii. We believe that housing developments should also contain levels of public open space sufficient to meet the recreational needs of their residents, and that these should not be substituted by payments of commuted sums for improvement of recreational facilities elsewhere. 5 iv where possible native species should be used, in the interests of biodiversity, and ryegrass monocultures should be avoided. (F)  
**Outcome** The principle of the provision of public open space is secured in the Local Plan Preferred Option. How and where this space will be provided is subject to a wider strategy and the requirements of the Open Space SPD. Details relating to habitat creation will be established on a site by site basis following guidance of Lancashire County Council who provide ecological support to the Council.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 1264  
**Consultee name** Mr Andrew Thorley Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd  
**Agent Name** Miss Caroline Simpson Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Amendments to various parts of the policy including, design, surface water run-off and ecological value to make the policy less onerous and more robust. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments relating to GN3 1.(i) noted and agreed. Comments relating to GN3 4.(ii) noted. However, this is important to ensure sustainable development in the Borough. The critical drainage areas will be identified clearly and evidenced in the justification of the policy. Comments relating to GN3 5(iii) noted. However, the need for the policy to be aspirational in ensuring sustainable design which not only protects but enhances where possible is in-keeping with PPS9.  
**Officer recommendation** Make changes as per recommendation in relation to GN3 1.(i). No change relating to GN3 4.(ii) other than identify clearly where the critical drainage areas are. Include the words "where possible" at the end of criterion 5 (iii).

---

**ID** 1271  
**Consultee name** Mr Alan Hubbard The National Trust  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** Policy GN3 The National Trust welcomes the proposed content of this Policy especially in terms of sustainable design and construction, as well as landscaping and the natural environment. However there is a major omission. The Policy needs to include reference to the protection and enhancement of heritage assets and their settings through the sensitive location and design of new developments, and the conversion of historic buildings.  
**Outcome** Reference is made to the need for development to respect historic character in criterion 1.ii so there is no real need to replicate Policy EN4.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 1290  
**Consultee name** St Modwen Properties PLC  
**Agent Name** John Francis  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** This policy deals with the design of development, including its quality. St Modwen acknowledges that adopted and evolving national planning policy guidance places considerable emphasis on the quality of design in new development, and it accepts that development should generally be of as high a standard of design and build quality as possible. However, there will be instances where the viability of a proposed development is brought into question because of design related expectations. In some of these cases there might well be an opportunity to drive down costs through adopting a different but still acceptable design solution or through using cheaper materials, the combined effects of which improve viability. In view of this we propose an amendment to this policy to ensure that where viability becomes an issue the policy can be applied with a degree of flexibility. Change of wording suggested. (S)  
**Outcome** PPS1 is clear that "good design ensures attractive usable, durable and adaptable places and is a key element in achieving sustainable development. Good design is indivisible from good planning". As such it is considered that diluting this policy to include the word "generally" is inappropriate.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Policy GN4**

**Title: Demonstrating Viability**

---

**ID** 23

**Consultee name** Mr Howard Courtley Courtley Consultants Ltd

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** Para 5.37 Planning Guidance does not require applicants to prove viability to justify a change of use for agricultural buildings. This is not consistent with PPS4 or NPPF which support the Change of use of such sites based against a criteria based policy. Policy GN4 attempts to constrain development contrary to the draft NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development. (F)

**Outcome** EC13.1 of PPS4 states: "When assessing planning applications affecting shops, leisure uses including public houses or services in local centres and villages, local planning authorities should: a. take into account the importance of the shop, leisure facility or service to the local community or the economic base of the area if the proposal would result in its loss or change of use b. refuse planning applications which fail to protect existing facilities which provide for people's day-to-day needs" Therefore, in conjunction with Policy IF1, Policy GN4 provides an important check on the loss of uses that are important to the local community or the economic base. The draft NPPF includes for a presumption in favour of sustainable development. In relation to what is sustainable, Para 72 of the draft NPPF provides three objectives for sustainable economic growth: "• plan proactively to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21st century • promote the vitality and viability of town centres, and meet the needs of consumers for high quality and accessible retail services; and • raise the quality of life and the environment in rural areas by promoting thriving, inclusive and locally distinctive rural economies." Therefore, Policy GN4 again provides an important mechanism for retaining vital and viable town centres and promoting thriving, inclusive and locally distinctive rural economies.

**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 93

**Consultee name** Church Commissioners For England

**Agent Name** Miss Jennifer Hadland Smiths Gore

**Nature of response** Support with conditions

**Summary** It is vital that the Local Plan is flexible enough to allow for changes of use in some cases. This can be achieved through an applicant demonstrating that the former use is no longer viable. The Church Commissioners for England therefore support Policy GN4 which encourages the Council to be proactive in terms of development proposals. Notwithstanding this, we do question the period of time suggested for marketing a premise and the proposed requirement for the premise / land to be regularly advertised in the local press on a weekly and then monthly basis. This can be an expensive requirement for the landowner. Additionally, the change of use of agricultural buildings other than a workers' dwelling should be included within this policy. (S)

**Outcome** Support noted. It is felt that the timescales for proof of marketing are reasonable based on the particular uses and the current lull in the market as a result of the economic downturn. Policy GN4 can be applied to other agricultural buildings if required, as the list in GN4 is not exhaustive, but as stated by consultee above, there is a need to not restrict unduly those agricultural buildings which may benefit from a change of use.

**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 553  
**Consultee name** Mrs Jackie Liptrott  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Policy GN4 is onerous and does not encourage flexibility in the planning process. Independent verification of a departure from policy should not be required nor charged for. GN5 The sequential test is unnecessarily complicated. Replaced GN4/GN5 with one policy that reflects national guidelines simplifying the planning process. Outline of wording suggested. (S)  
**Outcome** Policies GN4 and GN5 are both considered necessary. Whilst the Council accepts some of the points made by the Objector, the policy proposed by the Objector does not, in the Council's opinion, contain sufficient clarity to be able to be used in the Development Management process, especially for more contentious planning applications. The extra detail in Policies GN4 and GN5 helps provide certainty to applicants, the Council, and Inspectors in any appeals.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 799  
**Consultee name** Mr Robert W. Pickavance  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Agricultural Workers Dwellings: A better approach needs to be taken under this issue: many agricultural occupancies have been lifted, also if you live and work in the countryside it is hard to get building permission. (F)  
**Outcome** It is important that sufficient housing is maintained for agricultural workers in rural parts of the Borough to ensure sustainable rural communities and so agricultural workers' dwellings are included under GN4 in order to maintain an adequate supply of such dwellings.  
**Officer recommendation** A new policy will be introduced (RS5) to address accommodation for temporary agricultural / horticultural workers and such accommodation will also be referred to in Policy GN5 on sequential tests.

---

**ID** 842  
**Consultee name** Anglo International Up Holland Ltd  
**Agent Name** Ms Lorraine Davison DPP  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** This policy has no obvious basis in national planning policy guidance or the draft NPPF. Sites should be allocated only for uses that stand a reasonable prospect of being brought forward. A more appropriate viability policy is linked to enabling development and how it can be used to make an otherwise unviable scheme viable, e.g. enabling development to secure an important heritage asset. (S)  
**Outcome** The Local Plan does make allowance for general development viability and the role of enabling development, especially exemplified by Policy EC3 which allocates 4 employment / brownfield sites in rural areas that would struggle to deliver a viable proposal for employment development alone for mixed-use redevelopment. Policy GN4 is aimed at ensuring that uses that are viable are maintained where they are of most use, for example, retail in town centres, business units on key employment sites, agricultural workers' dwellings close to active farms. this is consistent with the draft NPPF.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action required

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Policy GN5**

**Title: Sequential Tests**

---

**ID** 24  
**Consultee name** Mr Howard Courtley Courtley Consultants Ltd  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Policy GN5 suggests a sequential approach included in Policy RS1 Residential Development. This approach should be applied in the allocation and choice of GB releases and housing allocations.(F)  
**Outcome** The methodology for selecting the proposed major sites for Green Belt release and housing allocations was broader than a sequential test. Further details on site selection are set out in the Green Belt Study and the Green Belt and Strategic Options Technical Paper.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 69  
**Consultee name** Ms Barton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Chequer Lane development should be subject to rigorous sequential testing as a greenfield site and not take place before development in Skelmersdale Town Centre has been secured and undertaken (S).  
**Outcome** The process for determining applications (Policy GN5) is different from the process for selecting Local Plan sites, although certain principles are common to both. A sequential process of sorts has been used in selecting proposed housing sites, and Skelmersdale Town Centre and other (brownfield and greenfield) land within Skelmersdale has been allocated for housing. Only after these sites were counted against the housing requirement for 2012-27 did we look at other non-Green Belt sites, including Chequer Lane, before having to resort to Green Belt release. It is agreed that regeneration of Skelmersdale Town Centre is a priority, but in order to maintain the required rolling five year supply of deliverable housing land, some sites in the Skelmersdale / Up Holland area may need to be developed before or at the same time as the Town Centre.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---



**ID** 843  
**Consultee name** Anglo International Up Holland Ltd  
**Agent Name** Ms Lorraine Davison DPP  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Suggested change to policy: '... within the expected project timeframe. In assessing a sequential test submitted in support of a planning application the Council will give consideration and weight to development that contributes towards delivering other planning benefits including enabling development.' Changes are also suggested to the policy justification. (S)  
**Outcome** 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. (This would not automatically mean that it would be granted permission because the specific justification for the particular enabling development proposed would need to be assessed.) As with other objections on behalf of Anglo International, the Council does not consider it appropriate or necessary to add wording to this Local Plan policy to refer to this specific scenario.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 870  
**Consultee name** Mr Philip Carter Environment Agency  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** PPS25 and the draft NPPF both require developments in Flood Zones 2 & 3 to satisfy a Sequential Test. Proposed Policy GN5 should be amended to reflect this. (F)  
**Outcome** It is agreed that national policy requires a sequential approach with regard to land at flood risk. There is a slight difference in approach, however, as mitigation measures can often be put in place which result in EA withdrawing objections to development on sites within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Given the changes to Policy SP1, development in FZ2/3 will be added to Policy GN5, but with appropriate wording to reflect the above.  
**Officer recommendation** Amend Policy GN5 to include land in Flood Zones 2 and 3. Add extra bullet point to first part of the policy, and explanatory text to the policy justification (new paragraph 5.50 or 5.63).

---

**ID** 1018  
**Consultee name** Sainsburys Supermarkets Ltd  
**Agent Name** Ms Anna Noble Turley Associates  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Policy GN5 is not required as it repeats national policy. (S)  
**Outcome** Contrary to the submission by the Objector, it is considered that Policy GN5 does add to PPS4 Policy EC15, and does provide a local interpretation, for example by clarifying the area of search for sites. It also applies to categories of development not covered by PPS4, and is thus considered necessary.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: 6.1**

**Title: The Economy and Employment Land**

---

**ID** 476

**Consultee name** Mr Robert Routledge Whitemoss Landfill Limited

**Agent Name** Mr Richard Percy Steven Abbott Associates

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** My clients wish to OBJECT to the consultation document and in particular to the employment land policies and strategy which they believe are flawed. It is suggested that the employment land policies should be revised to include an element of green belt release in the area to the south, east and west of the White Moss Business Park, to provide an adequate supply of employment land to serve the economic development needs of the Borough. (s)

**Outcome** Employment targets have been reviewed taking into account evidence including historic take up rates of land for the past 19 years. The employment land figure has been reduced from previous consultation due to the fact that the most recent years of employment completions, which are lower due to the economic climate, have been factored into the consultation. Given the current economic climate it is reasonable to assume that the lower levels of employment completions will continue in the early years of the Local Plan and that the anomalously high years of completions in two years of the last 19 will be highly unlikely to be seen again over the Local Plan period. The Council is confident that we can deliver the proposed targets in the locations specified.

**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 1190

**Consultee name** Mr John Gardner

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Support

**Summary** I support the increase in employment opportunities and would suggest that where possible the employment should be skilled rather than low cost warehousing which creates little skilled employment. (F)

**Outcome** comments noted. Where appropriate the Council will seek to encourage more skilled jobs.

**Officer recommendation** no action required

---

**ID** 1279

**Consultee name** Mr David Grimshaw

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Support

**Summary** We are prepared to develop plans together with West Lancashire District Council to ensure any proposed future development supports the construction of affordable housing. This is an opportunity for West Lancashire District Council to deliver Policy DE1 for the community of Burscough with new high quality housing providing first time buyers with a unique opportunity to buy their own home in a location supported by existing transport and social infrastructures. (F)

**Outcome** Comments noted

**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

<b>ID</b>	1282
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr David Grimshaw
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Support
<b>Summary</b>	Support of Red Cat lane development as it is in good proximity to employment (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	Comments of support noted
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No action required.

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Policy EC1**

**Title: The Economy and Employment Land**

---

**ID** 513

**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Support with conditions

**Summary** We support this policy, with the exception that the Council must take a firmer stance on ensuring that mixed-use sites, whether existing or new developments, are actually mixed. If one type of use (such as warehousing) is allowed to predominate it will frustrate the whole purpose of this policy. It is ironic and mistaken to direct that the only site to be protected from major traffic movements is the one that lies closest to a motorway junction. (F)

**Outcome** In relation to warehousing the Council has said that sites should be a mix of industrial, business, storage and distribution uses as is stated in the policy. Whitmoor Business park was excluded from being a mixed use site because Whitmoor is a relatively new development and was specifically designed to cater for B1 office use. If this site was also mixed it may lose its integrity as an office development and detract from some of the existing industrial estates which are more suitable. It is also important to protect the development of Skelmersdale town centre. In line with the NPPF the Council will consider allowing use classes C1 Hotels and D1 Non-residential Institutions at White Moss. It is believed this will allow flexibility for use of the site whilst protecting the integrity of the development.

**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 604

**Consultee name** Mrs Jackie Liptrott

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** The land at White Moss Business Park has not been developed during the last 25 years and should be considered for alternative uses. There is no clear vision in this Local Plan to identify new sectors that could successfully use this land to benefit the greater good. It is clearly not sustainable (in terms of the NPPF) to retain the land solely for B1 use. The precedent of alternative use has been set at one site at White Moss where storage and distribution (B8) has been allowed. Classes A1, (non-food retail and showrooms), A3, A4, C1,2,3 and D2 should be considered in addition to class B1. Allowing a wider designation would complement the vision for Skelmersdale town centre as well as complying with the draft NPPF. (S)

**Outcome** The Council are keen to see the White Moss Business Park developed out in its entirety over the 15-year plan period, but wish to maintain the character of the business park as high quality accommodation for businesses, with a particular focus on office-based businesses. However, it is acknowledged that the development of White Moss Business Park has not been as quick as originally hoped, especially in light of the recent economic recession. Therefore, the Council is willing to explore selected alternative business and employment-generating uses at White Moss Business Park, subject to the fact that they maintain the high quality character of the business park.

**Officer recommendation** Permitted land uses at White Moss Business Park will be extended to also include C1 (e.g. hotel) and D1 (e.g. creche / day nursery or training centres) uses.

---

**ID** 872  
**Consultee name** Mr Philip Carter Environment Agency  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Within Part 2 d) iii. of Policy EC1, it is stated that development must not cause unacceptable adverse environmental impacts. Could any development on allocated sites in the area subject to the known sewerage capacity limitations exacerbate the existing problem? We would recommend consulting with United Utilities to see whether or not this is an issue of concern.  
**Outcome** United Utilities have been fully consulted regarding this Local Plan and are aware of all the proposed allocated employment sites. The Council will continue to work with United Utilities as this scheme is further developed.  
**Officer recommendation** No further action required.

---

**ID** 927  
**Consultee name** Mr Clifford Holbert  
**Agent Name** Mr Michael Cunningham Cunningham Planning  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The area of land identified as the extent of Stanley Industrial Estate should include the 9 hectares of land to the south of Vale Lane which would be capable of immediate delivery and therefore immediately address the employment land shortfall. (S)  
**Outcome** This Council believes that other sites for employment uses should come forward before Green Belt sites such as the one proposed are considered. There is no need to release Green Belt on the edge of Skelmersdale for employment uses while there is sufficient land within the existing town boundaries.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 971  
**Consultee name** Strategy and Policy Group Lancashire County Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** The approach of developing existing employment land allocations and re-modelling industrial estates in Burscough and Simonswood is broadly supported. Support is also given to paragraph 6.11. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments of support noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1028  
**Consultee name** Mr Francis Williams Ormskirk Friends of the Earth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** There appears to be no assessment of the agricultural quality of the potential greenfield development sites. (F)  
**Outcome** In relation to greenfield sites proposed for employment all but a few are existing allocations. Only the land at Yew Tree Farm, Burscough is greenfield and not previously allocated for employment, and this has been subject to an assessment of agricultural land quality.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 1180  
**Consultee name** Mr Roger Clayton South Lathom Residents Association  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** We support Policy EC1 (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1311  
**Consultee name** Mrs Margaret Wiltshire CPRE (West Lancs Group)  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** We are pleased that the Council does not need to intrude into the Green Belt south of Skelmersdale to fulfill its employment land requirements. We are also pleased that over 60ha of the land required can be satisfied through the development of existing allocations and the regeneration of vacant and underused premises. In general we support this policy but would like to see a determination that large B8 developments will not predominate, particularly on greenfield sites; they take a lot of (sometimes agricultural) land, provide comparatively few local jobs and, with their over-enthusiastic lighting and untimely transport arrangements are a nightmare to nearby residents. We hope to see a "mix" of types on the ground as well as on paper. Also, referring to the Policy and paragraph 6.3, relevant public transport for workers and to work-locations needs to be expedited. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The Local Plan supports mixed use employment development which includes B1, B2 and B8. Policy IF2 Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice seeks to support and enhance transportation links to employment sites.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

<b>ID</b>	1333
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Damien Holdstock                      National Grid
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Observations
<b>Summary</b>	National Grid's ZU line crosses through the south eastern corner of the Simonswood Industrial Estate. National Grid prefers that buildings are not built directly beneath its overhead lines for safety and access reasons and this should be noted by developers and the Local Planning Authority. (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	Comments noted. The location of any buildings on this site has not yet been decided which will come later in the planning application stage. Further consultation work will take place when applications are submitted.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No action required

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: 6.2**

**Title: The Rural Economy**

---

<b>ID</b>	745
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mrs Alison Truman British Waterways
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Support with conditions
<b>Summary</b>	BW supports the reference to the canal as a focus for the provision of small-scale visitor attractions. However, it should be recognised in the supporting text that the provision of canal-related leisure facilities, such as marinas, boatyards and boat-hire companies, is essential to the continued success of the canal network as a visitor and leisure attraction, and that in some cases it will be necessary for such development to take place in rural areas including the Green Belt. (F)
<b>Outcome</b>	The Council fully supports the use of the canal to support the visitor economy . However the Council does not believe that these uses require a specific mention within the local plan and for any use to come forward a full justification would still be required.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No action required

---



**Chapter/Policy Number: Policy EC2**

**Title: The Rural Economy**

---

**ID** 25

**Consultee name** Mr Howard Courtley Courtley Consultants Ltd

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** Policy EC2 Rural economy should accord with PPS4 and draft NPPF and support economic growth including appropriate Change of Use of Agricultural properties based on a criteria policy. There should no requirement for the buildings to be vacant or derelict, no requirement to consider it re-use and no requirement for them to be based on "rural business". (F)

**Outcome** The policy clearly states that where it can be robustly demonstrated that if the site is unsuitable for an ongoing viable use (in accordance with the requirements of Policy GN4), the Council will consider alternative uses where this is in accordance with other policies in the Local Plan. As a general approach, the re-use of existing buildings within rural areas will be supported where they would otherwise be left vacant. The Council believes this section of the policy contains sufficient guidance whilst maintaining a degree of flexibility to consider change of use of agricultural properties. Policy EC2 seeks to protect the rural economy whilst allowing the appropriate re-use of buildings. The published NPPF says that local plans should support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well designed new buildings. The Council is satisfied the policy meets these requirements.

**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 94

**Consultee name** Church Commissioners For England

**Agent Name** Miss Jennifer Hadland Smiths Gore

**Nature of response** Support with conditions

**Summary** The Church Commissioners for England therefore support the general approach of Policy EC2 although, as stated previously, it is important for small scale development to be able to take place in the smaller settlements benefiting their communities. Rural decline must be avoided and flexibility must be incorporated into the forthcoming Local Plan. There is also support to protect employment sites unless a feasibility case can demonstrate that this is not the best use for the site. Each site should be assessed on their own individual merits. There is an abundance of vacant agricultural buildings which are no longer suitable or needed for agricultural use. We therefore fully support the Council and its decision to encourage the re-use of such buildings in the interests of sustainability. In addition, the Local Plan needs to address rural regeneration, especially for settlements which do not rank highly within the proposed settlement hierarchy. (S)

**Outcome** Comments of support noted. The policy seeks to support the rural economy in all areas and not just larger rural settlements. The policy also allows for the reuse of existing buildings in rural areas where they would otherwise be left vacant.

**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 246  
**Consultee name** Ms Judith Nelson English Heritage  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Suggestion to refer to English Heritage guidance document. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Reference to the English Heritage guidance will be made.  
**Officer recommendation** Reference to English Heritage Guidance- the maintenance and repair of traditional farm buildings; a guide to good practice' be added to supporting documents.

---

**ID** 735  
**Consultee name** Mr Martin Ainscough  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Allow the re-use of agricultural buildings for residential purposes.(S)  
**Outcome** Policy EC2 seeks to protect agricultural buildings in order to support agriculture and farming. The re-use of agricultural buildings must be protected where possible to support the rural economy. However, the policy does say that the Council will consider alternative uses were it can be robustly demonstrated that the site is unsuitable for an ongoing viable employment use. The Council is satisfied that this policy offers the correct level of protection whilst allowing for flexibility. It is recognised, however, that the NPPF allows for conversion of commercial buildings to housing, and conversion of other buildings in the Green Belt (subject to conditions). Other relevant Local Plan policies will be amended as necessary to conform with the NPPF.  
**Officer recommendation** No change to Policy EC2.

---

**ID** 832  
**Consultee name** Seddon  
**Agent Name** Miss Jane Worsey Higham & Co  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** In summary, the land at Greaves Hall Avenue has much to offer in meeting development needs on a brownfield site in a sustainable location within the settlement of Banks. The proposed Policy EC2 designation is considered too restrictive and an alternative mixed use land use designation under Policy EC3 is sought.  
**Outcome** The Council believe that this site is well located to meeting rural employment needs, especially given its proxmity to the Southport New Road. Alternative sites providing providing more mixed uses are found within close proximaty in more appropriate locations.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 844  
**Consultee name** Anglo International Up Holland Ltd  
**Agent Name** Ms Lorraine Davison DPP  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Suggested changes to policy and justification: 'Encouragement will also be given to enabling development that has the potential to contribute towards the general aims of this policy and which would deliver other planning related benefits subject to other relevant policies of the plan.' Suggested new paragraph in the policy justification. (S)  
**Outcome** 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. (This would not automatically mean that it would be granted permission because the specific justification for the particular enabling development proposed would need to be assessed.) As with other objections on behalf of Anglo International, the Council does not consider it appropriate or necessary to add wording to this (and other) Local Plan policies to refer to this specific scenario.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 873  
**Consultee name** Mr Philip Carter Environment Agency  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** We request that this policy is reworded as follows so that it relates specifically to the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), i.e. "Land allocated for the purpose of Rural Employment is as follows: i. Land between Greaves Hall Avenue and Southport New Road, Banks Development proposals for this site will be expected to proceed in strict accordance with the site specific requirements outlined in the West Lancashire BC Level 2 SFRA."  
**Outcome** Additional words relating to WLBC Level 2 SFRA to be added  
**Officer recommendation** Additional words relating to WLBC Level 2 SFRA to be added: Mitigation of flood risk in accordance with specific requirements of WLBC Level 2 SFRA and other site constraints will need to be provided.

---

**ID** 931  
**Consultee name** Estate of Mr J Heyes  
**Agent Name** Mr Michael Cunningham Cunningham Planning  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** Wording of Policy EC2 should be amended to reflect the fact that the reuse of rural buildings for residential purposes will be acceptable if it can be shown that they are not appropriate for employment use. (S)  
**Outcome** Policy EC2 seeks to allow the re-use of existing buildings within rural areas where they would otherwise be left vacant. The policy also says that where it can be robustly demonstrated that the site is unsuitable for an ongoing viable employment use, the Council will consider alternative uses where this is in accordance with other policies in the Local Plan. The Council believes that this approach will protect the rural economy whilst allowing a flexible approach to the re-use of buildings.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 978  
**Consultee name** Strategy and Policy Group Lancashire County Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Policy EC2 and/or EC3 should contain reference to the roll out of high speed broadband, which is a Corporate priority for Lancashire County Council - as outlined in the Lancashire Broadband Plan, and its benefits to the rural economy. (F)  
**Outcome** Additional comment to be added to reference and support LCC roll out of high speed broadband and make reference to the Lancashire Broadband Plan.  
**Officer recommendation** Additional wording required within Policy EC2 to read The Council will support and promote the roll out of high speed broadband.

---

**ID** 1265  
**Consultee name** Mr Andrew Thorley Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd  
**Agent Name** Miss Caroline Simpson Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Objection to Policy EC2 as it conflicts with PPS7. Suggested rewording to "Alongside other sustainability considerations including biodiversity; the quality and character of the landscape; its amenity value or heritage interest; accessibility to infrastructure, workforce and markets; maintaining viable communities; and the protection of natural resources, including soil quality the irreversible development of agricultural land will only be permitted where it would not result in the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land, except where absolutely necessary to deliver development allocated within this Local Plan or strategic infrastructure". (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. However, since submission of this representation the new NPPF has been published. Paragraph 112 allows for the protection of the best and most versatile agricultural land on account of the economic and other benefits it brings. In addition, most of the other matters raised in the suggested alteration to wording are addressed by other policies in the Local Plan.  
**Officer recommendation** No change necessary

---

**ID** 1272  
**Consultee name** Mr Alan Hubbard The National Trust  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** The National Trust supports and welcomes the reference to promotion and enhancement of tourism and the natural economy. Some suggestions as to wording change (S)  
**Outcome** Comments of support noted. Disagree with the proposed change in wording as it changes the meaning of the intended policy.  
**Officer recommendation** No change necessary

---

**ID** 1312  
**Consultee name** Mrs Margaret Wiltshire CPRE (West Lancs Group)  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** We generally support the Rural Economy Policy and associated comments. We do feel that there is scope for small-scale "cottage" industries related to the food trade and perhaps some niche markets. ( as in para 6.33) (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Policy EC3**

**Title: Rural Development Opportunities**

---

**ID** 95  
**Consultee name** Church Commissioners For England  
**Agent Name** Miss Jennifer Hadland Smiths Gore  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** The Church Commissioners agree with the assertion that although it is important to ensure some rural employment functions are delivered, it must be recognised that an element of flexibility is required in order to make schemes viable as employment uses are not always a viable option given the rural locations of the sites. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 248  
**Consultee name** Ms Judith Nelson English Heritage  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** Consideration should be given to specific sites (S)  
**Outcome** Policy EN4 requires that any development on these allocations should consider the impact on the setting of nearby listed buildings. As such, the suggested changes are not required  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 354  
**Consultee name** Mr P Crabtree Riverview Nurseries  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Query as to the boundaries and site included under Policy EC3. (S)  
**Outcome** The council believes that the land in question is not required for the very special circumstances needed.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 845  
**Consultee name** Anglo International Up Holland Ltd  
**Agent Name** Ms Lorraine Davison DPP  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The former St Joseph's Seminary should be included as a Rural Development Opportunity site. (S)  
**Outcome** 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. (This would not automatically mean that it would be granted permission because the specific justification for the particular enabling development proposed would need to be assessed.) As with other objections on behalf of Anglo International, the Council does not consider it appropriate or necessary to add wording to this (and other) Local Plan policies to refer to this specific scenario.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 875  
**Consultee name** Mr Philip Carter Environment Agency  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** We request that this policy is reworded as follows so that it relates specifically to the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), i.e. "The following sites are allocated as 'Rural Development Opportunities' i. Greaves Hall Hospital, Bank Development proposals for this site will be expected to proceed in strict accordance with the site specific requirements outlined in the West Lancashire BC Level 2 SFRA and must including a scheme for a replacement culvert along Aveling Drive."  
**Outcome** Additional wording to be added to specifically mention the WLBC level 2 SFRA. The specific mention of a culvert along Aveling Drive is not appropriate within this policy.  
**Officer recommendation** Additional wording to be added to relate to WLBC Level 2 SFRA. i. Greaves Hall Hospital, Banks (a site specific flood risk assessment in accordance with the WLBC Level 2 SFRA will be required.)

---

**ID** 903  
**Consultee name** HENRY ALTY LTD  
**Agent Name** Mr Richard Lee Richard Lee Limited  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** The development of the Alty's Brickworks site would help meet many of the objectives of the Local Plan. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments of support for proposed allocation noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 979  
**Consultee name** Strategy and Policy Group Lancashire County Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Policy EC2 and/or EC3 should contain reference to the roll out of high speed broadband, which is a Corporate priority for Lancashire County Council - as outlined in the Lancashire Broadband Plan, and its benefits to the rural economy. (F)  
**Outcome** As 978  
**Officer recommendation** AS 978

---

**ID** 1243  
**Consultee name** Mr Christie McDonald Steven Abbott Associates  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** The Rural Development Opportunity site at East Quarry, Appley Bridge is supported and in recognition of this a planning application for this site has been submitted.  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The Council is fully aware of the current planning application which is being determined by planning department. However the Council cannot control when a planning application is submitted.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 1318  
**Consultee name** Mr Duncan Gregory Gladman  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** Policy EC3 is supported provided the addition of B1 uses,  
**Outcome** Comments for support noted. Policy EC3 does say that a mix of uses will be included on the site including B1, B2, B8, residential uses, leisure, recreation and community uses.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---



**Chapter/Policy Number: 6.4**

**Title: Edge Hill University**

---

**ID** 37  
**Consultee name** Dr Anthony Evans  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Edge Hill University expansion due to impacts on Ormskirk's infrastructure (S).  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The effect of student fees and courses on student numbers needs to be monitored. The most recent development proposals are to meet current accommodation needs, rather than to facilitate a future increase in student numbers. Policy EN4 requires any further development at the University to incorporate measures to alleviate any existing or newly created traffic and / or housing impacts.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 40  
**Consultee name** Mr George Talbot  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support proposals for Edge Hill University (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 41  
**Consultee name** Gillian Dean  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support for proposed development of Edge Hill University (S).  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 42  
**Consultee name** Brenda Simons  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** I support the Council's proposals in respect of the Edge Hill University.(S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 43  
**Consultee name** Abigail Howley  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support proposals for Edge Hill University (S).  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 44  
**Consultee name** Lars McNaughton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support Edge Hill proposals. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 49  
**Consultee name** Sharon Cranney  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support for Local Plan policies with regard to the development of Edge Hill University. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 50  
**Consultee name** Claire Bunting  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support for proposed Edge Hill University policy. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 51  
**Consultee name** Denise Hill  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support the proposed policy for Edge Hill University. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 52  
**Consultee name** Virginia Kay  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support proposals to expand the Edge Hill University. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 54  
**Consultee name** Anita Walton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support Edge Hill University's proposals to expand eastwards. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 55  
**Consultee name** Helen Smallbone  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support Edge Hill University development proposals (S).  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 76  
**Consultee name** Alan Syder  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Edge Hill University is already too large for the town, with a student to resident ratio of 1:1, higher than elsewhere. Ormskirk is now past saturation point so no further growth should be allowed at Edge Hill. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Whilst the student numbers at Edge Hill University are not disputed, a significant number of these students do not live in Ormskirk. Policy EC4 allows for 10 hectares of land adjacent to the campus to be used for expansion of the University, but nothing beyond this, apart from uses appropriate within the Green Belt. The Council considers that allowing the use of this limited amount of Green Belt land will enable the University to address current accommodation and parking needs (rather than to facilitate future growth in numbers), provided the development of this land helps address problems with traffic and proliferation of houses in multiple occupation in Ormskirk.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 101  
**Consultee name** Mrs Jacqui Howe  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support for proposed Edge Hill University policies (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 176  
**Consultee name** ms Christine Williams  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support proposed Edge Hill University policies. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 186  
**Consultee name** J Briethaupt  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The Plan should not support the continued growth in Ormskirk of Edge Hill University, given problems associated with University expansion. WLBC should promote policies that will divert some activities of the University to another local town such as Skelmersdale. WLBC should remove the words 'continued growth' from their stated key principle supporting Edge Hill University to ensure there is no further growth of the University in Ormskirk. (S)  
**Outcome** The Council is aware of problems associated with recent University expansion, e.g. traffic and HMOs. It is considered that these two issues in particular contribute towards the exceptional circumstances that justify releasing 10ha of Green Belt land. Policy EC4 allows for the limited expansion of the campus to enable the University to address current accommodation and parking needs (rather than to facilitate future growth in numbers), provided the development of this land helps address problems with traffic and proliferation of HMOs in Ormskirk. The possibility of locating parts of the University in Skelmersdale has been explored, but is not considered a realistic prospect at present.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 237  
**Consultee name** Mike Goulding  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support for Edge Hill University's proposals (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 830  
**Consultee name** Mr George Wensley  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** My main concerns are around the growth of Edge Hill University and the impact on Ormskirk. Specific points raised: Impact on the Town Centre - spending power, alcohol; Impact on local housing stock, affordability and environment; Traffic congestion issues; Housing needs - housing should not be for students. (S) Market town is dying due to the increasing number of students in the area. Has had a negative impact on housing availability. Students are affecting the night time economy with alcohol fuelled excesses. Traffic is bad and road infrastructure cannot cope. Concerns that housing is not needed to these levels and that infill sites can be used. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. With regard to specific points raised: - Town Centre: The Council is aware of pressures on the town centre; Policy IF1 seeks to maintain the centre's vitality and viability. It is considered that students do patronise town centre shops, although it is agreed that drunken behaviour is unacceptable. - Policy RS3 seeks to tackle the accommodation issue, in particular rented properties (HMOs) using the powers the Council has available to it. New housing will not be permitted to be converted to HMOs. - Traffic congestion is a recognised issue in Ormskirk. It is hoped that the recent permission granted to EHU will help alleviate some of the congestion on St Helen's Road. - The capacity for infill housing, including the sites mentioned, has been taken account of in determining housing requirements and supply for the Borough.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 853  
**Consultee name** mr steven hopkin  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The expansion of Edge Hill University should be properly controlled. Council officers should not "roll over". The students of Edge Hill contribute to traffic problems; parking problems; anti-social behaviour; the loss of homes to student HMOs. The only people to benefit from Edge Hill University are landlords, off-licences, cheap shops and a few pubs. The rest of the residents have to suffer all the drawbacks. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. With regard to specific points made: As set out in the Edge Hill University Technical Paper, the Council considers that the need for limited expansion of the University into the Green Belt has been robustly demonstrated, as well as being agreed by the 2006 Local Plan Inspector. No further expansion is supported beyond the 10ha in Policy EC4 (and as per the recent planning applications). This is not a "rolling over". One reason why the recent applications were permitted is because it was considered they would go some way towards addressing traffic and student HMO problems. Furthermore, Policy RS3 should help control future HMO proposals. It is considered that the economic benefits of the University extend beyond the categories set out by the Objector, although it is recognised that there are unfortunate drawbacks which require to be addressed.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 914  
**Consultee name** Rod Hill  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Oppose expansion on Green Belt Land adjacent to the campus. Amendments to Policy EC4 (from CSPO CS6) are in line with the University's wishes, rather than the majority of respondents. Questions raised over Edge Hill University figures (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The views of objectors have been taken into account. It is agreed that no need for Green Belt release would be the ideal scenario. However, objectors' views need to be balanced against the operational needs of the University, as well as the findings of the Local Plan Inspector in 2005/6 (please see Technical Paper on EHU), who concluded that some Green Belt release was necessary. The possibility of a second, or split, campus has been discussed with EHU but not been deemed possible for various reasons. The figures provided by the Objector are noted, as are the statistics from the report written by the respected consultants Regeneris. Even at 293 employees within 5km (or 600 within 10km), the University is considered a major local employer.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 930  
**Consultee name** Mr Peter Banks  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** The whole of the University site should be removed from the green belt in preference to agricultural land. Additional student accommodation should be built on the University Campus sufficient to house the vast majority of students who currently occupy rented accommodation in various parts of the borough (HMOs). This would free up a substantial number of properties for use by permanent residents of the borough and reduce/eliminate the need to build on farmland. Only once the majority of existing students are housed on campus should the university be allowed to use further on-campus development to expand student numbers.(F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. One objective of allowing student accommodation within an expanded campus is that it should not simply facilitate an increase in student numbers in the short-term, but should demonstrably reduce demand for HMOs (Policy RS3 and para 7.61). A reduction in numbers of HMOs would be welcome, although the Council's powers policy-wise are limited to controlling future increases rather than reducing current figures. It is not agreed, however, that the whole of the land at St Helens Road towards Scarth Hill should be removed from the Green Belt.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 988  
**Consultee name** Michael Stores  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Just a couple of points re: the proposed development at Edge Hill University. > A successful University delivers significant economic benefits to Ormskirk and the surrounding region. > The proposed developments will consolidate existing provision and provide solutions to traffic and parking issues. > Finally and most importantly in these difficult economic times, the proposed developments will secure significant numbers of jobs in areas such as construction as well as providing new jobs within the University both academic and support. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 998  
**Consultee name** Mr John Lloyd  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** I ask the Council to consider introducing some further measures, other than those already planned. Such measures could include: Pulling back a little the boundary of the expansion at the perimeter of the sports pitches in order to give some more protection to adjacent properties and to alleviate problems caused by the development. Creating improved and wider barriers, buffers and screening to further reduce light and noise pollution from the development affecting local residents.  
**Outcome** Comments noted. However, these related specifically to the recent planning applications, rather than to the Local Plan policy for Edge Hill University. The Local Plan cannot incorporate the level of detail requested by the Objector. In principle, buffer zones and screening, etc. should be used to mitigate against the impact of development such as the University expansion.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1166  
**Consultee name** Mr Roger Clayton South Lathom Residents Association  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** A) The Edge Hill expansion does not go up to a defensible boundary and leaves the door open for further expansion to Scarth Hill. B) The developments granted permission goes beyond the "no more than 10 hectare" area of proposed release. C) The recent planning decisions should not have been determined against a draft plan which was still out to consultation. (S)  
**Outcome** A) The area marked for extending the University into the Green Belt shown in Figure 6.1 is considered defensible - it follows an existing hedge and line of trees, and clearly separates the university land from the adjacent land. B) The development proposed by the University that goes beyond the area marked on Local Plan figure 6.1 is for uses that are appropriate within the Green Belt, i.e. sport and recreation. This is why a masterplanning approach is required by the policy to development within the Green Belt (part (ii) of policy. C) The Council is unable to control the timing of planning applications. When an application is submitted in advance of a plan being adopted, the plan has less weight, and must be balanced against all relevant material considerations.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1189  
**Consultee name** Mr John Gardner  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** I support the expansion of Edge Hill University which should be seen as a jewel in West Lancashire's crown. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1227  
**Consultee name** Mr PF McLaughlin  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** I would very, very reluctantly agree the release for green belt land for further expansion of the campus, but I feel that a line must now be drawn for any future release of green belt for Edge Hill. I hope Edge Hill's statement that this development on the green belt will be 'enough for the foreseeable future' is true. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1234  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs JB Pincock  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to developments at Edge Hill. Saturation point has been reached, and there should be no further expansion of Edge Hill University. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. It is hoped that by releasing a limited amount of Green Belt land, the University's expansion can be controlled, that current accommodation needs can be met, and that this can help alleviate University-related issues in Ormskirk.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---



**Chapter/Policy Number: Policy EC4**

**Title: Edge Hill University**

---

**ID** 1  
**Consultee name** Mr Steven Jones  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Supports the proposed development of Edge Hill University.  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 6  
**Consultee name** Mr Roy Bayfield  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support for the expansion of Edge Hill University. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 39  
**Consultee name** Mrs Clare Shashati  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support for the development of Edge Hill University (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 514  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** As was mentioned during the previous consultation exercise, point ii should be clarified to ensure that it refers to the proposed release of up to 10 hectares of Green Belt land and not to further releases. We thought that this point had been accepted but the offending words have not been changed. We suggest adding the word "this" to point ii, to read "Requiring a masterplanned approach to this future development within the Green Belt" but, whatever wording is chosen, the point must be made clear. (F)  
**Outcome** It is agreed that no more than 10 ha of land should be released from the Green Belt for development of the University. However, part (ii) of Policy EC4 is referring not only to the 10ha of land proposed for release from the Green Belt, but to additional Green Belt land in which appropriate uses for the Green Belt (e.g. sports and recreation facilities) can be accommodated. It is considered proper that such uses should also be subject to a masterplanning approach.  
**Officer recommendation** No change (see also rep. 1181).

---

**ID** 537  
**Consultee name** Mr Bryan Pready  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** I support Policy EC4. Edge Hill University is certainly a major asset and its continued success brings a wide range of benefits to Ormskirk and the surrounding area. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 547

**Consultee name** Edge Hill University

**Agent Name** Mr Graham Love Turley Associates

**Nature of response** Support with conditions

**Summary** The University acknowledges the revisions made to this policy and fully supports and welcomes the new detailed policy wording. Two statistical corrections at para.6.49: the University contributes £75m per annum to the local economy and provides 1580 (FTE) jobs, as per the April 2011 updated report by Regeneris. The remaining amendments to the supporting text are less critical and the University is content to leave this wording to the Council's discretion such that it is kept under review and amended if necessary at the Publication Stage, to reflect the determination of the current planning applications. It is similarly recommended that the final boundary of the proposed campus extension allocation is kept under review relative to the determination of the current applications. (S)

**Outcome** Comments noted. The updated Regeneris Report's findings are noted, and paragraph 6.49 will be changed to reflect this update. It is not considered necessary to refer to the two recent planning applications at Edge Hill in the policy wording or its justification. Whilst it is recognised that the proposed development may help address the traffic, parking and accommodation issues in Ormskirk to an extent, there is no certainty at present that the permissions will be implemented. The Council does not agree that the proposed development will fully remedy the issues in Ormskirk such that they do not need consideration in the long term in the Plan. Therefore, it is considered appropriate to continue to refer to the above problems in Policy EC4 and its justification. In terms of the land proposed for release from the Green Belt, the new Green Belt boundary needs to be defensible. It is considered that the proposed new Green Belt boundary marked in the draft Local Plan is indeed defensible, and should be shown in the Plan, rather than any different boundary from the recent planning applications.

**Officer recommendation** Change para. 6.49 to read: "... Regeneris Consulting (April 2011) demonstrated that the University currently contributes £75 million per annum to the local economy and 1,580 full-time equivalent jobs." (Amend reference in footnote also.) Otherwise, no cha

---

**ID** 548

**Consultee name** Edge Hill University

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Support with conditions

**Summary** The University suggests that the supporting text to draft Policy RS3 would benefit from the inclusion of a short explanation of its proposed accommodation strategy and needs, summarising the information set out in the Technical Paper No.4. In addition the demand and supply of the stock of campus accommodation is continually monitored by the University Accommodation Office such that the accommodation strategy remains under regular review. It is recommended that the supporting evidence base data for the policy is therefore kept under review (S)

**Outcome**

**Officer recommendation**

---

**ID** 972  
**Consultee name** Strategy and Policy Group Lancashire County Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** The intentions of this policy are broadly supported. It is recognised that this will be taken forward in the context of the potential release of 10ha of greenbelt. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1029  
**Consultee name** Mr Francis Williams Ormskirk Friends of the Earth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** The fact that EHU has expressed a desire to expand should be taken into account but not drive the WLBC policies. The future of HE is uncertain, and many project a decline or levelling-off of student numbers over the coming years. There would seem to be nothing to prevent the University expanding into the green belt, whilst selling off property in the built-up area. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. It is agreed that projected student numbers needs monitoring, taking into account tuition fees, etc. The amount of Green Belt proposed for release is limited, and this should not lead to land within urban areas being sold off and the facilities moved into the countryside.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1175  
**Consultee name** D Lewis  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** From recently submitted information Edge Hill have 24,689 students. Ormskirk has a population of 24,000 giving a ratio of student to resident of 1:1. Making comparisons with other university towns in the area, Lancaster and Preston have ratios of 1:4 Moving further afield Edge Hill is larger than the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Liverpool, Bristol, and University College London in student numbers. All much larger population centres than Ormskirk. Whilst I appreciate the benefits a university brings I must stress that saturation point has now been passed and the statistics support this. The town's support network is now over stressed and the population can not support such a level. I therefore ask that no further development is made at Edge Hill University. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Whilst student numbers are significant, many students live away from Ormskirk and undertake a large proportion of their courses away from the town. The current development at the University is to meet the needs of existing students, rather than to facilitate significant future growth. Policy EC4 seeks to strike an appropriate balance between the operational needs of the University, its economic benefits, and minimising its impacts on Ormskirk.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1181  
**Consultee name** Mr Roger Clayton South Lathom Residents Association  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** A. The ambiguity between various points of this policy, relating to the amount of land being released from the Green Belt, needs addressing. B. No consideration is given to the impact of 800 student units on the water infrastructure in Ormskirk. (S)  
**Outcome** A. It is agreed that no more than 10 ha of land should be released from the Green Belt for development of the University. However, part (ii) of Policy EC4 is referring not only to the 10ha of land proposed for release from the Green Belt, but to additional Green Belt land in which appropriate uses for the Green Belt (e.g. sports and recreation facilities) can be accommodated, and it is right that such uses should also be subject to a masterplanning approach. (See rep. 514.) B. Condition 12 of the planning permission relating to Edge Hill University student accommodation requires that plans for foul drainage be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the development of any phase or plot taking place.  
**Officer recommendation** No change (see also rep. 514.)

---

**ID** 1313  
**Consultee name** Mrs Margaret Wiltshire CPRE (West Lancs Group)  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** We considered it premature for EHU to put forward applications for its easterly expansion. We urge the Council that this boundary be robust and defensible and that any future built development on the St.Helen's Road site should be within that boundary as in point iv. Travel plans should be strictly and effectively implemented (iii). Is point vi an appropriate part of a Local Plan? (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The boundary of the area for proposed Green Belt release follows a line of trees and a hedge, and is considered robust. Development on Green Belt land outside this area will be restricted to uses that are appropriate within the Green Belt. The Council agrees with the sentiment regarding point (iii), although it is considered that the development of a travel plan means that its implementation is implied, and does not need to be stated explicitly. It is considered that point (vi) is appropriate within the Local Plan (under the guise of 'spatial planning'). Edge Hill University have not objected to part (vi) of the policy.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Figure 6.1**

**Title: Proposed Expansion of Edge Hill Univeristy Campus**

---

<b>ID</b>	515
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad      Lathom South Parish Council
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	This policy (EC4) - which proposes release of Green Belt land, and the retention of adjacent land within the Green Belt - pays no attention to the matter of a defensible boundary. (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	It is agreed that Green Belt boundaries should be defensible. The boundary shown in Figure 6.1 is considered defensible - it follows an existing hedge and line of trees, and clearly separates the university land from the adjacent land. There is no intention to release for Edge Hill University any more than the 10 hectares of Green Belt land proposed in Figure 6.1. The timing of the submission of the planning applications by the University was beyond the Council's control. They were determined taking into account all relevant material considerations.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change.

---

**Chapter/Policy Number:** 7.1

**Title:** Residential Development

---

**ID** 32

**Consultee name** Mr Alan Disley

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** A. Object to change of use or redesignation of Green Belt land. B. Object to residential development in Up Holland - the village is overdeveloped and infrastructure will be unable to cope. C. Traffic calming measures should be included at Tower Hill Road. (S)

**Outcome** Comments noted. In terms of specific points raised: A. Owing to a shortage of suitable sites within areas excluded from the Green Belt, it has been necessary to propose Green Belt release / redesignation in this Local Plan to meet development requirements. B. In terms of infrastructure, the Highways Authority have raised no objections to the proposed levels of housing in Up Holland, the Utilities company have raised no concerns regarding water /wastewater capacity, and there are no identified 'showstopping' issues with social infrastructure. C. With regard to traffic calming, at this stage of the Local Plan we are not looking into site specifics or particular mitigation measures which could be put in place for particular developments. This level of detail would be more appropriate at the planning application stage.

**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 46

**Consultee name** John Gallagher

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** Object to housing in Up Holland due to poor infrastructure. The land should rather be used for recreation. (S)

**Outcome** In terms of infrastructure, the Highways Authority have raised no objections to the proposed levels of housing in Up Holland, the Utilities company have raised no concerns regarding water /wastewater capacity, and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies no capacity issues with regard to schools, doctors, dentists, etc. There is a significant amount of land designated as recreational space in the Up Holland area. If any recreation space were lost at Mill Lane, it would be compensated for. The land at Chequer Lane is not designated as recreational space.

**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 59  
**Consultee name** Mr Maurice Taylor  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Other  
**Summary** Suggestion as to alternative housing site in Tarleton (S).  
**Outcome** Comments noted. It is agreed that if housing were to be promoted in Tarleton / Hesketh Bank, it would be more appropriate at the southern end rather than the northern end. However, the site at Sutton Lane is currently subject to Policy DS4, and would be subject to a similar policy ('Protected Land' GN1) in the emerging Local Plan, which only allows small-scale affordable housing. This site may be better pursued through the Planning Control process, e.g. via a pre-application discussion, taking into account the above.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 68  
**Consultee name** Ms Barton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Chequer Lane development would contravene the density section of Policy RS1 (S).  
**Outcome** It is not agreed that the proposed development at Chequer Lane would contravene the housing density section of Policy RS1. As it is an outline application, density is not yet specified, but it appears to be in the order of 30 dw/ha. It would only contravene the density requirement if high density development (say over 40 dw/ha) or a density lower than the minimum were proposed, after taking into account gross and net developable areas. Appropriate mitigation measures to tackle increased traffic as a result of the development of the site should be considered at the planning application stage.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 70  
**Consultee name** Ms Barton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The development of Chequer Lane site goes against points 7.22 and 7.23 protecting small hamlets and guarding against developers cherry picking inappropriate sites. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The majority of housing is assigned to Skelmersdale, which remains the priority for development. There is just one allocated site at Up Holland, taking less than 10% of the quota for the Skelmersdale / Up Holland area. This site has been included because there are not considered to be enough deliverable sites within Skelmersdale to make up the 2,400 target figure. It is not considered that housing delivery within Skelmersdale will be compromised by the development of the Chequer Lane site.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---



**ID** 72  
**Consultee name** Mr Ronald Tyson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Any proposal for housing development in the northern parishes must consider transport, flooding and water/sewage services (S).  
**Outcome** Comments noted and agreed. These issues are part of the reason why the Plan has no housing sites allocated in the Northern Parishes area.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 73  
**Consultee name** Abigail Hislop  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Rather than spending millions of pounds on building estates is it not possible and cheaper to buy properties that are already on the property market, many of which are ex-council properties? This would address problems with HMOs proliferation, vacant properties, and Green Belt release. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. With regard to the specific points raised: > Buying empty properties: the principle of getting empty properties back into use is supported. Empty properties make up only about 3% of the Borough's housing stock. Such a percentage is normal, and necessary to help the housing market to function. There may be scope to reduce the number of empty properties in areas where there is a particularly high concentration. However, there remains a need to take some Green Belt to meet our needs. > The Council is aware of the need for larger social rented properties, and when there is an opportunity to procure affordable housing, it is taken. > The Council is aware of the significant issues with HMOs. Policy RS3 will limit the percentage of HMOs in each street, and should prevent the problem getting worse in future.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 102  
**Consultee name** Mr Mario Esposito  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Housing policy should put stronger controls on private landlords to assist with housing rent affordability. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. These relate more to housing allocations and rent policy than to Planning.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 105  
**Consultee name** Mr Anthony Harford  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Concern over design of residential development, and opposed to building on Green Belt at Firwood Road. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The land proposed for allocation east of Firwood Road is not Green Belt, but has been safeguarded land since the 1990s. If housing is built there, its design should have regard to existing residents and dwellings, including bungalows.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 238  
**Consultee name** Ms Barton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Greenfield development in Up Holland will derail regeneration for Skelmersdale which is the key priority of the Local Plan. (S)  
**Outcome** The Council considered and agreed that the housing figure for Skelmersdale was over-ambitious, and it was subsequently reduced by 20%. The previous version of the Plan (Core Strategy Preferred Options) grouped together Skelmersdale and Up Holland, as per previous plans (except the 2006 Plan - see response to rep. 45), independently of the Wainhomes representation. The Plan must be demonstrated to be deliverable. Housing is directed to Skelmersdale / Up Holland in the first instance owing to constraints in the Burscough / Ormskirk area. It is considered that by allocating a mix of greenfield sites in Skelmersdale, one site in Up Holland (Chequer Lane), and Skelmersdale Town Centre, housing targets can be met in the first few years of the Plan.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 372  
**Consultee name** Mrs L Clayton South Lathom Residents Association  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Objections to non-recognition of Lathom South as a parish. Concerns over proposed large development at Firwood Road due to potential increase of crime. (S)  
**Outcome** Lathom South Parish Council is not a settlement, but an administrative area. Settlements listed in the Table in SP1 were limited to those not washed over by the Green Belt. The only area of land not washed over by the Green Belt in Lathom and Lathom South is the land directly adjacent to the western edge of Skelmersdale bounded by Spa Lane, Firwood Road and Ormskirk Road (A577), including those properties on the south side of Ormskirk Road. This land is contiguous with the Skelmersdale urban area and includes XL Business Park (a functioning part of the wider Stanley Industrial Estate in Skelmersdale), the land proposed to be allocated between Firwood Road and Neverstitch Road for housing (and which may well have its primary access onto Neverstitch Road in Skelmersdale) and the existing residential properties on Ormskirk Road and Firwood Road. Therefore, while this land may, administratively, be within Lathom South, functionally and spatially it is a part of the Skelmersdale urban area and not an independent settlement. The land at Firwood Road has been safeguarded for future development since the early 1990s, and is now needed to meet development needs for the period 2012-2027.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 388  
**Consultee name** Mr William James  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** I object to Policy RS1 as there is no need for more houses to be built in our area (Firwood Road). There will be increased traffic, crime, noise. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The land has been safeguarded for future development since the early 1990s, and is now needed to meet development needs for the period 2012-2027. Housing needs are explained in the Housing Technical Paper.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 429  
**Consultee name** Ms Barton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Chequer Lane site should be removed from the Local Plan due to planning guidance on Category C noise levels and the recent noise assessment undertaken on part of the site. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The noise levels on the part of the site subject to the current planning application should be considered in accordance with the recommendations of the noise level study. Whilst it is accepted that the report concludes that noise from quarrying, even with an acoustic barrier, would mean approximately half of the site would fall under Category C, the report goes on to state: 'As the background noise level at site is relatively high due to the nearby M58 motorway, noise from quarrying activities would have lower impact on the site than it would in a more quiet rural location. It is also understood that quarrying activity would be sporadic and not constant and during daytime periods only.' The report recommends double glazing, and appropriate orientation of houses and location of habitable rooms to mitigate against the sporadic quarrying noise. As the quarrying is sporadic, residents should be able to open windows and enjoy the outdoor areas of their properties without enduring unacceptable noise. The objector's claim that noise levels on parts of the site closer to the motorway would fall under Category C or even Category D are unsubstantiated. Although it is recognised that there will be noise from the M58, which could increase in wet and/or windy conditions, there are a significant number of residential properties nearer to the motorway (and other, busier motorways) elsewhere.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 449  
**Consultee name** Miss Kerry Huyton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Objection to the proposed residential development at Firwood Road Lathom / Skelmersdale on account of crime, housing need, and vacant properties. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The land at Firwood Road has been safeguarded for future development since the early 1990s. It is now needed to meet development needs over the period 2012-2027. Whilst it is recognised that the market is currently poor, housing need remains, and it is expected that the market will pick up again. Developers are unlikely to build houses if it is not known that they will sell, and thus the risk of an increase in empty properties is not judged to be great. It is not considered appropriate to equate new development with crime.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 450  
**Consultee name** Mr David Newton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The Yew Tree Farm proposal represent a conflict with your own policy SP1. Similar broad proposals for large scale development were rejected by you in your response at 7.29 of the local plan. Much smaller developments throughout the county would allow for sustainable building allowing for for the poor state of the current (and foreseeable) fragile housing market, which is dominated by poor mortgage finance and affordability issues. Such large scale building puts a severe strain on already stretched infrastructure near this site.  
**Outcome** The Yew Tree Farm proposal is consistent with Policy SP1, which specifically mentions 500 dwellings at Yew Tree Farm. The word "significant" as used in Paragraph 4.29 of the Local Plan is referring to the idea of much larger developments than the 500 dwellings proposed for Yew Tree Farm. The argument that traffic would have knock-on effects elsewhere, even if improvements were made to local roads, would apply to development anywhere in the Borough and imply that no housing should be built. Whilst the idea of spreading development across the Borough is supported, the Council does not agree that an emphasis on 'much smaller developments, spread across the area, where developers can build incrementally as they judge viable demand' would result in 'many of the problems of roads, infrastructure etc being addressed much more easily'. The levels of developer contributions from small sites would not be enough to address local road / infrastructure problems.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 472  
**Consultee name** Darren Steele  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Firwood Road being used for residential development on grounds of amenity and housing need. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The land has been safeguarded for future development since the early 1990s and is now needed to meet development needs for 2012-2027. If housing were built behind back gardens, privacy distances would be applied to maintain amenity. The majority of the population live with development surrounding their properties. Housing needs are explained in the Housing Technical Paper. Whilst there are problems with the market at present, housing need remains.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 475  
**Consultee name** Ms Barton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Tower Hill Road, Up Holland is a 20pmh zone and identified as dangerous - increased traffic from a Chequer Lane development would further increase the dangers.  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The Council have received no objections from the Highways Authority regarding the proposed Chequer Lane housing designation. Appropriate traffic mitigation measures can be drawn up /put in place at the planning application /development stage.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 549  
**Consultee name** Mr Simon Artiss Bellway Homes Ltd  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Whilst we support all sustainable allocations and seek to deliver viable new housing developments to the Borough, we remain concerned that Ormskirk could deliver much more in terms of sustainable new housing; (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. It is agreed that Ormskirk is a highly sustainable settlement. However, land supply in Ormskirk is constrained by a lack of suitable sites within the urban area, and various issues (e.g. access, visual impact, continued fulfilment of Green Belt functions) with Green Belt sites around the settlement, especially those which are least distant from the town centre.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 626  
**Consultee name** Mr Anthony Harford  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Firswood Road development on grounds of turning the area into a massive housing estate, loss of agricultural land, development land available elsewhere, noise associated with the development disrupting residents, loss of view, increased traffic. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The land proposed for development is not Green Belt, although it is acknowledged that the loss of agricultural land is regrettable. The 2006 Local Plan states that the land will be considered for development after 2016 only if there are no longer any suitable sites within the urban area..." In order to meet development needs for 2012-2027 (and taking account of other development sites within the urban areas of West Lancashire), this site is now required, hence its proposed allocation. Development will need to have regard to the amenity of existing residents on the Firswood Road land. Any necessary improvements to highways will be dealt with at the planning application stage.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 724  
**Consultee name** Karen Baldwin  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Skelmersdale does not need yet another housing estate. The national economic problems may deepen and may encourage a new wave of crime in Skelmersdale. Put new housing in a place where there is more work and the population is not poor and deprived. Don't spoil the beautiful rural area around Skelmersdale. More should be done to improve the lives of the people here, but not building more houses. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The land has been safeguarded for future development since the early 1990s and is now needed to meet development needs for 2012-2027. Housing needs are explained in the Housing Technical Paper. There is employment at Skelmersdale, plus more planned. The existence of employment in the area is one reason why most housing development is being directed to the town. It is in order to protect the Green Belt, including the rural area around Skelmersdale, that non-Green Belt land instead, such as at Firswood Road, is being allocated for development.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 725  
**Consultee name** Mr Paul Dickie  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** I wish to object to RS1 in the draft Local Plan, and in particular in connection with the land off Firswood Road. I would like to state that the land is in Lathom South Parish and is not in Skelmersdale. This land is Grade 1 agricultural land and the majority of it is still farmed. There are several alternative sites available and with the current depressed market due to the national economic problems it would be foolish to alter the status of this land. Because of the present economic conditions there are several large areas of land which have been designated in the present plan as available for development, but so far developers have shunned the temptations to develop. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Whilst the land at Firswood Road is in Lathom South, it is directly adjacent to the western edge of Skelmersdale, contiguous with the Skelmersdale urban area and includes XL Business Park (a functioning part of the wider Stanley Industrial Estate in Skelmersdale). It may well have its primary access onto Neverstitch Road in Skelmersdale. Therefore, while this land may administratively, be within Lathom South, functionally and spatially it is a part of the Skelmersdale urban area and not an independent settlement. Brownfield sites (e.g. the TPT site on Railway Road) have been considered in preference to greenfield sites, but these are insufficient on their own to meet development needs. The 'alternative sites' referred to by the Objector are likely to have been included in the housing land supply, which includes such sites as Whalleys, plus a number of smaller unallocated sites within the built up area of Skelmersdale. As stated by the Objector, the 2006 Local Plan states that "the land will only be considered for development after 2016 if there are no longer any suitable sites within the urban area..." In order to meet development needs for 2012-2027 (and taking account of sites within the urban areas of West Lancashire), this site is now required, hence its allocation. Housing needs are explained in the Housing Technical Paper.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 729  
**Consultee name** Mr Robert rigby  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Chequer Lane development proposals on grounds of inadequate infrastructure and excessive noise (S).  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not conclude that there is insufficient infrastructure to cope with development at Chequer Lane. The noise levels on the part of the site subject to the current Wainhomes planning application will be considered in accordance with the recommendations of the Noise Level Study. Whilst it is accepted that the report concludes that noise from quarrying would be significant, it goes on to state: 'As the background noise level at site is relatively high due to the nearby M58 motorway, noise from quarrying activities would have lower impact on the site than it would in a more quiet rural location. It is also understood that quarrying activity would be sporadic and not constant and during daytime periods only.' Although it is recognised that there will be noise from the M58, which could increase in wet and / or windy conditions, there are a significant number of residential properties nearer to the motorway (and other, busier motorways) elsewhere.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 740  
**Consultee name** Ms Clare Carruthers  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** I am concerned about the possible disruption during any period of development, and how this would impinge on local residents. I am also worried about the type, and density, of housing which could be built, and how this would affect property values for the residents of Firswood Road. That said, if the plan for development goes ahead, I would want the option for my land to be incorporated in any such zoning. I feel this would in some way compensate for loss of value (both aesthetically, and financially) to my house, which would change from being located in a semi-rural area to being surrounded by a housing estate. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Residents were made aware of the plan through the local newspaper, as well as through direct emails to consultees. That is the point of encouraging people to join the consultation database. If development takes place, constructors will be encouraged to follow a national code of practice that minimises disruption to neighbours. The Objector's land lies within the proposed area for allocation, and thus could be considered for development, although this does not necessarily mean that the Objector's house (or garden) will automatically be part of the area developed.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 752  
**Consultee name** Mr William Robinson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** 3.1 The Council recognises that it is appropriate for new residential development to take place in, or on the edge of, key service centres, and that such development will be permitted on greenfield sites. 3.2 Mr & Mrs Robinson object to the failure of the Council to allocate land off School Lane for residential development in the Plan period for the reasons stated above. The site would represent an appropriate extension of the settlement boundary and is not of special character and can be developed in keeping with surrounding property. (F)  
**Outcome** The land at School Lane [Up Holland] was assessed in the Green Belt Study, but rejected as a potential development site as it fulfils purposes 1 and 2 of including land in the Green Belt (see the Council's website: [http://www.westlincs.gov.uk/planning/planning\\_policy/the\\_local\\_plan\\_2012-2027/evidence\\_and\\_research/green\\_belt\\_study.aspx](http://www.westlincs.gov.uk/planning/planning_policy/the_local_plan_2012-2027/evidence_and_research/green_belt_study.aspx)).  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---



**ID** 789  
**Consultee name** Mr Francis Williamson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** I would think and dispute that a development of this size is not needed by the population of West Lancashire. Due to overdevelopment in years gone by there is a moratorium in place to compensate for this and it seems a bit foolhardy to build homes at the present time when there is a depressed market and national economic problems. The area where I live [Blaguegate Lane] is a peaceful and relatively crime free area. This development would ruin the rural area and heighten fear of crime. Building here would mean that areas needing development would not take place. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The land has been safeguarded in Local Plans since the early 1990s for future development. In order to meet development needs for 2012-2027 (and taking account of other development sites within the urban areas of West Lancashire), this site is now required, hence its allocation. The housing 'moratorium' was effectively lifted in 2010. The justification for the housing target is set out in the Housing Technical Paper. Although it is recognised that the market is depressed at present, housing need remains, all the more so given the low build rates over recent years.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 790  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs WA Westby  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** I object to the above policy. The development would ruin our rural area. Development of this land for housing around Skelmersdale is not required by the people of West Lancashire, housing is needed in other areas, this development would not solve that problem, the size of this development does not take into account the depressed state of the housing market. (F)  
**Outcome** The land has been safeguarded in Local Plans since the early 1990s for future development. In order to meet development needs for 2012-2027 (and taking account of other development sites within the urban areas of West Lancashire), this site is now required, hence its allocation. In addition, other land has been allocated for development elsewhere in the Borough. Although it is recognised that the market is depressed at present, housing need remains, especially given low build rates over recent years.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 791  
**Consultee name** Mrs Rebecca Bibby  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** We feel that Skelmersdale already has enough low cost housing and would like to know what percentage is already providing low cost housing. Surely we need to be attracting second time buyers which would create more profit for the developers therefore enabling a quality regeneration of Skelmersdale town centre, creating new businesses and jobs, which we feel it deserves. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. It is agreed that there is a need to provide a range of housing in Skelmersdale in terms of cost / size and tenure. The Local Plan allocates land for over 1,850 units in Skelmersdale, the majority of which will be private market housing, including for second time buyers. However, there is also a need for affordable housing in Skelmersdale, despite a good number of low-cost properties in the town.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 800  
**Consultee name** Mrs Jane Stubbert  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** I do not agree with the house plans. Ormskirk Road is busy enough it is hard enough to drive out of your property because it is so busy. I bought the house 25 years ago because of the back not over looked and wildlife. We have a lot of different birds, owls, squirrels, bats, field mice. We have no trouble in this area. I feel with that many houses the crime rate will go up , with that amount of houses at the back of me i would feel very unsafe in my own home. I am very much and my family against this awful plan. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The land has been safeguarded for future development since the early 1990s. In order to meet development needs for 2012-2027 (and taking account of other development sites within the urban areas of West Lancashire), this site is now required, hence its allocation. If the site were to be developed, appropriate mitigation measures would be required for the wildlife on the site. It is inappropriate to equate new houses with crime.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 805  
**Consultee name** Alan R Haslam  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to housing in Up Holland. Up Holland is effectively becoming 'overspill' for Skelmersdale. Skelmersdale was designed to take more people and more development than that which it currently has. Up Holland has insufficient infrastructure to support further development (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Up Holland and Skelmersdale have been considered together in Local Plans since the development of Skelmersdale New Town. The only exception was the 2006 Local Plan where they were separated to allow for restraint in Up Holland and development (to aid regeneration) in Skelmersdale. Now that the policy of restraint is no longer supported regionally or nationally, the settlements are considered together again. Whilst Skelmersdale was originally intended to accommodate 80,000 people, the way the town has developed means that a population of this magnitude is no longer achievable, so there is not unlimited development land within the town. Over 90% of the housing allocations for the Skelmersdale / Up Holland area are within Skelmersdale. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not highlight any significant problems with regard to infrastructure capacity in Up Holland that cannot be overcome.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 822  
**Consultee name** Mr Iain Stanmore  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to development at Firwood Road on grounds of Skelmersdale overspill, increase in crime, existing empty homes, rural area, loss of agricultural land, loss of wildlife, (S)  
**Outcome** The land has been safeguarded for future development since the early 1990s. In order to meet development needs for 2012-2027 (and taking account of other sites within the urban areas of West Lancashire), this site is now required, hence its proposed allocation. Although it is recognised that the market is depressed at present, and that there are empty properties in Skelmersdale (which ideally should be brought back into use, a principle that the Council supports), housing need remains, especially given low build rates over recent years. The justification for the housing target is set out in the Housing Technical Paper. There is capacity in local schools (and other infrastructure capacity) to accommodate the development proposed for Skelmersdale. Comments regarding wildlife and agricultural land are noted.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

<b>ID</b>	824
<b>Consultee name</b>	Elizabeth Tyrer
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	I would like to object to the proposed development of the land to the rear of Chequer Lane. The land being considered for building is a valuable green area which would be lost forever once houses are built. It will take the greenfields from future generations. The housing is needed more in the Skelmersdale area. (F)
<b>Outcome</b>	Comments noted. To meet development needs for West Lancashire from 2012-2027, some greenfield land will unfortunately need to be built upon. The majority (over 90%) of allocated housing land in the Skelmersdale / Up Holland area is within Skelmersdale.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change

---

<b>ID</b>	833
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr & Mrs J Harker
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	<p>Our Objections are as follows: Land will be taken out of the Green Belt – a violation. Green Belt land should remain sacrosanct, especially as there are other non Green Belt sites available in the area. There has already been too much development in this area re the mammoth XL Business Park. It will take away what little open space we have left, which despite what the planners think, is of great value to us, birds and local wildlife. The new Draft Plan is ill-considered because the proposals would deliver housing development in and around Skelmersdale that is not needed by the population of West Lancashire. If this area is developed, it would, along with XL Business Park, form a complete development along the eastern side of Firwood Road creating a new urban area joined directly to Old Skelmersdale and eliminating any open, green space. As a consequence of the above we believe other Green Belt land to the west of Firwood Road would be ‘up for grabs’ for later development, which equates to the complete ruination of Green Belt land / open space around this area. We believe there are other more suitable sites for development than this Green Belt, Grade 1 agricultural land. There are still suitable sites within the urban area. The proposals state that development would take place from 2014 right through to 2026 causing disruption for 13 years. If these proposals are adopted they would prevent, that is, fail to provide suitable, appropriate housing development in other areas, where housing is actually needed. It is inconceivable to attempt to make up for the low numbers of houses built after 2003, when there has been a moratorium in place, which was designed to compensate for the massive over development in the preceding years! What nonsense! The 450 houses to be built take no account of the depressed state of the housing market and the national economic problems the country is suffering at the present time – with little chance of any substantial improvement within the next 10 years? Can the infra structure cope with an extra 450 households? What about noise, traffic pollution and at a time when we can expect less in the line of policing re the cuts, the possibility of an increase in crime cannot be ruled out. This housing development will destroy this rural area for no sound reason because it is an incoherent plan.</p>
<b>Outcome</b>	<p>The land is not Green Belt, but has been safeguarded for future development since the early 1990s. As quoted by the objector, the 2006 Local Plan states that the land will only be considered for development after 2016 if there are no longer any suitable sites within the urban area...” In order to meet development needs for 2012-2027, this site is now required, hence its allocation. The Council has taken full account of other sites within Skelmersdale, and within other parts of the Borough in determining its housing needs and supply. The justification for the housing target is set out in the Housing Technical Paper. Making up the deficit since 2003 is currently legally required. Although it is recognised that the market is depressed at present, housing need remains, especially given low build rates over recent years. The Plan covers 2012-2027 but this does not mean development will happen throughout that period on each development site. Skelmersdale has adequate infrastructure to cope with the proposed development. Other comments noted.</p>
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change

**ID** 835  
**Consultee name** Paul and Babette Kenyon  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to proposals at Firwood Road on grounds of agricultural land, traffic, no rail stations (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. In assessing the need to allocate greenfield / agricultural land for development, the Council has taken account of urban and brownfield sites in Skelmersdale and elsewhere in West Lancashire, as well as empty properties (see the Housing Technical Paper). It is agreed that ideally agricultural land should be preserved, but unfortunately this is not always possible. The majority of the Borough's agricultural land will be protected, as it is a recognised valuable resource.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 854  
**Consultee name** mr Lewis Mcwalters  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to RS1 residential development plan. Object to further development of Upholland infrastructure not in place. Object to Chequer Lane development because of loss of green fields, noise and safety issues.  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not highlight deficiencies with regard to school places or doctors in Up Holland.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 871  
**Consultee name** Christine Gleave  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Firwood Road proposals on grounds of (1) The rural character of the site; (2) Impact on Protected Species, especially Barn Owls; (3) Questionable sustainability - poor transport links and infrastructure (4) Poor economic circumstances; (5) Failure to demonstrate consideration of other (urban) sites; (6) Loss of prime agricultural land; (7) Poor accessibility. (S)  
**Outcome** The land has been safeguarded for future development since the early 1990s. In order to meet development needs for 2012-2027 (and taking account of sites within the urban areas of West Lancashire), this site is now required, hence its allocation. In response to specific points made: (1) Whilst it is recognised that the land is rural in nature, it is on the edge of the Borough's main settlement, and is not within the Green Belt (GB). It is in order to protect the GB (including GB around Skelmersdale, that non-GB land such as at Firwood Road is being allocated. (2) Neither the Local Plan nor its supporting documents state or imply that the land at Firwood Road has no ecological value. Comments regarding Protected Species are noted. Policy EN2 seeks to protect such species if present on a proposed development site. (3) Located on the edge of Skelmersdale, this site is reasonably sustainable, being beside a quality bus route, within reach of the town's facilities, and near employment areas. Skelmersdale has the infrastructure to cope with its allocated development. (4) Although it is recognised that the market is depressed at present, housing need remains - all the more so given low build rates over recent years. It is considered that the development of a site such as Firwood Road can deliver significant planning obligations. Through use of such tools as the Dynamic Viability model (Policy RS2), 'land banking' can be discouraged. (5) Brownfield sites have been considered in preference to greenfield sites, and urban sites in preference to rural sites, but these on their own are insufficient to meet development needs to 2027. (6) Whilst the loss of prime agricultural land is regrettable, the Local Plan has attempted to keep this to a minimum, and to release less good quality agricultural land for development in preference to prime land wherever possible. (7) See (3) above.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 877  
**Consultee name** Mr Bob Coventry  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Queries on why Skelmersdale is accommodating a disproportionate part of the housing. Burscough and Ormskirk require additional housing. Why cannot WLBC accelerate and upgrade the drainage infrastructure? (S)  
**Outcome** Skelmersdale is allocated most development because it is the highest ranked settlement in the settlement hierarchy, it has adequate infrastructure to accommodate more development, because suitable sites exist within the town, and because other areas have constraints. To answer the Objector's questions, yes, it is beyond the Council's ability to upgrade the drainage infrastructure in Ormskirk and Burscough - this is the responsibility of United Utilities who have told us that drainage improvements cannot be completed before 2020. Allocations must be demonstrated to be deliverable for the plan to be sound, and non-deliverability is a key consideration, not a 'feeble and unfound' (sic) argument.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 887  
**Consultee name** Mr Bob Coventry  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Objection regarding Firwood Road: a) It is not featureless and it has ecological value; b) Why is Grade 1 agricultural Green Belt land being considered when there are lesser quality / brownfield sites? c) The site's allocation contradicts the 2006 Replacement Plan d) The site has wildlife and recreational value. Land at NW Skelmersdale should be protected from development. (S)  
**Outcome** a) Comments noted. The Council has not described the land at Firwood Road in the terms quoted by the Objector. b) The land is not Green Belt. To meet its housing targets, the Council has first considered urban and brownfield sites, and these are part of the housing land supply. However, other land is needed in addition to such sites. c) The land has been safeguarded for future development since the early 1990s. The 2006 Local Plan states that the land will only be considered for development after 2016 if there are no longer any suitable sites within the urban area..." In order to meet development needs for 2012-2027, this site is now required, hence its allocation. This is not ignoring the 2006 Plan, but updating it. d) Comments noted.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 917  
**Consultee name** Mr Peter Banks  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Grove Farm, High Lane should be excluded from the plan completely. Development within Ormskirk and Aughton should be primarily incremental in smaller developments. Grove Farm should be replaced by Ruff Lane and Parrs Lane from the Plan B sites, and those sites should be replaced in Plan B, possibly by part of the Altys Lane site (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Land south east of Ormskirk and at Aughton, like Grove Farm, is prime agricultural land. This land was initially considered for development, but the negative effects associated with development in this area were considered overwhelmingly great, notwithstanding the narrowness of the Green Belt between Ormskirk and Burscough. The full reasoning for site selection is set out in the Strategic Options and Green Belt Release Technical Paper.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---



**ID** 949  
**Consultee name** Mr Paul Cotterill  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** (a) More detail is needed on the Proposals Maps. (b) Support recognition of issues surrounding housing density but still needs a quantitative analysis and proper rationale. (c) Do not support allocation of housing land at Grove Farm due to infrastructure problems and a flawed process in determining the housing strategy for Ormskirk as a whole. (d) The current proposals for Skelmersdale have been made on the basis of what land is readily available, rather than what is best for the development of Skelmersdale as a town. Higher density development within the "ring road" should be pursued rather than the current proposals. (S)  
**Outcome** (a) Comments regarding detail on Proposals Maps are noted. A comprehensive Proposals Map will be produced at the next stage. (b) Density - it is not considered that the plan can be so prescriptive as to specify the precise density for every site in the expected housing land supply, and thus the precise amount of land needed for housing. Even if the time and resources to do this were available, other uncertainties exist, for example sites not coming forward, windfall developments, and unexpected changes in density (e.g. unforeseen ground condition problems). Consultants were engaged in the SHLAA to estimate densities for potential housing sites, and these have been used in assessing housing land supply. (c) Comments regarding Ormskirk noted. Nursery Avenue was no longer pursued as a potential allocation mainly because of access difficulties. The Council took note of many representations on this matter in making this decision. As this is a Local Plan rather than a Core Strategy, it is entirely appropriate to move from an "area of search" to an "allocation". (d) Skelmersdale - the land allocated is not only available, but considered suitable in planning terms. To not consider such land would be an unsound approach. Whilst higher density development within walking distance of a good range of services is a worthy objective, it is considered that to rework the road layout in the town and plan for a population increase of up to 60,000 people is not deliverable and would not be found sound at examination.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 955  
**Consultee name** Mr L Mitchell  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Skelmersdale has been in decline for many years and the answer in my opinion is that priority should be given to address the situation by the regeneration of the empty properties, the cleaning of derelict housing and reusing brownfield sites. I object strongly to the plan to build on small green sites throughout the Skelmersdale area. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. It is agreed that the use of brownfield land, remediation of derelict sites, and the bringing back into use of empty properties is a good way to provide housing. Some housing from brownfield / derelict land is being assumed in the Plan, and the bringing back of empty properties into use is supported. However, the Plan's strategy for housing needs to be deliverable, and these sources on their own are insufficient to meet housing needs, and may not be deliverable. Therefore, the development of some greenfield land is also necessary.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 986  
**Consultee name** Mrs Julie Broadbent  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** We broadly support the Local Plan Preferred Options as currently drafted. Consideration should be given to revisiting the number of dwellings proposed for Skelmersdale, in order to reduce the need to release Green Belt. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The greatest amount of development (approximately 50%) has been allocated to Skelmersdale area, including sites that were part of the originally planned New Town. It is not just land availability that is the issue, but the ability of the (poor) market in Skelmersdale to deliver the required number of dwellings over the Plan's timescale. Even though the target has been reduced from the 3,000 in the Local Plan, the revised target of 2,400 is considered challenging, and if increased, it would be even more of a challenge to meet it, and to prove that it is deliverable.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 996  
**Consultee name** Mrs Roma Harvey  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** We wish to object to the Draft Local Plan Policy RS1. Our reasons are: There are currently many empty "Council" houses in the Skelmersdale area which should be taken into account in calculating development needs - I don't actually believe people are queuing up to live in Skelmersdale Development in and around Skelmersdale will not provide housing where it is needed The overall target number of houses ignores the depressed state of the housing market with Government doing the usual thing of creating employment for builders for a while and then be unable to sell the houses. The plans for the Skelmersdale and Burscough areas continue to encroach on the green areas of Lathom and Ormskirk. The fact that some areas have previously been designated for future building does not make it right. There may be more objections when Ormskirk becomes a suburb of the all engulfing "town" of Skelmersdale. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The Council is aware of empty properties, and supports their being brought back into use. However, in order for the housing market to function, a vacancy rate of between 3 and 4% is normal. West Lancashire's vacancy rate is at the lower end of this range. There is not considered to be sufficient scope for reducing this by a significant amount, or to discount this amount from overall housing targets. The current depressed state of the housing market is recognised (hence the lower targets in the earlier stages of the Plan), but housing need remains, all the more so given low build rates over recent years.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 1079  
**Consultee name** William Hardman  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Why go outside Skelmersdale when the town hasn't even reached half its original planned size? (S)  
**Outcome** The land directly adjacent to the western edge of Skelmersdale bounded by Spa Lane, Firwood Road and Ormskirk Road (A577) is contiguous with the Skelmersdale urban area and includes XL Business Park (a functioning part of the wider Stanley Industrial Estate in Skelmersdale), the land proposed to be allocated between Firwood Road and Neverstitch Road for housing (and which may well have its primary access onto Neverstitch Road in Skelmersdale) and the existing residential properties on Ormskirk Road and Firwood Road. Therefore, while this land may, administratively, be within Lathom South, functionally and spatially it is a part of the Skelmersdale urban area and not a separate settlement. The land at Firwood Road has been safeguarded for future development since the early 1990s, and is now needed to meet development needs for the period 2012-2027. Whilst the original intention for Skelmersdale was for a population in the order of 80,000, the way the town has developed means accommodating such a population is no longer possible. The need to allocate land at Firwood Road takes into account the allocation for development of land for over 1,400 units within the town, as well as an assumption of c300-400 properties on non-allocated sites within the town.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1082  
**Consultee name** Mr J Blackledge  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Firwood Road development on grounds of past mistakes, changing rural area, homes not needed, fear of crime (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. For clarification, the land at Firwood Road is not Green Belt land. There is a need to provide land for 4,650 houses in West Lancashire over the period 2012-2027 (as set out in the Housing Technical Paper). In assessing the need whether to allocate land at Firwood Road (which has been safeguarded for future development since the early 1990s) for housing, account was taken of land elsewhere within Skelmersdale, including brownfield land.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1086  
**Consultee name** Mr Herbert Edward Lawrence  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** We object to this plan also taking good farming land having lived here 58 years why spoil things. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The land has been safeguarded for future development since the early 1990s. In order to meet development needs for 2012-2027, and taking account of developable sites within the urban areas of West Lancashire, this site is now required, hence its allocation. Whilst it would be preferred not to develop any agricultural land, unfortunately it is necessary to release some such land for development, given housing needs and land supply.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1091  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs R Burns  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Firswood Road proposals on grounds of loss of identify, lack of housing need, loss of agricultural land (S).  
**Outcome** Comments regarding wildlife and loss of agricultural land noted. The land has been safeguarded for future development since the early 1990s. In order to meet development needs for 2012-2027, and taking account of sites within Skelmersdale and other urban areas of West Lancashire, this site is now required, hence its allocation. The justification for the housing target is set out in the Housing Technical Paper. Although it is recognised that the market is depressed at present, housing need remains, especially given low build rates over recent years. Lathom South is not a settlement, but an administrative area. The land directly adjacent to the western edge of Skelmersdale bounded by Spa Lane, Firswood Road and Ormskirk Road (A577) is contiguous with the Skelmersdale urban area and includes XL Business Park (a functioning part of the wider Stanley Industrial Estate in Skelmersdale), the land proposed to be allocated between Firswood Road and Neverstitch Road for housing (and which may well have its primary access onto Neverstitch Road in Skelmersdale) Therefore, while this land may, administratively, be within Lathom South, functionally and spatially it is a part of the Skelmersdale urban area and not an independent settlement.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1103  
**Consultee name** Mr Keith Williams Burscough Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Development of Grove Farm is opposed due to impact on Burscough. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The reasoning behind the proposed allocation of the Grove Farm site is set out in the Strategic Options and Green Belt Release Technical Paper.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1114  
**Consultee name** Chris Henshall  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** The HCA welcomes the principle of defining Skelmersdale as a Key Service Centre capable of delivering new homes across various sites in the Town Centre, Firswood Road, Whalleys / Cobbs Clough and at Chequer Lane in Up Holland. We would continue to recommend caution in predicting the rate of delivery of dwelling completions over the Plan period. Site specific comments in relation to Cobbs Clough, Whalleys, Beacon Lane/Elmers Green lane and Chequer Lane. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Predicting the delivery rate of dwelling completions over the Local Plan period on specific sites is required of the Council. It is recognised that such work is difficult to undertake with certainty, given the number of variables and the relatively long timescales involved.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

<b>ID</b>	1130
<b>Consultee name</b>	Miss Vickie Roberts
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	Object to Firswood Road proposals on grounds of: current housing market, housing need, overdevelopment, protection of rural area, traffic, drainage, crime. (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	<p>The land has been safeguarded for future development since the early 1990s. In order to meet development needs for 2012-2027, and taking account of other developable sites within Skelmersdale and other areas of West Lancashire, this site is now required, hence its allocation. The justification for the housing target is set out in the Housing Technical Paper. Currently, making up for previous deficits of completions against housing targets is a legal requirement, as borne out in various recent housing appeals and Core Strategy examinations. Although it is recognised that the market is depressed at present, housing need remains, especially given low build rates over recent years. The Council acknowledges the existence of empty properties, particularly in Skelmersdale, and agrees that bringing empty properties back into use is a good way of providing housing. However, the contribution that this can make towards housing land supply in West Lancashire is limited. If occupants of Council housing able to afford a property were forced out, as suggested by the objector, such people would need other properties to live in; thus there would be no reduction in housing targets. If the area were to be developed, necessary highways and infrastructure improvements would be required of the developers. A six week consultation period is considered adequate, and a 5pm Friday deadline appropriate. Other comments noted.</p>
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change

---

<b>ID</b>	1136
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr David Hughes                      Up Holland Parish Council
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	Object to Chequer Lane proposals on grounds of 1. Infrastructure shortcomings 2. Traffic and road safety concerns 3. Environmental constraints including flooding, green buffers, and adjacent SSSI 4. Residents' objections, including changes to Green Belt boundaries, grouping of Up Holland with Skelmersdale, more suitable land in Skelmersdale, extant permission at St Joseph's College 5. Adequacy of publicity / consultation process. (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	With regard to the specific headings set out by the Objector: 1. Infrastructure - this has been considered in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which was prepared in consultation with bodies such as the NHS, highways authority, education providers, etc. The IDP does not highlight any specific issues with regard to infrastructure capacity in Up Holland that cannot be addressed. 2. Traffic and Road Safety - housing development has implications for traffic wherever it takes place. Any direct impacts associated with Chequer Lane (and Mill Lane) can be dealt with at the planning application stage to the satisfaction of the highways authority. 3. Environmental constraints - development anywhere can have negative effects, but these can often be mitigated against. With suitable design, layouts, landscape buffers, etc, at Chequer Lane, it is considered that unacceptable negative impacts can be avoided. Both Up Holland sites have been considered in the Habitats Regulations Assessment (pp 188, 207). Emerging Local Plan policy EN2 seeks to protect SSSIs such as that adjacent to Chequer Lane. 4. Residents' objections - comments opposing Green Belt release noted. Sites such as Chequer Lane have been chosen in order to minimise the need for Green Belt release. Skelmersdale and Up Holland have been grouped together since the development of Skelmersdale New Town. The only plan in which they were treated separately was the 2006 Replacement Local Plan, when, in order to comply with regional policy, there was a policy of restraint in Up Holland and regeneration in Skelmersdale. The policy of restraint no longer applies, and thus the settlements are considered together again. Over 90% of the housing units proposed for allocation for the two settlements are in Skelmersdale. The planning permission at St Joseph's College has been taken into account. At present, we have received no indication from the developer that any [apartment] completions will take place during the Local Plan period. If we receive evidence to the contrary, any completions achieved before 2027 can be counted against the Plan's housing requirement. 5. Publicity - comments noted.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change

---

**ID** 1140  
**Consultee name** Adrian James  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** I was surprised to learn that the Council has already consulted builders about the plans. It is not surprising that the builders declared the plans for the original Skelmersdale development were "undeliverable". They would say that wouldn't they? If they can convince the Council of this, they know that there is a better chance of their being able to build on the Greebelt sites at premium prices. Would the correct reaction from the Council not have been "if you can't deliver then we will find other builders who can". I think that the Council owe it to the Council Tax payers to reveal the names of the building firms to whom they are speaking on our behalf. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The Council consults with a wide variety of individuals and groups; anyone is able to make representations on the Plan, and all representations need to be considered. The views of the development industry need to be taken into account, as they are instrumental in delivering the housing that is required. During the last consultation, they rightly pointed out that delivery of 200 dwellings per annum in a poor market area like Skelmersdale would be very challenging, and could be found unsound by a government Inspector. The Objector's comment: 'They would say that, wouldn't they?' could be applied to any person or body making representations. The names / companies of those developers who made representations as part of the Core Strategy and Local Plan process are publicly available on the consultation portal.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1141  
**Consultee name** Adrian James  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The part of Grove farm backing on to Pine Grove is often under water for six months of the year. Some years ago I understand that there was flooding on this estate. With this in mind any development on Grove Farm could pose flood risks as the proposed building on Grove Farm is at a level lower than the surrounding developments. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Flood risk is an important consideration, and the Environment Agency are consulted on the Plan and its proposed allocations.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1172  
**Consultee name** D Lewis  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** 1 I object to use of green belt land for housing. Grade 1 agricultural land is at a premium and needs to be preserved for food production. Every effort should be made to use Brownfield sites. 2,3 Given development constraints, Plan B is likely to be implemented at an early stage of the plan. More onerous conditions should be applied before sites are released under Plan B. 4 Housing requirements appear not to have been imposed on the Council. So why not set a housing target for a shorter period and then have reviews at the end of each period? (S)  
**Outcome** 1. It is agreed that it is preferable not to use Green Belt or agricultural land for housing. However, taking into account housing needs and housing land supply (including urban and brownfield sites), there is a need to release a small amount of Green Belt land for housing. 2. Comments noted. National planning policy in PPS3 required "management action" to bring forward land if delivery drops below 80% of targets. The Plan B trigger is in accordance with this. A lower requirement for years 1-5 has been set to take account of delivery constraints and the current state of the housing market. 4. Currently the RSS with its "top down" housing requirement is part of the development plan and the Local Plan must legally conform with this. However, the Housing Technical Paper anticipates the abolition of the RSS, and goes on to set a housing requirement based on the most up-to-date information. The plan and its housing target must cover a 15 year period, rather than allowing for a review after 5 years. The Local Plan's proposed phased housing requirement, however, performs a similar function to that suggested by the Objector.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1174  
**Consultee name** D Lewis  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Although any housing built has to conform to National Building Standards, these are low compared to other European countries particularly with regard to insulation and floor area. Could the council not redress this by applying a local standard, approved by local legislation? The standard would be on the lines of the Parker Morris standard once used for all Local Authority built housing. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. This is a good idea, but goes beyond the remit of the Local Plan. The Local Plan does have a policy on Low Carbon Development, including standards for the Code for Sustainable Homes.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1193  
**Consultee name** Mr John Gardner  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Where can I find the Government's data to support your statement that a further 4650 houses will be required during the 15 year period? (F)  
**Outcome** The figure is explained in the Housing Technical Paper, which can be found on the Council's website. This paper provides links to government data, e.g. population and household projections, which are all available on the internet.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---



**ID** 1199  
**Consultee name** Mr Roger Clayton South Lathom Residents Association  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** We have no objection to housing development at Whalleys, where the site is already set up for the purpose, and on the adjacent Cobbs Clough area which was previously allocated for employment development. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1203  
**Consultee name** Mr Roger Clayton South Lathom Residents Association  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The council dismisses empty housing as a factor that should be tackled but there were 1223 long-term empty properties in the Borough in 2010 and that number had grown since to an estimated 1379 by December 2011. What is the point of building new houses when properties that could be used are being left empty? (F)  
**Outcome** For the housing market to function effectively, a small proportion of empty homes are required. It is usual for this percentage to be 3-4%, and West Lancashire has a percentage of empty properties within this range. It is agreed that bringing empty homes back into use is a good way of meeting part of the overall housing need, and whilst the Council supports the idea of bringing empty homes back into use (and is working to do so in certain areas), it is not considered that there is scope for a sufficiently high number of empty properties to be brought back into use, nor is there the certainty to prove that such a number will be dealt with over the lifetime of the Plan, to factor a figure into the plan's overall housing land requirement.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1205  
**Consultee name** Mr Roger Clayton South Lathom Residents Association  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** a) Firwood Road is in Lathom, not Skelmersdale. b) Development here exacerbates an existing mistake. c) Paragraph 4.16 should specify that the greenfield land referred to does not apply to sites located in Lathom. d) Residents of Firwood Road tend to use Ormskirk, rather than Skelmersdale Town Centre. e) The land at Firwood Road has significant ecological and agricultural land value. f) South Lathom Parish Council is established to protect the identity of the area and will continue to do so. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. With respect to specific points: a) The Skelmersdale / Lathom issue has been responded to elsewhere. b) Regardless of what has been developed further north, the safeguarded land at Firwood Road is now required to help meet the Borough's housing requirement to 2027. c) It is agreed that the fourth bullet point in 4.16 would be an inaccurate reference to the land at Firwood Road. This bullet point is not referring to greenfield land in Lathom, but to sites such as Whalleys and Cobbs Clough. It is not considered necessary / appropriate to state explicitly that the reference is not to sites in South Lathom Parish. d) If Skelmersdale Town Centre is regenerated as planned, it is hoped that a significant number of residents of any new housing at Firwood Road will use that centre. e) Emerging policy EN2 contains a requirement that if it is suspected that there are protected species on a site, survey work be undertaken to assess the presence of such species, and to make provision for their needs. Whilst it would be preferable not to develop any prime agricultural land, unfortunately some will need to be released for development to meet the Plan's housing requirement. The land at Firwood Road has been chosen on account of various factors, including it already being safeguarded for development (i.e. not Green Belt), its relative sustainability, and the availability of infrastructure. f) Noted.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1231  
**Consultee name** Mr TA Patten  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** What is the use of building more houses when there is not enough work as it is. (F)  
**Outcome** Regardless of national levels of unemployment, people need houses. Building houses can create construction jobs, and help sustain local services, thereby saving (or creating) jobs. The Local Plan also encourages economic development and allocates land for employment.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1237  
**Consultee name** Mr L Mitchell  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Skelmersdale has been in decline for many years and the answer in my opinion is that priority should be given to address the housing shortage by the regeneration of empty properties clearing derelict houses and reusing brownfield sites. I object strongly to the plan to build on 'small green sites' throughout the Skelmersdale area. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. It is agreed that the use of brownfield land, remediation of derelict sites, and the bringing back into use of empty properties is a good way to provide housing. Some housing from brownfield / derelict land is being assumed in the Plan. However, the Plan's strategy for housing needs to be deliverable, and these sources on their own may not be deliverable, and are insufficient to meet housing needs. Therefore, the development of some greenfield land is also necessary.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1239  
**Consultee name** Ms Karen Martindale  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Suggested amendments to Policy RS1: Part (c) Add "character" after design; Part (d) Welcome minimum densities, but these should be robustly applied; Part (e) The threshold for provision of elderly accommodation should be 5 and the required percentage 40%; Part (f) Welcome the provision for 'restraint' although oversupply in an individual settlement will be hard to quantify.  
**Outcome** (c) It is agreed that character can be added to this sentence and to paragraph 7.9. (d) Comments noted. (e) Comments noted. Provision for the elderly needs to strike an appropriate balance between maximising the proportion of units achieved per development, and providing a framework in which the developments are encouraged to go ahead in the first place. It is considered that a threshold as low as 5 and a proportion as high as 40% may make too many developments unviable or discourage developers from pursuing such schemes in the first place. (f) Comments noted.  
**Officer recommendation** Add "character" to part (c) of Policy RS1 and to paragraph 7.9.

---

**ID** 1248  
**Consultee name** Ms Rosemary Cooper MP  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Petition of 277 names received against development at Mill Lane and Chequer Lane. (F)  
**Outcome** Petition noted  
**Officer recommendation** No new evidence has been provided in the petition in terms of weighing up the planning merits of Chequer Lane / Mill Lane, so no action required in terms of amending the Local Plan.

---

**ID** 1325  
**Consultee name** John Barlow  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The LPPO makes little mention of Grove Farm. It fails to identify or fully consider the following issues relating to Grove Farm: loss of green belt, environmental constraints in relation to waste water and surface water drainage issues, traffic impact, postcode boundaries, social issues, and impacts on wildlife habitat. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. As stated by the Objector, the Plan is already 262 pages long. To add in extra detail about Grove Farm would exacerbate this problem. Whilst the issues have not been set out in detail, these issues have all been considered when deliberating over the allocation of Grove Farm. With any greenfield / Green Belt release, there will be negative impacts. These need to be balanced against other factors, such as housing requirements, and how well the land fulfils the purposes of the Green Belt, etc. It is considered that these things are adequately set out in the Local Plan and supporting documents.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1340  
**Consultee name** Mr RE O'Brien  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Queries raised over the figures that inform housing requirements: - Inconsistency between figures from various sources; - The increase in housing requirements in the RSS was not linked to any increased population forecast; - National figures suggest a lower rate of increase in households than the emerging Local Plan; - WLBC's evidence does not justify this difference; - The demand for housing continues to shrink; - The Objector's own calculations indicate a requirement of 239 dwellings per year and no current deficit in completions. (S)  
**Outcome** The Council disagrees with the majority of the points made by the Objector. Many of these have been explained to the Objector in writing, and through other means. The evidence and justification for the Council's housing target is set out in Technical Paper 2: Housing, and the Council stands by the figures set out in that document.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Policy RS1**

**Title: Residential Development**

---

<b>ID</b>	45
<b>Consultee name</b>	Ms Barton
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	Up Holland cannot carry the housing burden for Skelmersdale. Chequer Lane development will destroy precious Green Belt Development would have unacceptable impact on Tower Hill Road. Share the housing needs with Ormskirk. (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	Relationship between Skelmersdale and Up Holland: Up Holland was counted with Skelmersdale in previous Local Plans, the exception being the 2006 Replacement Local Plan, where the general tone was restraint: in order to encourage housing in Skelmersdale, but to restrain it in Up Holland, the two settlements were treated as separate policy areas. Now, the government's agenda is pro-house building, and there is no need to have separate policies for Skelmersdale and Up Holland, so once again the two settlements are treated together. Out of the 2,400 dwellings target for Skelmersdale / Up Holland, less than 10% of the development is to be in Up Holland. 'Carrying the burden' is an inaccurate term. Skelmersdale / Up Holland will not be allowed to coalesce with Tontine and the surrounding areas. Green spaces between Up Holland and Skelmersdale are subject to policies preventing built development. Chequer Lane: Chequer Lane is not Green Belt land. In order to minimise the release of Green Belt land, sites such as Chequer Lane have been considered necessary to deliver the Local Plan's housing requirements. Tower Hill Road Whilst the Council is aware of issues relating to this road, the Highways Authority have not raised objections to the proposed housing allocation at Chequer Lane. If mitigation measures are required to address traffic issues resulting from development at Chequer Lane, these should be addressed at the planning application stage. Redistribution of housing to Ormskirk: When considering the distribution of housing across the Borough, Ormskirk was considered an appropriate place to direct housing. However, owing to a number of factors, including wastewater infrastructure capacity constraints, the amount of development that can be accommodated in Ormskirk over the Plan period is limited.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change

---

**ID** 96  
**Consultee name** Church Commissioners For England  
**Agent Name** Miss Jennifer Hadland Smiths Gore  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** The Church Commissioners generally support Policy RS1, but raise concerns over restrictions in Rural Service (sic) Villages. We question the viability of 100% affordable housing sites. Relying on such schemes has lead to an undersupply. We would advise that an element of market housing needs to be introduced into such schemes to ensure their deliverability. This would also be in accordance with the Draft NPPF paragraph 112. (S)  
**Outcome** It is recognised that NPPF paragraph 54 requires LPAs to consider whether allowing some market housing would facilitate the provision of significant affordable housing to meet local needs. Within Small Rural Villages, in recognition of the NPPF, it is proposed to amend the policy to allow very limited (up to 4 units) market housing developments, and market housing as an element of larger affordable housing schemes, in which the number of market units are the minimum necessary to make the overall development viable.  
**Officer recommendation** Change Policy RS1 to allow for some market housing in villages if it facilitates the provision of significant affordable housing to meet local needs. Also amend RS1 to make consistent with SP1 in relation to rural housing.

---

**ID** 180  
**Consultee name** Mr Andrew Watt  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support Policy RS1, in particular the priority for the development of brownfield land within settlement boundaries, for example sites such as Abbey Lane. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 311  
**Consultee name** D James  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Chequer Lane proposals. There appears to be adequate land in Skelmersdale for housing. Top-down housing targets need to be challenged. Brownfield sites should be more fully utilised. If immigration were controlled more strictly, there would be less pressure for housing and less unemployment. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Land is designated within Skelmersdale for housing (1,865 units, plus non-allocated sites / sites with permission), but this is not enough to meet development needs, hence the allocation of Chequer Lane. The Council has examined housing need / projections, etc. and come to the conclusion that 310 dwellings per annum are needed (see Technical Paper 2: Housing). Brownfield sites are preferred to greenfield sites for housing development, but the supply of brownfield sites in the Borough is diminishing. Much brownfield land is employment land, and if this were developed for housing, more (greenfield) employment land would subsequently need to be found. A significant component of future UK population growth will come from "natural change" (more births than deaths) rather than immigration. Control of immigration and natural change is beyond the powers of this Council.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 313  
**Consultee name** Janet Patton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to development in Up Holland, particularly at Chequer Lane. 1. Consultation has been inadequate. 2. Up Holland should not be classified with Skelmersdale. 3. There are infrastructure issues - doctors' surgeries, highways / footpaths, bus services, shops, parking. 4. Housing in Skelmersdale needs regeneration; the development of the Chequer Lane / Mill Lane sites will hinder this process. 5. There are a significant number of houses for sale in the Skelmersdale area. (S)  
**Outcome** 1. Comments noted. 2. Up Holland was counted with Skelmersdale in previous Local Plans, the exception being the 2006 Replacement Local Plan, where the general tone was restraint: in order to encourage housing in Skelmersdale, but to restrain it in Up Holland, the two settlements were treated as separate policy areas. Now, the government's agenda is pro-house building, and there is no need to have separate policies for Skelmersdale and Up Holland, so once again the two settlements are treated together. 3. In terms of infrastructure, the Highways Authority have raised no objections to the proposed levels of housing in Up Holland, the Utilities company have raised no concerns regarding water /wastewater capacity, and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies no capacity issues with regard to schools, doctors, dentists, etc. that cannot be addressed. 4. Comments noted. To meet housing targets, there is a need for greenfield allocations in addition to brownfield land and regeneration sites such as Skelmersdale Town Centre. It is not considered that housing delivery within Skelmersdale will be compromised by the development of the Chequer Lane site. 5. It is acknowledged that there are empty properties across the Borough. The proportion of empty properties in West Lancashire is approximately 3%. This is in line with the national average, and a 3-4% rate is usual to enable the housing market to function. It is not considered appropriate to assume any significant part of the housing land supply could come from the source of reducing the number of vacant dwellings. However, in principle, the Council supports the bringing back into use of vacant dwellings, and any decrease in the overall percentage of vacant dwellings (especially long-term vacant dwellings) locally, or across the Borough, would be welcomed.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 474  
**Consultee name** Stuart Roby  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Concerns over: (a) traffic from the proposed housing in the Whalleys area using Cobb's Brow Lane to access the M6 northbound, and (b) the protection of land in relation to proposed residential development at Whalleys and Cobb's Clough. (S)  
**Outcome** (a) It is recognised that the proposed housing in the Whalleys will generate traffic, and that some of this may use Cobb's Brow Lane. If expected traffic from these sites is likely to cause an unacceptable increase in traffic on Cobb's Brow Lane, measures will be put in place to address this issue at the time of any planning applications on the sites. (b) Whilst the land between Skelmersdale and Dalton does not have Green Belt status, it is subject to the next strongest policy of protection. The Council have no intention of allowing development on this land. The logic for proposing 2,400 houses in Skelmersdale is set out in Section 4 of the Local Plan. Sites have been chosen in north Skelmersdale, as this is where land is available.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 477

**Consultee name** Miss Allison McIntosh

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** Object to residential development in Up Holland. a) Up Holland should not be annexed to Skelmersdale. b) Developers will not be interested in building in Skelmersdale when greenfield sites are available in Up Holland. c) Developers may stall building in Skelmersdale in order to cause Plan B to be implemented. d) No exploration has been made of other sites elsewhere. e) The Council has been lobbied by housebuilders. f) Development at Up Holland robs the village of its green spaces which are an amenity to both Skelmersdale and Up Holland residents. g) Housing should be provided where the infrastructure exists. (S)

**Outcome** a) Skelmersdale and Up Holland have been considered together in previous plans. They were only separate in the 2006 Local Plan, where separate policies applied to Up Holland (restraint) and Skelmersdale (development encouraged to aid regeneration). b) Greenfield sites are allocated in Skelmersdale as well as in Up Holland. However, these sites are not enough to meet needs, so other sites are also allocated. c) Comments noted. d) Exploration has been made of other sites, as set out, for example, in the Green Belt Study and Technical Paper 1. Many sites have been considered in Skelmersdale as part of the work in preparing the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. e) Just as members of the public are able to comment on draft Plans, so are developers. This is not lobbying, any more than members of the public making comments is lobbying. f) Land designated as green or recreational space is protected in the Plan, and such land has generally been avoided when selecting sites. When alternative sites to Chequer Lane / Mill Lane were requested at the Skelmersdale Forum, members of the public suggested building on designated recreational land between Skelmersdale and Up Holland, a similar (or worse) scenario. g) The Objector states that housing is needed "where the infrastructure is – in Skelmersdale". Over 90% of the housing allocations for Skelmersdale / Up Holland (1,865 units out of 2,030 allocated) are within Skelmersdale.

**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 516

**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad      Lathom South Parish Council

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** The vast majority of this land is off Firwood Road Lathom. Only a small area lies behind properties on Ormskirk Road, Skelmersdale. Development of this land would provide a continuum of development out of Old Skelmersdale, crossing the ring road. According to the Police, crime and vandalism rates in these two distinct areas vary very considerably and so the proposed development would be likely to spread these problems outwards into an area of (currently) very low crime and vandalism, thereby affecting the amenity of the occupiers of existing and proposed properties, contrary to Objective 1 of the Vision (F)

**Outcome** Comments noted. It is not considered appropriate to equate new development with crime.

**Officer recommendation** No change

---



**ID** 517  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Chapter 7 Providing for Housing and Residential Accommodation page 100, para 7.7 - The plan for Skelmersdale Town Centre has been presented as being dependent on incentives and developments within the published (and subsequently extended) area to be a viable scheme on its own. Other housing schemes rely on profits generated , in order to provide affordable housing, housing for older people, public open space etc. within those developments. They cannot also be used to subsidise the Town Centre. (F)  
**Outcome** The proposed housing development within the Skelmersdale Town Centre area, if it is to cross-subsidise town centre development, may have less stringent demands placed on it with regard to open space, affordable housing, etc. (For example, affordable housing requirements in Skelmersdale Town Centre are significantly less than elsewhere.) Cross-subsidisation is also intended from other development, e.g. retail.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 518  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** No provision has been made for bringing empty properties back into use. (S)  
**Outcome** As stated, the proportion of empty properties in West Lancashire is approximately 3%. This is in line with the national average, and a 3-4% vacancy rate is usual to enable the housing market to function. Thus it is not considered appropriate to assume any significant part of the housing land supply could come from the source of reducing the number of vacant dwellings. However, in principle, the Council supports the bringing back into use of vacant dwellings, and any decrease in the overall percentage of vacant dwellings (especially long-term vacant dwellings) would be welcomed.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 519  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Chapter 7 Providing for Housing and Residential Accommodation page 100, para 7.10 - The development choices made do not live up to this statement. Greenfield land is being identified for development in preference to brownfield land in Skelmersdale. (F)  
**Outcome** Whilst the development of brownfield land in the first instance is supported, the amount of such land in West Lancashire is not enough to meet development needs, and thus greenfield land has been allocated for development. Brownfield land in Skelmersdale Town Centre is part of a housing allocation. Other brownfield sites, such as the former TPT site (Railway Road), are assumed to be part of the housing land supply, although not specifically allocated in the Local Plan for development on account of their size. The Local Plan must be demonstrated to be deliverable, and to insist that all brownfield sites are developed before any greenfield sites are commenced is not considered to be a deliverable strategy.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 520  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Chapter 7 Providing for Housing and Residential Accommodation pages 100 and 101, para 7.19 - This is too reactive. The time to act is before harm is caused, not after it has been caused. Harm can also be caused by developing to target in a stagnant market and this needs to be taken into account. It is not in anybody's interests to create a problem of long term empty properties in a location. (F)  
**Outcome** Unfortunately it is not possible to prevent development on account of it possibly (cumulatively) causing harm in future, although mitigation measures can be required through planning conditions to counteract likely harm. Housing targets are a national requirement. If the market is stagnant, most developers are unlikely to build, so the likelihood of creating significant numbers of new empty properties is low. The Council has tried to take account of the current market conditions by reducing housing targets in the short term, although this approach has recently been successfully challenged on appeal a number of times elsewhere in England.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 538  
**Consultee name** Mr Bryan Pready  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Policy RS1 Development in Small Rural Villages and outside settlements. There MUST be a strict requirement that ALL affordable housing is built within walking distance of a frequent bus service or a railway station. Without this, there is a real risk that some residents will be unable to access employment and education. Even if the main earner has a car, other family members are likely to be dependent on public transport. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Whilst this requirement is accepted in principle, in practice it may be too much of a constraint and may rule out some much-needed development. Housing development is not normally encouraged in places with poor access to public transport, but the widespread need for affordable housing means that an exception is made within the policy for such development in more rural areas. The need for affordable housing is also considered sufficiently weighty to override the usual expectation that housing be accessible by public transport. It is hoped that most affordable housing developments built will be within walking distance of public transport, but if not, prospective residents should note this fact, and should weigh up whether they could realistically live in such a location (for example, accessing education or employment by taking lifts, cycling, using a taxi, etc.) or whether they should look elsewhere.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 554  
**Consultee name** Mr Anthony Harford  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** I cannot see the logic behind your 2027 housing structure, using small plots of green belt areas, when you have large areas of green belt. You have already areas started ie. Dalton Park. we already have a buisness park at the bottom of our lane. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The logic for the distribution of housing, including the case for Green Belt release, is set out in Policy SP1, the Strategic Options and Green Belt Release Technical Paper, and in the Housing Technical Paper.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 596  
**Consultee name** Mr Robin Buckley Redrow Homes (Lancs) Ltd  
**Agent Name** Mr Tony McAteer  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** a) Objection to lack of allocation of any housing sites in Key Sustainable Villages, notwithstanding the fact that Policy EC3 allocates four mixed use sites in the rural areas. Land off Guinea Hall Lane, Banks should be allocated for housing. b) Objection to RS1(f), i.e. possible restraint. (S)  
**Outcome** a) Comments noted regarding Key Sustainable Villages and the attributes of the land east of Guinea Hall Lane, Banks. As stated elsewhere, the main reason behind a lack of housing allocations in Banks is infrastructure constraints, in particular foul drainage. b) It is agreed that housing targets are minima, and can be exceeded, and that there is scope for 'over-provision'. The reasoning behind RS1(f) is that the Plan is covering a 15 year timescale, and it is impossible to predict how circumstances might change over this period. Whilst it is recognised that housing targets are minima, given infrastructure constraints in some areas, there may be a need in certain individual settlements to restrict the amount of housing granted at some point in the future once the targets have been exceeded by a significant amount, in order to avoid unacceptable harm to such settlements. Just as there is scope in the Plan for an increase in housing land supply (through Plan B), it is also considered prudent for there to be scope to slow down housing delivery at some point in the future, but only if clearly judged necessary. RS1(f) makes it clear that restraint would only be considered if there was a significant over-supply of housing and if it was clear that such an over-supply would cause harm to local or wider policy objectives. At present, given a shortage in housing land supply, the likelihood of restraint (in particular Borough-wide restraint) is remote and will be so for the foreseeable future, but it is still considered worthwhile including the provisions for some kind of slow-down in delivery, even if it is never implemented.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 602  
**Consultee name** MR DAVID MCGUINNESS  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Chequer Lane proposals (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Up Holland has been considered together with Skelmersdale in previous Local Plans, the one exception being the 2006 Local Plan, where there was a need to impose restraint in Up Holland but not in Skelmersdale. The need for restraint has since been removed, hence the two settlements are being considered together again. Over 90% of the units allocated for the Skelmersdale / Up Holland area are in Skelmersdale.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 605  
**Consultee name** Mrs Emma Steele  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** There are already plenty of houses in Skelmersdale. The overall number of houses to be built ignores the depressed state of the housing market. Would ruin our rural area when there are plenty of other areas in Skelmersdale to develop. Crime would increase in this area. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The land has been safeguarded for future development since the early 1990s. As stated by the objector, the 2006 Local Plan states that the land will only be considered for development after 2016 if there are no longer any suitable sites within the urban area..." In order to meet development needs for 2012-2027, and taking account of sites within the urban areas of West Lancashire, this site is now required, hence its allocation. The justification for the housing target is set out in the Housing Technical Paper.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 731  
**Consultee name** Mrs Kerry Hesketh  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to residential development in Up Holland. a) Up Holland should not be annexed to Skelmersdale. b) Developers will not be interested in building in Skelmersdale when greenfield sites are available in Up Holland. c) Developers may stall building in Skelmersdale in order to cause Plan B to be implemented. d) No exploration has been made of other sites elsewhere. e) The Council has been lobbied by housebuilders. f) Development at Up Holland robs the village of its green spaces which are an amenity to both Skelmersdale and Up Holland residents. g) Housing should be provided where the infrastructure exists. (S)(S)  
**Outcome** a) Skelmersdale and Up Holland have been considered together in previous plans. They were only separate in the 2006 Local Plan, where separate policies applied to Up Holland (restraint) and Skelmersdale (development encouraged to aid regeneration). b) Greenfield sites are allocated in Skelmersdale as well as in Up Holland. However, these sites are not enough to meet needs, so other sites are also allocated. c) Comments noted. d) Exploration has been made of other sites, as set out, for example, in the Green Belt Study and Technical Paper 1. Many sites have been considered in Skelmersdale as part of the work in preparing the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. e) Just as members of the public are able to comment on draft Plans, so are developers. This is not lobbying, any more than members of the public making comments is lobbying. f) Land designated as green or recreational space is protected in the Plan, and such land has been avoided when selecting sites. When alternative sites to Chequer Lane / Mill Lane were requested at the Skelmersdale Forum, local members of the public suggested building on designated recreational land between Skelmersdale and Up Holland, a similar (or worse) scenario. g) The Objector states that housing is needed "where the infrastructure is – in Skelmersdale". Over 90% of the housing allocations for Skelmersdale / Up Holland (1,865 units out of 2,030 allocated) are within Skelmersdale.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 736  
**Consultee name** Mr Martin Ainscough  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Allocate some housing development in the key sustainable village of the Eastern Parishes. - Parbold. (S)  
**Outcome** The Local Plan only allocates major sites (over 100 units); there are no suitable sites of that size in the Eastern Parishes. However, the policy allows for residential development within settlements such as Parbold. It is not considered appropriate to allocate Green Belt land beside Parbold for development on account of the range of facilities available in the settlement, the quality of the landscape around the village, and the size and nature of the parcels of Green Belt land, as set out in the Green Belt study.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 801  
**Consultee name** Mr Robert W. Pickavance  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The New Road site should be specifically allocated as a housing site along with the other sites within Policy RS1. The Plan should define 'Greenfield' sites. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The attributes of the site are recognised. However, only large sites (over 100 units) have been allocated in the Plan. This does not necessarily mean that unallocated sites have less potential. Whether allocated or not, this site contributes towards the Local Plan housing land supply. It is not considered necessary to define "Greenfield", as the word has widespread use nationally, and the definition is simple. There are other greenfield sites within the Northern Parishes area.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 812  
**Consultee name** Mrs Lynn Fletcher  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Firswood Road proposals on the grounds of delaying development in the urban area, unsuitable roads, questions over number of houses required. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Land has been located in other parts of Skelmersdale as well as Firswood Road, and it is expected that these sites will be developed over the lifetime of the Local Plan. The land at Firswood Road has been safeguarded for future development since the early 1990s. In order to meet development needs for 2012-2027 (and taking account of other sites within the urban areas of West Lancashire), this site is now required, hence its proposed allocation. Although it is recognised that the market is depressed at present, housing need remains, especially given low build rates over recent years. It is agreed that the occupation and / or restoration of empty properties should be encouraged.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 816  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Parbold Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Parbold Parish Council is very concerned about development in Burscough feeling that once the green belt goes in Burscough it will be open season for everywhere else. The Parish Council is totally opposed to building on Green Belt and supports Burscough Parish Council objecting to the development on Yew Tree Farm. Parbold Parish Council is also against garden infill development in Parbold because it impacts on the drainage system for the whole of the village. In Parbold all new drainage/sewerage pipes join up with those that have been in for many years and cannot take the extra drainage/sewerage. To build homes on back gardens means cutting down trees which again does not help with surface water issues  
**Outcome** Comments noted regarding opposition to the release of Green Belt land at Burscough. The vast majority of the Green Belt will continue to be protected from inappropriate development. With regard to new housing in residential gardens, Policy RS1 part (c) requires that careful attention be paid to relevant policies. Potential loss of trees, and drainage / flooding issues should be taken into consideration in each individual planning application for housing, whether backland or elsewhere, each case being treated on its merits.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 818  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Dalton Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Dalton Parish Council note the proposed housing development at Whalleys. They would wish to add that the protected land comprising fields between this development and Dalton should be maintained as protected from development so as to form a buffer zone between the village and the town so that Dalton can preserve its rural character and not be merged or swallowed up by expansion of Skelmersdale Town. Terminology needs defining (S)  
**Outcome** Comments regarding Whalleys and land at Dalton are noted. Policy GN1 has two paragraphs on 'Protected Land' - these are considered to be a sufficiently clear definition of what is meant by 'Protected'. 'Safeguarded' land can be understood to be safeguarded \*from\* development, or safeguarded \*for\* [future] development. It is considered that Policy GN2 makes this sufficiently clear. Whilst it is accepted that Policies GN1 and RS1 allow for affordable housing developments of up to 10 units, the requirement for a sequential test should ensure that the Protected Land at Dalton should remain undeveloped (as there are likely to be sites within the built-up area of Skelmersdale that could accommodate any small-scale development proposed on Protected Land outside the town).  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

<b>ID</b>	823
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr David Webb
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	<p>1. The land at Firwood Road is safeguarded in the adopted Plan for development beyond 2016. Its allocation now contradicts the Plan. 2. Firwood Road is rural. Urban sites (with infrastructure in place) should be developed before rural farmland is considered. 3. Skelmersdale does not have the housing need to justify the release of so much housing land. The population is declining and many properties lie empty. People will not move to Skelmersdale. 4. The Council's economic forecasting has been shown to be flawed, and history may repeat itself with regard to Firwood Road.</p>
<b>Outcome</b>	<p>1. The land has been safeguarded for future development since the early 1990s. As stated by the objector, the 2006 Local Plan states that the land will only be considered for development after 2016 if there are no longer any suitable sites within the urban area..." Local Plans need reviewing to account for changing circumstances. In order to meet development needs for 2012-2027, and taking account of the capacities of sites within the urban areas of West Lancashire, the land at Firwood Road is now required, hence its proposed allocation in the latest local plan. 2. Comments noted. It is agreed that, ideally, urban sites should be developed before agricultural land. However, central government requires authorities to demonstrate a rolling five / six year supply of deliverable housing land. To safeguard deliverable greenfield sites such as Firwood Road from development until all urban / non-agricultural sites have been developed would result in a housing land supply well below required levels. This could leave the Council susceptible to planning appeals, and could in theory lead to not just Firwood Road but other agricultural land being lost to development on appeal, with the Council having less control. 3. The justification for the housing target is set out in the Housing Technical Paper and other documents referred to within the TP. Although it is recognised that the market is depressed at present, housing need remains, especially given low build rates over recent years. The 1990s development at Ashurst demonstrates people will move to Skelmersdale. 4. Comments noted. It is expected that in the current economy, housing would only be built at Firwood Road (or elsewhere) if the developers were sure the dwellings would be bought. An estate comprising predominantly empty properties is unlikely.</p>
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change

---



**ID** 846

**Consultee name** Anglo International Up Holland Ltd

**Agent Name** Ms Lorraine Davison DPP

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** Amendments proposed to the policy: e) Enabling Development – There will be instances where enabling development in the form of new residential that would otherwise be regarded as inappropriate by reference to this and other relevant policies can assist in securing other planning and development related objectives and / or benefits. Subject to consideration of the proposal in question and other relevant policies the Council will generally support such proposals.' Changes also proposed to the justification. (S)

**Outcome** 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. (This would not automatically mean that it would be granted permission because the specific justification for the particular enabling development proposed would need to be assessed.) As with other objections on behalf of Anglo International, the Council does not consider it appropriate or necessary to add wording to Local Plan Policy RS1 to refer to this specific scenario.

**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 855

**Consultee name** Miss Jacquelynn Burgess

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** In summary, we do understand that with a growing population, there is a need to build further developments and accommodate those that currently do not have adequate housing. Our objection is not with housing itself, but with developing sites unnecessarily or to a level which will irreparably degrade the area in which it is located. We feel very strongly that it is not yet necessary to start developing the proposed sites behind Firwood Road and raise major concerns with regards to the size, style and impact of high yielding developments within our currently sedate and beautiful surroundings. (S)

**Outcome** Comments noted. It is unfortunate that the property was purchased without the knowledge of the emerging Local Plan and the proposed allocation of the land at Firwood Road. The land has been safeguarded for future development since 1992 and is needed for this new plan period. In determining housing needs and proposed site allocations, account has been taken of sites within the built-up areas of Skelmersdale and elsewhere, including brownfield sites, but extra land is still required. Comments regarding wildlife are noted. Policy EN2 requires measures to provide for Protected Species. It may be appropriate to preserve certain parts of the site that have particular ecological value. Routes of public footpaths should be maintained, or else subject to minor diversions. In the current economic situation, affordable housing is needed by a variety of people, including young professionals and working families. It is inappropriate to equate affordable housing with social issues. The construction of new housing brings disruption wherever the housing is located, but schemes such as 'Considerate Constructors' can help minimise the disruption. The capacity of the site has been estimated using a density of 30 dwellings per hectare, which is a standard suburban density and does not represent 'cramming'. Privacy distances are used and adhered to when working out site layouts.

**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 863  
**Consultee name** Escalibur Ltd  
**Agent Name** Mr Alban Cassidy CA Planning  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The main housing allocations in West Lancashire are constrained by infrastructure and the market. This will mean that housing delivery will be below the required levels for 5-10 years. In order to address this shortfall land should be allocated in villages such as Appley Bridge where there are sustainable transport options and the potential for new development without harming the purposes of the green belt. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Green Belt land at Appley Bridge was considered in the Green Belt Study, but in preparing the Local Plan, its release was rejected on account of the land continuing to fulfil purposes of the Green Belt, and the relative sustainability of Appley Bridge compared with other settlements.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 878  
**Consultee name** Mr Philip Carter Environment Agency  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** Part c) of Policy RS1 identifies amenity, access, biodiversity and design as issues requiring careful attention. We request that infrastructure is added to this list. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. It is considered that to add the word, 'infrastructure' to part (c) of the policy is unnecessary, as the policy uses the phrase, "including, but not limited to", and thus already can cover sewerage infrastructure issues.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 885  
**Consultee name** Messrs R & J Pickavance Messrs R & J Pickavance  
**Agent Name** Mr Glyn Bridge McDyre & Co.  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Our main concern is the 20% provision for the elderly. It overlaps the Lifetime Homes Standard it is arbitrary and ill-defined in its requirements. We do not object to a density policy in principle, but the current approach needs refining. (S)  
**Outcome** With regard to density, it is considered that it is preferable to keep the policy a reasonable length by leaving the detail of the possible exceptions to the justification, and covering the matters suggested by the Objector with the phrase, 'subject to the specific context for each site'. Comments are noted regarding accommodation for the elderly and the Lifetime Homes Standard.  
**Officer recommendation** Change wording regarding the LHS and it needing to be met once mandatory. Clarify /amend wording with regard to the 20% provision for the elderly requirement.

---

**ID** 918  
**Consultee name** mr gerrard neil  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to proposals for Firswood Road on grounds of highways, traffic, visual amenity and loss of wildlife (S)  
**Outcome** Comments regarding wildlife noted. Policy EN2 deals with Protected Species. In the event that access to the site were to be taken from Firswood Road (and it must be stressed that no decision has yet been made regarding access), the road would need to be upgraded to a satisfactory standard to cope with the proposed development.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 923  
**Consultee name** Ms Barton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Developing Chequer Lane site would increase flood risk dramatically for a Catagory 1 Flood Risk Area (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Any planning applications on the Chequer Lane site would need to incorporate measures to deal with flooding issues to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency before being any grant of permission could take place. This is the case with the current application, where the EA have requested a Flood Risk Assessment be undertaken to further assess the risk of flooding, and how it can be mitigated against.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 933  
**Consultee name** Mr Peter Banks  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** See my comments on sections 4.1 and 4.4 relating to the Yew Tree Farm and Grove Farm sites. (S)  
**Outcome** Noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 934  
**Consultee name** Messrs Ramsbottom, Halliwell, & Jacton Etc.  
**Agent Name** Mr Michael Cunningham Cunningham Planning  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support for the identification of the land at Firswood Road, Lathom/Skelmersdale to be identified as housing land which will help address the housing land under-supply. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted, including statement about the mining issues report.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 943  
**Consultee name** Ms Barton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to residential development in Up Holland. a) Up Holland should not be annexed to Skelmersdale. b) Developers will not be interested in building in Skelmersdale when greenfield sites are available in Up Holland. c) Developers may stall building in Skelmersdale in order to cause Plan B to be implemented. d) No exploration has been made of other sites elsewhere. e) The Council has been lobbied by housebuilders. f) Development at Up Holland robs the village of its green spaces which are an amenity to both Skelmersdale and Up Holland residents. g) Housing should be provided where the infrastructure exists. (S)  
**Outcome** a) Skelmersdale and Up Holland have been considered together in previous plans. They were only separate in the 2006 Local Plan, where separate policies applied to Up Holland (restraint) and Skelmersdale (development encouraged to aid regeneration). b) Greenfield sites are allocated in Skelmersdale as well as in Up Holland. However, these sites are not enough to meet needs, so other sites are also allocated. c) Comments noted. d) Exploration has been made of other sites, as set out, for example, in the Green Belt Study and Technical Paper 1. Many sites have been considered in Skelmersdale as part of the work in preparing the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. e) Just as members of the public are able to comment on draft Plans, so are developers. This is not lobbying, any more than members of the public making comments is lobbying. f) Land designated as green or recreational space is protected in the Plan, and such land has generally been avoided when selecting sites. When alternative sites to Chequer Lane / Mill Lane were requested at the Skelmersdale Forum, members of the public suggested building on designated recreational land between Skelmersdale and Up Holland, a similar (or worse) scenario. g) The Objector states that housing is needed "where the infrastructure is – in Skelmersdale". Over 90% of the housing allocations for Skelmersdale / Up Holland (1,865 units out of 2,030 allocated) are within Skelmersdale.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 961  
**Consultee name** Wainhomes Developments  
**Agent Name** Mr Stephen Harris  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** (a) The allocation of the Chequer Lane site is supported. This could deliver completions by 2013/14 at 25 dwellings per annum. (b) The Sluice Lane (Rufford) site should be considered for allocation as a housing site. It could be developed within 5 years as the wastewater constraints can be overcome. Consideration could be given towards allocating the site for 55 dwellings. (S)  
**Outcome** (a) Comments noted regarding possible start date and delivery rates for the Chequer Lane site. (b) Comments noted regarding the Sluice Lane site. The Local Plan only allocates the largest sites (over 100 units) as housing sites. In practice, the non-allocation of the site should not result in any material difference to how the site is treated policy-wise, given the provisions of Policy RS1.  
**Officer recommendation** No change (see also Rep 801)

---

**ID** 973  
**Consultee name** Strategy and Policy Group Lancashire County Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Planned housing in Skelmersdale Town Centre and wider Skelmersdale sites will play a critical role in supporting town centre investment and regeneration. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1080  
**Consultee name** Mrs Cynthia Prescott  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object on grounds of loss of green spaces, loss of village character, traffic and infrastructure. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Up Holland has been classed with Skelmersdale since the inception of Skelmersdale New Town, except in the 2006 Local Plan (where, in accordance with regional policy at the time, there was a need to have restraint in Up Holland but development in Skelmersdale). The Infrastructure Delivery Plan has not highlighted any insurmountable infrastructure issues in Up Holland. If the Highways Authority deem it necessary, improvements to Chequer Lane and Tower Hill Road should be made as part of the planning application process.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1089  
**Consultee name** McCarthy & Stone, Retirement Lifestyles Ltd.  
**Agent Name** Mr Chris Butt The Planning Bureau Ltd  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** In summary, McCarthy and Stone stress the need to consider addressing the current and future housing needs of older people within your Local Authority, and for your Local Plan to acknowledge the role that owner-occupied sheltered housing schemes play in meeting older person housing needs and in providing housing choice for the wider community by freeing up valuable, under-occupied family homes in the local area. Alternative wording to Policy RS1 suggested. Consideration should be given to assigning elderly people's housing an enhanced planning status, similar to affordable housing. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The revised wording to Policy RS1 will be considered, alongside other representations on this requirement: "Development proposals for accommodation designed specifically for the elderly will be encouraged provided that they are accessible by public transport or a reasonable walking distance to community facilities such as shops, medical services, places of worship and public open space." The option of giving owner occupied retirement housing an enhanced status will be explored, although it is important not to create 'loopholes'.  
**Officer recommendation** Add to the policy or justification the suggested wording: "Development proposals for accommodation designed specifically for the elderly will be encouraged provided that they are accessible by public transport or a reasonable walking distance to community

---

**ID** 1100

**Consultee name** Bickerstaffe Trust

**Agent Name** Mr Graham Love Turley Associates

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** 1. Object to the failure to allocate housing sites on the periphery of Ormskirk, in particular east and west of Alty's Lane. 2. Object to part (f) of the policy, i.e. the possibility of restraint. (S)

**Outcome** 1. Site-specific comments noted. The reason for the choice of sites for allocation is set out in the Plan and Technical Paper on Strategic Options and Green Belt release. 2. It is agreed that housing targets are minima, and can be exceeded, and that there is scope for 'over-provision'. The reasoning behind RS1(f) is that the Plan is covering a 15 year timescale, and it is impossible to predict how circumstances might change over this period. Whilst it is recognised that housing targets are minima, given infrastructure constraints in some areas, there may be a need in certain individual settlements to restrict the amount of housing granted at some point in the future, in order to avoid unacceptable harm to such settlements. Just as there is scope in the Plan for an increase in housing land supply (through Plan B), it is also considered prudent for there to be scope to slow down housing delivery at some point in the future, but only if clearly judged necessary. RS1(f) makes it clear that restraint would only be considered if there was a significant over-supply of housing and if it was clear that such an over-supply would cause harm to local or wider policy objectives. At present, given a shortage in housing land supply, the likelihood of restraint (in particular Borough-wide restraint) is remote and will be so for the foreseeable future, but it is still considered worthwhile including the provisions for some kind of slow-down in delivery, even if it is never implemented.

**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1152

**Consultee name** Mr Robin Buckley Redrow Homes (Lancs) Ltd

**Agent Name** Mr Tony McAteer

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** a) Objection to the failure of the Plan to specifically allocate the land at Parr's Lane, Aughton for housing in the Plan. The failure to allocate the site for housing does not produce the certainty that the development plan is designed to provide. b) Objection to RS1(f), i.e. possible restraint. (S)

**Outcome** (a) Comments noted regarding Parr's Lane. The reasoning behind the proposed sites for Green Belt release (and for safeguarded / Plan B sites) is set out in the Strategic Options and Green Belt Release Technical Paper. (b) It is agreed that housing targets are minima and can be exceeded, and that there is scope for 'over-provision'. The reasoning behind RS1(f) is that the Plan is covering a 15 year timescale, and it is impossible to predict how circumstances might change over this period. Whilst it is recognised that housing targets are minima, given infrastructure constraints in some areas, there may be a need in certain individual settlements to restrict the amount of housing granted at some point in the future, in order to avoid unacceptable harm to such settlements. Just as there is scope in the Plan for an increase in housing land supply (through Plan B), it is also considered prudent for there to be scope to slow down housing delivery at some point in the future, but only if clearly judged necessary. RS1(f) makes it clear that restraint would only be considered if there was a significant over-supply of housing and if it was clear that such an over-supply would cause harm to local or wider policy objectives. At present, given a shortage in housing land supply, the likelihood of restraint (in particular Borough-wide restraint) is remote and will be so for the foreseeable future, but it is still considered worthwhile including the provisions for some kind of slow-down in delivery, even if it is never implemented.

**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1160  
**Consultee name** Mr Roger Clayton South Lathom Residents Association  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The evidence to support housing need is inaccurate. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Further details as to precisely how the Council has ignored its own sources, and the specific inaccuracies in the 2011 Housing Land Supply document, would be required from the Objector in order to provide a response to this representation (although it should be borne in mind that this consultation is on the Local Plan, not the HLS document).  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1164  
**Consultee name** Mr Leslie Connor The Jean and Leslie Connor Charitable Foundation  
**Agent Name** Mr Tony McAteer  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The minimal references to provision of accommodation for older people is disappointing. The 20% requirement in Policy RS1 is meaningless with its 'get out clause'. It is incorrect to say the Council cannot influence schemes for the elderly coming forward. Policy RS1 should include support for the provision of a continuing care community in the Borough. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. In the light of previous consultation responses, a requirement for 20% of units to be designed specifically for the elderly was added to the Plan. Much housing is suitable for people up to relatively old ages, as retired people tend to be more active and in better health than in previous generations. It is considered that this fact, along with the Lifetime Homes requirement will lead to the provision of a significant number of units of accommodation suitable for the elderly. The Plan does support extra care accommodation, although it does not go as far as allocating sites specifically for such uses (similarly with affordable housing). However, it should be stressed that extra care accommodation would not be supported in the Green Belt, unless it were on a site already specifically allocated for housing (and if the accommodation was Use Class C3). It is agreed that the statement "the Council is unable to influence such schemes coming forward" is inaccurate and should be changed.  
**Officer recommendation** Rephrase, "the Council is unable to influence such schemes coming forward" in paragraph 7.14. Add in clarification regarding the policy stance towards extra care schemes.

---

**ID** 1168  
**Consultee name** Vernon Property LLP  
**Agent Name** Mr D Walton Walton & Co  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Summary: The plan should therefore be amended to provide for (a) to allocate sufficient sites to meet the identified requirement in the Borough (b) the housing allocations should be provided in the Key Sustainable Villages and in particular Banks (c) within Banks the site identified as BA.019 in the SHLAA should be allocated for housing. It is within the village envelope, is immediately available and has no constraints. (S)  
**Outcome** Although only a small number of sites are allocated, the Plan makes clear that its housing land supply also comes from other sources. Only the largest sites are listed as allocations (over 100 units). There are no such sites in the Northern Parishes, except one safeguarded site. However, there are other sites in this area which can deliver housing, and which contribute towards the 400 dwellings target. Plan B sites are not included as part of the housing land supply. The safeguarded land east of Guinea Hall Avenue is clearly enclosed by development in Banks. Its inclusion as part of the settlement reflects this. The fact that this is a different approach from the 2006 Local Plan is considered to be of limited relevance. SHLAA site BA19 is roughly triangular, with one edge fronting onto the Green Belt, and is significantly less enclosed by the settlement of Banks than site BA.20. Site BA.19's continued designation as "Protected Land" is considered appropriate.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1171  
**Consultee name** Mr Leslie Connor The Jean and Leslie Connor Charitable Foundation  
**Agent Name** Mr Tony McAteer  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Objection to the failure of the Plan to specifically allocate the land at Bold Lane, Aughton for housing. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The reasons for the choice of sites for Green Belt release are provided in the Strategic Options and Green Belt release Technical Paper. Land at Bold Lane, Aughton, was not considered for Green Belt release because the Green Belt study found that it fulfilled a purpose of the Green Belt and its development would close the already narrow strategic gap between Aughton and the small village of Holt Green.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---



**ID** 1184  
**Consultee name** Mr Roger Clayton South Lathom Residents Association  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Skelmersdale cannot be relied upon to deliver the 5 to 10 year housing need as this does not address the wider Borough needs. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The target for Skelmersdale was reduced as, during the previous consultation, it was highlighted as unachievable. Whilst the current target is ambitious, it is considered deliverable. The rank of Skelmersdale in the settlement hierarchy, coupled with the availability of unconstrained sites in the town and constraints elsewhere, means that it is necessary to focus development in Skelmersdale in the first half of the Plan period. It is anticipated that the new housing will accommodate both people from Skelmersdale, and people moving in from elsewhere. It is hoped that by improving the job offer in the town, the high levels of out-commuting can be tackled.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1186  
**Consultee name** Mr Roger Clayton South Lathom Residents Association  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Skelmersdale cannot be relied upon to deliver the 5 to 10 year housing need as this does not address the wider Borough needs. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The target for Skelmersdale was reduced as, during the previous consultation, it was highlighted as unachievable. Whilst the current target is ambitious, it is considered deliverable. The rank of Skelmersdale in the settlement hierarchy, coupled with the availability of unconstrained sites in the town and constraints elsewhere, means that it is necessary to focus development in Skelmersdale in the first half of the Plan period. It is anticipated that the new housing will accommodate both people from Skelmersdale, and people moving in from elsewhere. It is hoped that by improving the job offer in the town, the high levels of out-commuting can be tackled.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1246  
**Consultee name** Ms Rosemary Cooper MP  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Petition of 277 names received against development at Mill Lane and Chequer Lane. (F)  
**Outcome** Petition noted.  
**Officer recommendation** No new evidence has been provided in the petition in terms of weighing up the planning merits of Chequer Lane / Mill Lane, so no action required in terms of amending the Local Plan.

---

**ID** 1254

**Consultee name** Mr Andrew Thorley Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Agent Name** Miss Caroline Simpson Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** 1. Objection to the minimum 30 dwellings per hectare housing density across the Borough, variation should be incorporated. 2. Objection to the requirement for a percentage of housing to be suitable for elderly accommodation, and for new dwellings to meet the Lifetime Homes Standard as there is no basis for these requirements. (S)

**Outcome** 1. It is considered that the wording of the policy allows for variation in density across the Borough, as the density is linked to the specific context for the site - which includes the character of the area, etc. Overall, an expected minimum density of 30dw/ha is considered to provide an appropriate balance between the amenity of the occupiers of new properties, and the efficient use of land. 2. Comments noted regarding the Lifetime Homes Standard and elderly accommodation requirements. It is considered that a 20% requirement for accommodation designed for the elderly is not over-onerous, and that (unlike an affordable housing requirement) it should not have any significant negative impact on viability. Whilst there is no "formula" as such to arrive at a 20% requirement, it could be argued that the requirement should be far higher, given the extent of the ageing of the population. 20% is considered a reasonable figure. Paragraph 7.15 of the Plan provides an open-ended definition of what is meant by such accommodation, and Policy RS1 allows for the requirement to be waived where it is clearly inappropriate. The justification for the Lifetime Homes Standard is set out in paragraphs 7.16-18. Viability may well be one consideration when determining whether or not it is appropriate to require that the LHS be met.

**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1259

**Consultee name** Mr Andrew Thorley Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Agent Name** Miss Caroline Simpson Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners

**Nature of response** Support with conditions

**Summary** Support for the allocation of Grove Farm subject to the inclusion of the north part of the site to allow delivery of up to 300 meetings. (s)

**Outcome** Support noted. The northern part of the Grove Farm site was not proposed for Green Belt release and included within the housing allocation because, by doing so, this would close the strategic Green Belt gap between Ormskirk and Burscough, albeit only by a small amount and that the gap would still be over 1km. On further consideration, given the constraints affecting certain parts of the Grove Farm site that would limit development and force an inappropriately high density of development on the remainder of the site, the ability to landscape the northern boundary of an expanded site sufficiently to minimise impact on the rest of the Green Belt and the opportunity to include land in a narrow strip alongside the railway line between Ormskirk and Burscough (to remain in the Green Belt) for the provision of a linear park / cycle route between the two towns, the inclusion of the northern part of the site in the allocation could be justified.

**Officer recommendation** It is recommended that the northern part of the Grove Farm site is included in the allocation to ensure delivery of a better quality of development and a large part of a linear park / cycle route between Ormskirk and Burscough.

---

**ID** 1319  
**Consultee name** Mr Duncan Gregory Gladman  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** • The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) promotes growth through a proactive planning system that encourages and facilitates development. • The Local Plan should not arbitrarily constrain growth through restrictive policies and insufficient allocations that prevent the housing needs of the Borough been satisfied during the local plan period. • The Local Authority should positively embrace development that meets the social, economic and environmental needs of the Borough. • Housing density should be defined in context with the character of the settlement, Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and marketability advice provided by house builders during the consultation process for the Local Plan. • It is important to ensure that the density policy can be applied flexibly in order to achieve the wider objectives of the Core Strategy (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted and generally agreed with. In terms of density, specifying a minimum density is considered most appropriate, but the policy makes clear that this density is to be applied subject to the specific context for each individual site, and thus allows for a measure of flexibility in the application of the density policy.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1326  
**Consultee name** John Barlow  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object on grounds of waste water and surface water. Any development of the Grove Farm site would require the implementation of adequate surface drainage infrastructure, which should ideally also benefit neighbouring properties, rather than add to existing issues. Any development of the Grove Farm site might require a major overhaul of the sewerage system on a highly local level and the implementation of drainage beyond the site boundaries. Should the development go ahead, it should be imperative that all necessary changes to the infrastructure for dealing with waste and surface water be carried out before the development of any homes. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The Council is grateful for the information provided. It is agreed that any problems with drainage /waste water /surface water need to be satisfactorily resolved if residential development is to take place on this site. It is considered, however, that the problems are not insurmountable, and that the development of the site is viable.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 1327  
**Consultee name** John Barlow  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Objection to Grove Farm on traffic issues. The Plan appears to fail to assess the impact of the proposed Grove Farm development in addition to the proposed housing at Burscough. Extensive comments on what kind of junction and other arrangements might be most appropriate for the Grove Farm site, given current traffic issues in the vicinity. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The Traffic Impact Assessment Tool (TIAT) that has informed the Transport Technical Paper has assessed the impact of all the development proposed in the Local Plan Preferred Options, including both the Grove Farm and Yew Tree Farm sites. If the Grove Farm site is to be developed for housing, an appropriate junction and other necessary traffic measures will need to be put in place, meeting the requirements of the Highways Authority. These measures should accommodate pedestrians and cyclists, as well as motor vehicles. Details of such measures would be worked out at the planning application stage.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1328  
**Consultee name** John Barlow  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Objection to Grove Farm proposals on grounds of loss of, and impact upon, the Green Belt. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The boundary of the land proposed for allocation at Grove Farm was chosen as it is relatively well-defined. If Grove Farm were to be developed for housing, the boundary between the housing development and the Green Belt would need to be strong, with appropriate screening vegetation added to the existing boundary where necessary. The importance of the 'strategic gap' between Ormskirk and Burscough is recognised, and the likelihood of the Council supporting further development along this 'gap' if / once Grove Farm is developed is minimal.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1329  
**Consultee name** John Barlow  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Developing Grove Farm would cross a postcode boundary (L39 / L40), effectively merging Ormskirk and Burscough; hundreds of properties considered by WLDC to be in Ormskirk would actually have Burscough addresses. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Even if the Grove Farm development were to cross a postcode boundary, this would not contribute 'on the ground' to the two settlements merging, and is not considered to be a material reason for ruling out development at Grove Farm.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1330  
**Consultee name** John Barlow  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** a) Recreational space should be provided at Grove Farm, rather than relying on existing facilities on the Scott Estate. b) There are social issues in close proximity to Grove Farm, which may affect the sale value of properties there. It might be wise to repair and landscape Hawthorn Road, or close the footpath at its western end, or both. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. a) The development of Grove Farm will require provision of open space on the site, commensurate with the size of the development, rather than relying on facilities elsewhere. b) Whilst the Grove Farm development cannot be expected to address social problems nearby, the comments regarding the footpath to Hawthorn Road will be taken into account. Increased 'natural surveillance' from extra properties in the Grove Farm area may help deter crime.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 1331  
**Consultee name** John Barlow  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The Grove Farm site has significant wildlife value, in particular a wide variety of bird species. There may also be great crested newts breeding to the north east of the site. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Policy EN2 of the draft Local Plan states that 'where there is reason to suspect that there may be protected species on or close to a proposed development site, planning applications should be accompanied by a survey assessing the presence of such species and, where appropriate, making provision for their needs'.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**Chapter/Policy Number:** 7.2

**Title:** Affordable and Specialist Housing

---

**ID** 314

**Consultee name** Mr John Watt

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Support

**Summary** Support for affordable housing. There has been too much emphasis on retail. The design of the schemes should readily allow for residents to be able to walk and cycle to facilities such as shops in the neighbourhood. Furthermore, such an approach will contribute to maintenance of healthy living through modest exercise. (S)

**Outcome** Comments noted. A suitable mix of housing is desired, in line with the government's aim of creating mixed communities. It is agreed that affordable units are a priority in most of the Borough. Energy efficiency and sustainable locations are supported, especially locations where residents can access services on foot or by bicycle. The objective of providing sufficient retail facilities in the Borough is to lessen the need of residents to travel elsewhere to buy goods.

**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 523

**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad      Lathom South Parish Council

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** 7.37 - The 35% requirement is itself a compromise figure, recognising the difficulty of dealing with the current shortfall of affordable housing. By effectively discounting the provision of 100% affordable housing schemes, and applying the standards set out in the policy statement on pages 105 and 106, the Council has no mathematical possibility of meeting the 35% target.

**Outcome** Comments noted. The Plan does not state that 35% is an overall target for affordable housing delivery. It is agreed that overall, less than 35% of housing developed is likely to be affordable.

**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 524  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Chapter 7 Providing for Housing and Residential Accommodation, page 108, para 7.40 - This wording allows for off-site provision to be made long distances away from development sites. The wording should set a distance (we suggest 1 kilometre). (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Whilst, in certain cases, the Council's definition of 'in the locality' could mean some distance away (e.g. on the far edge of a large settlement or parish), it is considered that, given housing needs have been assessed at parish level, the definition given in paragraph 7.40 is the most appropriate. It can, however, be stipulated that considering neighbouring parishes will be exceptional.  
**Officer recommendation** Alter wording of paragraph 7.40 to stipulate that 'in an adjacent parish' will be 'in exceptional cases'.

---

**ID** 525  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The targets set for housing development, when assessed in relation to tables 13 and 15 of the 2011 Annual Monitoring Report Technical paper 2: Housing, reveal that risk-assessed figures are fully taken up in most areas outside Skelmersdale. It is clear that affordable housing delivery is proving difficult already. Parked sites in those areas should re-assessed and, in addition, the Borough Council should enter into early discussions with Parish Councils to identify small rural plots that could be developed with 100% affordable housing for the benefit of their communities and without significant detriment to the areas concerned. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. It is agreed that affordable housing delivery is difficult but necessary in many rural areas. The Local Plan allows for 100% affordable housing schemes on land where market housing is not permissible (e.g. Protected Land). Some such sites are within the 0-15 year supply in the SHLAA; others are parked. Parked sites are reassessed each time the SHLAA is updated, to reflect any market or policy changes. The Council would welcome discussion with Parish Councils over possible sites suitable for 100% affordable housing schemes. Careful attention would need to be paid towards who would deliver such schemes.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 753  
**Consultee name** Mr William Robinson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** 3.3 Mr & Mrs Robinson accept the affordable and specialist housing percentages being proposed if the land off School Lane was allocated for housing. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 809  
**Consultee name** Mrs J Lawson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Suggestion of 2 sites potentially suitable for affordable housing, and request that they be accommodated within affordable housing / Green Belt policy (S).  
**Outcome** Comments and site suggestions noted. This Local Plan does not propose the allocation of any specific sites for affordable housing, in the Green Belt or elsewhere. It is considered that the proposed policy for housing in the Green Belt is appropriate, i.e. 'very limited' (up to 4 units) affordable housing may be permitted in the Green Belt if there are no suitable sites within non-Green Belt areas. A limit of 4 provides an appropriate balance between meeting affordable housing needs and protecting the openness of the Green Belt.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 811  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad      Parbold Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Parbold Parish Council cannot see affordable housing being built in Parbold, as the only land available is green belt which would be far too expensive for affordable housing. It is said that the ten houses possibly proposed for Parbold could be back garden infill, but again the only gardens big enough are mainly on The Common and Tan House, Some of those back gardens have already been built on regardless of the surface water/drainage/sewerage problems. The Parish believe that there is an urgent need to stop back land infill here in Parbold even though it goes against what WLBC say in the Local Plan. The misery some residents have to put up with, flooding and sewerage during periods of heavy rain is unfair. In Parbold because of the topography surface water is a serious problem which the planners do not take into consideration, you do not have to walk very far before you are going up / downhill. (F)  
**Outcome** It is recognised that there are limited housing development sites within the Parbold settlement boundary; the SHLAA shows a small number of sites, some of which could possibly be considered for affordable housing. Drainage / flooding issues should be taken into consideration in each individual planning application for housing, whether backland or elsewhere, each case being treated on its merits.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---



**ID** 884

**Consultee name** Mr Bob Coventry

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** The current economic climate the housing market is currently being driven by the affordable housing targets/ needs. The survey indicated that 70% of housing development in West Lancs. should be made affordable and also identifies the areas of greatest need. Skelmersdale or Lathom South parish does not fall within those areas identified. The figure 70% indicated is fantasy, although the report concedes that this is unrealistic, but makes reference to a figure of 35%. The plan as published has no chance of meeting the reduced 35% target. The percentages quoted are unachievable and thus bound to fail. (S)

**Outcome** The Housing Needs and Demand Study recommends that an affordable housing target of 35% be set, but the Local Plan makes no assumption that this will be achieved - there are lower requirements in certain areas, for smaller developments (and no requirement below the threshold of 8 dwellings), and the policy clearly states that the viability of each scheme will be taken into account, which in the current market means the specified percentages may well not be met. This is not a failure of the plan, but a demonstration of the Plan's realism, flexibility and responsiveness, in line with national policy. The Atkinson Kirby application was assessed primarily against the adopted (2006) Local Plan, not this emerging one.

**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1030

**Consultee name** Mr Francis Williams Ormskirk Friends of the Earth

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Observations

**Summary** We believe that the need for affordable housing in Ormskirk is acute, as so many houses in the town centre which will be available otherwise as starter homes, are in multiple occupation by students, and the need for affordable accommodation in Ormskirk is thus more acute.

**Outcome** Comments noted. It is in the light of this issue that Policy RS3 has been drawn up, although the Council has been largely powerless before now to control the proliferation of houses in multiple occupation.

**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1105

**Consultee name** Mr Keith Williams Burscough Parish Council

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Observations

**Summary** There is a need for affordable housing in Burscough. It is suggested that the affordable housing policy of the Borough Council needs to show a commitment to use any land it owns or that is in public ownership to deliver affordable housing to rent across the Borough.(S)

**Outcome** Comments noted. It is agreed that there is a need for affordable housing across the Borough, and in certain instances the Borough Council will consider / has considered building affordable housing on land in its ownership. However, this is generally not widespread, and a statement committing the Council to use any land in its ownership (or in other public ownership) to deliver affordable housing is not considered appropriate.

**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1139  
**Consultee name** Adrian James  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Plan A mentioned above would also have allowed for a town sports centre and 700 student lets close to the University campus thus cutting the amount of travelling needing to be undertaken by the students with a consequent reduction in traffic problems. There is a lack of affordable housing in Ormskirk. This need is caused to a great extent because when cheaper properties come on the market they are bought by private landlords and turned into student lets. The solution to this problem is to provide more student accommodation nearer the University of the type mentioned above. There is considerable concern about the number of empty business premises in the town centre of Ormskirk. Why does the council not think about giving planning permission for some of these to be turned into residential accommodation? This would ease the housing problem and bring more people into the town centre with a consequent benefit for the town centre businesses. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Reasons for the rejection of the 'non-preferred option' are set out in the Strategic Options and Green Belt Release Technical Paper. Policies EC4 and RS3 seek to address the student accommodation issue by supporting student accommodation on campus whilst restricting it elsewhere in Ormskirk, and by limiting the number of conversions from dwelling houses to houses in multiple occupation in the town. Policy IF1 (and the National Planning Policy Framework) allows for the conversion of certain town centre properties to residential, although this needs to be balanced against maintaining a vital and viable town centre with an adequate supply of retail premises.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1173  
**Consultee name** D Lewis  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Although you have set a target for the number of affordable houses for each site, you make no mention within the entire development plan of any requirements for rental accommodation or social housing provision for the elderly. (F)  
**Outcome** There is a requirement for rental accommodation within Policy RS2 ('the majority' of the affordable housing requirement; a more precise figure is not set in the Local Plan, but may possibly be specified in a future Supplementary Planning Document), and there is a requirement for housing provision for the elderly in Policy RS1 (20% of units in developments of 15 or more units). These requirements may overlap or coincide - when specific schemes are proposed, the Council's Housing Strategy and Development Manager advises as to the best type of accommodation to provide in particular areas, taking into account the Housing Needs and Demand Study.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1200  
**Consultee name** Mr Roger Clayton South Lathom Residents Association  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Affordable housing need and elderly accommodation is not addressed adequately in the plan. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. In order to deliver affordable housing, the level of demand placed on developers needs to be high enough to deliver a good number of units of affordable housing (and other benefits), but not so high that it makes development unviable and discourages development from happening. It is considered that the plan strikes the right balance with its requirements. Locational constraints, e.g. wastewater infrastructure, are beyond the Council's control. If the Objector has a better proven way of delivering affordable housing, this should be brought to the Council's attention. Policy RS1 has a requirement that 20% of new housing be designed for the elderly, that dwellings meet the Lifetime Homes Standard, and provides support for "extra care" type developments in appropriate locations.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1280  
**Consultee name** Mr David Grimshaw  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** It is our view that delivering affordable housing is a significant challenge for most local authorities in the UK. One of the reasons for this is that the underlying costs to the developer of constructing new houses is increasing primarily as a result of new regulations that rightly insist on better quality construction. Having said that it is also true that the single largest component of building new homes is the cost of the land which driven by scarcity value is also increasing in value. It is the agreed position of Mr Mawdsley that should this land be made available for development he would be open to discussions with West Lancashire Council with his preferred builder Grimshaw Construction Ltd to value the land at a level consistent with building affordable housing. This is an economic model that could be replicated in other parts of the borough. (F)  
**Outcome** Support noted.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Policy RS2**

**Title: Affordable Housing**

---

**ID** 97

**Consultee name** Church Commissioners For England

**Agent Name** Miss Jennifer Hadland Smiths Gore

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** Viability is a major factor with regard to the development rate of any new dwelling. We acknowledge that the Council will take account of viability when assessing each scheme. We consider the affordable housing threshold should be increased from 8 to 10 units or more, in line with the current Interim Housing Policy. We question the viability of retaining the element of the policy which refers to 100% affordable housing sites and would advise that an element of market housing needs to be introduced into such schemes. (S)

**Outcome** The Affordable Housing Viability Study, which is more recent than the evidence underpinning the Interim Housing Policy, advises that the threshold can be as low as 4 units whilst maintaining viability. The threshold of 8 is considered viable and reasonable. Viability will be taken into account in every scheme, and if the required percentage is clearly shown to be unviable, a lower percentage may be accepted. 100% affordable housing schemes have been achieved in various parts of the Borough in recent years, and are thus considered deliverable.

**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 521

**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Support with conditions

**Summary** We support the percentages quoted in the table.

**Outcome** Comments noted

**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 522  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** A. We believe that there will be demand for apartments in the actual centre of the town and that there could be an affordable element of around 20%. The developers are getting land and return on commercial premises out of the arrangement and that should underpin a greater component of affordable housing than 10%. Towards the outskirts of the development area there will be space for three- and four- bedroomed housing, again with demand and finance to support an affordable element above 10%. B. Outside Skelmersdale, although the percentages are supported, the 10 year delay in starting developments can only make the affordable housing situation worse, so the Council needs to allocate sites for 100% affordable housing and then work actively to deliver them. In rural settlements, the demographic changes forecast will have an extremely damaging effect unless small 100% affordable housing schemes are delivered using council initiatives, rather than waiting for proposals from developers. (F)  
**Outcome** A. As has been alluded to elsewhere by this Objector, delivering the Town Centre regeneration will be a challenging task. It is considered that a 10% requirement is appropriate. Doubling this requirement, even if it does not make schemes unviable in such an area, may put developers off investing in the Town Centre. Taking a masterplanned approach, profits from housing in parts of the Town Centre can be used to help finance other less profitable development in the town centre. (See rep. 517.) B. Comments noted. Whilst the Council has not allocated sites for 100% affordable housing (only large sites have been allocated), such uses will be supported on most housing sites. The Council does not have the resources to deliver a significant number of such schemes itself, but can work with developers to help facilitate such proposals.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 539  
**Consultee name** Mr Bryan Pready  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** I support this policy which seeks to maintain access to housing for those, especially younger adults with children, who would otherwise be excluded. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 598  
**Consultee name** Mr Robin Buckley Redrow Homes (Lancs) Ltd  
**Agent Name** Mr Tony McAteer  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** a) Objection to proposed affordable housing requirements, which are excessive and adversely affect viability, in particular the 35% requirement, which should be removed. b) Specialist housing needs to be defined and justified. c) Objection to the unjustified 80% social rented tenure. (S)  
**Outcome** a) The justification for the proposed affordable housing requirements is set out in the 2010 Affordable Housing Viability Study (as referred to in paragraph 7.36 of the Local Plan), which concluded that a 35% requirement was viable, even for developments significantly smaller than 15 units. Viability is taken into account on a case-by-case basis, as stated in the policy. b) The policy refers to specialist housing for the elderly, and gives examples. This more flexible approach is considered preferable to attempting to define exactly what specialist housing comprises (a definition which could change over time). The justification for specialist housing is set out in the Plan (i.e. the ageing population) and in the Housing Technical Paper. c) The justification for the social rented tenure requirement is set out in paragraph 7.45 of the draft Local Plan and based upon the 2010 Housing Needs and Demand Study (page xiv).  
**Officer recommendation** Make more explicit in the policy justification the reasons /justification for the affordable housing requirement (i.e. the Housing Needs and Viability Studies).

---

**ID** 802  
**Consultee name** Mr Robert W. Pickavance  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** A large amount of affordable housing has already been passed in Banks; this is in the northern parishes. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The affordable housing granted over recent years in the Northern Parishes, whilst significant, has not been enough to meet the Northern Parishes' affordable housing needs.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 847  
**Consultee name** Anglo International Up Holland Ltd  
**Agent Name** Ms Lorraine Davison DPP  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Amendments suggested to the policy: 'In instances where residential development can be demonstrated to be enabling development that will deliver other plan objectives and / or planning benefits, the Council will not seek an allowance for affordable units.' Amendments also suggested to policy justification. (S)  
**Outcome** 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. It was also recognised that affordable housing should not be required as the proposed scheme was enabling development. 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. As with other objections on behalf of Anglo International, the Council does not consider it appropriate or necessary to add wording to Local Plan Policy RS2 to refer to this specific scenario.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 890  
**Consultee name** Messrs R & J Pickavance Messrs R & J Pickavance  
**Agent Name** Mr Glyn Bridge McDyre & Co.  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The council needs to be careful in its increasing demands on housebuilders in the current very poor housing market. Whilst there are safeguards regarding viability, we still think the affordable homes requirement needs to be realistic in the first place. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The 35% affordable housing requirement is based upon a robust viability study prepared during the current difficult economic circumstances. Policy RS2 clearly states that viability will be taken into account when determining the percentage of affordable housing required. The viability calculations will take account of costs such as open space provision and meeting the Lifetime Homes Standard. A Dynamic Viability model may be used to account for changes in build costs and house prices over time. Private market units designed for the elderly may not necessarily lead to less profitability for developers, and, furthermore, these could in theory be part of the affordable housing element.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1031  
**Consultee name** Mr Francis Williams Ormskirk Friends of the Earth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** There is no need for a lower limit of 8-9 houses, so that if four are built, at least one should be affordable housing. We believe that all new housing in Ormskirk should be affordable to address the huge imbalance, but failing this, there of the affordable housing requirement should be one third, with no lower limit. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Whilst the Affordable Housing Viability Study advises that a lower limit as low as 4 could be chosen, along with a 25% requirement (or 35% for 6 units and over), this needs to be balanced against the need to ensure the delivery of such housing. If very stringent requirements are put in place, this may prevent developers, especially smaller builders, from building in the first place, and the Council then loses out on attaining any affordable housing. It is considered that a lower limit of 8 units provides an acceptable balance between obtaining affordable housing units for a wide range of developments, and providing a policy framework that encourages housing development in appropriate places.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1115  
**Consultee name** Chris Henshall  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** The HCA notes the proposed policies in respect of affordable housing, and supports the Council's intention to take viability factors into account when assessing individual schemes. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1153  
**Consultee name** Mr Robin Buckley Redrow Homes (Lancs) Ltd  
**Agent Name** Mr Tony McAteer  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** a) Objection to proposed affordable housing requirements, which are excessive and affect viability, in particular the 35% requirement, which should be removed. b) Specialist housing needs to be defined and justified. c) Objection to the unjustified 80% social rented tenure. (S)  
**Outcome** a) The justification for the proposed affordable housing requirements is set out in the 2010 Viability Study (as referred to in paragraph 7.36), which concluded that a 35% requirement was viable. Viability will be taken into account on a case-by-case basis, as stated in the policy. b) The policy refers to specialist housing for the elderly, and gives examples. This more flexible approach is considered preferable to attempting to define exactly what specialist housing comprises (a definition which could change over time). The justification for specialist housing is set out in the Plan (i.e. the ageing population) and in the Housing Technical Paper. c) The justification for the social rented tenure requirement is set out in paragraph 7.45 of the draft Local Plan and based upon the 2010 Housing Needs and Demand Study (page xiv).  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---



**ID** 1202  
**Consultee name** Mr Leslie Connor The Jean and Leslie Connor Charitable Foundation  
**Agent Name** Mr Tony McAteer  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Policy RS2 should allocate specific sites for accommodation for the elderly, and should recognise that such schemes can be considered as an exception to normal planning policy. (S)  
**Outcome** The Plan does not go so far as to allocate sites for elderly accommodation (neither does the plan allocate sites, or even suggest that it will do so, for affordable housing), but such accommodation, if Class C3, is likely to be supported on any allocated housing site, and on any other appropriate unallocated development site. It is not agreed that schemes for elderly accommodation should be considered as an exception to normal planning policy, neither is it judged appropriate for the policy to state that such schemes can be considered as an exception to normal planning policy.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1240  
**Consultee name** Ms Karen Martindale  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The threshold for bringing affordable housing forward should be 3, not 8. If this is not done, then different rates for affordable housing provision should apply across the Borough. The economy is likely to pick up during the Plan and developers will develop small sites, avoiding the threshold, which cannot be changed following adoption. There should be novel ways of providing affordable housing, not just via market housing developments. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Whilst it is recognised that the Affordable Housing Viability Study suggests a threshold as low as 4 can be applied, in the current economic situation it is judged that a low threshold may stifle almost all development, especially given other demands placed on developers. If the economy picks up and there is robust evidence that the Council is significantly 'missing out' on affordable housing, the Plan can be reviewed to lower the threshold. (The Dynamic Viability model allows for the percentage requirement to be varied as the economy changes.) A variable rate across the Borough is considered too complex, and to robustly justify such a policy (especially if it is to last 15 years) would involve a disproportionate amount of work. For this reason, a distinction is made between central Skelmersdale, elsewhere in Skelmersdale, and elsewhere in the Borough, but no other variations are included. Ideas such as self-build are supported; provision of 100% affordable housing schemes (and also schemes with a proportion of market housing to aid viability, in line with NPPF paragraph 54) are also supported.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

<b>ID</b>	1256
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Andrew Thorley                      Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd
<b>Agent Name</b>	Miss Caroline Simpson                  Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	1. The AHVS does not support a target of 35%. The affordable housing target on sites of more than 15 dwellings is unrealistic and should be reduced to 30%. The targets for smaller schemes should also be reduced accordingly. 2. Taylor Wimpey agrees that affordable housing should be negotiated on a site by site basis. 3. Taylor Wimpey requests that the tenure split on affordable homes clarifies whether affordable private rented dwellings are included. 4. Taylor Wimpey UK Limited objects to the expectation that all affordable homes should be built to Life Time Homes Standard as there is no justification for this in the Council's evidence base. (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	1. The Affordable Housing Viability Study does not say that a 35% requirement is unviable, but that a 35% requirement should not result in schemes being unviable. Moreover, the AHVS advises that a 35% requirement could be applied to a lower threshold than is used in the Plan. Thus the 35% Plan requirement is justified by the AHVS (and, moreover, the Plan is less 'onerous' than the AHVS suggests). The AHVS was carried out in 2009/10, during the current recession, and the economy may well pick up during the Plan period. It is therefore not considered appropriate to lower the 35% requirement at this point. If the 35% requirement renders a particular scheme unviable, the policy allows for a lower requirement to be used. 2. Comment noted. 3. With regard to the tenure split, detailed requirements are not included in the Local Plan. Once the Council has robust information on the implications of Affordable Rent (AR) for the Borough, an SPD will provide, inter alia, the details of tenure split. To answer the Objector's query, the Council considers affordable rent as intermediate, rather than social rented, accommodation. 4. Comments regarding Lifetime Homes are noted (see Rep. 1254).
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	Reword the justification of Policy RS2 (paragraphs 7.37, 7.45) to make it more clear regarding the Affordable Housing Viability Study, the forthcoming SPD, and affordable rent.

---

<b>ID</b>	1320
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Duncan Gregory Gladman
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	<p>It is recommended that Policy RS2 specifies a 30% affordable housing target for developments of 15 dwellings or more. We do not support a higher affordable housing requirement of 35%. It is not a commercially realistic target that will enable developments to come forward and deliver affordable housing. We support the Core Strategy's approach towards the issue of viability. If schemes are unable to deliver the full affordable housing requirement robust viability evidence needs to be submitted to demonstrate why this is the case. There should be a five year supply of affordable housing, and this should be monitored. (S)</p>
<b>Outcome</b>	<p>Comments noted, and generally agreed with, with the following exceptions: 1) It is considered that the proposed 35% affordable housing target should remain in the policy. The Affordable Housing Viability Study advises that a 35% requirement should not result in schemes being unviable. This study was carried out in 2009, in a time of recession. The economy may well pick up during the Plan period, and it is therefore not considered appropriate to lower the 35% requirement to 30% at this point. If such a requirement renders a particular scheme unviable, the policy allows for a lower requirement to be used in that case, subject to the presentation of robust viability data. 2) Five year supply of affordable housing - whilst the delivery of affordable housing is supported, and is a priority, it is considered that to bind the Council to maintaining a five year supply of affordable housing would not be appropriate. Given affordable housing need, it is unlikely the Council would ever be able to achieve a five year supply of affordable housing. There is no national policy requirement for such a supply. (NPPF paragraph 47 bullet 4 talks about housing land in general, not disaggregated to market and affordable housing land.) The Council already monitors affordable housing permissions and delivery.</p>
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change.

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: 7.3**

**Title: Provision of Student Accommodation**

---

**ID** 175

**Consultee name** Ms Jane Thompson

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** (a) NWTRA wish for 5% HMOs on ALL streets and roads; 1. Numbers of students per HMO needs to be taken into account. 2. Clustering needs to be taken into account - maybe have a clause preventing HMOs either side of a house. 3. The policy should address purpose-built student accommodation (which are not HMOs) 4. Parking for HMOs needs to be addressed. (S)

**Outcome** Comments noted. It is considered appropriate to go above 5% in certain busier streets for the reasons set out in the policy justification. Several of the busier streets already have HMO percentages above the 10%/15% limits proposed by the policies. With regard to the numbered points: 1. The fact that HMOs tend to have more occupants than the average small dwelling in Ormskirk is a factor that has been taken into account when arriving at the general 5% HMO limit. Paragraph 7.63 already mentions numbers of students per HMO being taken into account when assessing potential impact. 2. The policy already contains a phrase regarding clustering. A sentence could be added to the justification to highlight the scenario such as an HMO either side of a house. However, the policy as it stands is considered adequate. 3. Policy RS3 already addresses purpose-built (non-HMO) student accommodation. 4. Rather than having a specific parking policy for HMOs, the general Local Plan parking policy (IF2) has built-in flexibility to cover different types of development, and takes into account the sustainability of a particular site (proximity to bus, rail, cycle routes, etc.). The potential impact on the locality of each occupant having a car would be one of the matters taken into account when considering an application for an HMO.

**Officer recommendation** Add sentence to Policy RS3 justification regarding clustering of HMOs.

---

**ID** 526

**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** Student accommodation uses waste water infrastructure in the same way that housing does. There is an inconsistency between this policy, with no restraint up to 2020, and restraint of new housing development in Ormskirk until after 2020.

**Outcome** Comments noted. (See Rep. 1181.) Proposals for student accommodation would be subject to conditions requiring a foul drainage scheme to be approved by the Local Planning Authority before development of such accommodation takes place. This point could be clarified in the justification of Policy RS3.

**Officer recommendation** Consider adding a sentence to Policy RS3 justification to clarify this point.

---

**ID** 527  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** We fully support this policy.  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1228  
**Consultee name** Mr PF McLaughlin  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** The Council should continue to vigorously apply the limit in numbers to Houses of Multiple Occupation, for student accommodation and should look to extend the roads and areas that this affects (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The policy extends to all areas covered by the Article 4 Direction (i.e. all of Ormskirk, Aughton and Westhead). It is not possible to extend this area without creating a new Article 4 Direction, separate from the Local Plan. If indeed a new Article 4 Direction were to be created in future, Policy RS3 covers this eventuality. It is in recognition of problems with cheaper housing being converted to HMOs that the Article 4 Direction and Policy RS3 were drawn up. The Council will continue to monitor the situation.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Policy RS3**

**Title: Provision of Student Accommodation**

---

**ID** 540  
**Consultee name** Mr Bryan Pready  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** I support this policy. There is a very real need to restrict the numbers of HMOs in Ormskirk in order to mitigate their impact on other residents. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 935  
**Consultee name** Mr Peter Banks  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** I am in full support of a policy of restricting HMO's but as it cannot retrospectively reverse conversions that already exceed the limits on many roads, it should be extended so that no HMO conversions are permitted in roads and streets that are adjacent to existing roads where the new limits are already exceeded. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Whilst HMOs in one street may possibly have impacts on houses in neighbouring streets, it is considered that to apply a ban on HMOs in streets adjacent to those where the limit is already exceeded is difficult to justify. Most streets have a 5% limit, which in practice, means very few, if any, more HMOs.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1241  
**Consultee name** Ms Karen Martindale  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Support the Article 4 Direction covering Ormskirk / Aughton and Westhead. A distinction is required between student and other HMOs. Young professionals may also share a house; the owner may live in an HMO. Purpose-built student accommodation should be counted in some way against housing needs.  
**Outcome** Whilst the logic is understood behind the suggestion that a distinction needs to be made between student HMOs and other (young professional) HMOs, the national definition of HMOs / Use Class C4 makes no such distinction, and there is nothing in the current planning policy framework that could allow such a distinction to be made in policy terms. The point regarding student accommodation potentially contributing towards housing land supply (by freeing up HMOs) is noted. However, it is impossible to quantify how much effect this might have over the plan period. Also, if the University were to expand in future, extra student numbers are not taken account of in population projections, and this has not been factored into housing requirements. Generally speaking, if sufficient accommodation is built to meet the needs of new students moving to the area, there should be an overall neutral effect on housing need.  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: 7.4**

**Title: Provision for Gypsy & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople**

---

<b>ID</b>	834
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Steve Staines Friends, Families & Travellers
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Support with conditions
<b>Summary</b>	Recommendations for changes to the policy. (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	<p>The Council acknowledges that there is an unmet need in provision and is attempting to meet this need through this policy. Under the new national planning policy for traveller sites authorities can set their own targets based on historical demand. The Council is confident this has been done within the policy. Any sites built and managed will be so by private businesses/individuals and therefore their delivery is largely outside of the realms of the Council. As such it is very difficult for the Council to put a timescale in place for when sites will be delivered. The reason 3 pitches were chosen was because Government Guidance- Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites- A Good Practice Guide recommended that ideally sites should consist of a maximum of 15 pitches (as stated in the justification) and that with the required number of 21 pitches it was felt that allowing development on up to 3 pitches would allow for flexibility if only smaller sites are available or can be accommodated. The required number of pitches can still be met on less pitches. The Council is confident that this approach is in line with national policy and will help deliver the required number of pitches within West Lancashire.</p>
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	The Council will remove the wording for maximum pitch targets.

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Policy RS4**

**Title: Provision for Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople**

---

**ID** 273

**Consultee name** Mrs Alice de la Rue NFGLG

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** Object to setting limit on pitch figures and number of sites. Criteria are too restrictive, contrary to national policy. Restricting all sites to broad locations is unnecessarily restrictive, though allocations to meet existing need in those locations should be a priority.

**Outcome** The Council's targets for the provision of Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople was set using information based on the Lancashire Sub-Region Gypsy and Traveller Accomodation Assesment. The Council is confident that the policy criteria is a suitable local interperotation of nation policy. The broad locations identified are based on historic trends and also from discussions with memebers of the local gypsy traveller and travelling showpeople community. The Council are confident that that this approach is in line with national policy.

**Officer recommendation** The Council will remove the wording for maximum pitch targets. The Council is confident that we have selected the correct broad locations based on historical need and form spaeking with members of the travelling community. Along with the spcific criteria

---

**ID** 541

**Consultee name** Mr Bryan Pready

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Support

**Summary** I support this policy. (F)

**Outcome** Comments of support noted

**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 879

**Consultee name** Mr Philip Carter Environment Agency

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Support

**Summary** Residential caravan sites for permanent occupation are defined as 'highly vulnerable' developments in PPS25 and we support part c) v. of Policy RS4 as it will ensure that high risk development will not be supported in areas at risk of flooding.

**Outcome** Comments of support noted

**Officer recommendation** No action required

---



**Chapter/Policy Number: 8.1**

**Title: Maintaining Vibrant Town and Local Centres**

---

<b>ID</b>	528
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad      Lathom South Parish Council
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Observations
<b>Summary</b>	"A part" is meaningless and "wherever possible" compounds the problem. (F)
<b>Outcome</b>	Whilst it is preferable for non-retail businesses to have operating hours that coincide with 'normal' (9-5) hours, it is not realistic to demand that businesses can be open during the whole of this period, hence the 'get-out clauses'.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Policy IF1**

**Title: Maintaining Vibrant Town and Local Centres**

---

**ID** 542  
**Consultee name** Mr Bryan Pready  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** I support this policy, though I would like to see WLBC doing more to promote and sustain our town centres, in addition to what it is able to do via planning controls. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 936  
**Consultee name** Mr Peter Banks  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** I support this policy. Everything possible needs to be done to promote, support and maintain the character of our town centres and particularly the 'market town' character of Ormskirk Centre. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

**ID** 1019  
**Consultee name** Sainsburys Supermarkets Ltd  
**Agent Name** Ms Anna Noble Turley Associates  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Sainsbury's support the aim of Policy IF1. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No change

---

<b>ID</b>	1291
<b>Consultee name</b>	St Modwen Properties PLC
<b>Agent Name</b>	John Francis
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	Change of wording suggested to policy and justification to heighten the need to direct or encourage wherever possible new retail development in locations that have the potential to contribute towards other plan objectives, particularly regeneration. (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	Comments noted. It is not considered necessary to specifically mention the Skelmersdale Strategic Development Site, nor to cross-refer to contributing towards the delivery of other Local Plan regeneration objectives. These are explicit / implicit elsewhere in the Local Plan. In terms of the justification paragraph, whilst the proposed wording is generally agreed with, it is considered too lengthy. It is not considered necessary to argue for a major new foodstore in Skelmersdale Town Centre within the Policy IF1 justification.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change.

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: 8.2**

**Title: Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice**

---

**ID** 29  
**Consultee name** Mr Eric Daish  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Support the introduction of trams between Ormskirk and Skelmersdale (S).  
**Outcome** The Council does not believe that a tramway between Ormskirk & Skelmersdale would be financially viable and has been pursuing alternative transportation schemes.  
**Officer recommendation** No further action required

---

**ID** 77  
**Consultee name** Alan Syder  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Why is the Ormskirk Bypass continuing to be supported if there is no funding in the New Local Plan period for it? The Council should stop spending funds on surveys to look at improving transport and congestion issues in Ormskirk and start spending money actually making improvements.  
**Outcome** The Ormskirk by-pass is a long standing aspiration for both the Borough and County Council. The Borough Council hopes that funding will become available within the Local Plan period. Until such time when the by-pass has been ruled out in the long term the Council will continue to support the inclusion of the by-pass. The Council is also supportive of any smaller scale measure to be included to relieve congestion around Ormskirk.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 132  
**Consultee name** J Berry  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Need a policy to reduce traffic and encourage cycling. Need a rail link to Skelmersdale and electric trains from Ormskirk to Burscough. (S)  
**Outcome** The Council is actively trying to encourage cycling throughout West Lancashire and reduce congestion. The Council is also pursuing options for a direct rail link to Skelmersdale. When further work has been concluded the Council will have a better understanding of the potential routes and location of a rail station. The Council is working with Merseytravel to examine options for electrification to Burscough.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 185  
**Consultee name** J Briethaupt  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** I think WLBC should replace their statements in the local plan supporting a bypass with statements supporting small-scale traffic improvements in Ormskirk. (S)  
**Outcome** The Council will continue to support proposals for the Ormskirk by-pass until such time as the long term viability has been ruled out. Although the Policy does make reference to some smaller scale measures to improve accessibility through Ormskirk an addition to the policy will be made to include supporting appropriate measures for smaller scale improvements within Ormskirk to the highway network.  
**Officer recommendation** Additional criteria within the policy to read: Support improvements where appropriate for smaller scale measures in Ormskirk to improve the highway network.

---

**ID** 1176  
**Consultee name** D Lewis  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Need for sustainable transport and improvement of traffic flows through Ormskirk town centre. Need a bypass. (S)  
**Outcome** The Borough Council is supportive of smaller scale improvement to improve the flow of traffic through Ormskirk.  
**Officer recommendation** Additional criteria within the policy to read: Support improvements where appropriate for smaller scale measures in Ormskirk to improve the highway network.

---

**ID** 1191  
**Consultee name** Mr John Gardner  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** I support the proposed transport improvements but don't hold your breath re the Ormskirk bypass which to my knowledge has been proposed for well over 75 years! (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No further action required

---

**ID** 1196  
**Consultee name** Mr John Gardner  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Thank you for recognising the merits of carbon reduction through the use of ultra low carbon / electric vehicles and the benefits these can have for the environment. I am in no doubt that you will be aware that motorcycles produce considerably less carbon emissions than cars as well as being more environmentally friendly and cause considerably less congestion and damage to the road infrastructure. They also require far less space for parking purposes. We are also pleased to see the inclusion of Motorcycle parking bays in Appendix F of your document, and would suggest that where possible charging points be included for electric bicycles and motorcycles as well as electric cars. We would have liked to have seen a reference to Two Wheels 2 work which you will know is a government backed scheme to encourage mobility to education, training and work in rural areas for people who don't have access to public transport for those purposes. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments of support noted. Through the provision of Electric Vehicle Recharging Points provision for motorcycles and electric cycles may be included. The Council is fully supportive of initiatives which seek to encourage sustainable means of transport including Wheels 2 Work schemes although the Council does not believe that these schemes need to be specifically mentioned within this policy.  
**Officer recommendation** No further action required.

---

**ID** 1235  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs JB Pincock  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** I am amazed at the apparent absence of infrastructure proposals or suggestions to improve the local road network and relieve the congestion in Ormskirk (S).  
**Outcome** Policy IF2 actively seeks to encourage use of sustainable means of transport and reduce congestion across the Borough including Ormskirk. However the Council intends to add an additional criteria to the policy encouraging small scale improvements in Ormskirk Town Centre to reduce congestion.  
**Officer recommendation** The Council intends to add an additional criteria to the policy encouraging small scale improvements in Ormskirk Town Centre to reduce congestion.

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Policy IF2**

**Title: Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice**

---

**ID** 543

**Consultee name** Mr Bryan Pready

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Support with conditions

**Summary** I strongly support this policy, whilst recognising that substantial public funding will be needed to make many of these aspirations a reality. The development of the Yew Tree Farm and Grove Farm sites will provide opportunities to greatly improve cycle links between residential and employment areas in Ormskirk and Burscough and the plan must ensure that these are identified and prioritised. The plan rightly identifies the need for Skelmersdale to have its own railway station and that this can best be provided by upgrading the Kirkby – Wigan route, which will need to be increased from its current single track and electrified. Whilst the proposal for a spur to a new station in Skelmersdale town centre would be advantageous for local residents, it will be costly and will not benefit other users of the line. The plan ought, perhaps, to make provision for another option, the creation of a new “Parkway” station on the existing line, adjacent to Skelmersdale’s southern industrial area. Such a station could have extensive “park and ride” facilities and good bus links to all parts of the town. (S)

**Outcome** Comments of support noted. In relation to fig 8.1 and the links to cycling the Council did not want to overcomplicate the map by putting on all proposed and existing cycle routes of which there are many, nor did we feel this was appropriate within the Local Plan. As part of the proposal for Yew Tree Farm cycling and pedestrian links will be included. In relation to proposals for a new rail station for Skelmersdale the Council has not decided where the rail station will be built or the exact route of the line. Further study is being undertaken by the Council which should help inform where the proposed rail line and station are located.

**Officer recommendation** No further action required

---

**ID** 685

**Consultee name** Mr David Cheetham

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Observations

**Summary** No need for a new bus station, need for new road in Skelmersdale (S)

**Outcome** Comments of support in relation to a new rail station noted. Although the Council has an aspiration of a new bus station for Skelmersdale Town Centre no locations have yet been decided of where the new bus station will be located. The Council has consulted Lancashire County Council highways department regarding all the Council’s proposed developments and they have said that providing appropriate mitigation measures are put in place they believe that the highway network can cope with the level of development. More detailed transport assessments will be conducted at the masterplan stage.

**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 814  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Parbold Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Parbold Parish Council would ask that if possible it be written into the local plan that HGV's/lorries should not be allowed to divert from the main road and travel through the centre of the village which lorries from Round O Quarry do. Some drivers obviously find it easier than trying to pass the parked cars on Alder Lane.(F)  
**Outcome** The local plan says it will support safety and quality of life for residents and would seek to support any initiatives put forward, however the Council does not feel that it would be appropriate to specifically mention this initiative in the policy.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 882  
**Consultee name** Mr Philip Carter Environment Agency  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** We are pleased to see that the Council is seeking to encourage the use of low emission vehicles through the provision of Electric Vehicle charging points in new development. We agree that this will help the Council contribute to reducing the emissions from transport within the borough.  
**Outcome** Comments of support noted  
**Officer recommendation** No further action required

---

**ID** 883  
**Consultee name** Mr Philip Carter Environment Agency  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** We are pleased to see that the Council is seeking to encourage the use of low emission vehicles through the provision of Electric Vehicle charging points in new development. We agree that this will help the Council contribute to reducing the emissions from transport within the borough. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments of support noted  
**Officer recommendation** No further action required

---



**ID** 937  
**Consultee name** Mr Peter Banks  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** One of the most important infrastructure developments, if not the most important, is improved rail links within the borough and onwards to the main rail network. Skelmersdale needs a station, which could potentially become the main station for the borough. It is therefore essential that plenty of car parking is provided at the station. It is also essential that a rail link is re-established from Ormskirk to Skelmersdale and on to Wigan to connect with the West Coast main line. Land for this station, and the associated car park and rail lines needs to be allocated and protected from any conflicting development.  
**Outcome** Comments of support noted and in particular the need to provide car parking at any new station and improve links to Wigan and the West Coast Main Line.  
**Officer recommendation** No Further Action Required

---

**ID** 938  
**Consultee name** Mr Peter Banks  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** We need the Ormskirk A570 bypass - but will it ever be built???  
**Outcome** Comments noted. The A570 Ormskirk bypass is a long standing aspiration for both the Council and Lancashire County Council. However there is presently a lack of funding to see its delivery and uncertainty about where future funding will come from. Lancashire County Council are currently exploring what small scale measures can be implemented to reduce congestion on the A570.  
**Officer recommendation** No further action required

---

**ID** 974  
**Consultee name** Strategy and Policy Group Lancashire County Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Part b of the policy relating to the delivery of transport schemes safeguards an extensive list of potential schemes. A greater degree of prioritisation is needed in order to be able to would allow a focus on those schemes which are key to the delivery of the plan. This could then be reflected in the development of the Community Infrastructure Levy. (F)  
**Outcome** The Council does not feel prioritising schemes would be appropriate within the Local Plan. Lancashire County Council are the transport authority and the Borough Council will continue to work with LCC on all transport related projects.  
**Officer recommendation** No further action required

---

**ID** 976  
**Consultee name** Strategy and Policy Group Lancashire County Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** There is a need to carry out Traffic Assesments.  
**Outcome** Comments regarding requirement for detailed Traffic Assesment noted. The Council have been working with LCC highways throughout the preperation of our Local Plan and will continue to involve LCC when more detailed Traffic assesments are undertaken.  
**Officer recommendation** No alteration to policy required. LCC to be consulted at appropriate time.

---

**ID** 1222  
**Consultee name** Town Planning Team LNW Network Rail  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** Additional comments required in relation to level crossing safety (S)  
**Outcome** The Council have considered the comments and beleive that they are unnecessary.  
• Any planning application which may increase the level of pedestrian and/or vehicular usage at a level crossing should be supported by a full Transport Assessment assessing such impact; and  
• The developer is required to fund any required qualitative improvements to the level crossing as a direct result of the development proposed. On the first bullet point the policy already seeks to actively promote travel plans in accordance with DfT guidance on Transport Assessments. So the Council does not feel we need to include the point On the second bullet point the Council believes this may be crossing over with CIL or be a consideration within S106 agreements at the planning application stage.  
**Officer recommendation** No further action required

---

**ID** 1266  
**Consultee name** Mr Andrew Thorley Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd  
**Agent Name** Miss Caroline Simpson Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** There is currently no justification to support the implementation of electric charging points and it is difficult to estimate the demand for such facilities over the life of the Local Plan. It is considered unreasonable to require that all developments provide EVRP and this should be removed from the policy. (S)  
**Outcome** The Council beleive that as green technology continues to develop the demand for elecetric cars and therefore Electric Vehicle Recharging points will also continue to grow. Elecetric Vehicle Recharging points are being set up in neighbouing authorities and the Council believe that this needs to be encouraged in West Lancashire as a cross boundary issue. Also this is a 15 year plan and the Council believe we are being pro-active in actively trying to provide for current and future needs.  
**Officer recommendation** No further action required

---

**ID** 1314  
**Consultee name** Mrs Margaret Wiltshire CPRE (West Lancs Group)  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** A by pass is not the right solution to Ormskirk's traffic problems. Less expensive and less destructive methods could be applied. Stronly support a new rail link to Skelmersdale. Improvements to Ormskirk bus station needed (S)  
**Outcome** Comments of support noted. In relation to the Ormskirk by-pass the Council will continue to support this scheme untill the long term viability of the scheme has been ruled out. The Council is working with LCC to examine what smaller scale measures can be put in place to reduce the impacts of traffic in Ormskirk. Additional criteria to be placed within the policy to say that the Council will support smaller scale schemes to help reduce the impacts of congestion around Ormskirk Town Centre.  
**Officer recommendation** Additional criteria to be added to read the Council will support smaller scale schemes to help reduce the impacts of congestion around Ormskirk Town Centre.

---

**ID** 1353  
**Consultee name** Mr Roger Bell OPSTA  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** We also favour the development of all railway stations in the borough to allow for: • step free access for disabled passengers • enhancement of their function as multi-modal transit points with: o adequate car and secure cycle parking, o easy to use bus train interchanges o and safe walking routes with adequate lighting and road crossing protection We appreciate that the Borough does not control these areas directly but should be minded to press for these points should the occasion arise. (f)  
**Outcome** The Borough Council agrees with the points made and will continue to work to make representations to the appropriate bodies.  
**Officer recommendation** Continue to work to make representatin to LCC and Network Rail.

---

**ID** 1355  
**Consultee name** Mr Roger Bell OPSTA  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** OPSTA have made a number of comments relating to aspirational schemes the Council is wokring towards. In particular they support the development of Ormskirk Rail/bus station into a full multi modal interchange, better segregation for cyclists and pedestrians and the improvements of traffic management facilities in Ormskirk.  
**Outcome** The Council are fully supportinve of many of the points made by OPSTA. However as West Lancashire BC is not a transport authority many of the suggestions are outside of the remit of the Council. The Council will however continue to push for these initiative to be completed by making comments to LCC and other appropriate bodies.  
**Officer recommendation** Continue to make representations seeking improvements to transport infrastructure in Ormskirk and other parts of the Borough.

---

**ID** 1357  
**Consultee name** Mr Roger Bell OPSTA  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** OPSTA support the council's proposed plans for the promotion and development of a re-established rail connection for Skelmersdale. This has been under discussion for almost fifty years.  
**Outcome** The Borough Council will continue to work with partners to push for improvements to rail facilities in West Lancashire . In particular the Council has already part financed a demand study. We have also agreed with partners LCC and Merseytravel to undertake a more detailed examination of the costs of potential options/routes which will form part of the GRIP 1 process. Once this work has been completed we should be in a better position to know where it at all a new route is possible/feasible.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 1358  
**Consultee name** Mr Roger Bell OPSTA  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Comments regarding support for aspirational schemes and concern over potential changes to services and rolling stock. Potential opportunities to improve services in line with other initiatives taking place outside of West Lancashire.  
**Outcome** West Lancashire Borough Council has been working in collaboration with Sefton Council, along with Lancashire County Council and Merseytravel to explore options for an appropriate link to be made to link the rail lines between Ormskirk, Burscough and Southport. Merseytravel have employed consultants to examine the feasibility of a range of potential options and we are awaiting the results. Where evidence is available the Borough Council has sought to protect routes so that they do not prejudice the delivery of future transportation projects. The Borough Council will continue to work with Lancashire County Council to ensure that appropriate representations are made to improve rail facilities across West Lancashire.  
**Officer recommendation** The Borough Council will continue to protect facilities for future transportation schemes and continue to push for improved rail services.

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Policy IF2**

**Title: Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice**

---

<b>ID</b>	977
<b>Consultee name</b>	Strategy and Policy Group      Lancashire County Council
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	Paragraph 8.35 is incorrect. There is no "proposed reinstatement of the Burscough Curves". This is at present aspirational. (F)
<b>Outcome</b>	Comments noted. Proposed change of wording to take place Replace proposed reinstatement to read aspirational reinstatement
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	Comments noted. Proposed change of wording to take place Replace proposed reinstatement to read aspirational reinstatement

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: 8.3**

**Title: Service Accessibility and Infrastructure for Growth**

---

**ID** 58  
**Consultee name** Mr Benny Gamero  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Cemetery in Skelmersdale / Up Holland requested (S).  
**Outcome** There is no obligation on Local Authorities or Central Government as a whole to provide cemeteries or to require others to do so. Therefore, West Lancashire Borough Council is responsible for the administration of the existing cemeteries but not for the provision of new sites. Any attempt to create a new cemetery or crematorium on land previously used for something else would be regarded as a material change of use of land. The developer would have to submit a planning application for consideration by the Council and this would be assessed in line with the Local Plan Policies. The Council empathises with your concern regarding the provision of cemeteries in Skelmersdale but unfortunately there are no plans to make such a provision within the LPPO.  
**Officer recommendation** No Change Required

---

**ID** 320  
**Consultee name** Ms Rose Freeman                      The Theatres Trust  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Given the amendments to Policies CS11 (now IF1) and CS13 (now IF3) as recommended in the Feedback Report, and the inclusion of theatres in Table F.4 Parking Standards, we support the document and have no further comment to make. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments Noted  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 1260  
**Consultee name** Mr Andrew Thorley                      Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd  
**Agent Name** Miss Caroline Simpson                      Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Policy IF3 is too onerous and should be reworded to state:- "Seek to mitigate impacts on the quality of existing infrastructure as a result of new development". (s)  
**Outcome** It is vital that new development meets its infrastructure requirements either through the use of existing capacity or by providing improvements to meet the new demand. Mitigation measures are a reasonable suggestion and this can be built into Policy IF3. However, it is important that infrastructure is delivered through development and not an optional extra that applicants may "seek" to achieve.  
**Officer recommendation** Change wording to IF3 (ii) to: mitigate any negative impacts to the quality of the existing infrastructure as a result of new development;

---

**ID** 1283  
**Consultee name** Mr David Grimshaw  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** All of these schools are Primary/Junior Schools and are ideally placed to support young growing families from first time buyers of the properties proposed at Red Cat Lane (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1295  
**Consultee name** Kate Wheeler Natural England  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** We would also like to take the opportunity to specifically welcome CS 408 Policy Area CS13: Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure and would welcome being engaged with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. (F)  
**Outcome** Comment noted (in relation to Policy IF4 rather than CS13)  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1352  
**Consultee name** Mr Roger Bell OPSTA  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** A feature common to all the schemes is the need to upgrade local infrastructure to meet the needs of both existing and future residents. (s)  
**Outcome** Comments noted - the Local Plan encourages infrastructure development to take place preceding or concurrent with new development and also encourages such new infrastructure to be located sustainably, including with access to public transport wherever possible.  
**Officer recommendation** no action required

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Policy IF3**

**Title: Service Accessibility and Infrastructure for Growth**

---

**ID** 803  
**Consultee name** Mr Robert W. Pickavance  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** 8.70: Development in Rufford could take place now without overloading the services.  
**Outcome** Rufford is subject to the same waste water treatment works constraint as Ormskirk, Burscough and Scarisbrick as they are all within the same foul drainage area.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 886  
**Consultee name** Mr Philip Carter Environment Agency  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** The sewerage capacity problems represent a risk to water quality in the borough. Policy IF3 clearly requires new development in Ormskirk, Burscough Rufford & Scarisbrick affected by the waste water treatment limitations to be phased to coincide with the delivery of appropriate solution that meets standards of the Council, the Undertaker and the Regulator. This requirement is critically important as it will ensure that any development proposals brought forward in these areas in advance of an agreed solution would be contrary to Local Plan policy, ensuring the protection of water quality.(F)  
**Outcome** Comment noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 975  
**Consultee name** Strategy and Policy Group Lancashire County Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Support in line with Corporate Priorities (F)  
**Outcome** Comment noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---



**ID** 1101  
**Consultee name** Bickerstaffe Trust  
**Agent Name** Mr Graham Love Turley Associates  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The wastewater infrastructure constraint at Ormskirk is a fundamental issue affecting the soundness and delivery of the Local Plan. It must be determined whether it is appropriate to defer provision on these grounds or whether a technical solution (collective or individual) must be found before 2020 to enable certain earlier delivery. (S)  
**Outcome** The appropriate solution for such an infrastructure problem is the responsibility of the sewerage undertaker, United Utilities. It would not be reasonable for the Local Plan to commit to resolving this in place of the undertaker when specific legislation requires that they must make the improvements. The Local Plan PO seeks to prevent unnecessary worsening of this issue to relate to United Utilities spending programme which is likely to result in delivered improvements by 2020 at the latest. This is considered to be in accordance with PPS12.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1273  
**Consultee name** Mr Alan Hubbard The National Trust  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** Policy IF3 The National Trust welcomes recognition of the need to make certain that development in the Ormskirk/Burscough area is phased to ensure that necessary improvements to waste water treatment are delivered. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: 8.4**

**Title: Developer Contributions**

---

**ID** 746

**Consultee name** Mrs Alison Truman British Waterways

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Support

**Summary** BW supports the reference to the canal as a form of transport infrastructure to which CIL contributions will apply. The canal network should therefore also be listed under criterion (v) of Policy IF4 as a type of Green Infrastructure in recognition of its wider role. (S)

**Outcome** The infrastructure that CIL contributions will fund will be established outside of the Local Plan. This will be subject to additional documentation relating to the CIL regulations and in particular Regulation 123. The list of green infrastructure in Policy IF4 is indicative only and need not be exhaustive. If a direct impact from development is felt upon the canal network then developer contributions may be sought through a Section 106 legal agreement, where the requirement meets all the necessary tests.

**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 813

**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Parbold Parish Council

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Support with conditions

**Summary** Support the steer of development to areas not at risk of flooding, but point out that flooding is still an issue in parbold. No allocation of land for allotments. (S)

**Outcome** Comments noted. Particular mention of allotments will be included in Policy EN3.

**Officer recommendation** Make reference to Allotments in Policy EN3

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Policy IF4**

**Title: Developer Contributions**

---

**ID** 98

**Consultee name** Church Commissioners For England

**Agent Name** Miss Jennifer Hadland Smiths Gore

**Nature of response** Observations

**Summary** Developer contributions are intended to ensure that developers make appropriate provision for any losses, or supply additional facilities and services, that are required to mitigate the impact of a development. However, by instilling onerous planning obligations on a scheme a proposed development can quickly become unviable. Flexibility is therefore required with regard to developer contributions to ensure that a 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. (F)

**Outcome** When the Council establishes a Community Infrastructure Levy Charge, it will be informed by development viability and set at a level to allow flexibility and to avoid stifling development. This is a requirement of the CIL regulations and will be one of the key considerations when the CIL is independently examined to ensure it is reasonable. In terms of Section 106 agreements, these will continue to operate on a site by site basis, ensuring they are only used to make that development acceptable in planning terms by mitigating site specific requirements.

**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 240

**Consultee name** Mr Malcolm Jackson

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** There should be a strategy for allotments (S)

**Outcome** A more detailed strategy for the delivery of allotments would be best placed within a Green Infrastructure Strategy which the Council wishes to progress in the future.

**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 730

**Consultee name** Mr Simon Harrison

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** Concern regarding lack of clear strategy for allotments (S)

**Outcome** A more detailed strategy for the delivery of allotments would be best placed within a Green Infrastructure Strategy which the Council wishes to progress in the future. Particular mention of allotments will be included in Policy EN3

**Officer recommendation** Make reference to Allotments in Policy EN3

---

**ID** 848  
**Consultee name** Anglo International Up Holland Ltd  
**Agent Name** Ms Lorraine Davison DPP  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Additional paragraph suggested for the policy: 'In instances where development can be demonstrated to be enabling development that would deliver other plan objectives and / or planning benefits, the Council will consider a reduced Section 106 Contribution subject to the impact of this on the acceptability of the development proposed.' Changes suggested for the policy justification. (S)  
**Outcome** When the Council establishes a Community Infrastructure Levy Charge, it will be informed by development viability and set at a level to allow flexibility and to avoid stifling development. This is a requirement of the CIL regulations and will be one of the key considerations when the CIL is independently examined to ensure it is reasonable. In terms of Section 106 agreements, these will continue to operate on a site by site basis, ensuring they are only used to make that development acceptable in planning terms by mitigating site specific requirements. As such, it is not considered that further clarification is required within Policy IF3 to allow reduced contributions as they will only be sought in the first instance where it is absolutely necessary to ensure the development is acceptable. Notwithstanding this, the Council is considering introducing an "exceptions policy" to support the CIL. This will be detailed in a separate document to the Local Plan and will allow negotiation for payment of CIL on "exceptional" sites which meet the criteria set out within the CIL Regulations i.e. the cost associated with the Section 106 agreement outweighs the cost of the CIL charge.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required.

---

**ID** 888  
**Consultee name** Mr Philip Carter Environment Agency  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** We support this policy with particular reference to use of developer contributions for flood prevention and SUDS, green infrastructure and climate change initiatives. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 895

**Consultee name** Messrs R & J Pickavance      Messrs R & J Pickavance

**Agent Name** Mr Glyn Bridge      McDyre & Co.

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** This is part of a cumulative imposition on housebuilders which will discourage development and not help the much needed economic recovery. A buoyant development economy will in any case bring investment and revenues to the Council through Council Tax and business rates, without these additional demands. (S)

**Outcome** When the Council establishes a Community Infrastructure Levy Charge, it will be informed by a development viability assessment, carried out in the current economic climate and set at a level to allow flexibility and to avoid stifling development. This is a requirement of the CIL regulations and will be one of the key considerations when the CIL is independently examined to ensure it is reasonable. In terms of Section 106 agreements, these will continue to operate on a site by site basis, ensuring they are only used to make that development acceptable in planning terms by mitigating site specific requirements.

**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1223

**Consultee name** Town Planning Team LNW      Network Rail

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Observations

**Summary** Additional requirements should be included within the policy to ensure developer funds are required for improving existing station facilities where development will cause an increase in patronage. (S)

**Outcome** Policy IF4 sets out the expectation that development may be required to contribute financially towards rail infrastructure. The Council does not consider it appropriate to expand on the detail of the nature of these improvements within the Local Plan document. This may be done at the time of negotiating a Section 106 agreement or when considering expenditure of any future CIL receipts. Furthermore, it is not appropriate to require through planning policy that development pays for the requirement of rail operators to ensure their existing assets meet code of practices relating to health and safety and disability

**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 1261

**Consultee name** Mr Andrew Thorley      Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

**Agent Name** Miss Caroline Simpson      Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** The Infrastructure Delivery plan should be amended in relation to school places to reflect the evidence and remove the requirement for an upgrade in the local school provision. (S)

**Outcome** The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be fully reviewed and updated ahead of the next consultation stage for the emerging Local Plan.

**Officer recommendation** No action required in relation to the Local Plan Preferred Options.

---

<b>ID</b>	1292
<b>Consultee name</b>	St Modwen Properties PLC
<b>Agent Name</b>	John Francis
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	Change of wording suggested to policy (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	<p>When the Council establishes a Community Infrastructure Levy Charge, it will be informed by a development viability appraisal and set at a level to allow flexibility and to avoid stifling development. This is a requirement of the CIL regulations and will be one of the key considerations when the CIL is independently examined to ensure it is reasonable. In terms of Section 106 agreements, these will continue to operate on a site by site basis, ensuring they are only used to make that development acceptable in planning terms by mitigating site specific requirements. Notwithstanding this, the Council is considering introducing an "exceptions policy" to support the CIL. This will be detailed in a separate document to the Local Plan and will allow negotiation for payment of CIL on "exceptional" sites which meet the criteria set out within the CIL Regulations i.e. the cost associated with the Section 106 agreement outweighs the cost of the CIL charge.</p>
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change required

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: 9.1**

**Title: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure**

---

**ID** 815  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Parbold Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Recycling services need supporting (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted and passed on to the relevant team. However, this is outside the remit of the Local Plan.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 817  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Parbold Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Support for recycling needed. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted and passed on to the relevant team. However, this is outside the remit of the Local Plan.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 1092  
**Consultee name** Mr Frank Kennedy  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Suggested changes to policy text (S)  
**Outcome** The Council seeks to deliver low carbon development and address climate change but the policy must be evidenced based. National Government intends to drive the carbon emissions of new development down through the changes to building regulations and therefore the planning framework should support this. To require development to exceed this could be onerous and would need to be evidenced to suggest development can afford to do so.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 1106  
**Consultee name** Mr Keith Williams Burscough Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** Burscough Parish Council would wish to see greater commitment to sustainability and to the application of renewable energy sources in the development of the Local Plan (F)  
**Outcome** Comment noted, it is considered Policy EN1 shows a genuine commitment to sustainable development in the Borough.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 1188  
**Consultee name** Mr John Gardner  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** I can find no reference to shale gas extraction in the document although it is highly likely to be an issue in the northern parishes over the next 15 years. Likewise there is little mention of renewable energy from wind power and whether this is an area which will be supported. (S)  
**Outcome** Gas extraction is a matter for the County Council as the minerals and waste planning body for the Borough. The Policy is flexible towards the type of renewable technologies that would be appropriate in the Borough and is generally supportive of its development subject to balancing environmental impacts.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---



**Chapter/Policy Number: Policy EN1**

**Title: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure**

---

**ID** 316  
**Consultee name** Mr Leigh Boyton WLCPRE  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** In general, WLCPRE supports WLBC's Policy EN1 and intentions.  
**Outcome** Comments Noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 544  
**Consultee name** Mr Bryan Pready  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** I support the policies in this Chapter. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 889  
**Consultee name** Mr Philip Carter Environment Agency  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Part 1 iv. of Policy EN1 appears to repeat the provisions of Policy SP1 in relation to the location of development in a low flood risk area. As such you may consider that it is not required as part of this policy, although we do support the use of shading and SUDS to mitigate climate change and promote low carbon development. (F)  
**Outcome** The parts of the policy referring to flood risk will be removed from SP1 and EN1 and located within GN3 as a general guide for all development. The SUDS and shading elements will remain.  
**Officer recommendation** Delete the parts of the policy repeated in SP1 and make reference to GN3 and expand the acronym "SuDS to full definition as follows 1. iv) be resilient to climate change by incorporating shading and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems and locating it away

---

**ID** 939  
**Consultee name** Mr Peter Banks  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** I support policy EN1 - Low Carbon development.  
**Outcome** Comment noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1134  
**Consultee name** Mr Nick Sandford Woodland Trust  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** In Policy EN1 on low carbon development and energy infrastructure, we would like to see some reference to the important role which trees and woods can play in enabling both mitigation of and adaptation to climate change. Pont iv of the policy refers to incorporating shading which implies a role for new tree planting and woodland creation but we would like to see this stated more explicitly. We would also like to see more reference in the policy to the use of wood as a sustainable energy source. (F)  
**Outcome** The Council intends to produce an SPD with greater detail in that developers may use as a guide to sustainable development and tackling climate change locally. The level of detail suggested would be best place in this type of document.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 1224  
**Consultee name** Town Planning Team LNW Network Rail  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** The impacts of wind turbine development upon the safe operation of the rail network is still subject to research. However, there are some concerns and these should be taken into account when determining applications for turbines and developers should be made aware. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. This level of detail is suitable for planning application and condition stage, as is noted within the representation.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

<b>ID</b>	1262
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Andrew Thorley                      Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd
<b>Agent Name</b>	Miss Caroline Simpson                  Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	The inclusion of low carbon development requirements such as the Code for Sustainable Homes Standards [CfSH] and BREEAM are outside planning control and this overall approach and policy is flawed. There is no justification for requiring contributions to a community energy fund and this should be removed from the policy. Objection to all developments exploring the potential for district heating due to viability concerns. (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	National Planning Policy is clear that whilst it is the Governments intention to drive low carbon development through tightening of the building regulations, planning clearly has a role to play in providing a supportive framework and ensuring that development which passes through the development management process is capable of achieving higher standards of low carbon design as required through other regulation. Furthermore, both National Planning Policy and the Draft National Planning Policy Framework are clear that when setting any local requirement for a building's sustainability, this should be done in a way consistent with the Government's zero carbon buildings policy and nationally described standards, such as Code for Sustainable Homes, should be adopted. The intention for development to contribute financially to a Community Energy Fund is in line with the future increases in building regulations and CSH and BREEAM levels. Where zero carbon is not achievable onsite, the Government is currently drafting an Allowable Solutions Framework which will allow for a development to offset any remaining carbon through a financial contribution to a fund which would then be used to promote wider carbon reduction activities. A Community Energy Fund allows the Council greater autonomy over expenditure of such funds within the Local Authority area. Notwithstanding this point, the framework is still currently being formulated and the detail of what will actually constitute an "allowable solution" is still largely open to debate. With this in mind it may be appropriate to remove some detail within the policy to simply allow a hook for any potential future collection of funds. The Council recognises that it is not viable for all development to be required to integrate a district heating or decentralised energy network and this is why the policy requires that all "major" development "explores" the opportunity for such schemes. Furthermore, given the viability of such schemes is often related to density rather than size alone, it would be inappropriate to require consideration of district heating and decentralised energy networks on "very large scale developments" only.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	Reword Policy EN1 1.(iii) to ensure it is not overly prescriptive but provides a sufficient hook for securing future contributions to offset carbon through an "Allowable Solutions Framework" currently still being drafted by the Government.

<b>ID</b>	1274
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Alan Hubbard                          The National Trust
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Support with conditions
<b>Summary</b>	Policy EN1 (+ para 9.11) The overall stance set out in Policy EN1 is supported by the National Trust. However, it would be strengthened by inclusion as Policy of the criteria set out in the supporting para 9.11 for considering wind energy proposals. These are important considerations that should not be consigned to supporting text but instead should be formed into specific criteria against which such proposals will be assessed. (F)
<b>Outcome</b>	Comments of support noted. The Policy should not be too prescriptive to ensure it is flexible for the life of the Local Plan. However, having considered the representations made by The National Trust and in light of the significant potential capacity for wind development within the Borough, it is appropriate to provide more guidance on the assessment of such matters within the Policy.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	The wind development assessment criteria will be moved from the justification into the Policy itself.

**ID** 1322  
**Consultee name** Mr Duncan Gregory Gladman  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Policy EN1 is too prescriptive and may deter development. A more general and supportive policy would be more appropriate.  
**Outcome** National Planning Policy is clear that whilst it is the Governments intention to drive low carbon development through tightening of the building regulations, planning clearly has a role to play in providing a supportive framework and ensuring that development which passes through the development management process is capable of achieving higher standards of low carbon design as required through other regulation. Furthermore, both National Planning Policy and the Draft National Planning Policy Framework are clear that when setting any local requirement for a building's sustainability, this should be done in a way consistent with the Government's zero carbon buildings policy and nationally described standards, such as Code for Sustainable Homes, should be adopted. Policy EN1 seeks only to require delivery of the Code levels in line with the increases to the Building Regulations. Therefore, it is not considered that it is to onerous on development but provides the necessary supportive framework for delivering low carbon development.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 1338  
**Consultee name** Ms Yana Bosseva RenewableUK  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** RenewableUK welcomes the provisions for renewable energy contained in the Preferred Options document. Above we have outlined the benefits renewable energy has for the economy and the security and stable prices of electricity supply. We seek that they be referred to in the Core Strategy. We have also suggested that sustainable development and renewable energy be included in the vision and strategic objectives for the Borough.  
**Outcome** Comments and support noted.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 1344  
**Consultee name** Mr David Dunlop The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester & North Merseyside  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** It would benefit from some reference to European and national sites and more of a presumption against infrastructure which would harm them. Also some reference to mitigation being required where "acceptable harm" is likely to occur! (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted and accepted in relation to mitigation reference. Reference to European and nature sites is considered to be too prescriptive and crossing the line into other policy areas such as EN2.  
**Officer recommendation** Reference to Policy EN2 1(a) within criterion 2. (iv) in relation to required mitigation.

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: 9.2**

**Title: Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Natural Environme**

---

**ID** 111  
**Consultee name** Mr Maclver  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Ormskirk linear park (S)  
**Outcome** The proposed linear park has been investigated and a feasibility study conducted in 2006. You are correct in saying that this study does not provide detailed costings of the linear park. However the study does say that it is possible to develop the park. The study does outline a number of potential issues including crossing roads and recommends possible solutions. When further work has been conducted looking into these solutions the Council will be in a position to produce detailed costs of the proposed route. The Council is aware that there are engineering issues including pipes on the route, however the Council is confident that there are solutions to overcome these issues. In order to avoid the park going through land owned by local home owners you are correct that the route has been diverted. The Council does not believe that this minor diversion is an issue. The report does say that compulsory purchase of lane may be required. However the Council would rather obtain the land through other means than go down the Compulsory Purchase option. This would only be done as a last resort. Even if this was done the land would remain in the Green Belt. Many similar linear parks around the country operate with multi use paths. The Council believes that with appropriate management and design a multi-use path can operate effectively. The Council along with Lancashire County Council would have to ensure that regular maintenance of the park was taken into account as proposals develops. The consultation report dated August 2011 looks at a range of options designed at reducing congestion in Ormskirk and in this context the linear park was highlighted as a potential scheme, however was not identified as one of the priority schemes. Although some residents which live along the route may feel the continued protection of this route is a blight the Council believes that the potential benefits of the route outweigh any negatives.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 315  
**Consultee name** Mr John Watt  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Biodiversity needs to be protected (S)  
**Outcome** Chapter 9 contains two policies EN2 Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Natural Environment and Policy EN3 Provision of Green Infrastructure which seek to protect the and enhance where possible the natural environment in West Lancashire. Many of the specific issues you mentioned in relation to management of Council land/property cannot be dealt with under the Local Plan but your comments have been forwarded to the appropriate section of the Council.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 891  
**Consultee name** Mr Philip Carter Environment Agency  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Grammatical error @ 9.32 – replace 'there' with 'their'  
**Outcome** Gramatical error noted and will be changed  
**Officer recommendation** Gramatical error noted and will be changed

---

**ID** 941  
**Consultee name** Ms Barton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** In the current proposals in for Chequer Lane Up Holland, Natural England have stated the development should NOT encroach any further than currently outlined. The proposals in the local plan would ignore this request. (S)  
**Outcome** Natural England have been consulted about this Local Plan containing the proposals for Cheuqer Lane and have not raised any objections. The Council will further consult Natural England as this scheme develops.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Policy EN2**

**Title: Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Natural Environme**

---

**ID** 247  
**Consultee name** Ms Judith Nelson English Heritage  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** We support the references to historic landscapes and the identification of area of landscape history importance on the proposals map (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 317  
**Consultee name** Mr Leigh Boyton WLCPRE  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** In general, WLCPRE supports WLBC's Policy EN2 and intentions.  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 838  
**Consultee name** Ms Barton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The council should pay more than lip service to biodiversity and encourage quality green spaces in our communities (S)  
**Outcome** The Council continues to prioritise development on brownfield sites and is only looking to Green Belt release once development on Brownfield sites has been taken into account as outlines in policy SP1 A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire The overall environmental impact of the local plan will be assessed as part of the HIA and SIA. Sites will also be more closely assessed at the planning application stage. Where sites are found to have an environmental impact appropriate mitigation measures will need to be put in place.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 932  
**Consultee name** Charnwick Ltd  
**Agent Name** Mr Michael Cunningham Cunningham Planning  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** Some wording of Policy EN2 should have the wording under Nature Conservation Sites amended to make it clear that future development of certain sites may be acceptable in certain circumstances. (S)  
**Outcome** The policy states that 'where development is considered necessary adequate mitigation measures .... This indicates but is not specific that some development may be acceptable in certain circumstances. Additional wording will be added to the front of this paragraph to say that in certain limited circumstances where the Council consider it appropriate development may be considered necessary.  
**Officer recommendation** Additional wording will be added to the front of this paragraph to say that in certain limited circumstances where the Council consider it appropriate development may be considered necessary.

---

**ID** 940  
**Consultee name** Mr Peter Banks  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** I fully support policy EN2 - the natural environment.  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No further action required

---

**ID** 1131  
**Consultee name** Mr Nick Sandford Woodland Trust  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** We are particularly pleased that Policy EN2 now contains strong protection for both ancient woodland and ancient/veteran trees and also commitment to increasing tree and woodland cover. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments of support noted  
**Officer recommendation** No further action required

---

**ID** 1132  
**Consultee name** Mr Nick Sandford The Woodland Trust  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** A number of councils have adopted a two for one replacement policy and there are even examples of a three for one ratio being used, as a means of ensuring that the tree population is at least maintained at its current level and possibly may grow over time. (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted and policy will be changed to allow trees to be replaced on a two for one basis opposed to a one for one as currently stated.  
**Officer recommendation** Change wording to read replace trees on a two for one basis, where possible, where this is not possible agreement should be sought from the local planning authority.

---



**ID** 1263  
**Consultee name** Mr Andrew Thorley Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd  
**Agent Name** Miss Caroline Simpson Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** Taylor Wimpey broadly supports Policy EN2: Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Natural Environment but with regards to (c) trees and hedgerows we object to the requirement to "replace any trees lost on a like for like basis" as this is not always possible or deliverable. We therefore suggest that Policy EN2 (c) iv) is re-worded to state:- "Where possible replace any trees lost on like-for-like basis". (F)  
**Outcome** The Borough Council intends to alter this policy to allow flexibility.  
**Officer recommendation** Change wording to read replace trees on a two for one basis, where possible, where this is not possible agreement should be sought from the local planning authority.

---

**ID** 1275  
**Consultee name** Mr Alan Hubbard The National Trust  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** Change of wording suggested (S)  
**Outcome** Comments of support noted. In relation to para 1.i. the Council will alter the wording to include a reference to enhancement where possible.  
**Officer recommendation** Change para 1.i. to read: Protect and where possible, enhance all sites of...

---

**ID** 1332  
**Consultee name** Mr Damien Holdstock National Grid  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** As currently worded, part (f) of Policy EN2 in the Preferred Options document only allows development which makes a positive contribution to the landscapes and their key features. Whilst National Grid will always seek to avoid, minimise or mitigate impacts of its projects, the type of infrastructure development which we may need to undertake in the future to meet its operational needs, may not necessarily be considered to 'make a positive contribution' to landscapes and their key features' under the proposed policy. National Grid does not wish to be restricted from meeting any future operational requirements placed upon them, and therefore wish to see the policy amended to reflect a more balanced approach incorporating consideration of the need for development.  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Any work required in order to maintain the Nation Grid should be Permitted Development under Class G, Part 17 of the General Permitted Development Order and as such the Policy wording should not need to be altered.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

<b>ID</b>	1345
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr David Dunlop The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester & North Merseyside
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Support with conditions
<b>Summary</b>	EN1 is saying implies that there will be occasions when they can't be protected and safeguarded! Similarly one of the paragraphs under "Nature Conservation Sites" (below) similarly makes mention of over-riding local need. I am sure there need to be qualifications such as this but the two statements conflict at present. The Plan needs to be more proactive? In addition to the provisions of national and European law, and the requirements of national planning policy, development must adhere to the provisions set out through these comments (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	Section i of Policy EN1 seeks to highlight and reinforce the protection of these sites as a an overriding principle of the Policy. However there may be occasions where there is an overwealming local need to allow some type of development on these sites. With regards to the Ribble Coast and Wetlands Regional Park the Council is fully supportive of the initiative but cannot go into speicific proposals because the develoment of this park is only a concpet at present which is being led by LCC. With regard to Green Corridors the Council does not believe that the local plan is the appropriate location to list speicific schemes. Although the Council does intend to provide a seperate Green Infrastructure Strategy the strategy has not been completed yet. Green infrastructure is also covered within the Council Infrastructure Delivery Plan which is published and available on the Council's website.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No action required

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: 9.3**

**Title: Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space**

---

**ID** 33  
**Consultee name** B Taylor  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to linear park on safety grounds (S).  
**Outcome** Consultants conducted work in 2006 looking at the feasibility of the proposed route. This report concluded that it is possible to develop the park; however a number of barriers would have to be overcome first of all. The Council and Lancashire County Council are fully supportive of this scheme and are committed seeing this scheme delivered. This scheme has also been brought forward into Lancashire LTP3. The Council is aware that many residents have concerns regarding this proposal and in particular have concerns relating to a perception of crime and anti social behaviour. However the Council believe that many of these concerns can be addressed through design and management.  
**Officer recommendation** No further action required

---

**ID** 35  
**Consultee name** Mr John Evans  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Ormskirk linear park (S).  
**Outcome** Consultants conducted work in 2006 looking at the feasibility of the proposed route. This report concluded that it is possible to develop the park; however a number of barriers would have to be overcome first of all. The Council and Lancashire County Council are fully supportive of this scheme and are committed seeing this scheme delivered. This scheme has also been brought forward into Lancashire LTP3. The Council is aware that many residents have concerns regarding this proposal and in particular have concerns relating to a perception of crime and anti social behaviour. However the Council believe that many of these concerns can be addressed through design and management.  
**Officer recommendation** No further action required

---

**ID** 36  
**Consultee name** Mrs Patricia Davis  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Ormskirk linear park. (S)  
**Outcome** Consultants conducted work in 2006 looking at the feasibility of the proposed route. This report concluded that it is possible to develop the park; however a number of barriers would have to be overcome first of all. The Council and Lancashire County Council are fully supportive of this scheme and are committed seeing this scheme delivered. This scheme has also been brought forward into Lancashire LTP3. The Council is aware that many residents have concerns regarding this proposal and in particular have concerns relating to a perception of crime and anti social behaviour. However the Council believe that many of these concerns can be addressed through design and management.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 47  
**Consultee name** Mrs J.K Jacques  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Oppose the Ormskirk linear park (S).  
**Outcome** Consultants conducted work in 2006 looking at the feasibility of the proposed route. This report concluded that it is possible to develop the park; however a number of barriers would have to be overcome. Including the two local authorities there are 14 landowners in total. The Council and Lancashire County Council are fully supportive of this scheme and are committed seeing this scheme delivered. This scheme has also been brought forward into Lancashire LTP3. The Council is aware that many residents have concerns regarding this proposal and in particular have concerns relating to a perception of crime and anti social behaviour. However the Council believe that many of these concerns can be addressed through design and management.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 48  
**Consultee name** Mrs Joan Goldsmith  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to the Ormskirk linear park (S).  
**Outcome** Consultants conducted work in 2006 looking at the feasibility of the proposed route. This report concluded that it is possible to develop the park; however a number of barriers would have to be overcome. Including the two local authorities there are 14 landowners in total. The Council and Lancashire County Council are fully supportive of this scheme and are committed seeing this scheme delivered. This scheme has also been brought forward into Lancashire LTP3. The Council is aware that many residents have concerns regarding this proposal and in particular have concerns relating to a perception of crime and anti social behaviour. However the Council believe that many of these concerns can be addressed through design and management.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 53  
**Consultee name** Mrs Susan Jones  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** I object to the Ormskirk linear park. (S).  
**Outcome** Consultants conducted work in 2006 looking at the feasibility of the proposed route. This report concluded that it is possible to develop the park; however a number of barriers would have to be overcome. Including the two local authorities there are 14 landowners in total. The study also identified physical problems with the proposed line, however several options and solutions were also identified including building a bridge to span Plough Lane. The Council and Lancashire County Council are fully supportive of this scheme and are committed seeing this scheme delivered. This scheme has also been brought forward into Lancashire LTP3. The Council is aware that many residents have concerns regarding this proposal and in particular have concerns relating to a perception of crime and anti social behaviour. However the Council believe that many of these concerns can be addressed through design and management.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 103  
**Consultee name** Mr Richard Goth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Ormskirk-Skelmersdale linear park (S).  
**Outcome** The proposed Linear Park is for a multi-use path which may accommodate cyclists/walkers and also horse riders as was proposed in the last local plan 2001-2016. Consultants conducted work in 2006 looking at the feasibility of the proposed route. This report concluded that it is possible to develop the park; however a number of barriers would have to be overcome. Including the two local authorities there are 14 landowners in total. The study also identified physical problems with the proposed line, however several options and solutions were also identified including building a bridge to span Plough Lane. The Council and Lancashire County Council are fully supportive of this scheme and are committed seeing this scheme delivered. This scheme has also been brought forward into Lancashire LTP3. The Council is aware that many residents have concerns regarding this proposal and in particular have concerns relating to a perception of crime and anti social behaviour. However the Council believe that many of these concerns can be addressed through design and management.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 386  
**Consultee name** Mr Thomas Stub  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** Provision of allotments should be considered and included in the Local Plan. (S)  
**Outcome** additional wording to be added to include allotments.  
**Officer recommendation** Under Criterion 1.i. additional wording added to include allotments

---

**ID** 387  
**Consultee name** Joan and David Evans  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to linear park in Westhead (S)  
**Outcome** The proposed linear park has been investigated and a feasibility study conducted in 2006. This study does not provide detailed costings of the linear park. However the study does say that it is possible to develop the park. The study does outline a number of potential issues including crossing roads and recommends possible solutions. When further work has been conducted looking into these solutions the Council will be in a position to produce detailed costs of the proposed route. The Council is aware that there are engineering issues including pipes on the route, however the Council is confident that there are solutions to overcome these issues. In order to avoid the park going through land owned by local home owners you are correct that the route has been diverted. The Council does not believe that this minor diversion is an issue. The report does say that compulsory purchase of lane may be required. However the Council would rather obtain the land through other means than go down the Compulsory Purchase option. This would only be done as a last resort. Even if this was done the land would remain in the Green Belt. Many similar linear parks around the country operate with multi use paths. The Council believes that with appropriate management and design a multi-use path can operate effectively. The Council along with Lancashire County Council would have to ensure that regular maintenance of the park was taken into account as proposals develops. The consultation report dated August 2011 looks at a range of options designed at reducing congestion in Ormskirk and in this context the linear park was highlighted as a potential scheme, however was not identified as one of the priority schemes. Although some residents which live along the route may feel the continued protection of this route is a blight the Council believes that the potential benefits of the route outweigh any negatives.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 473  
**Consultee name** Carol Smith  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to play area at Elm Place, Ormskirk (S)  
**Outcome** The Council's Open Space Sports and Recreation Study (October 2009) identified that Ormskirk has the greatest deficiency of childrens play areas and as such is actively seeking to encourage new sites where appropriate. Given the limited availability of land to construct new play areas this site goes some way to helping the Council reduce the level of deficiency.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 545  
**Consultee name** Mr Anthony Hardwick  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to playground at Elm Place on basis of safety, site bounded by rail line, flooding, holes, pre-existing park at County Road, increase in crime and anti-social behaviour. (S)  
**Outcome** The Council's Open Space Sports and Recreation Study (October 2009) identified that Ormskirk has the greatest deficiency of childrens play areas and as such is actively seeking to encourage new sites where appropriate. Given the limited availability of land to construct new play areas this site goes some way to helping the Council reduce the level of deficiency. The Council believes that if designed correctly any safety issues can be overcome.  
**Officer recommendation** No further action required

---

**ID** 623  
**Consultee name** Mrs J Carlisle  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Elm Place play area on grounds of traffic, wildlife disturbance, retired residents, safety in relation to the electric rail line (S).  
**Outcome** The Council's Open Space Sports and Recreation Study (October 2009) identified that Ormskirk has the greatest deficiency of childrens play areas and as such is actively seeking to encourage new sites where appropriate. Given the limited availability of land to construct new play areas this site goes some way to helping the Council reduce the level of deficiency. The Council believes that if designed correctly any safety issues can be overcome.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 726  
**Consultee name** L Hanshaw  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to play area at Elm Place on grounds of retired residents, poor access, traffic, safety, protection of environment and wildlife. (S)  
**Outcome** The Council's Open Space Sports and Recreation Study (October 2009) identified that Ormskirk has the greatest deficiency of childrens play areas and as such is actively seeking to encourage new sites where appropriate. Given the limited availability of land to construct new play areas this site goes some way to helping the Council reduce the level of deficiency. The Council believes that if designed correctly any safety issues can be overcome. Environmental considerations will also be taken into account closer to the application stage.  
**Officer recommendation** No further action required

---

**ID** 747  
**Consultee name** Mrs Alison Truman British Waterways  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** BW supports the reference in this paragraph to the inland waterways and canal network as a form of Green Infrastructure, along with the recognition of the multi-functional role of such infrastructure and its value to society. (F)  
**Outcome** Comments of support noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 808  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Parbold Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** (g) reads Latham but should be Lathom Avenue. Parbold Parish Council ask why there is a plan to build a play area here as there is one close by at the village hall and another at Burnside, where there are more children? Also, please note that Parbold Hill is a landfill site (F)  
**Outcome** Latham Avenue is incorrectly spelled and will be changed. The Open Space Sports and Recreation Study October 2009 says that key deficiencies of play areas for children and young people are evident in Parbold. This site was chosen as a site that could be realistically delivered.  
**Officer recommendation** Latham Avenue in section g)i to be changed to read lathom Avenue.

---

**ID** 821  
**Consultee name** L Hanshaw  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Petition of 28 names, all of residents or visitors to Elm Place objecting to proposals for play area. (S)  
**Outcome** The Council's Open Space Sports and Recreation Study (October 2009) identified that Ormskirk has the greatest deficiency of childrens play areas and as such is actively seeking to encourage new sites where appropriate. Given the limited availability of land to construct new play areas this site goes some way to helping the Council reduce the level of deficiency. The Council believes that if designed correctly any safety issues can be overcome.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 831  
**Consultee name** Mr Terry Lake  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Provision of land for allotments need to be included in the policies. (S)  
**Outcome** The Council considers that allotments are an important part of Green Infrastructure even though they are not specifically mentioned in the policy. The Council will specifically mention allotments in the policy  
**Officer recommendation** Additional wording to be included mentioning allotments.

---



**ID** 837  
**Consultee name** Mr J Bell  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to linear park. More consideration and thought needs to be given to it such as maintenance. (S)  
**Outcome** The proposed linear park has been investigated and a feasibility study conducted in 2006. The study does say that it is possible to develop the park. The study does outline a number of potential issues including crossing roads and recommends possible solutions. When further work has been conducted looking into these solutions the Council will be in a position to produce detailed costs of the proposed route. The Council is aware that there are engineering issues including pipes on the route, however the Council is confident that there are solutions to overcome these issues. In order to avoid the park going through land owned by local home owners you are correct that the route has been diverted. The Council does not believe that this minor diversion is an issue. The report does say that compulsory purchase of lane may be required. However the Council would rather obtain the land through other means than go down the Compulsory Purchase option. This would only be done as a last resort. Even if this was done the land would remain in the Green Belt. Many similar linear parks around the country operate with multi use paths. The Council believes that with appropriate management and design a multi-use path can operate effectively. The Council along with Lancashire County Council would have to ensure that regular maintenance of the park was taken into account as proposals develops. The consultation report dated August 2011 looks at a range of options designed at reducing congestion in Ormskirk and in this context the linear park was highlighted as a potential scheme, however was not identified as one of the priority schemes. Although some residents which live along the route may feel the continued protection of this route is a blight the Council believes that the potential benefits of the route outweigh any negatives.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 858  
**Consultee name** Mr Colin Elliott  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Policies should support allocation of land for allotments (S)  
**Outcome** The Council accept that allotments are an important part of Green Infrastructure even if they are not specifically mentioned within the policy. Additional wording recognising allotments as part of Green Infrastructure will be included.  
**Officer recommendation** Additional wording to include allotments to be added to policy.

---

**ID** 892  
**Consultee name** Mr Philip Carter Environment Agency  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Grammatical error @ 9.43 – delete repeated word 'space'  
**Outcome** Error noted and will be corrected  
**Officer recommendation** Error noted and will be corrected

---

**ID** 893  
**Consultee name** Mr Philip Carter Environment Agency  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Grammatical error @ 9.43 – delete repeated word 'space'  
**Outcome** Error noted and will be corrected  
**Officer recommendation** Error noted and will be corrected

---

**ID** 942  
**Consultee name** Mr Peter Banks  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** I fully support the principles in Section 9.3 and in particular would love to see the provision of a linear park between Ormskirk and Skelmersdale. However, it is even more important to re-establish a rail link between Ormskirk and Skelmersdale and in any conflict over the use of this land, the provision of the rail link should take priority.  
**Outcome** The Council are currently exploring options for a rail link to Skelmersdale. However the proposed link would come off the Kirkby-Wigan line and not Ormskirk-Skelmersdale. This is because there are far greater benefits providing a direct route to Liverpool-Wigan and also Merseyrail have said they have limited capacity on the Ormskirk Liverpool line.  
**Officer recommendation** No actions required

---

**ID** 1074  
**Consultee name** J Whittaker  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Elm Place play area on grounds of traffic safety, wildlife and house prices (S)  
**Outcome** The Council's Open Space, Sports and Recreational Study 2009 highlights that the greatest quantitative shortfall of children's play areas is found in Ormskirk. As such, and given the limitation of space available for such facilities the Council believes that this site should come forward. The Council believes that this site can be developed and managed in a way that is safe for both users of the site, local residents and road users. When a sites to be built any protected species will be taken into account. Issues relating to future values of properties are not a planning matter and cannot be taken into consideration.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 1077  
**Consultee name** Ray Fowler  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Policies should support allocation of land for allotments (S)  
**Outcome** The Council sees allotments as very much an important part of GI and does intend to mention them in the policy specifically. The Council does have an allotment strategy and is actively looking to promote and increase the number of allotments in the Borough.  
**Officer recommendation** Include additional wording to include allotments.

---

**ID** 1109  
**Consultee name** Mrs Carolyn Cross Wrightington Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** On a more specific note with regard to the "Provision of Green Infrastructure" the Parish Council would like to enquire what the proposals are for informal countryside recreational activities at Hunters Hill and, what proposals will be developed to protect and improve facilities at Fairy Glen, Appley Bridge. (F)  
**Outcome** This proposal is seen as an additional facility and not a replacement. The site requires low key environmental improvements. The site could accommodate picnic facilities as well as walking, cycling and horse riding facilities.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 1143  
**Consultee name** MR STEPHEN MARTIN  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Policies should support allocation of land for allotments (S)  
**Outcome** The Council sees allotments as very much an important part of GI and does intend to mention them in the policy specifically. The Council does have an allotment strategy and is actively looking to promote and increase the number of allotments in the Borough.  
**Officer recommendation** The Council will include additional wording to specifically mention allotments.

---

<b>ID</b>	1144	
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Nick Jacobs	Ormskirk Rugby Club
<b>Agent Name</b>		
<b>Nature of response</b>	Observations	
<b>Summary</b>	As you know we are fortunate to be strategically located in the heart of Ormskirk on Green Lane. Having just signed a further 25 year lease with WLBC the continuation of our place within the heart of the local community has been assured. However, we currently only have the space for 2 pitches; the size of our membership necessitates our needing 4 or more and we rent further pitches on Church Fields to accommodate our requirements. We are therefore currently assessing a number of different sites and options to provide for the further expansion of our membership and the provision there-for in the future. We would like to be part of your consultation to continue to provide excellence in sporting participation for the people of West Lancashire, particularly as our increasing membership has meant we have outgrown our current location. (F)	
<b>Outcome</b>	Comments noted	
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	The Council will continue to consult with Ormskirk Rugby Club	

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Policy EN3**

**Title: Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space**

---

**ID** 74  
**Consultee name** Mrs Daphne Chappell  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Object to Ormskirk-Skelmersdale linear park (S)  
**Outcome** Comments noted regarding levels of support. The percentages used were taken from actual figures from respondents are so are factual. Consultants conducted work in 2006 looking at the feasibility of the proposed route. This report concluded that it is possible to develop the park; however a number of barriers would have to be overcome. Including the two local authorities there are 14 landowners in total. The study also identified physical problems with the proposed line, however several options and solutions were also identified including building a bridge to span Plough Lane. The Council and Lancashire County Council are fully supportive of this scheme and are committed seeing this scheme delivered. This scheme has also been brought forward into Lancashire LTP3. The Council is aware that many residents have concerns regarding this proposal and in particular have concerns relating to a perception of crime and anti social behaviour. However the Council believe that many of these concerns can be addressed through design and management.  
**Officer recommendation** No further action required

---

**ID** 81  
**Consultee name** Mrs Stephanie Hopkin  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Request to reconsider the designation of land at Elm Place, Ormskirk as recreational space (SC2.17) due to concerns about its suitability (S).  
**Outcome** The Council's Open Space Sports and Recreation Study (October 2009) identified that Ormskirk has the greatest deficiency of childrens play areas and as such is actively seeking to encourage new sites where appropriate. Given the limited availability of land to construct new play areas this site goes some way to helping the Council reduce the level of deficiency. The Council believes that if designed correctly any safety issues can be overcome. Environmental considerations will also be taken into account closer to the application stage.  
**Officer recommendation** No further action required.

---

**ID** 241  
**Consultee name** Mr Malcolm Jackson  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Should include a focus on allotment provision. (S)  
**Outcome** Although allotments are not specifically mentioned they are seen as being an important part of Green Infrastructure and specifically as providing a recreational use. Additional wording to be added to make specific mention to allotments  
**Officer recommendation** Under Criterion 1.i. additional wording added to include allotments

---

**ID** 318  
**Consultee name** Mr Leigh Boyton WLCPRE  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** WLCPRE supports WLBC's Policy EN3 and intentions. We would also suggest a commitment to the provision of new land specifically for allotments and also the provision of street trees (S)  
**Outcome** Additional wording to be added to encourage the development of allotments. The Council does consider that trees are an important part of Green Infrastructure however specific criteria encouraging tree cover and requiring that developments include appropriate tree planting is included under policy EN2 Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Natural Environment.  
**Officer recommendation** Under Criterion 1.i. additional wording added to include allotments

---

**ID** 374  
**Consultee name** Mr Anthony Shorrock  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Having a play area at Elm Place would make life difficult for residents because of the road which is narrow and subject to collapse. Coronation Park is literally around the corner making this a seemingly pointless exercise.  
**Outcome** Comments noted however there is a deficiency of play areas identified in the open space area within that locality.  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 737  
**Consultee name** Mr Martin Ainscough  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The proposed childrens play area at Lathom Avenue Parbold would be much better sited as part of a mixed use development off Greenfield Avenue, should this ever be allowed. (F)  
**Outcome** The Council is not proposing any mixed use development off Greenfield Avenue and therefore it would be inappropriate to try and include the proposed childrens play area as part of the proposed development  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

<b>ID</b>	1133
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Nick Sandford                      The Woodland Trust
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Support with conditions
<b>Summary</b>	We welcome the commitment to an integrated network of green infrastructure. We would like to see provision of trees and woodland included in this assessment. we would like to see the Council adopt some targets for new woodland creation, particularly in view of the rather low woodland cover in West Lancashire at present. (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	The Borough Council is committed to increasing Woodland cover across West Lancashire and does acknowledge that we have relatively low woodland cover compared to some authorities but this is because as an authority we have a large amount of agricultural land which does not lend itself to woodland cover. As such the Council will not be setting specific targets in relation to woodland cover.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No action required.

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: 9.4**

**Title: Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Built Environment**

---

<b>ID</b>	242
<b>Consultee name</b>	Ms Judith Nelson                      English Heritage
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Observations
<b>Summary</b>	It is suggested that the Local Plan covers how the conservation and enjoyment of heritage assets will be addressed, and that they are a key issue for the Borough (S).
<b>Outcome</b>	At paragraph 9.72 The Local Plan makes specific reference to the Councils at risk register and that it will continue to monitor and up date it. Additional detail to this would be better placed in a guidance or heritage strategy document or if necessary and SPD
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change required

---



**Chapter/Policy Number: Policy EN4**

**Title: Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Built Environment**

---

**ID** 64  
**Consultee name** Mr Anthony Northcote Plannig and Local Authority Liason, The Coal Authority  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** The Coal Authority supports the recognition of land instability as a planning issue within criterion 1 vii. of this policy. (F)  
**Outcome** Comment noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 319  
**Consultee name** Mr Leigh Boyton WLCPRE  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** In general, WLCPRE supports WLBC's Policy EN4 and intentions  
**Outcome** Comments Noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 738  
**Consultee name** Mr Martin Ainscough  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** I would strongly endorse the policy of encouraging inspiring and imaginative design and would encourage the continued use of the RIBA funded panel to police this. The members of the planning committee and the head of planning also need to sign up to this and back their officers and not be swayed by NIMBY neighbours.(F)  
**Outcome** Comments of support noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action required

---

**ID** 849  
**Consultee name** Anglo International Up Holland Ltd  
**Agent Name** Ms Lorraine Davison DPP  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The policy needs to be more in line with the draft NPPF in terms of enabling development. Policy EN4 does not go far enough to ensure that the potential benefits of enabling development are fully covered. More detailed references should be made to English's Heritage's Enabling Development Guide. (S)  
**Outcome** Section b) of Policy EN4 states that 'Substantial harm or loss of a listed building, park or garden will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances where it can be demonstrated that: i) the substantial harm to, or loss of significance of, the heritage asset is necessary in order to deliver substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss: or the nature or the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site. iv)the harm to or loss of the heritage asset is outweighed by the benefits of bringing the site back into use. As such the Council believes that the policy does fall in line with the NPPF in enabling development. Additional wording will also be added to make reference to English heritage's Enabling Development Guide.  
**Officer recommendation** Additional wording will also be added to make reference to English heritage's Enabling Development Guide.

---

**ID** 894  
**Consultee name** Mr Philip Carter Environment Agency  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** The reuse of derelict and industrial land is supported, but wherever there is a potential contaminated land impact, appropriate contaminated land assessments should be undertaken to demonstrate the risk to controlled waters. Development will be expected to ensure there is no risk of pollution to controlled waters to ensure compliance with the Water Framework Directive, and this relates not only to ground contamination but also surface water run-off and effluent discharges. We are satisfied that part 1 vii of Policy EN4 reflects the need to prevent pollution of the water environment by requiring development to minimise the risk from all forms of pollution, contamination and land instability. Although we support the policy, it is apparent that part 1 of Policy EN4 covers similar issues to Policy GN3. To avoid repetition, you may feel that part 1 of Policy EN4 could be incorporated into Policy GN3 as part of the submission version of the plan and that Policy GN3 could be renamed Policy GN3 'Sustainability & Design of Development'? (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted. Part 1 Quality Design of Policy EN4 will be integrated within Policy GN3 Design of Development to avoid repetition within the Local Plan  
**Officer recommendation** Part 1 Quality Design of Policy EN4 will be integrated within Policy GN3 Design of Development to avoid repetition within the Local Plan.

---

<b>ID</b>	1293
<b>Consultee name</b>	St Modwen Properties PLC
<b>Agent Name</b>	John Francis
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	This policy would benefit from the inclusion of wording which would allow it to be applied more flexibly in the event that design expectations arising out of the policy impact on viability. Change of wording suggested (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	The Council is confident that the existing policy is deliverable and allows for a level of flexibility to enable development to come forward.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No action required

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Chapter 10**

**Title: Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"**

---

**ID** 99

**Consultee name** Church Commissioners For England

**Agent Name** Miss Jennifer Hadland Smiths Gore

**Nature of response** Support with conditions

**Summary** Recommendation for consideration and inclusion of additional sites as part of the Plan B. (S)

**Outcome** See Response to Representation 92 from same consultee

**Officer recommendation** No Action

---

**ID** 529

**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Object

**Summary** Review of delivery under the plan, monitor and manage approach would be annual, so there should be no need for surprise at the 5 year (and 10 year) stages. Sites listed in Aughton, Ormskirk and Burscough all use the same waste water infrastructure as sites held back until 2020 and later. It would be nonsensical to bring forward plan B sites in advance of plan A sites. Bringing forward sites at Halsall, close to the Southport boundary, would be very likely to deliver most benefit for the population of Sefton, rather than West Lancashire. This suggests that the overall target for West Lancashire is too high, in the light of infrastructure and flooding concerns. (F)

**Outcome** The Five Year reviews for Plan B are not proposed for monitoring purposes but to give certainty within the Local Plan period, i.e. for 5 years the new Local Plan will be given chance to take effect and then its performance will be reviewed and, if necessary, selected Plan B sites will be released to boost housing delivery. Following this, a further 5 years will pass, allowing the Council to see the effect of the Local Plan (and any Plan B sites released at Year 5) over a longer period, before reviewing performance and, again, releasing selected Plan B sites if required. Only 2 Plan B sites (Ruff Lane and Red Cat Lane) are affected by the same waste water infrastructure issues as the preferred sites for Green Belt release, and so would not be released in advance of this issue being resolved. However, Plan B is not just a back-up for the preferred sites, it is a back-up for the whole Plan. While the Plan B sites in Halsall would rely on Sefton services and may attract Sefton residents, they are in West Lancs and can count toward meeting West Lancs needs. They have been selected because, compared to other sites considered elsewhere in West Lancs, they do not fulfil Green Belt purposes and / or are more sustainably located. This has no reflection on the Borough-wide housing target.

**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 550  
**Consultee name** Mr Simon Artiss Bellway Homes Ltd  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** 2. Plan B Sites – we support the introduction of such a provision as this was identified in the recent Bolton Core Strategy Hearing by the Inspector. Up to 7 sites are identified, many in smaller settlements/locations. As you are required to deliver sustainability through the Local Plan we assume that a comparative assessment of sustainable development has been undertaken, although we do not have the resources to appraise that work. What we seek is a Plan that provides sufficient viable development opportunities in the plan period to deliver your targets and a robust Plan B strategy should it be called upon; (F)  
**Outcome** Support noted  
**Officer recommendation** No action

---

**ID** 819  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Dalton Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Dalton Parish Council comment that development of land on Mill Lane, Up Holland could impact upon their parish as blurring the area between Up Holland and Dalton and merging two settlements. Mill Lane is a dangerous road. It is used by Heavy Good Vehicles travelling between Dalton Quarry and Ravenhead Brick Works, it has one side of the road permanently blocked by parked cars because the housing there is on a steep hill with no offstreet parking, it would result in the loss of a well-used play area and exacerbate pressure on the road there. (F)  
**Outcome** The Mill Lane site is enclosed by the Up Holland settlement area, so its development would not "blur" the area between Up Holland and Dalton. Traffic concerns in relation to Mill Lane have been considered but the creation of a new access onto Mill Lane for any new development could actually make the road safer by causing traffic to slow down. The vast majority of the open space would be unaffected by any development proposals and if development would result in the loss of the play area, it would need to be replaced elsewhere on the open space at the developers cost.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

<b>ID</b>	902
<b>Consultee name</b>	Roger Tym & Partners
<b>Agent Name</b>	Mr John Cookson Roger Tym & Partners
<b>Nature of response</b>	Support with conditions
<b>Summary</b>	<p>Our client's site at New Cut Lane represents an excellent opportunity for residential development. The strengths of the site include: • the site is sustainably located, close to shops and services, and the Council clearly accepts that it represents an appropriate location for residential uses (otherwise the site would not be proposed for release from the Green Belt); • the site faces no suitability issues such as the constraints imposed by waste water treatment issues in many locations across the Borough; • the site's owners are willing to see the site come forward for development; • the site faces no achievability constraints and a high-profile developer is keen to take the site on; • the early provision of much-needed housing at the site will help West Lancashire Borough Council to meet its challenging dwelling targets and to increase the delivery of affordable housing; • the site presents a rare opportunity for the expansion of Southport / Birkdale / Ainsdale; and • the site will not have any effect on the Council's strategic regeneration objectives in Skelmersdale, Ormskirk and Burscough, all of which are a considerable distance from New Cut Lane and are completely different housing markets. We therefore welcome the Council's proposal to release the New Cut Lane site from Green Belt designation. However, we are concerned that the Council's proposed approach set out in draft Policy GN2 and in Chapter 10 of the Local Plan Preferred Options is too restrictive, and will needlessly delay this site from coming forward and delivering new dwellings for the benefit of both West Lancashire and Sefton. We consider that, instead, the site should be allocated for residential uses in the Local Plan. If the Council prefers to keep the site as 'Plan B' land, we consider that the Council should examine the possibility of releasing this land at a much earlier stage in the plan period than would be possible under the terms of the 'Plan B' wording as currently drafted, so that sufficient deliverable 'Plan B' sites can be brought forward at the appropriate time to meet identified shortfalls against dwelling targets. Whilst the latter suggestion would be an improvement on the 'Plan B' mechanism as currently drafted, allocating our client's site for residential use would undoubtedly be the best way of capturing the significant benefits offered by the site.</p>
<b>Outcome</b>	See response to Representation 825 from same consultee
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change to LPPO

---

<b>ID</b>	905
<b>Consultee name</b>	Jamie Fletcher
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	Concerns over Plan B. (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	<p>The "Plan A" is the whole Local Plan - the preferred strategy, if you will. The Council have proposed this Local Plan because it is deliverable. The Plan B is a back-up plan to ensure flexibility if an unforeseen issue arises with a site or area of the Borough that means the preferred strategy cannot be delivered in its entirety. St Joseph's College is not a part of the preferred strategy or "Plan B" of the Local Plan, because the planning permission for the site has been shown to be unviable.</p>
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No Action

---

**ID** 956  
**Consultee name** Mr & Mrs Kershaw  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** As we own a proportion of the land that is included in the "Plan B", before we could support the proposal we would need to know in depth the quality (i.e. social housing, affordable housing and market housing), quantity and proximity of the proposed developments to our home. We would also like to see further information of the infrastructure for the proposed developments, particularly as our water main runs from Moss Road to our property directly under where the proposed development would occur. (S)  
**Outcome** If the Moss Road Plan B site were to come forward over the course of the Local Plan, it would be required to fulfil all other policies in the Local Plan, like any other development proposal. Therefore, 35% of the new housing on the site would be required to be affordable, with the remainder market housing. Table 10.1 in the LPPO assumes a potential housing capacity for the Moss Road Plan B site of 240 dwellings. New development would need to ensure that access to infrastructure for existing properties, such as water mains, was maintained.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action

---

**ID** 960  
**Consultee name** Wainhomes Developments  
**Agent Name** Mr Stephen Harris  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Whilst Plan B is supported, there are concerns about its 'triggers'. A requirement of 310 dwellings per annum should be used, not the 260 in the first five years of the Plan. The Plan should explain how Plan B sites are to be chosen for release. There are concerns over the appropriateness and deliverability of several of the Plan B sites. Others should thus be identified. (S)  
**Outcome** As currently proposed, the annual target for the first 5 years of the Local Plan would be 260 dwellings. Therefore, any shortfall that Plan B sites may need to make-up for after 5 years would be in relation to the 260 dwelling annual target (1,300), not a 310 dwelling annual target (1,550). Views on the 80% trigger noted, but any threshold has the same effect. 80% was selected as a reasonable threshold that gives a degree of flexibility both ways. If the housing market is slightly slower to recover than anticipated, the 80% threshold (which probably wouldn't be triggered in this instance) gives the Local Plan to the chance to recover the slight deficit more naturally over the course of the Plan period without having to release more greenfield land for development. In relation to how Plan B sites will be selected from the list of 7 to make-up any deficit that emerges over the plan period, this will be a fresh assessment based on the latest evidence at the time of the 5 or 10-year review. While the 3 Plan B sites in Halsall would rely on Sefton services and may attract Sefton residents, they are in West Lancs and can count toward meeting West Lancs needs. They have been selected because, compared to other sites considered elsewhere in West Lancs, they do not fulfil Green Belt purposes and / or are more sustainably located. Therefore, they are suitable for the Plan B. Given that the Plan B allows for up to 15% extra on top of the Local Plan target and all sites are expected to be deliverable either by Year 5 or Year 10, the 7 sites selected are considered sufficient.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 963  
**Consultee name** Wainhomes Developments  
**Agent Name** Mr Stephen Harris  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Whilst Plan B is supported, there are concerns about its 'triggers'. A requirement of 310 dwellings per annum should be used, not 260. The Plan should explain how Plan B sites are to be chosen for release. There are concerns over the appropriateness and deliverability of several of the Plan B sites. Others should thus be identified. The Safeguarded Land at Parrs Lane should be allocated for housing, or at least a Plan B site.(S)  
**Outcome** See Rep 960 from same consultee  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 997  
**Consultee name** Mr John Lloyd  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** I do not think that the seven sites in Plan B should yet be released from the Green Belt for possible future development as there is no present nor forthcoming need actually foreseen for this land. (S)  
**Outcome** The only time that Green Belt boundaries should be reviewed, is through the preparation of a Local Plan. Given that the new Local Plan is for a 15-year period, this would mean that the Green Belt should not need to be reviewed for at least 15 years. Plan B sites need to be identified to ensure flexibility in housing delivery over the entire plan period and, for them to be deliverable, they cannot remain in the Green Belt. Therefore, the Council could not earmark Plan B sites without releasing them from the Green Belt. However, given that Plan B is only a back-up plan if the preferred strategy fails to deliver as anticipated, it would be hoped that the Plan B sites would remain as they are, albeit not designated as Green Belt.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action required

---

**ID** 1088  
**Consultee name** Susan Dunn West Lancashire Civic Trust  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** With regard to Plan B we would not support any further incursions into the Green belt in respect of the areas listed (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No Action

---



**ID** 1096  
**Consultee name** Mr Francis Williams Ormskirk Friends of the Earth  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The Environment Agency have stated that further development at Aughton would place unbearable strain on the water table.  
**Outcome** Comments relating to the Environment Agency's views on development in Aughton will be further investigated as to date this view has not been shared with the Council, despite the EA's continued engagement in the process.  
**Officer recommendation** No change.

---

**ID** 1104  
**Consultee name** Mr Keith Williams Burscough Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Red Cat Lane Plan B is strongly opposed. It fails to provide a defensible boundary against development and fails on infrastructure grounds, traffic and drainage. (S)  
**Outcome** While the release of the Red Cat Lane site from the Green Belt would not initially result in a stronger boundary to the Green Belt in this area, if it was developed, this would "round-off" the settlement area between Red Cat Lane and Moss Nook and create a stronger boundary to both the Green Belt and settlement area. In relation to traffic, if development of the site were anticipated to create traffic problems, the developer would need to rectify these issues as part of the development. In relation to drainage, the Council's information does not show any culverts under the land but the drainage issues in Burscough are well documented. Development at Red Cat Lane would be required to ensure that it did not make the local drainage issues worse.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 1154  
**Consultee name** Mr Robin Buckley Redrow Homes (Lancs) Ltd  
**Agent Name** Mr Tony McAteer  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Plan B is contrary to national policy. Deliverability should be resolved within the Plan itself, not through a 'Plan B'. Ormskirk / Aughton and the Northern Parishes can play an important role in delivering the Council's objectives. Plan B should be able to be implemented earlier than five years, based on annual monitoring. (S)  
**Outcome** The Plan B is proposed as a method of having flexibility in the Local Plan, as required by current and proposed national planning policy. It bears no reflection on the Council's confidence in the preferred strategy. The 5-year review (i.e. 2 reviews in a 15 year plan) does not constitute frequent and is also not an "update". The Plan B is part of the Local Plan - merely a mechanism to provide flexibility and avoid a formal update of the entire Local Plan. The 5 and 10-year reviews are also separate from the annual monitoring that will continue to take place. The 5 and 10-year reviews will utilise the annual monitoring data to make a decision as to whether any Plan B sites need to be released for development but are not monitoring processes in themselves. The Council have chosen a 5-year review in order to allow the Local Plan to become established and see whether it is working as intended before releasing more greenfield land.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action required

---

**ID** 1183  
**Consultee name** Mr Jonathan Clarke Knowsley MBC  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** The Council supports the evidence base employed to identify the West Lancashire's preferred locations for Green Belt release. The Preferred Options document discusses the possibility of releasing some additional Green Belt land for development as part of a "Plan B" scenario. Knowsley Council supports the need to maintain flexibility in the strategy; however it is queried whether other means should also be explored should new development fail to deliver more than 80% of anticipated housing targets over a 5 or 10-year timeframe. This may include, for example, intensification of development within existing allocations, review of the housing target or release of other "surplus" sites which may have become available since adoption of the Plan. (f)  
**Outcome** Observations noted. The Council have chosen a "Plan B" approach in order to give a degree of certainty over the plan period and avoid any need for a formal Local Plan update or review which releases "surplus" sites that emerge, or further Green Belt sites, part way through the plan period. Given the rural nature of West Lancs, intensification of existing allocations would not be suitable (and on the few sites it is, this has already been taken into account in delivering the housing target). Given that the housing target is based on housing need as evidenced by the CLG household projections, unless these projections fall over the plan period, it would be inappropriate to reduce the housing target unless neighbouring authorities were to deliver a proportion instead.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action required

---

**ID** 1194  
**Consultee name** Mr John Gardner  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Has account been taken of the 300 new dwellings which have existing planning approval for construction on the site of the former St Joseph's College in Up Holland? (f)  
**Outcome** To the best of the Council's knowledge, the planning permission granted in 2007 in relation to St Joseph's College will not be delivered over the plan period because it is no longer viable. Any amended application would therefore involve substantial changes to the proposals and would be an entirely separate decision which may not be granted permission. Therefore, based on the current permission and proposals, the Council do not expect this site to come forward for development, meaning that the Council cannot count it toward the delivery of the Local Plan housing target.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 1213  
**Consultee name** Mr Andrew Taylor David Wilson Homes  
**Agent Name** Ms Lorraine Davison DPP  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Chapter 10 should be fully revised. The present approach to housing land provision is unsound and creates unnecessary uncertainty and risk. Allocating at Land at Parr's Lane, Aughton will address the uncertainty by providing a suitable, available, achievable and deliverable housing allocation and remove the need for a 'Plan B'. (S)  
**Outcome** See Response to Representations 1211 and 1212 from same consultee  
**Officer recommendation** No Action required

---

**ID** 1229  
**Consultee name** Mr PF McLaughlin  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support  
**Summary** The reinforced Plan B would seem a sensible standby if housing development plans are problematic. (F)  
**Outcome** support noted  
**Officer recommendation** no action

---

**ID** 1242  
**Consultee name** Ms Karen Martindale  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Concerns at late emergence of Plan B. We believe that Plan B land should not be released at this time. Plan B is flawed. The policy disincentivises developers from building less profitable sites elsewhere in the Borough so that they can develop greenfield sites. The whole policy is counterproductive. Projected housing numbers for some sites should be amended to be consistent with density policy in RS1. (S)  
**Outcome** The Plan B is proposed as a method of having flexibility in the Local Plan, as required by current and proposed national planning policy. It bears no reflection on the Council's confidence in the preferred strategy. The Council have chosen a "Plan B" approach in order to give a degree of certainty over the plan period and avoid any need for a formal Local Plan update or review part way through the plan period if an unforeseen issue causes certain sites not to be delivered. In relation to the density of particular sites, the reasons for this are provided in the site assessments appended to Technical Paper 1. For Parrs Lane and Ruff Lane, it is because the need to develop in context with the surrounding area. For Red Cat Lane, it is because of the fact that the site has existing dwellings on its western and eastern edge and involves several ownerships (some of which are back gardens). Therefore, the entire site might not be developed out.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action required

---

**ID** 1267  
**Consultee name** Mr Andrew Thorley Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd  
**Agent Name** Miss Caroline Simpson Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** Broad support for Plan B but objection to the fact that the Grove Farm north part of the site is not included in either Plan A or Plan B. (S)  
**Outcome** Support noted In relation to the northern part of the Grove Farm site, see rep 1259 against Policy RS1  
**Officer recommendation** See recommendation for rep 1259 against Policy RS1

---

**ID** 1270  
**Consultee name** Mr Alexis De Pol  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** As an alternative to additional Green Belt release through the Plan B, the Plan should consider windfall development opportunities on non-Green Belt land in the Northern Parishes in order to meet this need.  
**Outcome** The potential of the Northern Parishes to deliver development is recognised, and the 400 units assumed for this area is a minimum target and can be exceeded. It is agreed that in general terms, it is preferable to consider non-Green Belt land before Green Belt. However, as alluded to by the Objector, there are issues with infrastructure in the Northern Parishes and there is not considered to be potential for major housing delivery in this area over and above the 400 units assumed in the Plan. Even if flood risk can be adequately mitigated against site-by-site, there are significant hydraulic issues with regard to water supply and waste water, whose resolution would need to be at a Northern-Parishes wide level, rather than site-by-site as individual planning applications are submitted. We have no indication from United Utilities that such works will take place during the lifetime of the Plan, and thus it is not agreed that the Plan should assume significant 'windfall' (or Plan B) housing potential in the Northern Parishes area.  
**Officer recommendation** no change

---

**ID** 1316  
**Consultee name** Mrs Margaret Wiltshire CPRE (West Lancs Group)  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** We do understand the bureaucratic need to have spare land for housing over each five year slot. However, the more we look at the situation, the more we believe that Plan A will make only limited progress and the attractive ex-Green Belt and DS4, mostly green-field sites will in due course become available and a rush to build new houses will amazingly emerge! The demonstrated "flexibility" will enable the patient developers to choose the choicest plots. (S)  
**Outcome** See Response to Representation 1310 from same consultee  
**Officer recommendation** No Action required

---

<b>ID</b>	1321
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mrs Margaret Wiltshire CPRE (West Lancs Group)
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	para 10.8 The table at 10.8 gives an explicit example of something the Council does in several contexts:- policies and figures are prescribed butthen you don't keep to them. A blatant example is the affordable housing proportions. (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	In relation to the density of particular sites, the reasons for this are provided in the site assessments appended to Technical Paper 1. For Parrs Lane and Ruff Lane, it is because the need to develop in context with the surrounding area. For Red Cat Lane, it is because of the fact that the site has existing dwellings on its western and eastern edge and involves several ownerships (some of which are back gardens). Therefore, the entire site might not be developed out.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No Action

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Table 10.1****Title: Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"**

---

<b>ID</b>	26	
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Howard Courtley	Courtley Consultants Ltd
<b>Agent Name</b>		
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object	
<b>Summary</b>	Table 10.1 sites and in particular site (vi) Fine Janes farm should be allocated under RS1 Residential Development in the period 2012-2017 for 60 dwellings. (S)	
<b>Outcome</b>	See Response to Representation 17 from same consultee.	
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No Action Required	

---

<b>ID</b>	739	
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Martin Ainscough	
<b>Agent Name</b>		
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object	
<b>Summary</b>	Land needs to identified in the eastern Parishes and particularly around the key sustainable village of Parbold. In particular par of PAR03 in the Green Belt Study. No development potential for the village of Parbold over the next 15 years is unsustainable. (F)	
<b>Outcome</b>	See Response to Representation 734 from the same consultee	
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No Action required	

---

<b>ID</b>	981	
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Peter Banks	
<b>Agent Name</b>		
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object	
<b>Summary</b>	With the exception of Mill Lane, Upholland (on which I do not express any opinion either way), all of the sites in Table 10.1 should be included in the main plan in place of Grove Farm, High Lane and the majority of Yew Tree Farm (north), Burscough. The rest of Yew Tree Farm (north) could be transferred to this table, but Grove Farm should be excluded from the plan completely as any encroachment into the green belt separating Ormskirk and Burscough will tend to lead to the eventual linking of these two towns. Either Altys Lane, or Holborn Hill should be brought into the list of Plan B sites in place of Grove Farm. (F)	
<b>Outcome</b>	Technical Paper 1 sets out the process the Council went through in identifying preferred Green Belt sites for development and Plan B sites. This process showed that Yew Tree Farm and Grove Farm were the most sustainable and appropriate sites for release from the Green Belt. Therefore, it would be inappropriate to place them in Plan B instead without new evidence to justify this. The development of the Grove Farm site, as proposed in the LPP0, would not close the strategic gap between Ormskirk and Burscough, otherwise it would have been found to still fulfil a purpose of the Green Belt. Altys Lane and Holborn Hill sites were assessed (see Technical Paper 1) but were not found to be as suitable for Plan B as the 7 sites selected.	
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No Action required	

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Appendix A**

**Title: Local Plan Preparation**

---

<b>ID</b>	804
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mr Robert W. Pickavance
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Other
<b>Summary</b>	Having campaigned for the last twenty-five years for the New Road site to be developed I feel now is the time to move the site forward with a tasteful development that would be in keeping with the village and would be acceptable to the village community where I live. (S)
<b>Outcome</b>	Comments noted
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Appendix B**

**Title: The Spatial & Strategic Objectives**

---

**ID** 100

**Consultee name** Church Commissioners For England

**Agent Name** Miss Jennifer Hadland Smiths Gore

**Nature of response** Observations

**Summary** Finally, with regard to monitoring and implementing the proposed policies within the Local Plan, it is important for the polices and justification behind them to be flexible enough to address potential changes that may take place over the next 15 years which covers the forthcoming plan period. (F)

**Outcome** Comments noted. This flexibility to change is dealt with through the policies. Regular monitoring will ensure that the plan can adapt to any changes.

**Officer recommendation** No action required.

---

**ID** 1296

**Consultee name** Kate Wheeler Natural England

**Agent Name**

**Nature of response** Observations

**Summary** Recommendations for monitoring indicators in relation to the SA. (S)

**Outcome** Comments noted. The recommendations will be considered when the SA indicators are prepared.

**Officer recommendation** The recommendations will be considered when the SA indicators are prepared.

---



**Chapter/Policy Number: Appendix C**

**Title: Planning Policy Background**

---

<b>ID</b>	1323
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mrs Margaret Wiltshire CPRE (West Lancs Group)
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Support
<b>Summary</b>	We are pleased to see the updated explanation of the Planning Policy Background. (F)
<b>Outcome</b>	support noted
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No action

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Appendix D**

**Title: Setting Locally-determined Targets**

---

<b>ID</b>	530
<b>Consultee name</b>	Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad      Lathom South Parish Council
<b>Agent Name</b>	
<b>Nature of response</b>	Object
<b>Summary</b>	The "RSS deficit" over the years 2003-2012 is a false figure, since most of that "deficit" occurred as a result of restraint to correct over-development in the preceding years. (s)
<b>Outcome</b>	It is clear from Inspector's decisions on recent Examinations of Local Development Documents and from the Government's Growth Agenda that the Council are required to make up what has been termed the RSS deficit or "pent-up" need for housing that has yet to be delivered. Therefore, the housing target in the Local Plan must account for this.
<b>Officer recommendation</b>	No change

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Appendix E**

**Title: Delivery & Risk**

---

**ID** 531  
**Consultee name** Mrs Elizabeth Anne Broad Lathom South Parish Council  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Appendix E Delivery and Risk Policy Area RS4 page 236 Contingencies for the Risks Contradictory statement. (f)  
**Outcome** Disagree  
**Officer recommendation** No Action

---

**ID** 896  
**Consultee name** Mr Philip Carter Environment Agency  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** In relation to Policy IF3 and the 'contingencies for the risks', as stated during the consultation on the preferred option Core Strategy, on-site waste water treatment in sewerred areas would be unacceptable from the perspective of the Environment Agency. (s)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** Amend 2nd para of Contingencies for the Risks for Policy IF3 to remove reference to on-site waste water treatment.

---

**Chapter/Policy Number: Appendix G****Title: Key Amendments to the Proposals Map**

---

**ID** 27  
**Consultee name** Mr Howard Courtley Courtley Consultants Ltd  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Amend Appendix Map G7 Western Parish and change from GN 4 (vi) Fine Janes Farm to RS1 Residential development RS1 (x) Fine Janes Farm. (F)  
**Outcome** Disagree - see response to Representation 17 from same consultee  
**Officer recommendation** No Action

---

**ID** 239  
**Consultee name** Mr Tim Haughton  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** There has been too much housing development in this area recently. (f)  
**Outcome** Comment noted  
**Officer recommendation** No Action

---

**ID** 377  
**Consultee name** Mr Andy Pringle ICD / Maharishi Community  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Support with conditions  
**Summary** On Map G3 the boundary should also include Victoria Park as a development potential for a mixed use development to further enhance the town and town centre. In addition to Yew Tree Farm this would be a natural infill development. (S)  
**Outcome** Disagree - See response to Representation 376 from same consultee  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 898  
**Consultee name** Mr Philip Carter Environment Agency  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** List of constraints which apply in relation to each map/sites. (S)  
**Outcome** Observations noted. The constraints pointed out will be applied at planning application stage in the event these sites are allocated. The consideration of Skelmersdale and Ormskirk as a Critical Drainage Area will take place within the SFRA Level 2 which is due to be finalised following consultation of the draft. Direct reference will be made to the SFRA Level 2 within the relevant sections of the Local Plan. The replacement of the Aveling Drive Culvert will be referenced within the Local Plan.  
**Officer recommendation** Direct reference will be made to the SFRA Level 2 within the relevant sections of the Local Plan. The replacement of the Aveling Drive Culvert will be referenced within the Local Plan.

---

**ID** 926  
**Consultee name** Sheila Wright Bain Wright Partnership  
**Agent Name** Ms Sheila Wright  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Whilst the settlement boundary has been extended to include more of Tarleton School's buildings, it should be further extended to include the sports centre and hardstanding. (S)  
**Outcome** Agreed  
**Officer recommendation** Amend settlement boundary to include sports centre and hardstanding.

---

**ID** 983  
**Consultee name** Mr Andy Pringle Ideal Community Developments  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** To include Victoria Park, Burscough in the green belt release for mixed use residential development in conjunction with Burscough Football Ground for approximately 100 units. This on the basis that the sports and recreation will be relocated to an alternative suitable location. (F)  
**Outcome** See response to rep 376 from same consultee  
**Officer recommendation** Without new evidence to justify Green Belt release in this location and without certainty on potential proposals for redevelopment within the settlement boundary, this land should not be allocated in the Local Plan for mixed-use redevelopment.

---

**ID** 1001  
**Consultee name** Mr Stephen Barron  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** Query over amendments to boundaries within the proposals maps (S)  
**Outcome** Amendments of boundaries at Fletcher Ave and Fairbank Ave were made to attempt to better reflect the built-up area of the village. The open space at Fletcher Avenue, while protected from development as it is a public open space, is correctly included within the settlement boundary as it lies directly between residential dwellings to the west and the Tarleton Mill Rural Development Opportunity to the east, both of which are part of the settlement area. As such, it should be retained within the settlement area as a public open space.  
**Officer recommendation** No change required

---

**ID** 1013  
**Consultee name** Mr D Rimmer  
**Agent Name** Mr Chris Cockwill Cockwill & Co  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Settlement boundaries around Banks should be changed to reflect planning permission and funding from the HCA for housing. (S)  
**Outcome** Disagree - inclusion of site within settlement area or otherwise would have no impact on delivery of site as per existing planning permission  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 1026  
**Consultee name** Hughes Mushrooms  
**Agent Name** Mr Chris Cockwill Cockwill & Co  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** The settlement boundary of Newburgh should be changed to include PB.24(SHLAA Site) to the excluded from the Green Belt and within the Settlement Boundary enabling redevelopment to take place. (F)  
**Outcome** Green Belt release on the edge of rural settlements such as Newburgh was considered in the plan preparation process and rejected as an unsustainable approach and would involve the release of land that is still fulfilling the purposes of the Green Belt.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 1084  
**Consultee name** Mr Stan Meredith ADGBURM  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Map G1, p.254 – is there an error in identifying this site on the Proposals Map as GN1 (a) iv rather than as GN2, as so described on p.67 ?; if so, does such mis-attribution impair the validity of the consultation process on this matter?(F)  
**Outcome** Map G1, on p.252, included an error on the label for the Mill Lane site in up Holland. While this error is regrettable, it does not invalidate the consultation in any way.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 1135  
**Consultee name** 3G All Weather Football  
**Agent Name** Mr Paul Sedgwick Sedgwick Associates  
**Nature of response** Object  
**Summary** Suggested amendment to Green Belt boundary at 140 Station Road, Hesketh Bank. (S)  
**Outcome** The vast majority of the site marked on the attached plan is still open and in a sports / recreation use (e.g. sports pitches) or in a horticultural use and so a suitable use in the Green Belt. The development of a single building (itself only in the north-west corner of the site, adjacent to the village boundary) does not justify the release of the entire site.  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

**ID** 1324  
**Consultee name** Mrs Margaret Wiltshire CPRE (West Lancs Group)  
**Agent Name**  
**Nature of response** Observations  
**Summary** We were pleased to see some maps and would have liked more. These were rather small and it was not always easy to read the detail. On map G7, the numbering of sites does not correspond to the table in the text (p65-66). (F)  
**Outcome** Comments noted  
**Officer recommendation** No Action Required

---

## **Response to Local Plan Preferred Options Representations 920, 1070 and 1071 submitted by Michelle Blair, Ms Gillian Bjork and Gavin Rattray**

### General Comments

**Brownfield sites** – the Local Plan does not allocate all potential housing sites within the Borough because, the way policy is written (SP1, GN1 and RS1), it is made clear that the principle of residential development on sites within the settlement boundaries (especially brownfield sites) is permitted, subject to the specific requirements of other policies in the Local Plan. In preparing the Local Plan, the Council have used the SHLAA as the basis for available and suitable land for development and in order to meet the housing target set for the Borough it is clear that the all the available and suitable sites within the settlement boundaries will be required as well as a small amount of Green Belt land.

**Empty houses** – It is not appropriate to count empty homes toward the delivery of housing development targets. It should also be noted that vacancy levels in West Lancashire are in the nationally accepted normal range (3-4%) required for the housing market to function efficiently.

**“Small-scale” infill of Green Belt** – when considering the options for the release of Green Belt in the Local Plan, the Council based their decision on two key factors: firstly, the quality of the Green Belt and the impact removing the Green Belt designation would have and, secondly, the sustainability and deliverability of development in any given location.

In relation to the first factor, the Green Belt Study identified only 14 parcels of land that no longer fulfilled at least one of the purposes of the Green Belt. Of these 14, only 10 parcels were in sustainable locations and deliverable, 5 of which together form the Yew Tree Farm site. The remaining 5 have all been included in the Local Plan either as a preferred development site or a “Plan B” site.

While the quality of the Green Belt is not the only factor, consideration must be given to how changing the Green Belt boundary would impact the remaining Green Belt nearby. When a Green Belt boundary is changed the boundary must be set having regard to the intended permanence of the new boundary so that it may endure beyond the plan period. This can be challenging in rural areas characterised by large fields, often only separated by weak boundaries, and can mean a Green Belt boundary is moved further than is actually required. This is especially the case when considering only “small-scale” infill.

In addition, spreading development around several Green Belt sites has the effect of diluting the development funding for new infrastructure, as well as impacting on more areas of Green Belt. In a rural area such as West Lancs, where infrastructure can often need upgrading to service new development, a critical mass of development is required to make the development viable. “Small-scale” infill would not generate this critical mass in any one location and instead cause infrastructure problems in several locations.

**Affordable housing** – Policy RS2 expressly requires that a set percentage of properties in a development must be affordable. The only reason that the Council would allow a specific development to move away from this requirement is on the



grounds of financial viability, but this would only rarely affect a development proposal and, even then, it is unlikely that no affordable housing contribution would be made.

**Spare capacity within neighbouring authorities** – the Council has worked closely with all its neighbours in preparing the West Lancashire Local Plan and in preparing the Local Plans / LDFs of neighbouring authorities.

At Options stage (September 2009), the Council consulted on an option whereby neighbouring properties took a proportion of West Lancs' housing target. This option was not only rejected by residents of West Lancs, but was found to be unrealistic given that neighbouring authorities are struggling to find sufficient land to meet their own housing needs.

In addition, any transfer of housing target between Local Authorities should only take place where there is a close relationship between housing markets, and while there is a degree of overlap with housing markets in some neighbouring authorities, West Lancs' housing markets are broadly consistent with the Borough boundary.

**Incomplete and non-impartial evidence** – while this issue will be addressed where it is raised in the detailed comments, the Council has great confidence in the thoroughness of the Local Plan evidence base and has no reason to believe that any of the sources of this evidence are anything other than robust and accurate sources of evidence undertaken by professionals with suitable qualifications and undertaken with impartiality.

## 1. Surface Water and Fluvial Flooding

The Local Plan Preferred Options (LPPO) acknowledges that there are surface water flooding issues in Burscough and Policy SP3 requires any development to resolve these issues in relation to the Yew Tree Farm site – it states that development should deliver: “*Measures to address the surface water drainage issues on the Yew Tree Farm site and in Burscough generally*”. Ultimately, it is believed that this surface water flooding constraint can be overcome through improvements to the drainage infrastructure and this would be funded by developers.

In addition, any increase in surface water run-off from the development of a greenfield site would not be permitted to be discharged to a public sewer and so the improvements to drainage infrastructure will also address any increased surface water run-off from the Yew Tree Farm site as a result of development.

In relation to fluvial flooding, no part of the Burscough settlement area (as proposed in the LPPO) is affected by Flood Zones 2 or 3, while Ormskirk and Skelmersdale both have small areas of land in Flood Zones 2 and 3 alongside watercourses flowing through the towns. Therefore, while Burscough may be lower lying, the risk of fluvial flooding is still very low and should not act as a constraint to development and the Spatial Evidence Paper is correct to state that “*Burscough does not lie directly in areas of significant fluvial flood risk*”.

## 2. Waste Water

There are two separate waste water issues described here; one with regard the environmental limits on discharge at the New Lane treatment works and one with regard the capacity of the sewer network running through Burscough to New Lane.

Both would need to be addressed prior to, or through, development at Yew Tree Farm and this is clearly set out in the penultimate paragraph of Policy SP3.

In relation to the Green Belt Study, this assessment informed the preparation of the Local Plan, but it did not decide which parcels of land should or should not be removed from the Green Belt or what they should be developed for. Only the Local Plan can do this. Therefore, the Green Belt Study simply found that, along with other parcels, the land at Yew Tree Farm and the land at Parrs Lane (AUG04) does not fulfil the purposes of being included in the Green Belt anymore.

Stage 3 of the Green Belt Study went on to assess the sustainability and deliverability merits of the sites that were found to no longer fulfil the purposes of the Green Belt, simply to inform the consideration of these sites in the Local Plan process, but, again, it cannot make a decision as to whether a site is removed from the Green Belt or how it is developed. Agricultural land quality and waste water infrastructure were just two of the many factors assessed in Stage 3.

### 3. School Places

Consideration has been given to the impact of new development in Burscough on school places. However, this consideration has to be informed by the Local Education Authority's views on the matter. The Council has consulted closely with the Local Education Authority on development proposals in the LPPO, and no issue has been raised with regard secondary school places in Burscough or elsewhere in the Borough.

### 4. Traffic

- a) The Traffic Impact Assessment Tool (TIAT) that has informed the Transport Technical Paper has assessed the impact on the local road network in West Lancashire of **all** the development proposed in the LPPO, as well as the 3 options consulted upon previously for the Core Strategy Preferred Options (CSPO). It does not assess the impact of any one site, as this would be unhelpful as it would take that impact out of the context of the rest of the Local Plan developments.
- b) The data collected from the TIAT was considered in light of several factors, including Traffic Master data, which calculates the average speeds and journey times along a route. This data identifies "evidence of traffic density" as where speeds slow, the same amount of traffic will inevitably become more dense. Therefore, this issue was considered in the assessment work undertaken and the results of this showed a clear issue on the A570 in relation to the Core Strategy Option 1 which was far greater than the impact on the A59 in any of the other options.
- c) The evidence summarised in the Transport Technical Paper clearly acknowledges that there will be more traffic on the roads across the Borough and that, in certain locations, this increase in traffic could potentially have a detrimental impact. However, consideration needs to be given to how severe this impact would be in different locations with different development options and what improvements to the highway network can be made to reduce any negative traffic impact. Ultimately, it is considered that, as well as the potential impact on Burscough being less than other parts of the Borough with other development

options, there are improvement measures that can be identified to improve traffic flow through Burscough.

- d) See response to “school places” above.
- e) While the LPPO includes the Ormskirk bypass as an infrastructure improvement that the Council supports and would like to see happen, the fact remains that, at the moment, it would seem funding for the bypass will not be available in the foreseeable future. Therefore, it would be inappropriate to include it as a mitigation measure for any option.

## 5. Green Belt

- a) The Green Belt Study has been validated by Lancashire County Council, who gave an independent professional view of the study. Their views and validation of the study were an integral part of the development of the study.
- b) Burscough is included alongside Skelmersdale / Up Holland and Ormskirk / Aughton as a large built-up area because these are the three largest settlements and the only Key Service Centres in the Borough. However, even if Burscough had not been considered as a large built-up area for the purposes of the Green Belt Study, and the parcels on the edge of Burscough had not been assessed against Purpose One, the same parcels would still have been found as not fulfilling the purposes of the Green Belt. Parbold is not considered a Key Service Centre, and so was considered as a rural settlement in the Green Belt Study.
- c) The option of delivering some of West Lancs’ housing needs in neighbouring authorities was considered at the Core Strategy Options stage in September 2009. The neighbouring authorities that would be most appropriate for meeting West Lancs’ housing needs are struggling to meet their own housing needs on non-Green Belt land, and so this option was not considered viable. It would also be inappropriate to require a neighbouring authority(ies) to meet West Lancs’ housing needs in their Green Belt if there are reasonable and sustainable sites in the Green Belt in West Lancs.
- d) Assessing the Green Belt is inevitably a subjective process. National guidance is not so prescriptive as to result in an entirely objective method of assessing Green Belt, and so the interpretation of different purposes and of different boundaries will vary somewhat even between planning professionals. In particular, the character of the Yew Tree Farm site makes it more difficult than most to divide into parcels and indeed, some planning professionals would consider it as one whole parcel due to the strongest boundaries in the area being the roads and built-lines that make up the boundary of the strategic development site. However, it is unlikely that a change to how the site was divided into parcels would have resulted in a different outcome.
- e) Green Belt is a long-term policy instrument, hence why Green Belt boundaries have not been changed in the Ormskirk / Aughton and Burscough area for 25 years even though it was intended that the Green Belt in this area would be reviewed after 20 years at most. However, as pointed out, the development of the disused airfield for industrial units has affected the character of the Green Belt to the south-west of Burscough.

In terms of the purposes of the Green Belt:

- Purpose 1 – The release of Green Belt at Yew Tree Farm would not constitute urban sprawl given that it is already contained on three and a half sides and it would not close the gap between Burscough and the hamlet of New Lane.
- Purpose 2 – The industrial estate and existing housing at Vicarage Gardens are both closer to the hamlet of New Lane than any part of the proposed Strategic Development Site. It will also not close the gap between Ormskirk and Burscough.
- Purpose 3 – PPG2 (and now the NPPF) defines what is a “countryside use” in relation to this purpose and large parts of the Yew Tree Farm site cannot be said to clearly be in such a use at the current time from a visual inspection of the site. The majority of open fields / land offer the opportunity for agriculture to take place, some form of wildlife to exist and recreational uses to occur. However, the study assessed the parcels to examine whether a clear countryside use was occurring. On any of the parcels assessed within the study, not just those within Burscough, the Council were looking for clear signs of agriculture, wildlife existence (such as a designation or visible presence), recreational activities such as stabling, outdoor pursuits or designated paths and parklands and considering whether a parcel contributes to an attractive landscape. None of the parcels making up the Yew Tree Farm site clearly demonstrated how they fulfilled any such countryside use. Furthermore, through the consultation process on the draft Green Belt Study, no uses were then subsequently brought to the attention of the Council, for example from farmers who may have been occupying the land or local people who may have used the land for recreational purposes.
- Purpose 4 – Burscough is not a historic town in the sense that PPG2 intended it to be meant and it has already been acknowledged by the Council that Burscough has been mislabeled a historic market town in several documents – this is being corrected.

In relation to New Lane, the hamlet is “washed over” by the Green Belt (i.e. it is part of the Green Belt). Purpose Two relates to the merging of two settlements not in the Green Belt. However, even if New Lane could be considered in this way, the release of Green Belt at Yew Tree Farm is further away from New Lane than existing industrial and residential areas that are not in the Green Belt.

- f) The draft Green Belt Study was publicly consulted upon in May / June 2011 and there was ample opportunity for members of the public to have input to the study via this consultation. This consultation raised several instances where inconsistencies in assessment had taken place and the Council were able to rectify these thanks to this input. No-one queried the assessment of parcels BUR08-12, nor the assessment of APB10, at that time. It should also be added that the independent validation by LCC did not query this assessment.

BUR08-12 are a unique situation with regard the Green Belt in West Lancs. Together they constitute a relatively small area that is virtually entirely enclosed by areas of land not in the Green Belt. This means the land contributes very little, if anything, to the openness of the wider Green Belt and the Green Belt Study could just have easily not divided the site into several parcels, but considered it instead as one, single large parcel. Therefore, it is appropriate to consider the parcels collectively as well as individually. Ultimately, the assessments of the

many parcels in the Green Belt Study are generally consistent and they have been independently validated and scrutinised via a public consultation.

In assessing Purpose Three, the Green Belt Study can only assess the land as it is at the time of assessment and the descriptions used are accurate for the site at the time of assessment, and are still accurate at the time of the LPPO consultation. However, it should be stressed that, while the condition of the site does not help any case for the site remaining in the Green Belt, the key reason that it no longer fulfils the purposes of the Green Belt is its enclosure. This enclosure influences the character of the site as a whole and, in many ways, discourages “countryside uses”.

- g) As stated above, the draft Green Belt Study has been independently validated and the subject of a public consultation exercise and the descriptions used are accurate for the site at the time of assessment, and are still accurate at the time of the LPPO consultation.
- h) Purpose Four relates to the setting and character of historic towns, not simply any Listed Building. English Heritage’s letter refers to the proposed LPPO Policy SP3, not the Green Belt Study. The fact that there are 3 Listed Buildings adjacent to the site has no bearing on Green Belt policy.
- i) Table 6.4 provides a summary of the assessments of the parcels, drawing out the key issues for deliverability and sustainability. The full assessment is provided in Appendix 3.
- j) Agricultural land classification has not been used as a defining constraint as to whether land should be released from the Green Belt or not. The Green Belt Study, which cannot make the decision to release land from the Green Belt, merely attempts to assess the deliverability issues affecting those parcels found no to fulfil the purposes of the Green Belt using the best available evidence. The evidence referred to in relation to agricultural land classification is all from an impartial and professional source.

However, the Local Plan can make the decision to release Green Belt or not and the LPPO proposes to release not only BUR08-12, but also AUG04 and ORM01, demonstrating that, while agricultural land classification was a consideration, it ultimately does not prevent land from being released from the Green Belt if other factors provide sufficient justification to do so.

## 6. Loss of amenities, wildlife habitat and heritage

- a) Heritage matters are addressed in Policy EN4 of the LPPO, which would replace Policy EN5 of the current 2006 Replacement Local Plan. Development can occur at Yew Tree Farm and other locations in the Borough without having a detrimental impact on the Listed Buildings in proximity. Mitigation measures would be proposed by an applicant for approval at submission of a planning application or potentially through a masterplan on a site such as Yew Tree Farm. English Heritage’s comments have been received separately and Policy SP3 will be amended accordingly.
- b) Where possible, developments should seek to retain mature trees and hedgerows as part of the development proposals but, where this is not possible, Policy EN2 of the LPPO requires replacement of these features.

- c) While the HRA raises concerns about the impact on Martin Mere of development at Yew Tree Farm, it suggests potential mitigation measures and, ultimately, does not rule out development of the site on this basis. The LPPO proposals for Yew Tree Farm do not represent an increase in the size of development at Yew Tree Farm as previously proposed in the options for the Core Strategy.

## 7. Housing

The Yew Tree Farm development will deliver an element of affordable housing as would be required by Policy RS2, but the choice of Yew Tree Farm as preferred site is not on the basis of its provision of affordable housing. While it would be ideal to place affordable housing precisely where the need is, this is not always possible because of other planning considerations.

## **Response to Local Plan Preferred Options Representations submitted using the BAG standard letter template**

### 1) Viable alternatives are available

While it is true that there were more objections to “Option 1” of the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation than other options, “Option 2” received very few objections and there was still a relatively large number of objections to “Option 3”. The Local Plan Preferred Option for Green Belt release essentially forms a hybrid of Options 1 and 2, and so has tried to balance the views expressed in the last consultation with other evidence and factors which must influence the Council’s decision-making.

The Petition received in December 2011 was received too late to have any bearing on the preparation of the Local Plan Preferred Options document, but will of course be taken into consideration alongside comments in this consultation.

All brownfield sites in West Lancs have been taken into account and the vast majority will be required for development in the Local Plan period – Green Belt release has only been considered because there is insufficient brownfield land to meet the housing and employment land targets.

Existing empty homes in the Borough cannot be counted toward the housing target for the Local Plan and WLBC have never stated that it can. A 3% vacancy is typical in any housing market and is required to ensure an appropriate level of “churn” in the housing market.

Spreading Green Belt release around several smaller sites around the Borough was considered as a potential option early on in the preparation of the Local Plan, but was rejected because it would impact on more areas of Green Belt (many of which actually fulfil the purposes of Green Belt), it would spread the impact on infrastructure around the Borough without raising sufficient developer contributions to address the infrastructure issues created by those developments in several different places, and even a small amount of development on the edge of a rural village can have a much greater impact than on a small town like Burscough. It should also be noted that the delivery of several small sites solely of affordable housing to replace the 500 dwellings proposed at Yew Tree Farm would be highly unlikely.

### 2) Burscough as a rural area

Burscough is the Borough’s third largest settlement, is considered a Key Service Centre that residents from a wide surrounding area use for services and amenities and is a far more sustainable settlement than the next largest settlement in the Borough (Tarleton) with comparably better infrastructure than the rural areas of the Borough. In comparison to the larger settlements in the Borough, Skelmersdale with Up Holland is proposed to take over half the new housing in the Borough over the next 15 years (and the market cannot deliver any greater than this in one area) and Ormskirk suffers from

similar infrastructure constraints to Burscough, except that Ormskirk has far greater traffic congestion issues with limited scope for improvements to the highway infrastructure.

### 3) Reducing the gap between residential areas and industrial units

Any development of the Yew Tree Farm site, whether for residential or employment uses, would be required to meet standard planning and building regulations in relation to distances between residential and employment uses, and so an appropriate and safe buffer between residential and employment areas would be maintained. The land at Yew Tree Farm as it currently stands provides a far larger buffer than is required to maintain the safety of residents.

### 4) Waste Water Problems

Addressing the constraints of the existing waste water treatment infrastructure that serves Ormskirk, Burscough, Rufford and parts of Scarisbrick is not a constraint that the Council can resolve independently. United Utilities are the sewerage undertaker for West Lancashire and as such they have a duty to upgrade and improve the network to support growth and development. However, the Council have regular dialogue with both United Utilities and the Environment Agency to assist in delivering these improvements in order to support development and growth within the Borough.

Whilst the Council understands that residents feel these improvements should be made regardless of new development, both United Utilities and the Environment Agency have confirmed that the treatment works is currently operating to an acceptable standard. Notwithstanding this point, all parties are aware of the capacity constraint within the system and will continue to work together to ensure that a resolution is within the future work programme of United Utilities.

### 5) Surface Water Flooding

The responsibility for addressing the surface water flooding issues in Burscough lies with United Utilities, who have a duty to maintain and upgrade the sewers, and landowners, who have a duty to maintain culverts on their land. New development provides a potential opportunity to address some of these issues as the engineering work that must be put in place by a developer or landowner to ensure that the surface water infrastructure can cope with the additional development will also improve the existing situation. Such improvements must be made before any development proposals on Yew Tree Farm are delivered.

### 6) Traffic Issues

The Council, together with Lancashire County Council (as highways authority), have undertaken analysis of the potential increase in traffic associated with all new developments proposed in the Local Plan, and the three separate options previously consulted upon. While new development in



Burscough will add more vehicles onto the road network around the settlement, the capacity of the road network can adequately support the increased number of vehicles, when taken together with improvements to junctions and the management of traffic.

#### 7) Detail on transport proposals

The Council are working closely with transport providers to encourage improvements to rail and bus services / infrastructure that serve Burscough. However, given that the responsibility for implementing any public transport or highway improvements does not lie with the Council, all the Local Plan can do is support proposals the Council believes would be beneficial and cost-effective and encourage those organisations responsible for that infrastructure to deliver improvements.

Detailed junction improvements directly associated with the Yew Tree Farm site would be assessed and identified through a separate masterplanning exercise for the site in the future, in close consultation with the local community. A new bypass for Burscough has not been proven to be cost-effective or necessary and is highly unlikely to come forward.

#### 8) Loss of Green Belt, agricultural land and wildlife habitat

The Council are looking at releasing Green Belt land for development only as a last resort in order to meet housing and employment needs over the next 15 years. The total area of Green Belt release proposed in the Local Plan is for approximately 135 ha, which constitutes only 0.39% of the Borough's Green Belt. This relatively small quantity of land, not all of which is used for agriculture, represents a very small proportion of the Borough's agricultural land and will have little effect on the agricultural economy in the Borough.

The agricultural land quality of the Yew Tree Farm site, which was assessed by professional consultants, was only one factor used in assessing the potential sites for Green Belt release. In comparison to the other sites assessed (including some which had been assessed in more detail for agricultural land quality), the Yew Tree Farm site generally did not have as good quality agricultural land.

The Yew Tree Farm site is bounded by existing development on three and a half sides, with only a small 100m gap between the built line on the western boundary (Tollgate Road) and a larger 500m gap on the northern boundary (Higgins Lane). The Green Belt study found that this site no longer fulfils any of the purposes of the Green Belt.

The HRA ultimately found that the Local Plan did not have any negative effects on international sites of nature importance that could not be mitigated for. To the best of the Council's knowledge, the Yew Tree Farm site does not hold any significant habitat or wildlife value, but if protected species and their habitats were identified on the site, these would need to be accommodated before development took place.

**Recommendation:** No Action Required

Respondent Surname	Respondent first name	Respondent title	Respondent organisation	Agent name	Agent organisation	Rep number	Chapter/Policy Number	Chapter / Policy Title
Abram	Diane					743	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Abram	L	Mr and Mrs				778	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Ackers	Chris					404	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Ainscough	Martin	Mr				732	3.2	Spatial and Strategic Objectives
Ainscough	Martin	Mr				733	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Ainscough	Edward	Mr				820	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Ainscough	Martin	Mr				734	Policy GN2	Safeguarded Land
Ainscough	Martin	Mr				735	Policy EC2	The Rural Economy
Ainscough	Martin	Mr				736	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Ainscough	Martin	Mr				737	Policy EN3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Ainscough	Martin	Mr				738	Policy EN4	Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Built Environment
Ainscough	Martin	Mr				739	Table 10.1	
Alker	Janet	Mrs				721	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Allen	AR					466	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Allen	J	Mrs				774	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Anderson	Gordon					435	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Anglo International Up Holland Ltd				Ms Lorraine Davison	DPP	839	3.2	Spatial and Strategic Objectives
Anglo International Up Holland Ltd				Ms Lorraine Davison	DPP	840	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Anglo International Up Holland Ltd				Ms Lorraine Davison	DPP	841	Policy GN1	Settlement Boundaries
Anglo International Up Holland Ltd				Ms Lorraine Davison	DPP	842	Policy GN4	Demonstrating Viability
Anglo International Up Holland Ltd				Ms Lorraine Davison	DPP	843	Policy GN5	Sequential Tests
Anglo International Up Holland Ltd				Ms Lorraine Davison	DPP	844	Policy EC2	The Rural Economy
Anglo International Up Holland Ltd				Ms Lorraine Davison	DPP	845	Policy EC3	Rural Development Opportunities
Anglo International Up Holland Ltd				Ms Lorraine Davison	DPP	846	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Anglo International Up Holland Ltd				Ms Lorraine Davison	DPP	847	Policy RS2	Affordable Housing
Anglo International Up Holland Ltd				Ms Lorraine Davison	DPP	848	Policy IF4	Developer Contributions
Anglo International Up Holland Ltd				Ms Lorraine Davison	DPP	849	Policy EN4	Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Built Environment
Artiss	Simon	Mr	Bellway Homes Ltd			551	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Artiss	Simon	Mr	Bellway Homes Ltd			552	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Artiss	Simon	Mr	Bellway Homes Ltd			549	7.1	Residential Development
Artiss	Simon	Mr	Bellway Homes Ltd			550	Chapter 10	Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"
Ashcroft		Mr				166	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Ashcroft	J	Mrs				336	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Ashcroft	J					692	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Ashcroft	H					703	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Ashton	Scott David	Mr				618	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Atkinson	B	Mrs				236	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Bagnall	J	Mr				117	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Bailey	Ashley	Mr				716	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Bailey	Glezel					717	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Bailey	Kenneth	Mr				718	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Bailey	Pauline	Mrs				719	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Baker	John	Mr				140	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Baldwin	Karen					724	7.1	Residential Development

Respondent Surname	Respondent first name	Respondent title	Respondent organisation	Agent name	Agent organisation	Rep number	Chapter/Policy Number	Chapter / Policy Title
Ball	Sydney					456	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Balmer	Denis					688	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Bamber	Peter	Mr				104	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Bampton	JN					275	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Banks	Peter	Mr				909	2.2	Key Issues
Banks	Peter	Mr				925	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Banks	Peter	Mr				928	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
Banks	Philip	Mr				389	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Banks	Peter	Mr				929	Policy GN2	Safeguarded Land
Banks	Peter	Mr				930	6.4	Edge Hill University
Banks	Peter	Mr				917	7.1	Residential Development
Banks	Peter	Mr				933	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Banks	Peter	Mr				935	Policy RS3	Provision of Student Accommodation
Banks	Peter	Mr				936	Policy IF1	Maintaining Vibrant Town and Local Centres
Banks	Peter	Mr				937	Policy IF2	Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice
Banks	Peter	Mr				938	Policy IF2	Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice
Banks	Peter	Mr				939	Policy EN1	Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure
Banks	Peter	Mr				940	Policy EN2	Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Natural Environment
Banks	Peter	Mr				942	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Banks	Peter	Mr				981	Table 10.1	
Barclay	HJ	Mrs				1062	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Barge	J	Mr & Mrs				283	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Barlow	Harold					777	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Barlow	John					1325	7.1	Residential Development
Barlow	John					1326	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Barlow	John					1327	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Barlow	John					1328	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Barlow	John					1329	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Barlow	John					1330	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Barlow	John					1331	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Barrie	E					120	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Barron	Stephen	Mr				1009	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Plan
Barron	Stephen	Mr				1001	Appendix G	Key Amendments to the Proposals Map
Barton		Ms				915	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Plan
Barton		Ms				69	Policy GN5	Sequential Tests
Barton		Ms				68	7.1	Residential Development
Barton		Ms				70	7.1	Residential Development
Barton		Ms				238	7.1	Residential Development
Barton		Ms				429	7.1	Residential Development
Barton		Ms				475	7.1	Residential Development
Barton		Ms				45	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Barton		Ms				923	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Barton		Ms				943	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Barton		Ms				941	9.2	Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Natural Environment
Barton		Ms				838	Policy EN2	Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Natural Environment
Basterra	J	Mr & Mrs				1056	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Baxter	AA					282	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Baybutt	A	Mr				437	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Bayfield	Roy	Mr				6	Policy EC4	Edge Hill University
Beaham	A	Mr				384	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Beaton	Ron					646	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Beaumont	Stephen	Mr				160	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Beaumont	P	Mr & Mrs				635	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Beer	Pamela					249	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Beesley	W					580	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Beesley	C					614	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Bell	Roger	Mr	OPSTA			1351	Chapter 3	A Vision for West Lancashire 2027
Bell	Roger	Mr	OPSTA			1354	Chapter 4	Strategic Policies
Bell	Roger	Mr				1349	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Bell	Roger	Mr	OPSTA			1350	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Bell	Roger	Mr				1127	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire

Respondent Surname	Respondent first name	Respondent title	Respondent organisation	Agent name	Agent organisation	Rep number	Chapter/Policy Number	Chapter / Policy Title
Bell	Roger	Mr				1125	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Bell	Roger	Mr	OPSTA			1356	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
Bell	Roger	Mr				1348	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Bell	Roger	Mr	OPSTA			1353	Policy IF2	Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice
Bell	Roger	Mr	OPSTA			1355	Policy IF2	Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice
Bell	Roger	Mr	OPSTA			1357	Policy IF2	Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice
Bell	Roger	Mr	OPSTA			1358	Policy IF2	Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice
Bell	Roger	Mr	OPSTA			1352	8.3	Service Accessibility and Infrastructure for Growth
Bell	J	Mr				837	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Bellamy	Elaine					211	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Bellingall	Eric					299	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Berry	J					132	8.2	Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice
Bibby	Rebecca	Mrs				791	7.1	Residential Development
Billington		Mr & Mrs				567	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Birch	P					566	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Birch		Mr/Mrs				612	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Birch	L					693	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Birchall	Claire					220	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Birchall	G	Mr & Mrs				1040	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Birchall	Judith					1078	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Birney	Thomas					576	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Bjork	Gillian	Ms				385	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Bjork	Gillian	Ms				723	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Bjork	Simon	Mr				865	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Bjork	Diane					999	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Bjork	Carl					1000	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Bjork	Gillian	Ms				1070	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Blackledge	Glyn & Pat	Mrs & Mr				908	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Blackledge	Glyn & Pat	Mrs & Mr				910	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Blackledge	J	Mr				1082	7.1	Residential Development
Blair	Michelle					920	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Blair	Michelle	Ms				944	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
Blair	Michelle	Ms				946	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
Blair	Michelle	Ms				947	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
Blair	Michelle	Ms				948	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
Blair	Michelle	Ms				950	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
Blair	Michelle	Ms				952	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
Blair	Michelle	Ms				954	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
Bleasdale	WA					146	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Bligh	F. D.					126	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Bligh	F. D.					420	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Bligh	RDM					1197	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Blythin	A					305	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Bold	Susan	Mrs				588	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Bolton	CJ					115	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Bond	Dorothy M					359	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Booth	D	Mr				300	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Boreham	SC	Mr				225	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Bosseva	Yana	Ms	RenewableUK			1339	3.1	Vision
Bosseva	Yana	Ms	RenewableUK			1341	3.2	Spatial and Strategic Objectives
Bosseva	Yana	Ms	RenewableUK			1342	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Bosseva	Yana	Ms	RenewableUK			1338	Policy EN1	Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure
Bowen	TR					234	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Boyton	Leigh	Mr	WLCPRE			316	Policy EN1	Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure
Boyton	Leigh	Mr	WLCPRE			317	Policy EN2	Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Natural Environment
Boyton	Leigh	Mr	WLCPRE			318	Policy EN3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Boyton	Leigh	Mr	WLCPRE			319	Policy EN4	Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Built Environment
Bradley	George	Mr				195	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Brady	KA					672	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Brandreth	S	Mrs				170	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Braun	Harald	Dr.				80	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough

Respondent Surname	Respondent first name	Respondent title	Respondent organisation	Agent name	Agent organisation	Rep number	Chapter/Policy Number	Chapter / Policy Title
Bridge	TM					290	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Brierly	Patricia					1050	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Briethaupt	J					312	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Briethaupt	J					186	6.4	Edge Hill University
Briethaupt	J					185	8.2	Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice
Briggs	DA					271	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			479	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Plan
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			480	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Plan
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			481	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Plan
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			482	2.1	Spatial Portrait
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			483	2.1	Spatial Portrait
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			484	2.1	Spatial Portrait
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			485	2.1	Spatial Portrait
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			487	2.1	Spatial Portrait
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			488	2.1	Spatial Portrait
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			489	2.1	Spatial Portrait
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Parbold Parish Council			810	2.1	Spatial Portrait
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			486	2.2	Key Issues
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			490	3.1	Vision
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			491	3.1	Vision
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			492	3.1	Vision
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			493	3.1	Vision
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			494	3.1	Vision
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			495	3.2	Spatial and Strategic Objectives
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			496	3.2	Spatial and Strategic Objectives
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			497	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			502	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			503	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			504	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			505	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			506	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			507	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			498	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			499	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			500	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			501	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			508	4.3	Skelmersdale Town Centre
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			509	4.3	Skelmersdale Town Centre
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			510	Policy GN1	Settlement Boundaries
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			511	Policy GN1	Settlement Boundaries
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			512	Policy GN3	Design of Development
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			513	Policy EC1	The Economy and Employment Land
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			514	Policy EC4	Edge Hill University
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			515	Figure 6.1	Proposed Expansion of Edge Hill University Campus
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			516	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			517	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			518	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			519	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			520	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Parbold Parish Council			816	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Dalton Parish Council			818	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			523	7.2	Affordable and Specialist Housing
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			524	7.2	Affordable and Specialist Housing
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			525	7.2	Affordable and Specialist Housing
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Parbold Parish Council			811	7.2	Affordable and Specialist Housing
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			521	Policy RS2	Affordable Housing
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			522	Policy RS2	Affordable Housing
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			526	7.3	Provision of Student Accommodation
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			527	7.3	Provision of Student Accommodation
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			528	8.1	Maintaining Vibrant Town and Local Centres
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Parbold Parish Council			814	Policy IF2	Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice

Respondent Surname	Respondent first name	Respondent title	Respondent organisation	Agent name	Agent organisation	Rep number	Chapter/Policy Number	Chapter / Policy Title
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Parbold Parish Council			813	8.4	Developer Contributions
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Parbold Parish Council			815	9.1	Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Parbold Parish Council			817	9.1	Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Parbold Parish Council			808	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			529	Chapter 10	Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Dalton Parish Council			819	Chapter 10	Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			530	Appendix D	Setting Locally-determined Targets
Broad	Elizabeth Anne	Mrs	Lathom South Parish Council			531	Appendix E	Delivery & Risk
Broadbent	Julie	Mrs				986	7.1	Residential Development
Brough	L					413	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Brown	J	Mr				145	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Brown	David					281	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Brown	Harald E	Dr				351	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Brown	Carol and Thomas					631	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Bryant	KM					577	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Buckley	Robin	Mr	Redrow Homes (Lancs)	Mr Tony McAteer		582	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Buckley	Robin	Mr	Redrow Homes (Lancs)	Mr Tony McAteer		1147	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Buckley	Robin	Mr	Redrow Homes (Lancs)	Mr Tony McAteer		586	Policy SP2	Skelmersdale Town Centre - A Strategic Development Site
Buckley	Robin	Mr	Redrow Homes (Lancs)	Mr Tony McAteer		1148	Policy SP2	Skelmersdale Town Centre - A Strategic Development Site
Buckley	Robin	Mr	Redrow Homes (Lancs)	Mr Tony McAteer		590	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
Buckley	Robin	Mr	Redrow Homes (Lancs)	Mr Tony McAteer		1149	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
Buckley	Robin	Mr	Redrow Homes (Lancs)	Mr Tony McAteer		593	Policy GN1	Settlement Boundaries
Buckley	Robin	Mr	Redrow Homes (Lancs)	Mr Tony McAteer		1150	Policy GN1	Settlement Boundaries
Buckley	Robin	Mr	Redrow Homes (Lancs)	Mr Tony McAteer		595	Policy GN2	Safeguarded Land
Buckley	Robin	Mr	Redrow Homes (Lancs)	Mr Tony McAteer		1151	Policy GN2	Safeguarded Land
Buckley	Robin	Mr	Redrow Homes (Lancs)	Mr Tony McAteer		596	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Buckley	Robin	Mr	Redrow Homes (Lancs)	Mr Tony McAteer		1152	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Buckley	Robin	Mr	Redrow Homes (Lancs)	Mr Tony McAteer		598	Policy RS2	Affordable Housing
Buckley	Robin	Mr	Redrow Homes (Lancs)	Mr Tony McAteer		1153	Policy RS2	Affordable Housing
Buckley	Robin	Mr	Redrow Homes (Lancs)	Mr Tony McAteer		1154	Chapter 10	Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"
Bull	Michelle					608	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Bunting	RL	Mr & Mrs				349	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Bunting	Claire					50	6.4	Edge Hill University
Burdett	Alan					229	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Burge	Elaine					687	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Burgess	Jacquelynn	Miss				855	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Burke		Mr & Mrs				279	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Burke	R	Mr & Mrs				423	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Burns	R	Mr & Mrs				1091	7.1	Residential Development
Burnside	Gill	Mrs				464	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Butterworth	T					445	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Caffery	Sharon					201	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Cain	David	Mr				555	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Cain	Catherine					557	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Cain	David					558	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Caird	Alastair	Mr				12	5.1	Settlement Boundaries
Carberry	L	Mr				583	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Carlisle	J	Mrs				623	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Carruthers	Clare	Ms				740	7.1	Residential Development
Carter	Philip	Mr	Environment Agency			856	1.4	Planning Policy on Minerals & Waste Developments
Carter	Philip	Mr	Environment Agency			857	2.1	Spatial Portrait
Carter	Philip	Mr	Environment Agency			860	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Carter	Philip	Mr	Environment Agency			862	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Carter	Philip	Mr	Environment Agency			864	Policy SP2	Skelmersdale Town Centre - A Strategic Development Site
Carter	Philip	Mr	Environment Agency			867	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
Carter	Philip	Mr	Environment Agency			868	Policy GN2	Safeguarded Land
Carter	Philip	Mr	Environment Agency			869	Policy GN3	Design of Development
Carter	Philip	Mr	Environment Agency			870	Policy GN5	Sequential Tests
Carter	Philip	Mr	Environment Agency			872	Policy EC1	The Economy and Employment Land
Carter	Philip	Mr	Environment Agency			873	Policy EC2	The Rural Economy
Carter	Philip	Mr	Environment Agency			875	Policy EC3	Rural Development Opportunities

Respondent Surname	Respondent first name	Respondent title	Respondent organisation	Agent name	Agent organisation	Rep number	Chapter/Policy Number	Chapter / Policy Title
Carter	Philip	Mr	Environment Agency			878	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Carter	Philip	Mr	Environment Agency			879	Policy RS4	Provision for Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople
Carter	Philip	Mr	Environment Agency			882	Policy IF2	Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice
Carter	Philip	Mr	Environment Agency			883	Policy IF2	Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice
Carter	Philip	Mr	Environment Agency			886	Policy IF3	
Carter	Philip	Mr	Environment Agency			888	Policy IF4	Developer Contributions
Carter	Philip	Mr	Environment Agency			889	Policy EN1	Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure
Carter	Philip	Mr	Environment Agency			891	9.2	Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Natural Environment
Carter	Philip	Mr	Environment Agency			892	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Carter	Philip	Mr	Environment Agency			893	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Carter	Philip	Mr	Environment Agency			894	Policy EN4	Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Built Environment
Carter	Philip	Mr	Environment Agency			896	Appendix E	Delivery & Risk
Carter	Philip	Mr	Environment Agency			898	Appendix G	Key Amendments to the Proposals Map
Cartwright	JD					434	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Caunce	J	Mrs				218	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Cavan	Jill	Ms	Downholland Parish Council			13	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Chadburn	Gill					785	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Chadwick	TA	Mrs				951	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Chadwick	D	Mr				953	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Chapman	Andrew	Mr				198	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Chappell	Daphne	Mrs				74	Policy EN3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Cheetham	David	Mr				673	1.4	Planning Policy on Minerals & Waste Developments
Cheetham	David	Mr				675	2.1	Spatial Portrait
Cheetham	David	Mr				683	2.2	Key Issues
Cheetham	David	Mr				684	3.1	Vision
Cheetham	David	Mr				1334	Policy SP2	Skelmersdale Town Centre - A Strategic Development Site
Cheetham	David	Mr				1335	Policy SP2	Skelmersdale Town Centre - A Strategic Development Site
Cheetham	David	Mr				1336	Policy SP2	Skelmersdale Town Centre - A Strategic Development Site
Cheetham	David	Mr				1337	Policy SP2	Skelmersdale Town Centre - A Strategic Development Site
Cheetham	A	Mr and Mrs				788	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Cheetham	David	Mr				685	Policy IF2	Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice
Cheung	S	Mr				296	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Christie	R	Mr & Mrs				425	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Clancy	T J	Mr and Mrs				570	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Clark	LM	Mrs				363	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Clarke	Jonathan	Mr	Knowsley MBC			1182	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Plan
Clarke	Jonathan	Mr	Knowsley MBC			1179	Policy SP2	Skelmersdale Town Centre - A Strategic Development Site
Clarke	John F	Mr				71	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Clarke	JF					205	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Clarke	Chris					632	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Clarke	Laura					657	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Clarke	Brenda					260	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Clarke	Jonathan	Mr	Knowsley MBC			1183	Chapter 10	Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"
Clayton	L	Mrs	South Lathom Residents Association			959	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Plan
Clayton	Roger	Mr	South Lathom Residents Association			1156	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Plan
Clayton	Roger	Mr	South Lathom Residents Association			1206	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Plan
Clayton	Roger	Mr	South Lathom Residents Association			1146	2.1	Spatial Portrait
Clayton	Roger	Mr	South Lathom Residents Association			1157	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Clayton	Roger	Mr	South Lathom Residents Association			1165	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Clayton	Roger	Mr	South Lathom Residents Association			1346	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Clayton	Roger	Mr	South Lathom Residents Association			1158	Policy SP2	Skelmersdale Town Centre - A Strategic Development Site
Clayton	Roger	Mr	South Lathom Residents Association			1162	Policy GN1	Settlement Boundaries
Clayton	Roger	Mr	South Lathom Residents Association			1180	Policy EC1	The Economy and Employment Land
Clayton	Roger	Mr	South Lathom Residents Association			1166	6.4	Edge Hill University
Clayton	Roger	Mr	South Lathom Residents Association			1181	Policy EC4	Edge Hill University
Clayton	L	Mrs	South Lathom Residents Association			372	7.1	Residential Development
Clayton	Roger	Mr	South Lathom Residents Association			1199	7.1	Residential Development
Clayton	Roger	Mr	South Lathom Residents Association			1203	7.1	Residential Development
Clayton	Roger	Mr	South Lathom Residents Association			1205	7.1	Residential Development
Clayton	Roger	Mr	South Lathom Residents Association			1160	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Clayton	Roger	Mr	South Lathom Residents Association			1184	Policy RS1	Residential Development



Respondent Surname	Respondent first name	Respondent title	Respondent organisation	Agent name	Agent organisation	Rep number	Chapter/Policy Number	Chapter / Policy Title
Clayton	Roger	Mr	South Lathom Residents Association			1186	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Clayton	Roger	Mr	South Lathom Residents Association			1200	7.2	Affordable and Specialist Housing
Clements	Ian	Mr				209	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Clintworth	Jan	Mrs				133	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Coates	Brian					454	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Cocks	A	Mr				587	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
colbourn	john	mr				970	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Connell	K	Mr				216	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Connell	Mary					1067	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Connolly	Lucille					328	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Connolly	M					422	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Connor	Leslie	Mr	The Jean and Leslie Cd	Mr Tony McAteer		1169	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Connor	Leslie	Mr	The Jean and Leslie Cd	Mr Tony McAteer		1170	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
Connor	Leslie	Mr	The Jean and Leslie Cd	Mr Tony McAteer		1164	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Connor	Leslie	Mr	The Jean and Leslie Cd	Mr Tony McAteer		1171	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Connor	Leslie	Mr	The Jean and Leslie Cd	Mr Tony McAteer		1202	Policy RS2	Affordable Housing
Cook	E	Mrs				569	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Cooper MP	Rosemary	Ms				1248	7.1	Residential Development
Cooper MP	Rosemary	Ms				1246	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Corcoran	Michael	Mr				197	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Cork	Patricia					344	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Cottell	Gillian	Mrs				199	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Cotterill	Paul	Mr				949	7.1	Residential Development
Courtley	Howard	Mr	Courtley Consultants Ltd			15	3.1	Vision
Courtley	Howard	Mr	Courtley Consultants Ltd			16	3.2	Spatial and Strategic Objectives
Courtley	Howard	Mr	Courtley Consultants Ltd			17	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Courtley	Howard	Mr	Courtley Consultants Ltd			18	Figure 4.1	Key Diagram
Courtley	Howard	Mr	Courtley Consultants Ltd			19	Policy SP2	Skelmersdale Town Centre - A Strategic Development Site
Courtley	Howard	Mr	Courtley Consultants Ltd			20	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
Courtley	Howard	Mr	Courtley Consultants Ltd			21	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
Courtley	Howard	Mr	Courtley Consultants Ltd			23	Policy GN4	Demonstrating Viability
Courtley	Howard	Mr	Courtley Consultants Ltd			24	Policy GN5	Sequential Tests
Courtley	Howard	Mr	Courtley Consultants Ltd			25	Policy EC2	The Rural Economy
Courtley	Howard	Mr	Courtley Consultants Ltd			26	Table 10.1	
Courtley	Howard	Mr	Courtley Consultants Ltd			27	Appendix G	Key Amendments to the Proposals Map
Coventry	Bob	Mr				880	2.1	Spatial Portrait
Coventry	Bob	Mr				881	2.1	Spatial Portrait
Coventry	Bob	Mr				877	7.1	Residential Development
Coventry	Bob	Mr				887	7.1	Residential Development
Coventry	Bob	Mr				884	7.2	Affordable and Specialist Housing
Cox		Dr				469	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Coyle	Jackie					615	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Crabtree	P	Mr	Riverview Nurseries			354	Policy EC3	Rural Development Opportunities
Cranness	SM					232	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Cranney	Sharon					49	6.4	Edge Hill University
Craven	Ian					439	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Crawford	John	Mr				1198	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Critchley		Mr & Mrs				1054	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Crombleholme	J					136	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Cronin	B	Mrs				382	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Cronin	D	Mr				383	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Cross	Carolyn	Mrs	Wrightington Parish Council			1108	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Plan
Cross	Carolyn	Mrs	Wrightington Parish Council			1109	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Cunningham	Cain					1209	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Curran	Charlotte					758	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Dainty	K	Mrs				409	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Daish	Eric	Mr				29	8.2	Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice
Dale	Julie					1076	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Daniels	DJ					715	5.2	Safeguarded Land
David Crompton	Crompton property developments			Mr Simon Pemberton	JASP Planning Cons	1167	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
Davies		Mr				112	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough

Respondent Surname	Respondent first name	Respondent title	Respondent organisation	Agent name	Agent organisation	Rep number	Chapter/Policy Number	Chapter / Policy Title
Davies	RJ	Mr				338	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Davies	N	Mrs				431	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Davies	A	Mrs				258	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Davis	Patricia	Mrs				36	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Dawber	Frank	Mr				379	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Dawson	S	Mrs				347	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Dawson	R	Mr				444	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Dawson	Michael					1069	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Day	J	Mr and Mrs				613	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
de la Rue	Alice	Mrs	NFGLG			273	Policy RS4	Provision for Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople
de Larrinaga	RAR	Lt Coln		Mr Michael Cunningham	Cunningham Planning	924	Policy GN2	Safeguarded Land
De Pol	Alexis	Mr				1268	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
De Pol	Alexis	Mr				1269	Policy GN1	Settlement Boundaries
De Pol	Alexis	Mr				1270	Chapter 10	Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"
Dean	D&K					414	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Dean		Mr & Mrs				564	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Dean	JR					361	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Dean	Gillian					41	6.4	Edge Hill University
Delaney	F	Mr				629	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Denovan	S					428	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Dereli	Cynthia	Mrs				742	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Dereli	Cynthia	Mrs				859	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Devenish	George	Mr				187	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Devenish	Vivien	Mrs				188	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Devenish	Andrew	Mr				191	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Dickie	Paul	Mr				725	7.1	Residential Development
Dickinson	T	Mr		Mr Michael Cunningham	Cunningham Planning	922	Policy GN1	Settlement Boundaries
Dickinson	Ed	Mr				14	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Dickinson	Ed	Mr				177	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Dickinson	Ed	Mr				727	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Dickinson	Ed	Mr				1129	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Difonzo	B					323	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Dillon	Derek					231	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Disley		Mr & Mrs				221	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Disley	J	Mrs				1041	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Disley	Alan	Mr				32	7.1	Residential Development
Ditchfield	A	Mr & Mrs				269	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Dobson	JA	Mr & Mrs				1233	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Doran	T	Mr & Mrs				155	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Doran	William					759	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Downey	J	Mrs				228	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Downey	James					302	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Drury	Corinne					1051	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Drury	David					1052	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Duffy	Jennifer					556	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Duffy	Michael					559	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Dundersale	K	Mr				625	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Dunlop	David	Mr	The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester & North Merseyside			1343	3.2	Spatial and Strategic Objectives
Dunlop	David	Mr	The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester & North Merseyside			1344	Policy EN1	Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure
Dunlop	David	Mr	The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester & North Merseyside			1345	Policy EN2	Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Natural Environment
Dunn	Susan		West Lancashire Civic Trust			1087	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Dunn	Susan		West Lancashire Civic Trust			1088	Chapter 10	Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"
Dutton	JS					291	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Earnshaw	D	Mrs				345	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Eastwood	Tanya					681	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Eaton	B & I					394	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Eaton	EA					701	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Eckersley	Nick	Mr	Hurlston Brook			34	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Edge Hill University				Mr Graham Love	Turley Associates	547	Policy EC4	Edge Hill University
Edge Hill University						548	Policy EC4	Edge Hill University
Elliott	Colin	Mr				858	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space

Respondent Surname	Respondent first name	Respondent title	Respondent organisation	Agent name	Agent organisation	Rep number	Chapter/Policy Number	Chapter / Policy Title
Ennis	Gary					447	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Ennis	Karen	Mrs				448	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Entwistle	Michael	Mr				356	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Esposito	Mario	Mr				102	7.1	Residential Development
Essery	Imelda	Mrs				660	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Etherbridge	P					123	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Evans	PL	Mrs				754	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Evans	Anthony	Dr				37	6.4	Edge Hill University
Evans	John	Mr				35	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Evans	Joan and David					387	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Even	JM					350	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Fairclough	David					301	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Fairclough		Mr and Mrs				341	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Fairhurst	Peter	Mr				130	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Fairhurst	Peter	Mr				911	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Farley	Will					235	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Farnworth	Sylvia	Mrs				365	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Farrall	Pam	Mrs				722	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Farrington	Lisa					416	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Fearns	BM	Mrs				129	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Fearns	BM	Mrs				163	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Fillis	J	Mr				1126	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Plan
Finch	JA	Mr & Mrs				137	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Finch	Peter	Mr				619	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Finch	Peter	Mr				627	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Fisher	J	Mrs				297	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Fitness	A	Mrs				292	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Fitzgibbon	J					690	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Fleming	Janine					116	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Fleming	B	Ms				173	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Fletcher	Jamie					904	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Plan
Fletcher	Jamie					906	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Fletcher	Lynn	Mrs				812	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Fletcher	Jamie					905	Chapter 10	Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"
Formby	L					578	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Forrest	Geoffrey					705	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Forshaw	Gordon	Mr				121	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Forshaw	Victoria					585	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Forshaw	Paul					654	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Forshaw	Mark					655	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Forshaw	Janet	Mrs				656	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Fowler	Ray					1077	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Frampton	R	Mr & Mrs				262	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Francis	P	Mrs				158	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Freeman	Rose	Ms	The Theatres Trust			320	8.3	Service Accessibility and Infrastructure for Growth
Frith	Christine					775	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Furlong	D	Mrs				989	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Fyles	A	Mr & Mrs				207	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Fyles	J & L					233	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Gadsby	DR					162	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Gallagher	John					46	7.1	Residential Development
Galma	Elizabeth					1039	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Gamero	Benny	Mr				58	8.3	Service Accessibility and Infrastructure for Growth
Gandun	Chris	Mr				165	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Gardiner	Colin R	Mr				179	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Gardner	John	Mr				1187	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Plan
Gardner	John	Mr				1192	4.3	Skelmersdale Town Centre
Gardner	John	Mr				1195	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Gardner	John	Mr				1190	6.1	The Economy and Employment Land
Gardner	John	Mr				1189	6.4	Edge Hill University
Gardner	John	Mr				1193	7.1	Residential Development

Respondent Surname	Respondent first name	Respondent title	Respondent organisation	Agent name	Agent organisation	Rep number	Chapter/Policy Number	Chapter / Policy Title
Gardner	John	Mr				1191	8.2	Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice
Gardner	John	Mr				1196	8.2	Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice
Gardner	John	Mr				1188	9.1	Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure
Gardner	John	Mr				1194	Chapter 10	Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"
Garrett	S	Mr				637	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Garrett	Stuart					639	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Garrett	Lynn					645	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Garrett	John					648	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Garrett	Luke	Mr				649	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Garrett	Joe					644	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Gaskell	John	Mr				252	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Gaskell	Matthew David					698	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Gerrard	Jennifer					367	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Gilchrist	Martin	Mr				28	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Gill	Lynn	Mrs				340	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Glaysher	B	Mrs				651	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Gleave	Christine					871	7.1	Residential Development
Glover	LJ	Mrs				259	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Glover	J					261	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Glover	G					712	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Goldsmith	Joan	Mrs				48	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Goth	Richard	Mr				103	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Goulding	Mike					237	6.4	Edge Hill University
Graham	J	Mr & Mrs				353	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Green	Martin	Mr				391	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Green	Denis John	Mr				453	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Greenall	J	Mr				214	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Greene	LM	Ms				620	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Gregory	Duncan	Mr	Gladman			1315	3.1	Vision
Gregory	Duncan	Mr	Gladman			1317	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Gregory	Duncan	Mr	Gladman			1318	Policy EC3	Rural Development Opportunities
Gregory	Duncan	Mr	Gladman			1319	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Gregory	Duncan	Mr	Gladman			1320	Policy RS2	Affordable Housing
Gregory	Duncan	Mr	Gladman			1322	Policy EN1	Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure
Griffin		Mr and Mrs				1118	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Grime	S					764	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Grimes	Joyce					757	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Grimshaw	David	Mr				1278	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
Grimshaw	K	Mr & Mrs				407	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Grimshaw	David	Mr				1276	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Grimshaw	David	Mr				1277	Policy GN2	Safeguarded Land
Grimshaw	David	Mr				1281	5.3	Design of Development
Grimshaw	David	Mr				1279	6.1	The Economy and Employment Land
Grimshaw	David	Mr				1282	6.1	The Economy and Employment Land
Grimshaw	David	Mr				1280	7.2	Affordable and Specialist Housing
Grimshaw	David	Mr				1283	8.3	Service Accessibility and Infrastructure for Growth
Haeger	Julie					181	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Hall	F	Mrs				348	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Hall	Graham and Betty					628	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Hampson	Karen					339	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Hampson	R	Mr				399	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Hanke	Hilary	Rev				964	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Hannah	RE	Mr				392	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Hannon	F J					110	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Hanshaw	L					726	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Hanshaw	L					821	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Hardaker	Jemma					1117	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Hardman	William					1079	7.1	Residential Development
Hardwick	Anthony	Mr				545	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Harford	Anthony	Mr				105	7.1	Residential Development
Harford	Anthony	Mr				626	7.1	Residential Development

Respondent Surname	Respondent first name	Respondent title	Respondent organisation	Agent name	Agent organisation	Rep number	Chapter/Policy Number	Chapter / Policy Title
Harford	Anthony	Mr				554	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Harker	J	Mr & Mrs				833	7.1	Residential Development
Harrison	George	Mr				135	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Harrison	P	Miss				325	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Harrison	J					352	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Harrison	Simon	Mr				730	Policy IF4	Developer Contributions
Hart	Sheila	Mrs				128	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Hart	Sheila	Mrs				131	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Hart	Marcus	Mr				200	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Hartill	John					707	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Harvey	Roma	Mrs				996	7.1	Residential Development
Haslam	Alan R					805	7.1	Residential Development
Haughton	Tim	Mr				239	Appendix G	Key Amendments to the Proposals Map
Hayes-Sinclair	T	Mr & Mrs				164	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Hayton	F	Mr and Mrs				599	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Hayton	G	Mr & Mrs				1047	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Heaton	David					293	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Heaton	I					694	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Hedley		Mr & Mrs				366	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Hedley	Ian	Mr				677	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Henshall	Chris					1111	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Plan
Henshall	Chris					1112	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Henshall	Chris					1113	Policy SP2	Skelmersdale Town Centre - A Strategic Development Site
Henshall	Chris					1114	7.1	Residential Development
Henshall	Chris					1115	Policy RS2	Affordable Housing
Hesketh	Amanda					638	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Hesketh	Christopher	Mr				364	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Hesketh	Kerry	Mrs				731	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Hester	M	Mrs				766	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Higgins	DH	Mrs				451	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Higham	Frank					263	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Higson	Julie					1121	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Hill	Marie-Therese					395	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Hill	Denise					51	6.4	Edge Hill University
Hill	Rod					914	6.4	Edge Hill University
Hillman	CA	Mrs				467	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Hislop	Abigail					73	7.1	Residential Development
Hogarth		Mr				676	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Holbert	Clifford	Mr		Mr Michael Cunningham	Cunningham Planning	927	Policy EC1	The Economy and Employment Land
Holden	Lee					1120	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Holdstock	Damien	Mr	National Grid			1333	Policy EC1	The Economy and Employment Land
Holdstock	Damien	Mr	National Grid			1332	Policy EN2	Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Natural Environment
Holker		Mr & Mrs				227	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Holker		Mr and Mrs				438	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Holland	Brendan					664	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Hollingsworth	W	Mr				250	5.2	Safeguarded Land
hopkin	steven	mr				851	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
hopkin	steven	mr				852	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
hopkin	steven	mr				853	6.4	Edge Hill University
Hopkin	Stephanie	Mrs				81	Policy EN3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Hopson	Joyce					442	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Hopwells Frozen Foods						617	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Horridge	Stephanie					147	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Horrocks	D					666	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Horrocks	J	Mrs				668	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Hotchkiss	Julie	Ms	Ashton, Leigh & Wigan Primary Care Trust			106	Table 3.1	Policies achieving the Objectives
Hotchkiss	Julie	Ms	Ashton, Leigh & Wigan Primary Care Trust			108	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Hotchkiss	Julie	Ms	Ashton, Leigh & Wigan Primary Care Trust			107	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
Hounslea	B					633	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Howarth	William					700	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Howe	Jacqui	Mrs				101	6.4	Edge Hill University

Respondent Surname	Respondent first name	Respondent title	Respondent organisation	Agent name	Agent organisation	Rep number	Chapter/Policy Number	Chapter / Policy Title
Howley	Abigail					43	6.4	Edge Hill University
Hubbard	Alan	Mr	The National Trust			768	2.1	Spatial Portrait
Hubbard	Alan	Mr	The National Trust			771	2.1	Spatial Portrait
Hubbard	Alan	Mr	The National Trust			772	2.1	Spatial Portrait
Hubbard	Alan	Mr	The National Trust			1142	2.1	Spatial Portrait
Hubbard	Alan	Mr	The National Trust			1244	3.1	Vision
Hubbard	Alan	Mr	The National Trust			1247	3.2	Spatial and Strategic Objectives
Hubbard	Alan	Mr	The National Trust			1251	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Hubbard	Alan	Mr	The National Trust			1253	Policy SP2	Skelmersdale Town Centre - A Strategic Development Site
Hubbard	Alan	Mr	The National Trust			1255	Policy GN1	Settlement Boundaries
Hubbard	Alan	Mr	The National Trust			1271	Policy GN3	Design of Development
Hubbard	Alan	Mr	The National Trust			1272	Policy EC2	The Rural Economy
Hubbard	Alan	Mr	The National Trust			1273	Policy IF3	
Hubbard	Alan	Mr	The National Trust			1274	Policy EN1	Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure
Hubbard	Alan	Mr	The National Trust			1275	Policy EN2	Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Natural Environment
Hughes	David	Mr	Up Holland Parish Council			1137	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Hughes	David	Mr	Up Holland Parish Council			1136	7.1	Residential Development
Humphries		Mr and Mrs				565	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Hunt	Marie					1116	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Hunter	K	Mr				144	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Hurst	A	Mrs				362	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Huyton	Kerry	Miss				449	7.1	Residential Development
Iddon	June	Ms				828	Policy GN1	Settlement Boundaries
Ireland	M	Mr				276	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Jackson	L	Mr				411	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Jackson	Malcolm	Mr				240	Policy IF4	Developer Contributions
Jackson	Malcolm	Mr				241	Policy EN3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Jacobs	Nick	Mr	Ormskirk Rugby Club			1145	3.2	Spatial and Strategic Objectives
Jacobs	Nick	Mr	Ormskirk Rugby Club			1144	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Jacques	J.K	Mrs				47	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
James	Adrian					1138	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
James	Margaret					289	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
James	A	Mrs				419	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
James	Mark	Mr				826	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
James	William	Mr				388	7.1	Residential Development
James	Adrian					1140	7.1	Residential Development
James	Adrian					1141	7.1	Residential Development
James	D					311	Policy RS1	Residential Development
James	Adrian					1139	7.2	Affordable and Specialist Housing
Jean	D	Mr				573	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Jeffries	EH					433	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Jennings	Margaret	Rev				478	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Jepson	Stephen	Mr				621	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Jepson	Lynne					659	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Johnson	F					143	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Johnson	I					167	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Johnson	Frank & Beryl	Mr & Mrs				1061	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Johnson	Sylvia					670	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Johnston	J					403	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Jones	Gareth	Mr	N W Skelmersdale Lan	Mr Gareth Robert Jones	Scott Wilson	1257	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Jones	L	Mr				224	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Jones	EP	Mr & Mrs				270	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Jones	W	Mr				427	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Jones	G	Mr and Mrs				779	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Jones	AT	Mr and Mrs				827	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Jones	Sarah	Miss				624	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Jones	Kathleen					713	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Jones	Steven	Mr				1	Policy EC4	Edge Hill University
Jones	Susan	Mrs				53	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Kay	Virginia					52	6.4	Edge Hill University
Keen	MS	Mr				127	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough

Respondent Surname	Respondent first name	Respondent title	Respondent organisation	Agent name	Agent organisation	Rep number	Chapter/Policy Number	Chapter / Policy Title
Kennedy	Dawn	Mrs				787	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Kennedy	Frank	Mr				1092	9.1	Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure
Kenny	John					141	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Kenyon	James	Mr				151	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Kenyon	Paul and Babette					835	7.1	Residential Development
Kerr	Davean					109	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Kerrison	RJ					154	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Kershaw		Mr & Mrs				956	Chapter 10	Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"
Killeen		Mr & Mrs				295	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Killen	Michelle					784	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
King	ES	Mr				418	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
King	Patricia	Mrs				874	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
King	Mervyn	Mr				901	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
King	Joyce	Mrs				756	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Kingston	G	Mr & Mrs				652	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Kirby		Mr & Mrs				204	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Knowles		Mr & Mrs				118	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
LAING	ANDREW	MR		Mr Paul Sedgwick	Sedgwick Associates	1073	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Lake	Terry	Mr				831	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Lambert	R	Mr				213	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Langton		Mr & Mrs				156	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Lason	R					1123	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Lawrence	Herbert Edward	Mr				1086	7.1	Residential Development
Lawson	G	Mr				574	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Lawson	J	Mrs				809	7.2	Affordable and Specialist Housing
Lea	Dave					288	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Lea	Ann	Mrs				571	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Lea	Elaine	Mrs				7	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
Lee	WS	Mr				324	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Leet	EJ					568	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
LeMarinel	K	Mr & Mrs				206	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Lewis	Gemma					643	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Lewis	Joe					1185	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Lewis	D					1175	Policy EC4	Edge Hill University
Lewis	D					1172	7.1	Residential Development
Lewis	D					1174	7.1	Residential Development
Lewis	D					1173	7.2	Affordable and Specialist Housing
Lewis	D					1176	8.2	Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice
Leyland	Norman					861	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Liggett	Joan					172	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Link	Peter	Mr				748	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Liptrot	David A					678	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Liptrot	J	Mrs				679	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Liptrott	Jackie	Mrs				603	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Liptrott	Jackie	Mrs				553	Policy GN4	Demonstrating Viability
Liptrott	Jackie	Mrs				604	Policy EC1	The Economy and Employment Land
Lloyd	John	Mr				998	6.4	Edge Hill University
Lloyd	John	Mr				997	Chapter 10	Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"
Lock	RJ					410	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Long	Ivan	Mr				277	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Lowe	R	Mr				284	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Lowman	DB	Mr & Mrs				203	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Lown	WH					665	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Lucas	DE	Mr				611	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Lunn	NM					465	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Lyon	F	Mr & Mrs				148	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Lyon		Mr & Mrs				322	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Maclver		Mr				111	9.2	Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Natural Environment
Mackintosh	J					342	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Madden	Barry & Violet					765	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Madden	Barry & Violet					806	5.2	Safeguarded Land

Respondent Surname	Respondent first name	Respondent title	Respondent organisation	Agent name	Agent organisation	Rep number	Chapter/Policy Number	Chapter / Policy Title
Maddocks	J	Mr				1232	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Maher	A	Mr				217	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Malone	Carolyn	Ms				161	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Mannix	Geraldine					829	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Mansell	David	Mr				1110	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Marley	Katie					1053	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Marriott	J G	Mr				142	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Marshall	Mike	Mr				84	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Marshall	P					584	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Martin	Anthony	Mr				122	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Martin	G	Mr				149	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Martin	I					597	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Martin	Neil					704	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Martin	RT					755	5.2	Safeguarded Land
MARTIN	STEPHEN	MR				1143	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Martindale	Karen	Ms				1238	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Martindale	Karen	Ms				1239	7.1	Residential Development
Martindale	Karen	Ms				1240	Policy RS2	Affordable Housing
Martindale	Karen	Ms				1241	Policy RS3	Provision of Student Accommodation
Martindale	Karen	Ms				1242	Chapter 10	Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"
Martland	S					264	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Martland	A	Mrs				662	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Massie	HC	Mr				278	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Mathews	Steve	Mr	Sefton Council			1161	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Plan
Mathews	Steve	Mr	Sefton Council			1163	Policy GN2	Safeguarded Land
Maxfield	Carl	Mr				560	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Maxfield	Marcus					561	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
McAleavey	Rita	Mrs				532	3.1	Vision
McClennon	K					786	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
McCloskey	John	Mr				182	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
McCloskey	S J					183	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
McCloskey	John	Mr				1060	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
McCloskey	L					184	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
McConnell	Kevin	Mr				1207	5.2	Safeguarded Land
McCoy	Barbara					369	5.2	Safeguarded Land
McDonald	Brenda	Ms				202	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
McDonald	R					210	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
McDonald	Steve					212	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
McDonald	Christie	Mr	Steven Abbott Associates			1243	Policy EC3	Rural Development Opportunities
McDougall	G					424	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
McGathan	Karen					251	5.2	Safeguarded Land
McGathan	David	Mr				256	5.2	Safeguarded Land
MCGUINNESS	DAVID	MR				602	Policy RS1	Residential Development
McGunigle	R					990	5.2	Safeguarded Land
McGunigle	Jasmine					991	5.2	Safeguarded Land
McGunigle	Mike					992	5.2	Safeguarded Land
McGunigle	Lily					993	5.2	Safeguarded Land
McGunigle	Joseph					994	5.2	Safeguarded Land
McIntosh	Allison	Miss				477	Policy RS1	Residential Development
McKenzie	Patricia					174	4.3	Skelmersdale Town Centre
McKenzie	Maureen	Mrs				471	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
McLaughlin	PF	Mr				1230	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Plan
McLaughlin	PF	Mr				1225	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
McLaughlin	PF	Mr				1226	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
McLaughlin	PF	Mr				1227	6.4	Edge Hill University
McLaughlin	PF	Mr				1228	7.3	Provision of Student Accommodation
McLaughlin	PF	Mr				1229	Chapter 10	Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"
McMillan	E	Mrs				607	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
McNabb	Lawrence and Janice					152	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
McNaughton	Lars					44	6.4	Edge Hill University
Mcwalters	Lewis	mr				854	7.1	Residential Development



Respondent Surname	Respondent first name	Respondent title	Respondent organisation	Agent name	Agent organisation	Rep number	Chapter/Policy Number	Chapter / Policy Title
Medway	Jean					446	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Mellor	Derek	Mr				1034	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Mellor	M	Mrs				1043	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Meredith	D E					897	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Meredith	Stan	Mr	ADGBURM			1083	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Meredith	Stan	Mr	ADGBURM			1084	Appendix G	Key Amendments to the Proposals Map
Merrick	Elaine					308	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Miller	S	Mr				589	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Milliken	T&G					343	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Mitchell	Morven					562	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Mitchell	L	Mr				955	7.1	Residential Development
Mitchell	L	Mr				1237	7.1	Residential Development
Molyneux	E					572	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Monks	Trevor					807	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Moore	Nicola					303	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Moore	Christine					616	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Moore	Suzanne					689	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Moreton	Graham					1048	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Morley	Kathryn					436	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Morley		Mr & Mrs				563	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Morley	Stephanie					630	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Morley		Mr & Mrs				769	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Morris	Karen					780	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Moss	M	Mr				208	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Mudd	J	Mr				463	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Mullin	Annemarie	Dr				10	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Mullin	A	Dr				157	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Munnelly	Carl	Mr				381	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Munro	JA	Mrs				640	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Munro	JA	Mrs				836	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Murray	Geoff	Mr				150	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Murray	Joy					594	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Murray	Deborah					1038	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Murray	JG	Mr				1210	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
Musson-Christie	Judy					609	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Neale	Keith					426	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
neil	gerrard	mr				918	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Nelson	Judith	Ms	English Heritage			243	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Nelson	Judith	Ms	English Heritage			244	Policy GN1	Settlement Boundaries
Nelson	Judith	Ms	English Heritage			245	Policy GN3	Design of Development
Nelson	Judith	Ms	English Heritage			246	Policy EC2	The Rural Economy
Nelson	Judith	Ms	English Heritage			248	Policy EC3	Rural Development Opportunities
Nelson	Judith	Ms	English Heritage			247	Policy EN2	Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Natural Environment
Nelson	Judith	Ms	English Heritage			242	9.4	Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Built Environment
Newton	K					600	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Newton	DR	Mr				601	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Newton	C	Mrs				653	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Newton	David	Mr				450	7.1	Residential Development
Nicholson	J	Mr				468	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Noble	David					402	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Norbury	PM					783	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Norris	E					223	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Norris	Richard	Mr				274	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Norris	Jake					770	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
North	Chery					168	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Northcote	Anthony	Mr	Plannig and Local Authority Liason, The Coal Authority			60	1.4	Planning Policy on Minerals & Waste Developments
Northcote	Anthony	Mr	Plannig and Local Authority Liason, The Coal Authority			61	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Northcote	Anthony	Mr	Plannig and Local Authority Liason, The Coal Authority			62	4.3	Skelmersdale Town Centre
Northcote	Anthony	Mr	Plannig and Local Authority Liason, The Coal Authority			63	Policy GN3	Design of Development
Northcote	Anthony	Mr	Plannig and Local Authority Liason, The Coal Authority			64	Policy EN4	Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Built Environment
O'Brien	James					669	5.2	Safeguarded Land

Respondent Surname	Respondent first name	Respondent title	Respondent organisation	Agent name	Agent organisation	Rep number	Chapter/Policy Number	Chapter / Policy Title
O'Brien	RE	Mr				1340	7.1	Residential Development
O'Brywd	TJ & BS					1037	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
O'Connor	Peter					1032	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
O'Connor	L					1033	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Oldfield	Sheila					440	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
O'Neill	G	Ms				67	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
O'Neill	Elaine					331	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
O'Neill	G	Ms				462	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Openshaw	Steve	Mr				380	4.3	Skelmersdale Town Centre
Orme	L	Ms				169	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Orme	Barbara	Mrs				330	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Ormesher	Edward James	Mr				912	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Owen	D	Miss				432	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Owen	Helen	Mrs				761	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Parker	JM	Mr				606	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Parker	Pauline	Mrs				850	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Parker	Jess E					1064	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Parker	MJ					1065	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Parker	PA					1066	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Parker	J					663	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Parle	M					267	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Patten	TA	Mr				1231	7.1	Residential Development
Patton	Janet					313	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Peet	Eileen					368	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Perrett	Bryan	Mr				346	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Physick	B	Ms				307	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Phythian	Marion					355	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Phythian	K	Mr				455	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Pickavance	R & J	Messrs	Messrs R & J Pickavance	Mr Glyn Bridge	McDyre & Co.	876	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Pickavance	R & J	Messrs	Messrs R & J Pickavance	Mr Glyn Bridge	McDyre & Co.	885	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Pickavance	R & J	Messrs	Messrs R & J Pickavance	Mr Glyn Bridge	McDyre & Co.	890	Policy RS2	Affordable Housing
Pickavance	R & J	Messrs	Messrs R & J Pickavance	Mr Glyn Bridge	McDyre & Co.	895	Policy IF4	Developer Contributions
Pickavance	Robert W.	Mr				792	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Plan
Pickavance	Robert W.	Mr				793	2.1	Spatial Portrait
Pickavance	Robert W.	Mr				794	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Pickavance	Robert W.	Mr				795	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Pickavance	Robert W.	Mr				796	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
Pickavance	Robert W.	Mr				797	Policy GN1	Settlement Boundaries
Pickavance	Robert W.	Mr				798	Policy GN3	Design of Development
Pickavance	Robert W.	Mr				799	Policy GN4	Demonstrating Viability
Pickavance	Robert W.	Mr				801	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Pickavance	Robert W.	Mr				802	Policy RS2	Affordable Housing
Pickavance	Robert W.	Mr				803	Policy IF3	
Pickavance	Robert W.	Mr				804	Appendix A	Local Plan Preparation
Pincock	JB	Mr & Mrs				1234	6.4	Edge Hill University
Pincock	JB	Mr & Mrs				1235	8.2	Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice
Pinnington	ED	Mrs				720	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Ploughley	E	Mrs				708	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Pope	D	Mr & Mrs				113	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Porter	Anne	Ms				82	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Porter	Laura					83	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Porter	Reg					373	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Porter	Laura					900	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Powell	HM	Mrs				298	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Powell	LG					714	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Pready	Bryan	Mr				533	3.1	Vision
Pready	Bryan	Mr				534	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Pready	Bryan	Mr				535	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Pready	Bryan	Mr				536	5.1	Settlement Boundaries
Pready	Bryan	Mr				537	Policy EC4	Edge Hill University
Pready	Bryan	Mr				538	Policy RS1	Residential Development

Respondent Surname	Respondent first name	Respondent title	Respondent organisation	Agent name	Agent organisation	Rep number	Chapter/Policy Number	Chapter / Policy Title
Pready	Bryan	Mr				539	Policy RS2	Affordable Housing
Pready	Bryan	Mr				540	Policy RS3	Provision of Student Accommodation
Pready	Bryan	Mr				541	Policy RS4	Provision for Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople
Pready	Bryan	Mr				542	Policy IF1	Maintaining Vibrant Town and Local Centres
Pready	Bryan	Mr				543	Policy IF2	Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice
Pready	Bryan	Mr				544	Policy EN1	Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure
Prendergast	Lynda					125	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Prentice		Mr & Mrs				406	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Prescott	Jennifer	Miss				189	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Prescott	Angela	Mrs				190	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Prescott	William	Mr				192	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Prescott	Cynthia	Mrs				1080	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Price	Mary	Mrs				461	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Price	Penny					1044	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Price	Erika	Mrs				1236	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Pringle	Andy	Mr	ICD / Maharishi Community			376	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Pringle	Andy	Mr	Ideal Community Developments			982	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Pringle	Andy	Mr	ICD / Maharishi Community			375	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
Pringle	Andy	Mr	Ideal Community Developments			1107	Policy GN1	Settlement Boundaries
Pringle	Andy	Mr	ICD / Maharishi Community			377	Appendix G	Key Amendments to the Proposals Map
Pringle	Andy	Mr	Ideal Community Developments			983	Appendix G	Key Amendments to the Proposals Map
Pritchard	M	Mrs				153	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Pritchard	Jeannie	Mrs				741	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Purcell		Mr & Mrs				1122	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Ramsbottom	E	Mr & Mrs		Mr Michael Cunningham	Cunningham Planning	913	Policy GN1	Settlement Boundaries
Ramsbottom	Ian	Mr		Mr Michael Cunningham	Cunningham Planning	919	Policy GN1	Settlement Boundaries
Ramsdale	Ian	Mr				193	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Ramsdale	Doris					452	5.2	Safeguarded Land
rattray	gavin	MR				907	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Plan
Ratray	Gavin					4	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Ratray	Gavin					1071	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
rattray	gavin	MR				945	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
Rawlinson	Thomas	Mr				56	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Rawlinson	M J	Mrs				57	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Rawsthorne	Ralph	Mr				65	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Rawsthorne	Ralph	Mr				66	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Rawsthorne	A	Mr & Mrs				124	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Rawsthorne	M					219	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Rawsthorne	Sharon					899	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Rawsthorne	Sharon					1059	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Rawsthorne	Joanne					1068	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Rawsthorne	Sheena	Mrs				1075	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Rhodes		Mr & Mrs				680	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Richardson	L	Mr				767	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Richardson	Roy	Mr				194	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Richardson	Julia	Mrs				400	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Riding	Mike	Mr				78	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
RIDING	MARIA	Mrs				79	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Ries-Birchall	G	Mr				321	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
rigby	Robert	Mr				729	7.1	Residential Development
Rimmer	D	Mr		Mr Chris Cockwill	Cockwill & Co	1023	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Rimmer	D	Mr		Mr Chris Cockwill	Cockwill & Co	1013	Appendix G	Key Amendments to the Proposals Map
Rimmer	MC					459	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Rimmer	Claire	Ms				8	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
Roberts	Irene	Clerk to Aughto	Aughton Parish Council			984	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Roberts	S	Mr & Mrs				642	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Roberts	Alan & Pam					1057	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Roberts	Irene	Clerk to Aughto	Aughton Parish Council			985	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Roberts	Vickie	Miss				1130	7.1	Residential Development
Robinson	William	Mr				749	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Robinson	William	Mr				750	4.3	Skelmersdale Town Centre

Respondent Surname	Respondent first name	Respondent title	Respondent organisation	Agent name	Agent organisation	Rep number	Chapter/Policy Number	Chapter / Policy Title
Robinson	Daniel	Mr				134	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Robinson	William	Mr				751	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Robinson	William	Mr				752	7.1	Residential Development
Robinson	William	Mr				753	7.2	Affordable and Specialist Housing
Roby	J & N					458	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Roby	Stuart					474	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Roche-Walker	Shelly					592	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Rolf	Josh	Mr				658	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Rollins	N					326	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Rood	Craig					781	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Rood	Stuart					782	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Roughley	M					421	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Roughley	J					709	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Roughley	Derek					710	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Roughley	E					711	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Routh	Leonard	Dr				1221	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Routledge	Robert	Mr	Whitemoss Landfill Lim	Mr Richard Percy	Steven Abbott Assoc	476	6.1	The Economy and Employment Land
Roxburgh	K	Mr & Mrs				371	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Russell	O	Mrs				230	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Sainsburys Supermarkets Ltd				Ms Anna Noble	Turley Associates	1017	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Sainsburys Supermarkets Ltd				Ms Anna Noble	Turley Associates	1018	Policy GN5	Sequential Tests
Sainsburys Supermarkets Ltd				Ms Anna Noble	Turley Associates	1019	Policy IF1	Maintaining Vibrant Town and Local Centres
Sandford	Nick	Mr	Woodland Trust			1134	Policy EN1	Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure
Sandford	Nick	Mr	Woodland Trust			1131	Policy EN2	Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Natural Environment
Sandford	Nick	Mr	The Woodland Trust			1132	Policy EN2	Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Natural Environment
Sandford	Nick	Mr	The Woodland Trust			1133	Policy EN3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Sankey		Mr & Mrs				396	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Sass	Stella & Bill					1204	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Saunders	L	Mr and Mrs				622	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Scarisbrick	Margaret					415	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Scott	Mal					1049	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Scully	P					695	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Sears	RP	Mr	North Meols Parish Councils			987	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Seddon	N					405	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Senior	Karen					139	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Shacklady	Jayne					634	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Sharples	Patricia					674	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Shashati	Clare	Mrs				39	Policy EC4	Edge Hill University
Shaw	Frank					641	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Sheehah	Maureen					215	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Shepherd	Paul					272	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Shiel	Catherine and Paul					1124	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Shorrock	Anthony	Mr				374	Policy EN3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Sillett	Brian	Mr				5	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Sillett	Brian	Mr				30	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Sillett	Brian	Mr				114	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Simons	Brenda					42	6.4	Edge Hill University
Simpkin	M					408	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Simpkin	W					702	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Skelly	L	Ms				255	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Slowey	WC					1063	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Smallbone	Helen					55	6.4	Edge Hill University
Smallshaw		Miss				682	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Smith	N					138	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Smith		Mr				304	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Smith	Dorothy					671	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Smith	Alyson					696	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Smith	David					697	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Smith	A & G					706	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Smith	Carol					473	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Spearing	A					691	5.2	Safeguarded Land

Respondent Surname	Respondent first name	Respondent title	Respondent organisation	Agent name	Agent organisation	Rep number	Chapter/Policy Number	Chapter / Policy Title
Spencer	D	Mr				470	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Spencer		Mr and Mrs				773	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
St Modwen Properties PLC				John Francis		1284	2.1	Spatial Portrait
St Modwen Properties PLC				John Francis		1285	2.2	Key Issues
St Modwen Properties PLC				John Francis		1286	3.2	Spatial and Strategic Objectives
St Modwen Properties PLC				John Francis		1287	3.2	Spatial and Strategic Objectives
St Modwen Properties PLC				John Francis		1288	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
St Modwen Properties PLC				John Francis		1289	Policy SP2	Skelmersdale Town Centre - A Strategic Development Site
St Modwen Properties PLC				John Francis		1290	Policy GN3	Design of Development
St Modwen Properties PLC				John Francis		1291	Policy IF1	Maintaining Vibrant Town and Local Centres
St Modwen Properties PLC				John Francis		1292	Policy IF4	Developer Contributions
St Modwen Properties PLC				John Francis		1293	Policy EN4	Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Built Environment
Staines	Steve	Mr	Friends, Families & Travellers			834	7.4	Provision for Gypsy & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople
Stanley	Paul	Mr				3	4.3	Skelmersdale Town Centre
Stanmore	Iain	Mr				822	7.1	Residential Development
Stannard		Mr & Mrs				443	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Starkie	John					636	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Steele	Gillian	Mrs				1208	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Steele	Darren					472	7.1	Residential Development
Steele	Emma	Mrs				605	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Stephens	M	Mr				667	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Stevenson	George					610	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Stevenson		Mr				647	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Stevenson	Peter & Gwen					1055	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Stokes	R					393	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Stores	Michael					988	6.4	Edge Hill University
Stott	Phil	Mr				31	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Stott	C	Dr				309	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Stott	P					310	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Strategy and Policy Group			Lancashire County Council			967	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Strategy and Policy Group			Lancashire County Council			980	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Strategy and Policy Group			Lancashire County Council			968	Figure 4.1	Key Diagram
Strategy and Policy Group			Lancashire County Council			969	Policy SP2	Skelmersdale Town Centre - A Strategic Development Site
Strategy and Policy Group			Lancashire County Council			971	Policy EC1	The Economy and Employment Land
Strategy and Policy Group			Lancashire County Council			978	Policy EC2	The Rural Economy
Strategy and Policy Group			Lancashire County Council			979	Policy EC3	Rural Development Opportunities
Strategy and Policy Group			Lancashire County Council			972	Policy EC4	Edge Hill University
Strategy and Policy Group			Lancashire County Council			973	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Strategy and Policy Group			Lancashire County Council			974	Policy IF2	Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice
Strategy and Policy Group			Lancashire County Council			976	Policy IF2	Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice
Strategy and Policy Group			Lancashire County Council			977	Figure 8.1	Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice
Strategy and Policy Group			Lancashire County Council			975	Policy IF3	
Stub	Thomas	Mr				386	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Stubbert	Jane	Mrs				800	7.1	Residential Development
Stubbings	P	Mr & Mrs				1046	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Stubbs	Margaret					1119	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Suggett		Mr & Mrs				285	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Sullivan	Rosalie					1036	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Suppell	K	Mr and Mrs				575	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Sutcliffe		Mr				268	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Sutton	T					401	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Swift	Jill					333	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Swift	Nicholas					335	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Swift	G	Mr				257	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Swift	Kevin					1347	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Syder	Alan					75	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Syder	Alan					76	6.4	Edge Hill University
Syder	Alan					77	8.2	Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice
Sylvester	C	Mrs				119	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Sylvester	A					294	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Taberner	Joan	Mrs				360	5.2	Safeguarded Land

Respondent Surname	Respondent first name	Respondent title	Respondent organisation	Agent name	Agent organisation	Rep number	Chapter/Policy Number	Chapter / Policy Title
Talbot	George	Mr				40	6.4	Edge Hill University
Taylor	Andrew	Mr	David Wilson Homes	Ms Lorraine Davison	DPP	1214	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Plan
Taylor	Andrew	Mr	David Wilson Homes	Ms Lorraine Davison	DPP	1215	2.2	Key Issues
Taylor	Andrew	Mr	David Wilson Homes	Ms Lorraine Davison	DPP	1216	3.2	Spatial and Strategic Objectives
Taylor	Andrew	Mr	David Wilson Homes	Ms Lorraine Davison	DPP	1211	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Taylor	Andrew	Mr	David Wilson Homes	Ms Lorraine Davison	DPP	1212	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Taylor	Andrew	Mr	David Wilson Homes	Ms Lorraine Davison	DPP	1217	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Taylor	Andrew	Mr	David Wilson Homes	Ms Lorraine Davison	DPP	1218	Policy GN1	Settlement Boundaries
Taylor	Andrew	Mr	David Wilson Homes	Ms Lorraine Davison	DPP	1219	Policy GN2	Safeguarded Land
Taylor	Andrew	Mr	David Wilson Homes	Ms Lorraine Davison	DPP	1213	Chapter 10	Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"
Taylor	Christine	Ms				1081	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Plan
Taylor	Chris	Mr				159	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Taylor	BJ					916	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Taylor	Maurice	Mr				59	7.1	Residential Development
Taylor	B					33	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Thompson	R	Mr and Mrs				417	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Thompson	Lara					1045	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Thompson	Jane	Ms				1085	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Thompson	ST	Mr				1201	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Thompson	Jane	Ms				175	7.3	Provision of Student Accommodation
Thorley	Andrew	Mr	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Miss Caroline Simpson	Nathaniel Lichfield &	1249	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Plan
Thorley	Andrew	Mr	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Miss Caroline Simpson	Nathaniel Lichfield &	1252	3.2	Spatial and Strategic Objectives
Thorley	Andrew	Mr	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Miss Caroline Simpson	Nathaniel Lichfield &	1258	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Thorley	Andrew	Mr	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Miss Caroline Simpson	Nathaniel Lichfield &	1264	Policy GN3	Design of Development
Thorley	Andrew	Mr	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Miss Caroline Simpson	Nathaniel Lichfield &	1265	Policy EC2	The Rural Economy
Thorley	Andrew	Mr	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Miss Caroline Simpson	Nathaniel Lichfield &	1254	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Thorley	Andrew	Mr	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Miss Caroline Simpson	Nathaniel Lichfield &	1259	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Thorley	Andrew	Mr	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Miss Caroline Simpson	Nathaniel Lichfield &	1256	Policy RS2	Affordable Housing
Thorley	Andrew	Mr	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Miss Caroline Simpson	Nathaniel Lichfield &	1266	Policy IF2	Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice
Thorley	Andrew	Mr	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Miss Caroline Simpson	Nathaniel Lichfield &	1260	8.3	Service Accessibility and Infrastructure for Growth
Thorley	Andrew	Mr	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Miss Caroline Simpson	Nathaniel Lichfield &	1261	Policy IF4	Developer Contributions
Thorley	Andrew	Mr	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Miss Caroline Simpson	Nathaniel Lichfield &	1262	Policy EN1	Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure
Thorley	Andrew	Mr	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Miss Caroline Simpson	Nathaniel Lichfield &	1263	Policy EN2	Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Natural Environment
Thorley	Andrew	Mr	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Miss Caroline Simpson	Nathaniel Lichfield &	1267	Chapter 10	Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"
Thorman	G	Mr				337	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Topping	Linda					11	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Topping		Mr & Mrs				280	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Town Planning Team LNW			Network Rail			1222	Policy IF2	Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice
Town Planning Team LNW			Network Rail			1223	Policy IF4	Developer Contributions
Town Planning Team LNW			Network Rail			1224	Policy EN1	Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure
TOWNLEY	PETER	MR				38	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Plan
Train	M	Mrs				254	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Train	G					398	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Travis	Estate of John	Estate of Mr J Travis		Mr Michael Cunningham	Cunningham Planning	921	Policy GN1	Settlement Boundaries
Travis	Robert J. & K. ADA					1245	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Trigg	MT					265	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Trigg	E	Mrs				266	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Truman	Alison	Mrs	British Waterways			744	2.1	Spatial Portrait
Truman	Alison	Mrs	British Waterways			745	6.2	The Rural Economy
Truman	Alison	Mrs	British Waterways			746	8.4	Developer Contributions
Truman	Alison	Mrs	British Waterways			747	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Turner	Maurice	Mr				995	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Tweedie	Joyce K					253	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Tyrer	JB					357	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Tyrer	Maureen					358	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Tyrer	Elizabeth					824	7.1	Residential Development
Tyson	Ronald	Mr				72	7.1	Residential Development
Vella MBE	Karl	Mr				1093	4.3	Skelmersdale Town Centre
Vella MBE	Karl	Mr				1094	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Voller	MF	Mr				581	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Walisley	Simon					1058	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough

Respondent Surname	Respondent first name	Respondent title	Respondent organisation	Agent name	Agent organisation	Rep number	Chapter/Policy Number	Chapter / Policy Title
Walker		Mrs				327	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Wallace	S	Mrs				591	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Wallbank	Lee					441	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Walmsley	A					776	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Walsh	JP & M					728	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Walton	Anita					54	6.4	Edge Hill University
Ward	Allen	Mr				222	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Warden	AD					430	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Wareing	Ruth	Miss				329	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Wareing	MJ	Mr				650	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Warrilow	C	Rev				762	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Watt	Andrew	Mr				178	Policy GN1	Settlement Boundaries
Watt	Andrew	Mr				180	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Watt	John	Mr				314	7.2	Affordable and Specialist Housing
Watt	John	Mr				315	9.2	Preserving and Enhancing West Lancashire's Natural Environment
Webb	David	Mr				823	Policy RS1	Residential Development
Webber	Martin	Mr				378	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Webster	Ron	Mr				2	Policy SP2	Skelmersdale Town Centre - A Strategic Development Site
Welham	M					579	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Welsh	Barry	Mr				171	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Wensley	George	Mr				830	6.4	Edge Hill University
Westby	WA	Mr & Mrs				790	7.1	Residential Development
Whalley	CD					390	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Wheeler	Kate		Natural England			1294	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Wheeler	Kate		Natural England			1295	8.3	Service Accessibility and Infrastructure for Growth
Wheeler	Kate		Natural England			1296	Appendix B	The Spatial & Strategic Objectives
White	B	Mrs				287	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Whitehead	Chris					412	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Whitfield	Margaret					22	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Whitfield	Margaret					306	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Whitfield	Geoffrey	Mr				661	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Whitfield	N	Mrs				763	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Whittaker	J					1074	9.3	Provision of Green Infrastructure and Open Recreation Space
Wilcock	Ann					686	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Williams	Keith	Mr	Burscough Parish Council			1098	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Plan
Williams	Francis	Mr	Ormskirk Friends of the Earth			1002	2.1	Spatial Portrait
Williams	Francis	Mr	Ormskirk Friends of the Earth			1003	2.1	Spatial Portrait
Williams	Francis	Mr	Ormskirk Friends of the Earth			1005	3.2	Spatial and Strategic Objectives
Williams	Francis	Mr	Ormskirk Friends of the Earth			1006	3.2	Spatial and Strategic Objectives
Williams	Francis	Mr	Ormskirk Friends of the Earth			1007	3.2	Spatial and Strategic Objectives
Williams	Francis	Mr	Ormskirk Friends of the Earth			1008	3.2	Spatial and Strategic Objectives
Williams	Francis	Mr	Ormskirk Friends of the Earth			1004	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Williams	Francis	Mr	Ormskirk Friends of the Earth			1010	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Williams	Francis	Mr	Ormskirk Friends of the Earth			1011	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Williams	Francis	Mr	Ormskirk Friends of the Earth			1012	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Williams	Francis	Mr	Ormskirk Friends of the Earth			1014	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Williams	Francis	Mr	Ormskirk Friends of the Earth			1015	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Williams	Francis	Mr	Ormskirk Friends of the Earth			1016	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Williams	Francis	Mr	Ormskirk Friends of the Earth			1020	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Williams	Francis	Mr	Ormskirk Friends of the Earth			1021	Policy SP2	Skelmersdale Town Centre - A Strategic Development Site
Williams	Karen					85	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Williams	Mike	Mr				196	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Williams	D					226	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Williams	Diane					332	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Williams	Francis	Mr	Ormskirk Friends of the Earth			1022	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Williams	Martin	Mr				1042	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Williams	Keith	Mr	Burscough Parish Council			1099	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Williams	Keith	Mr	Burscough Parish Council			1102	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Williams	Doreen	Mrs				9	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
Williams	Francis	Mr	Ormskirk Friends of the Earth			1024	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
Williams	Francis	Mr	Ormskirk Friends of the Earth			1025	Policy GN1	Settlement Boundaries

Respondent Surname	Respondent first name	Respondent title	Respondent organisation	Agent name	Agent organisation	Rep number	Chapter/Policy Number	Chapter / Policy Title
Williams	Francis	Mr	Ormskirk Friends of the Earth			1027	Policy GN3	Design of Development
Williams	Francis	Mr	Ormskirk Friends of the Earth			1028	Policy EC1	The Economy and Employment Land
Williams	Christine	ms				176	6.4	Edge Hill University
Williams	Francis	Mr	Ormskirk Friends of the Earth			1029	Policy EC4	Edge Hill University
Williams	Keith	Mr	Burscough Parish Council			1103	7.1	Residential Development
Williams	Francis	Mr	Ormskirk Friends of the Earth			1030	7.2	Affordable and Specialist Housing
Williams	Keith	Mr	Burscough Parish Council			1105	7.2	Affordable and Specialist Housing
Williams	Francis	Mr	Ormskirk Friends of the Earth			1031	Policy RS2	Affordable Housing
Williams	Keith	Mr	Burscough Parish Council			1106	9.1	Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure
Williams	Francis	Mr	Ormskirk Friends of the Earth			1096	Chapter 10	Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"
Williams	Keith	Mr	Burscough Parish Council			1104	Chapter 10	Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"
Williamson	Francis	Mr				789	7.1	Residential Development
Wilson	Lisa	Mrs				286	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Wiltshire	Margaret	Mrs	CPRE (West Lancs Group)			1220	1.1	The West Lancashire Local Plan
Wiltshire	Margaret	Mrs	CPRE (West Lancs Group)			1297	1.4	Planning Policy on Minerals & Waste Developments
Wiltshire	Margaret	Mrs	CPRE (West Lancs Group)			1298	2.1	Spatial Portrait
Wiltshire	Margaret	Mrs	CPRE (West Lancs Group)			1299	2.1	Spatial Portrait
Wiltshire	Margaret	Mrs	CPRE (West Lancs Group)			1300	3.1	Vision
Wiltshire	Margaret	Mrs	CPRE (West Lancs Group)			1301	3.2	Spatial and Strategic Objectives
Wiltshire	Margaret	Mrs	CPRE (West Lancs Group)			1302	4.1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Wiltshire	Margaret	Mrs	CPRE (West Lancs Group)			1303	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Wiltshire	Margaret	Mrs	CPRE (West Lancs Group)			1304	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Wiltshire	Margaret	Mrs	CPRE (West Lancs Group)			1305	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Wiltshire	Margaret	Mrs	CPRE (West Lancs Group)			1306	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Wiltshire	Margaret	Mrs	CPRE (West Lancs Group)			1307	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
Wiltshire	Margaret	Mrs	CPRE (West Lancs Group)			1308	Policy GN1	Settlement Boundaries
Wiltshire	Margaret	Mrs	CPRE (West Lancs Group)			1309	Policy GN1	Settlement Boundaries
Wiltshire	Margaret	Mrs	CPRE (West Lancs Group)			1310	Policy GN2	Safeguarded Land
Wiltshire	Margaret	Mrs	CPRE (West Lancs Group)			1311	Policy EC1	The Economy and Employment Land
Wiltshire	Margaret	Mrs	CPRE (West Lancs Group)			1312	Policy EC2	The Rural Economy
Wiltshire	Margaret	Mrs	CPRE (West Lancs Group)			1313	Policy EC4	Edge Hill University
Wiltshire	Margaret	Mrs	CPRE (West Lancs Group)			1314	Policy IF2	Enhancing Sustainable Transport Choice
Wiltshire	Margaret	Mrs	CPRE (West Lancs Group)			1316	Chapter 10	Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"
Wiltshire	Margaret	Mrs	CPRE (West Lancs Group)			1321	Chapter 10	Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a "Plan B"
Wiltshire	Margaret	Mrs	CPRE (West Lancs Group)			1323	Appendix C	Planning Policy Background
Wiltshire	Margaret	Mrs	CPRE (West Lancs Group)			1324	Appendix G	Key Amendments to the Proposals Map
Winstanley	Catherine					370	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Wood	Elaine					334	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Woods	Brian					457	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Woods	PM					1035	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
Woods	C					397	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Wright	Sheila		Bain Wright Partnership	Ms Sheila Wright		926	Appendix G	Key Amendments to the Proposals Map
Wynn	V					699	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Wynn	WL					760	5.2	Safeguarded Land
Young	Robert	Mr				460	4.4	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough
	Escalibur Ltd		Escalibur Ltd	Mr Alban Cassidy	CA Planning	866	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
	Escalibur Ltd		Escalibur Ltd	Mr Alban Cassidy	CA Planning	863	Policy RS1	Residential Development
	Vernon Property LLP			Charlotte McKay		1177	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
	Vernon Property LLP			Charlotte McKay		1178	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
	McCarthy & Stone, Retirement Lifestyles		McCarthy & Stone, Retirement Lifestyles	Mr Chris Butt	The Planning Bureau	1089	Policy RS1	Residential Development
	Hughes Mushrooms		Hughes Mushrooms	Mr Chris Cockwill	Cockwill & Co	1026	Appendix G	Key Amendments to the Proposals Map
	Vernon Property LLP			Mr D Walton	Walton & Co	1168	Policy RS1	Residential Development
	Edge Hill University		Edge Hill University	Mr Graham Love	Turley Associates	546	3.2	Spatial and Strategic Objectives
	Bickerstaffe Trust			Mr Graham Love	Turley Associates	1090	Policy SP1	A Sustainable Development Framework for West Lancashire
	Bickerstaffe Trust			Mr Graham Love	Turley Associates	1095	Policy SP3	Yew Tree Farm, Burscough - A Strategic Development Site
	Bickerstaffe Trust			Mr Graham Love	Turley Associates	1097	Policy GN2	Safeguarded Land
	Bickerstaffe Trust			Mr Graham Love	Turley Associates	1100	Policy RS1	Residential Development
	Bickerstaffe Trust			Mr Graham Love	Turley Associates	1101	Policy IF3	
	Seddon		Seddon	Miss Jane Worsey	Higham & Co	832	Policy EC2	The Rural Economy
	Church Commissioners For England		Church Commissioners	Miss Jennifer Hadland	Smiths Gore	88	3.1	Vision
	Church Commissioners For England		Church Commissioners	Miss Jennifer Hadland	Smiths Gore	89	3.2	Spatial and Strategic Objectives



