Core Strategy Consultation 2011: Summary of Representations and Responses

Plan Ref - Preface

Summary Objection to broad areas of plans, including housing and provision of facilities. (S)

Response 3,000 new homes are targeted for Skelmersdale for several reasons, including the need to generate investment in the town to support regeneration proposals for the town and the fact that as the Borough's largest town it has most key services and these will be improved the proposals for the town centre (Policy CS2). In addition, there is land available in Skelmersdale for new development, whereas much of the rest of the Borough has limited land available within towns and villages and so even more development would need to be provided in the Green Belt than is currently proposed in the Core Strategy if development was diverted from Skelmersdale to areas such as Ormskirk and Burscough. Based on discussions with the PCT, they have no plans to change current hospital service provision in the Borough in light of the Core Strategy's proposals. The Core Strategy supports the provision of a range of new facilities and infrastructure in Skelmersdale and the town centre proposals (Policy CS2) set out these improvements, including a new bus station, new retail and leisure facilities and improvements to the Tawd Valley for recreation. The Core Strategy also supports a new rail link for Skelmersdale (Policy CS12) but this is not something the Council can deliver and there may be difficulties gaining funding for such a proposal. Policy CS8 on affordable housing sets out that 20% of housing in developments of 15 or more dwellings in Skelmersdale will be affordable (including social housing), with this figure reduced to 10% within the town centre area. The affordable housing which is to be social housing will be managed by Registered Social Landlords. The Core Strategy is a key document in helping to deliver the Vision for West Lancashire as set out in the Sustainable Community Strategy, and is setting a coherent spatial strategy for development across the Borough. It will replace the Local Plan adopted in 2006 under the old planning system. In relation to Skelmersdale specifically, the proposals within the Core Strategy builds upon the plans already put forward in the masterplan for the town centre. While the delivery of this masterplan has been delayed due to the current economic climate, the Council is confident it can still be delivered, with the proposed slight modifications in Policy CS2, within the Core Strategy period.

Recommendation No Action Required

Plan Ref - Preface

Summary Opposed to the release of green belt and concerned about the impact on traffic in Ormskirk and Burscough. (S)

Response Green Belt and impact on countryside and agricultural land - there is insufficient land within existing towns and villages that is suitable for new development, therefore a small portion of Green Belt will be needed to meet development needs. Any development on Green Belt will need to be designed in such a way as to minimise any impact on the countryside beyond it. While the loss of agricultural land is never ideal, the preferred options have been selected because much of the land involved in these options is not the highest quality agricultural land. Traffic Impacts - the Council are aware of the potential impacts of proposals on the highway network and traffic levels and are undertaking ongoing work to better understand this. Any new development will be required to do all it can to mitigate for traffic impacts that it creates and measures will be needed to prevent rat-running. The Council will also support strategic improvements to the highway network (e.g. Ormskirk Bypass) if funding can be found and will support improvements to public transport to encourage people to use this rather than the car. Edge Hill University - Policy CS6 provides a policy to manage any expansion of the University if expansion is required during the Core Strategy period. Any expansion will also need to address issues of traffic, car parking and student accommodation associated with the University. Employment land - comments noted

Recommendation No Action Required

Plan Ref - Preface

Summary Green belt and agricultural land should not be used for development, but rather to encourage agriculture. Future homes should only be allowed in built up areas and should be in accordance with need. (S)

Response Agricultural land - The Council acknowledges the importance of agriculture in West Lancs and indeed promotes it through Policy CS5. However, in order to meet development needs, a very small percentage will have to be developed. The quality of the agricultural land will be one aspect that informs the decision on which option is brought forward in the next stage of the plan. Built-up area vs Green Belt - all suitable land for development within the built-up areas of existing settlements will be developed over the Core Strategy period, still leaving a deficit which would need delivering on Green Belt in order to meet development needs. Affordable and under-occupied housing - there is a serious shortage of affordable housing in West Lancs and so the Core Strategy (Policy CS8) seeks to deliver more affordable housing and in all parts of the Borough. Changing household trends have influenced the need for new housing and the Council are aware of the issue of under-occupation. By providing more high quality accommodation for the elderly, it is hoped that this will release more existing family housing onto the market for purchase or rent by families who will fully occupy the property.

Recommendation Amend residential and affordable housing development policies to include a requirement that 20% of units in developments of 15 units or more be designed specifically for the elderly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cspo Ref</th>
<th>Observer Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Plan Ref</th>
<th>Preface</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cspo-163</td>
<td>Mrs Elizabeth-Anne Broad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: There should be no Green Belt release in Parbold and more general development should also be limited. (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Response: Comments noted. There are no plans to release Green Belt in the Parbold area for housing. The residential development policy allows for infill and garden development, as this source of housing land supply helps minimise the need for Green Belt release. However, such development would only be permitted if it satisfies a number of criteria, and close attention is paid to the amenity of neighbours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation: No further action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-194</td>
<td>Mr Brian Sheasby</td>
<td>Principal Planning Review and Planning Contributions Officer Lancashire County Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: That Smithy Farm, Broad Lane, Downholland be designated for residential development as part of the Borough Council's strategy to provide housing and residential development sites to meet the Borough's needs for the period of the plan. (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Response: Comments noted regarding the site, which was also submitted by LCC in the West Lancashire SHLAA. However, it is not the function of the Core Strategy to designate individual small sites. The comments on this site are more suited to the Site Allocations DPD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation: No further action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-198</td>
<td>Mrs Stephanie Hopkin</td>
<td>Planning Officer Lancashire County Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Is the consultation process correct (and legal)? Do people need more time / information? Can we sustain a development of this size? (S) Let's be smarter with our proposals and minimise greenbelt decimation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Response: It is considered that the consultation material has made clear that views are being sought on the Ormskirk option, and that this is the Council's non-preferred option. Comments regarding Ormskirk have been noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation: No further action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-199</td>
<td>Mrs Anne-Sophie Bonton</td>
<td>Planning Officer Lancashire County Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: It is felt that much more importance should be made to broadband, both its significance and more importantly how improved telecoms can be realised across the whole borough. There are several references to pre-2010 General Election policy and no references to new policy of the Coalition Government. This should be updated and Local Enterprise Partnerships referred to. (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Response: The National Planning Policy Framework emphasises that advanced, high quality communications infrastructure is essential for economic growth and that the development of high speed broadband technology and other communications networks also plays a vital role in enhancing the provision of local community facilities and services. An overview of the provision of digital infrastructure is set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Comments regarding the wider National Framework are noted and when the next stage of the Core Strategy is prepared it will be updated to reflect the current and most up to date Government policy. At this stage a preferred option was not known to the Council and it was important whilst we continue to work on the evidence base to inform the final document, to engage the public and Elected Members in this selection process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation: Included as a requirement in the local infrastructure policy, all development to make provision for communications / digital infrastructure. Update the document to include the most up-to-date government policy. At the next stage of consultation indicate a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-20</td>
<td>Mr John Doug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: I consider all the proposals made by West Lancs for the LDF to be totally unnecessary and out of character for Ormskirk. (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Response: Views Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation: No Action Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-234</td>
<td>Paul Cotterill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary: Comments on various aspects of the LDF, including the view that the document should be re-written and consulted upon again, given its serious flaws. (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Response: The representation has been split and is dealt with in the appropriate sections of the document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation: No action required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>csopo-266</td>
<td>Anne-Sophie Bonton</td>
<td>Planning Officer Lancashire County Council - Strategic Planning Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Preface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Summary of comments made individually elsewhere only.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>All comments have been addressed individually at the relevant consultation point within the document.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No action required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csopo-322</th>
<th>Ms Diana Jolly</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Preface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>I request the Borough Council Cabinet extend the Consultation Plans with all three options available on an equal footing. Thus allowing all residents to have their say. (F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>The Ormskirk option, albeit Non-Preferred by the council is included in all promotional material for the consultation and the Core Strategy itself. Thus encouraging the public to make representations and have their say regarding the Ormskirk Option.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No action required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csopo-490</th>
<th>Mr B Howard</th>
<th>Clerk of the Council Newburgh Parish Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Preface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>There is little mention of the implications of schools in the document. There are concerns about the impact of large residential developments and potential for change in the availability of customary choices, based on established relationships with particular schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>The LDF team has been working with a wide variety of stakeholders when drafting the Core Strategy. This has included discussions with education providers and an assessment of where school provision is weaker. On this basis, site specific aspirations set out within the Core Strategy, such as those areas for Green Belt release, have had regard for capacity within schools and identified where further provision is needed. As the remainder of the Core Strategy is more general, it sets broad aims of the plan only. Policy CS13 deals with ensuring that local social and community services (including education) are in place to meet development proposals. Further details will be provided in other LDF documents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csopo-542</th>
<th>Mrs Margaret Wiltshire</th>
<th>Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Preface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>The Core Strategy Document should be updated to include changes at the regional level and also adapt to LTP3- the County's Strategy for Lancashire, which is currently replacing LTP2. (s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Comments Noted with reference to updating document to include LTP3 and LEP's. However at the time publication LTP3 had not been published and the Lancashire LEP had not been finalised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Update the document to including reference to LTP3 and LEP's within Appendix C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csopo-6</th>
<th>Neil Ainsworth</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Preface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Agree with broad principles of development, with particular support for Ormskirk non-preferred option. However, strongly opposes Green Belt development (S).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Support for non-preferred option noted. While the Council are reluctant to consider development on Green Belt themselves, there is not enough land for new development within existing towns and villages in the Borough to accommodate the need for new housing and employment to 2027. Therefore, the Council are having to consider development on a small portion of Green Belt to meet these needs. In addition, in order to deliver improvements such as a Sports Village (in the case of the non-preferred option), other development, particularly housing, is required to fund those improvements. Without contributions from new development, improvements to facilities such as Sports Clubs are unlikely to be delivered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No Action Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csopo-640</th>
<th>Skelmersdale Limited Partnership</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Preface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>The representations we are submitting to the Core Strategy take account of national planning policy guidance within PPS1, PPS4 and PPS12 and the Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West (RSS) which, among other things include an underlying requirement to protect existing centres and ensure their vitality and viability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No action required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plan Ref - Jason and Marcus Bleasdale

Summary

Jason and Marcus Bleasdale own Little Moor Hall Farm, a 25.38 hectare (62.72 acre) parcel of land situated south of Parrs Lane in Aughton, which they wish to bring forward for a high-quality residential-led mixed-use development as part of an urban extension to the established settlement of Aughton. Any development proposal for Little Moor Hall Farm could also potentially incorporate some additional land located adjacent to the site, north of Parrs Lane.

Response

Comments noted

Recommendation

No action required.

Plan Ref - Mr Ian Yates

Summary

I am opposed to Option 3 (the "non-preferred option") as put forward in the leaflet distributed by the Borough Council. Green Belt release should only take place in exceptional circumstances, and where there is a direct social benefit to the adjacent community. RSS housing figures should be reviewed and revised.

Response

Comments noted. It is agreed that development densities should be "sensible". There is likely to be a policy on density in a forthcoming Development Management Policies document. With regard to housing figures, following a Court of Appeal ruling in May 2011, the intention to abolish RSS cannot be taken into account when Councils are considering the adoption of new Development Plan Documents such as Core Strategies, until such time as a Strategic Environmental Assessment of RSS abolition has been concluded. Thus the Council is obliged to use the 300 dwellings per annum housing requirement at present in the Core Strategy.

Recommendation

No action required.

Plan Ref - Mrs Carolyn Cross

Summary

Disappointing that after setting the evidence and background to the need for elderly accommodation (Chapters 1-3), the only reference to housing for the elderly thereafter is a small section in Policy CS7.

Response

The Core Strategy makes clear, as stated by the Objector, that providing for the accommodation needs of an ageing population is an important issue. The Core Strategy generally avoids detailed policies, but provides the 'hook' for the basis of detailed policies in other LDF documents. The evidence base at present does not indicate what proportion of housing developments should be elderly persons' accommodation, and the appropriate amount is likely to vary on a case-by-case basis. 2008-based Household Projections have been investigated, and a requirement that 20% of units in developments of 5 units or more be designed specifically for the elderly is now proposed for the new emerging residential development policy.

Recommendation

Policy CS7 Residential Development to be amended to include a requirement that 20% of homes in the development of 15 units or more be designed specifically for the elderly.

Plan Ref - The Coal Authority

Summary

The Coal Authority is keen to ensure that coal resources are not unduly sterilised by new development. In instances where this may be the case, The Coal Authority would be seeking prior extraction of the coal. The West Lancashire area has been subjected to coal mining which will have left a legacy. Whilst most past mining is generally benign in nature potential public safety and stability problems can be triggered and uncovered by development activities. It is important that new development delivered through the Local Development Framework, recognises the problems and how they can be positively addressed.

Response

Comments noted. The Council is aware that there are issues in certain areas relating to past mining and the possible existence of coal deposits, and that these need to be taken into account when considering the amount of development that can be assigned to each area, and to the allocation of specific sites. The Council will consult / is consulting with the Coal Authority at all stages, including this Preferred Options stage, and importantly, when considering the allocation of specific sites, as well as when assessing planning applications. (Consultation with The Coal Authority has already taken place with regard to specific sites proposed for allocation in the next stage of the Plan's preparation.)

Recommendation

No change to Plan itself, but maintain ongoing consultation as the Plan is progressed.
Summary
The Core Strategy needs to set out how the Lancashire Minerals and Waste DPD needs to be taken into account in West Lancashire. New wording for inclusion in the introduction proposed. (S)

Response
Comments noted. It is agreed that the Core Strategy needs to specify how it takes account of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste DPD, and thus consideration will be given to inserting the suggested wording (or very similar) into the Core Strategy.

Recommendation
Add wording suggested by Coal Authority to the Core Strategy’s introduction: “Lancashire County Council has responsibility for identifying sites and policies for Minerals and Waste Development in the County. Therefore Minerals and Waste Issues are not covered.”

Mr Steven Hopkin

Summary
NO to 4,500 homes NO to building on green belt NO to 600 Houses in Ormskirk as this would be disastrous for Character of town, green belt, traffic congestion, pollution to name but a few NO more expansion to Edge Hill university, especially on green belt. The monster that is Edge Hill needs taming. WLDC to be strong against the likes of greedy businessmen like Ormskirk2027 and Edge Hill University Finally, as Councillor Martin Forshaw says, “West Lancashire has a wonderful mix of vibrant towns and picturesque villages, and boasts some of the most beautiful countryside in the UK.” Quite right. Thank you Councillor Forshaw. LET’S KEEP IT THIS WAY!

Response
Comments noted. With regard to specific points raised: 1. Housing needs figures take account not only of birth rates, but also a range of factors including changes in family profiles (e.g. more divorces), single person households, migration, etc. The Council considers 300 dwellings per annum is appropriate for West Lancashire. However, not being able to accommodate the whole of the Borough's housing need in suitable non-Green Belt sites means that Green Belt has to be considered. 3. Problems associated with Burscough option noted. 4. Comments on Dispersal option noted. 5. Comments regarding non-preferred option noted. 6. Skelmersdale is considered the appropriate place for the majority of the Borough's new housing given its range of services and the capacity of its infrastructure to accommodate new development. 7. Comments regarding Edge Hill University noted. Unfortunately, it is not possible to meet all the University's building requirements within the current campus area, hence the need for more land. The Council is aware of the impacts associated with the University. 8. Comments on affordable housing noted, although it is considered that the Objector misunderstands what constitutes affordable housing. 9. Comments regarding the consultation events and voting forums noted.

Recommendation
No further action.

Mrs EA Broad

Summary
Consultation period is too short (S)

Response
Comments noted. It is considered that six weeks is an adequate amount of time to read and comment on documents. This consultation is beyond the requirements of government plan-making Regulations. Whilst Sefton and Knowsley had longer consultation periods, unlike West Lancashire they did not carry out “Options” consultation (2009 in West Lancs). The Sefton and Knowsley periods also span the holiday season (July/August).

Recommendation
No further action.

Mr Robert W. Pickavance

Summary
1.1.5: I would like our site (adjacent to New Road, Rufford) to be included in the DPD and the DMP and I am willing to discuss the site to ensure it is in-keeping with the developments in the surrounding area. (F)

Response
Comments noted

Recommendation
No action required.

Mr Greg Mitten

Summary
The consultation has been well carried out but could be improved by posting leaflets by royal mail rather than in free papers. Also by having more one to one meeting with community groups. When developing the selected preferred option, issues to be addressed include ensuring the development of access to services including transport links, the targeting of employment and skills opportunities, particularly in deprived areas and encouraging entrepreneurial activity including business start-up (S)

Response
Comments noted with reference to the consultation process. With regards to access to services including transport links the Core Strategy seeks to encourage economic growth across the Borough and in particular to support the regeneration of Skelmersdale.

Recommendation
No Further Action.
Summary Report does not consider health impacts of some areas of the Core Strategy. (S)
Response Comments noted. The Core Strategy does not address site allocations and instead provides broad areas of search.
Consequently, the HIA cannot specifically address issues raised in this comment. However, comments will be acknowledged and investigated in later stages of the LDF.
Recommendation Additional investigation will be done with regard to the HIA in future stages of the Core Strategy.

Observations
Plan Ref 1.3 Technical Assessments of the Core Strategy

Summary Support for recognising a different approach to Skelmersdale compared to the rest of the Borough. More emphasis could be made on the need for better transport links to and from Skelmersdale. (S)
Response Comments noted relating to the lack of accessible public transport in Skelmersdale. Reference in the document to the Bypass is caveated with a statement to confirm that probability of this being delivered is low.
Recommendation Additional wording to make reference to the internal transport network within Skelmersdale and also transport links with Liverpool will be added.

Observations
Plan Ref Chapter 2 Spatial Portrait and Key Issues for West Lancashire

Summary Boundary of Lathom Parish needs amending on Fig 2.2 (S)
Response The Council acknowledges that the Blaguegate Lane and Firswood Road area are identified as falling within the parish of Lathom South. However, the Core Strategy must identify functional spatial areas, for the purpose of the document the area identified as Skelmersdale includes these areas and must be identified as one spatial entity.
Recommendation No action.

Observations
Plan Ref Chapter 2 Spatial Portrait and Key Issues for West Lancashire

Summary The only conclusion which can be drawn is that development must be confined to non flood-risk areas. (s)
Response If any new development is to go ahead in Banks, it will be directed to areas outside of flood risk areas as a priority and in accordance with the PPS25 sequential test.
Recommendation No action.

Observations
Plan Ref Chapter 2 Spatial Portrait and Key Issues for West Lancashire

Summary Concerns over the number and type of housing proposed in the Core Strategy - would like to see more low occupation density housing suitable for an ageing population.
Response The dispersal and nature of new housing development is something that has been given and will continue to be given a great deal of attention in order that supply meets demand within the Borough.
Recommendation No action.

Observations
Plan Ref Chapter 2 Spatial Portrait and Key Issues for West Lancashire

Summary Natural England would like more detail on the key issues.
Response Comments noted.
Recommendation Minor changes to be made within the document to reflect these comments.

Observations
Plan Ref Chapter 2 Spatial Portrait and Key Issues for West Lancashire

Summary The spatial portrait for West Lancashire highlights the importance of the historic environment and the Vision identifies the need to retain local character and conserve heritage assets. I suggest, however, that the Vision could be extended to cover investment in and enhancement of historic places, including the public realm. The Borough has a number of heritage assets at risk and I am surprised that this and the need for investment in the historic environment is not included as a Key Issue. (s)
Response Comments noted.
Recommendation No change. The Vision provides an overview. The policies provide more details on how this can be achieved.
Summary

Spatial portrait should refer to the role that housing can play in boosting employment and supporting the local economy. (S)

Response

Comments noted.

Recommendation

No change.

Observations

Spatial Portrait and Key Issues for West Lancashire

cspo-432

Mr Andrew Thorley

Strategic Land Manager

Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

Plan Ref

Chapter 2

Spatial Portrait and Key Issues for West Lancashire

Observations

Summary

Spatial portrait should refer to the role that housing can play in boosting employment and supporting the local economy. (S)

Response

Comments noted.

Recommendation

No change.

Observations

Spatial Portrait and Key Issues for West Lancashire

cspo-450

Mr Roger Bell

Spatial Portrait and Key Issues for West Lancashire

Observations

Summary

data inaccuracies in relation to West Lancashire residents travel to work patterns in spatial portrait. (S)

Response

Comments noted.

Recommendation

Data inaccuracies checked and corrected.

Observations

Spatial Portrait and Key Issues for West Lancashire

cspo-51

Church Commissioners For England

Observations

Summary

The importance of small scale development should be acknowledged and supported in rural settlements and in locations with good access to services and facilities. (S)

Response

Comments noted. It is agreed that an appropriate amount of development should be permitted in rural areas with a reasonable number of facilities and services. The Core Strategy allows for residential development in the Western Parishes area.

Recommendation

No action.

Observations

Spatial Portrait and Key Issues for West Lancashire

cspo-517

Mr Alan Hubbard

Land Use Planning Adviser

The National Trust

Observations

Summary

Key features section for Rufford should make specific reference to Rufford Old Hall. (S)

Response

Comments noted.

Recommendation

Change made.

Observations

Spatial Portrait and Key Issues for West Lancashire

cspo-532

Hesketh Estate

Observations

Summary

Aughton forms a vital part of the second largest population in the Borough and we consider it to be an important key service centre.

Response

Comments noted.

Recommendation

No action.

Observations

Spatial Portrait and Key Issues for West Lancashire

cspo-737

Crompton property developments

David Crompton

Observations

Summary

Various observations on the Spatial Portrait. (S)

Response

Comments Noted

Recommendation

Minor amendments addressed.

Observations

A Spatial Portrait of West Lancashire

Plan Ref

2.1

A Spatial Portrait of West Lancashire

Object

Summary

If Option B is selected a Level 2 SFRA would be required (S)

Response

Comments Noted

Recommendation

Comment acknowledged. A Stage 2 SFRA report is currently being prepared.
The Millenium Ribble Link should be recognised within the Spatial Portrait. This connects the Lancaster Canal to the Leeds and Liverpool Canal and the wider inland waterway network. (S)

Response Comments noted. The diagram at Fig. 2.2 shows the Rufford Branch of the Canal joining the River Douglas at Tarleton, which is a correct representation of reality (Tarleton Lock). This is not considered to need amendment. In terms of recognising the Ribble Link, the following phrase can be added to the end of the sentence at Line 5: "... and branches off northwards towards the Lancaster Canal via the Ribble Link."

Recommendation The following has been added to the end of the third sentence (line 5) of paragraph 2.1.6: "... and branches off northwards towards the Lancaster Canal via the Ribble Link."

Plan Ref 2.1
Mr Martyn Coy
Planner British Waterways

Object

Summary The Millenium Ribble Link should be recognised within the Spatial Portrait. This connects the Lancaster Canal to the Leeds and Liverpool Canal and the wider inland waterway network. (S)

Response Comments noted. The diagram at Fig. 2.2 shows the Rufford Branch of the Canal joining the River Douglas at Tarleton, which is a correct representation of reality (Tarleton Lock). This is not considered to need amendment. In terms of recognising the Ribble Link, the following phrase can be added to the end of the sentence at Line 5: "... and branches off northwards towards the Lancaster Canal via the Ribble Link."

Recommendation The following has been added to the end of the third sentence (line 5) of paragraph 2.1.6: "... and branches off northwards towards the Lancaster Canal via the Ribble Link."

Plan Ref 2.1
Mrs EA Broad
Parish Clerk Lathom South Parish Council

Object

Summary Under the description of a spatial portrait of West Lancashire, Blaguegate Lane and Firswood Road been grouped into Skelmersdale without acknowledging the area of Lathom at all. This area must be recorded in this document as Lathom. (S)

Response The Council recognises the results of the 2005 Local Plan Inquiry, and the boundaries of Lathom South Parish. However, the land was safeguarded in the Local Plan with the intention of meeting Skelmersdale's development needs, if necessary, in the longer-term. If this land were to be developed, the development would count towards Skelmersdale's totals, and the resulting urban land would for all intents and purposes form part of the Skelmersdale Urban Area, notwithstanding the Parish boundary.

Recommendation No change.

Plan Ref 2.1
Mr Shaun Taylor
Planning Associate Director G L Hearns Property Consultants

Object

Summary The Spatial Portrait should mention market housing and links between supply, green belt release and delivery of affordable housing.

Response The Spatial Portrait contains a section on housing (paragraphs 2.1.11 - 2.1.12) which, whilst it does not include the word 'market', does refer to owner-occupied housing. It is recognised that the housing requirement (the majority of which will be market housing) results in the need for Green Belt release, and links to delivery of affordable housing and economic growth, but it is not considered necessary to list this as a Key Issue in the Spatial Portrait.

Recommendation No change.

Plan Ref 2.1
Mr D Rimmer
Observations

Summary Development in Bank should not be discarded on flood risk alone. There may be suitable sites. Transport (HGV) movements are likely to increase in settlements. The agricultural sector should be supported throughout the document. Questions the strength of Skelmersdale's housing market to support 3000 new homes.

Response The Core Strategy does not discount Banks for development based on flood risk and even identifies some land to the south of the settlement as a possible area of search within Option 2 which was presented to the public during this consultation exercise. Comments noted regarding transport and HGV's. Farm diversification is encouraged within Policy CS5. Focusing economic development around Skelmersdale is the necessary approach in order for the Council to begin to tackle some of the deprivation issues associated with Skelmersdale.

Recommendation No action required.

Plan Ref 2.1
Mrs Jo Robison
Associate Smiths Gore

Support

Summary Support the reference to Aughton as a single town, amalgamated with Ormskirk (S)

Response Comments noted

Recommendation No action required.

Plan Ref 2.1
Mr Robert W. Pickavance
Support

Summary I fully support this point, Rufford has excellent transport links, North, South, East and West and also has an excellent rail service. (F)

Response Acknowledged

Recommendation No action.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation #</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Plan Ref</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cspo-468</td>
<td>Mr Marcus Bleasdale</td>
<td>Bleasdale Investments Ltd</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>A Spatial Portrait of West Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-509</td>
<td>Mr Alan Hubbard</td>
<td>Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>A Spatial Portrait of West Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-549</td>
<td>Mrs Margaret Wiltshire</td>
<td>Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>A Spatial Portrait of West Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-650</td>
<td>Mr Simon Artiss</td>
<td>Planning Manager Bellway Homes Ltd</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>A Spatial Portrait of West Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-678</td>
<td>Jason and Marcus Bleasdale</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>A Spatial Portrait of West Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-433</td>
<td>Mr Andrew Thorley</td>
<td>Strategic Land Manager Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Key Issues in West Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-470</td>
<td>Mr Marcus Bleasdale</td>
<td>Bleasdale Investments Ltd</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Key Issues in West Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
summary

It is surprising that environmental issues do not figure more prominently in the Key Issues section. (S)

Response

Comments noted - agricultural land and Green Belt are identified as key issues within the Borough within the key issues section. There are also many other non-environmental issues which need to be addressed and it is considered that the level of detail in this list is appropriate. However, it may be useful to add heritage to this list.

Recommendation

Reference to heritage assets added.

cspo-523

Mr Alan Hubbard

Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust

plan ref 2.2 Key Issues in West Lancashire

Observations

summary

It is surprising that environmental issues do not figure more prominently in the Key Issues section. (S)

Response

Comments noted - agricultural land and Green Belt are identified as key issues within the Borough within the key issues section. There are also many other non-environmental issues which need to be addressed and it is considered that the level of detail in this list is appropriate. However, it may be useful to add heritage to this list.

Recommendation

Reference to heritage assets added.

cspo-679

Jason and Marcus Bleasdale

plan ref 2.2 Key Issues in West Lancashire

Observations

summary

Edge Hill University’s desire to expand is identified as one of the key issues in West Lancashire. Jason and Marcus Bleasdale wish to register their concern about the potential adverse effects that any expansion of the university might have on the character of the historic market town of Ormskirk. The Green Belt is identified as one of the other key issues in West Lancashire. Jason and Marcus Bleasdale welcome the Council’s acknowledgement that the tightly defined Green Belt boundaries that currently exist within the Borough limit the options available for future development.

Response

Comments noted

Recommendation

No further action.

cspo-81

Mrs MARIA RIDING

plan ref 2.2 Key Issues in West Lancashire

Object

summary

Object to Burscough option and development in Banks. Development should be located close to the motorway at Ormskirk or Bickerstaffe. (S)

Response

Comments noted. One reason why Burscough was chosen and not Scarisbrick or Haskayne is the good level of facilities and services in Burscough, plus its good public transport links. The same reasoning would preclude land in Bickerstaffe.

Recommendation

No action.

cspo-83

Mr Ian Yates

plan ref 2.2 Key Issues in West Lancashire

Observations

summary

The impact Edge Hill has on the local community of Ormskirk needs to be better accounted for. (S)

Response

Comments noted

Recommendation

No change.

cspo-141

Mr Philip Carter

Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency

plan ref Chapter 3 A Vision for West Lancashire 2027 and the Spatial & Strategic Objectives

Object

summary

Wording in the vision regarding flood risk and mitigation is inappropriate and should be changed to reflect National Policy Guidance

Response

Comments noted. Wording will be amended for next drafting of the document.

Recommendation

Wording amended as per EA objections.

cspo-325

Mr Roger Clayton

plan ref Chapter 3 A Vision for West Lancashire 2027 and the Spatial & Strategic Objectives

Object

summary

Reference to RSS is probably out of date and unnecessary. Target for BfL inconsistent with earlier sections of document. (S)

Response

Acknowledged. RSS still to be considered at this stage.

Recommendation

No action required.

cspo-423

Ms Judith Nelson

English Heritage

plan ref Chapter 3 A Vision for West Lancashire 2027 and the Spatial & Strategic Objectives

Observations

summary

Objective 7 This objective covers the protection of heritage assets. PPS5 sets out the Governmentâ€™s aim for the conservation of the historic environment and heritage assets where well-managed change which sustains significance and heritage interest is acceptable. You may wish to consider substituting conservation for protection in the document.

Response

Comments noted.

Recommendation

Replaced ‘protect’ with ‘conserve’ in relation to Heritage Assets within Objective 7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cspo-435</td>
<td>Mr Andrew Thorley</td>
<td>Strategic Land Manager Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>The importance of Ormskirk/Aughton should be given greater emphasis in the Vision. Reference to the need for use of Green Belt should be identified in Objective 5. Object to aspirations for carbon neutral development under Objective 8. (S)</td>
<td>Comments noted. Ormskirk/Aughton is given adequate importance in the Vision and there are many areas of the Borough which must be considered. It is not considered necessary to add reference to the Green Belt within Objective 5 as the emphasis is on developing brownfield land first. The need for Green Belt land is addressed later in the document and is not a major objective of the Core Strategy. In relation to Objective 8, we proposed changing the wording to ‘low carbon technology’.</td>
<td>Objective 8 amended to read 'low carbon technology' instead of 'carbon neutral technology'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-473</td>
<td>Mr Marcus Bleasdale</td>
<td>Bleasdale Investments Ltd</td>
<td>Support with conditions</td>
<td>Support intention to secure the long-term stability of Ormskirk/Aughton, but suggest that Aughton is treated as a single settlement in planning terms. Concern about traffic problems associated with Edge Hill. (S)</td>
<td>Comments noted. It is considered inappropriate to treat Aughton as a single settlement given its links and dependence upon the wider Ormskirk urban area. It is important to maintain this rather than allowing Aughton to expand into a larger settlement in its own right, which may have significant impact on the surrounding Green Belt. Comments on traffic issues also noted.</td>
<td>No action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-704</td>
<td>Ms Rose Freeman</td>
<td>Planning Assistant The Theatres Trust</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>A Vision This is still too long with too much detail &amp; it should précis the Objectives with the detail being in the policiesâ€™ text.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
<td>No Further Action. The Vision has been reduced to only include information considered necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-738</td>
<td>Crompton property developments</td>
<td>David Crompton</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Core Strategy needs to be revisited as it is unsound due to timescales (S)</td>
<td>It is agreed that the Core Strategy must be shown to be deliverable. Work is ongoing with those bodies who would deliver the Plan to ensure that its content is achievable (e.g. United Utilities, other infrastructure providers, developers, etc.). For a plan looking 15 years into the future, and being prepared in uncertain economic times, it is not possible to set out every timetable in detail. Instead, a pragmatic view needs to be taken. The Council considers the draft Core Strategy, along with its evidence base (including such documents as an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, currently under preparation) will provide the required information to demonstrate it is deliverable and meet the tests of soundness. Comments received from &quot;delivery bodies&quot; during this consultation are being given careful consideration, and where necessary, the draft Plan will be amended. There is a &quot;Plan B&quot; in the Core Strategy, which provides an alternative course of action should the Plan not be delivered in the anticipated way. This is being refined in the light of consultation comments and other evidence being received.</td>
<td>No specific action in response to this objection, but obviously it is necessary to show the Core Strategy is deliverable, setting out what will be done by whom and when.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-107</td>
<td>Mrs Jackie Liptrott</td>
<td></td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Support for the Council's approach to utilities provision (S).</td>
<td></td>
<td>No action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-140</td>
<td>Mr Philip Carter</td>
<td>Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support for the Council's approach to utilities provision (S).</td>
<td></td>
<td>No action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Support/Obj</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>csps-168</td>
<td>Mr Martyn Coy</td>
<td>Planner British Waterways</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support w/conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>A Vision for West Lancashire 2027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Vision should make specific reference to the Leeds-Liverpool Canal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>It is considered that the word “waterways” includes the Leeds-Liverpool Canal, and that to add the Canal specifically to paragraph 5 of the Vision is not necessary. As stated by the Objector, the Canal is mentioned specifically in paragraph 18 of the Vision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>csps-218</td>
<td>Mr Shaun Taylor</td>
<td>Planning Associate Director G L Hearn Property Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>A Vision for West Lancashire 2027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Further consideration needs to be given to decisions surrounding growth including when and where this takes place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Comments noted however further work on developing the Core Strategy, in terms of delivery is still underway in order to ensure the Submission Core Strategy is a “sound” document.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No action required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>csps-220</td>
<td>Mr D Rimmer</td>
<td>Planning Associate Director G L Hearn Property Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support w/conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>A Vision for West Lancashire 2027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Vision needs to be realistic and achievable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>We are aware of the risks associated with deliverability of development in Skelmersdale based on consultation feedback and historic development completion rates. In response to this a review has been carried out to ensure the appropriate balance of development is spread across the Borough to ensure housing delivery is not jeopardised but that the focus remains on Skelmersdale to support regeneration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>A review of housing targets and spread to ensure growth needs are met has been undertaken.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>csps-396</td>
<td>Wirral to Wyre Team Natural England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>A Vision for West Lancashire 2027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Natural England wants to see aspirational Visions that strongly promote the importance of the natural environment and its conservation and enhancement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>The word 'important' has been replaced before 'biodiversity' in the third paragraph on page 27.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>csps-510</td>
<td>Mr Keith Keeley</td>
<td>Planning Associate Director G L Hearn Property Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td>Object</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>A Vision for West Lancashire 2027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Without reference to an IDP the deliverability of the proposals cannot be guaranteed (s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>The Vision is a statement of where the Council wish to see the Borough being in 2027, as it relates to spatial planning. Therefore, the quote referenced is stating an aim that the Council will seek to achieve through the Core Strategy. The Council are aware an IDP is necessary to inform this and the wider document, and this will be provided alongside the Publication Draft Version of the Core Strategy, as per PPS12. A draft IDP is not required during Regulation 25 public consultation, which the CSPO consultation is a part of. The Council acknowledges that it will not always be easy to find solutions for infrastructure constraints in many parts of the Borough, and this will ultimately inform any decision on where development will be targeted in the Borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No Action Required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>csps-530</td>
<td>Mr Alan Hubbard</td>
<td>Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>A Vision for West Lancashire 2027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>The National Trust supports the proposed Vision and welcomes the new paragraph addressing climate change. (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casenote</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Support/Objection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>csp-653</td>
<td>Mr Simon Artiss</td>
<td>Planning Manager Bellway Homes Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>A Vision for West Lancashire 2027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>A vision for West Lancashire (Para 3.1) - given the options for growth set out later in the Core Strategy (CS), including the urban expansion of Ormskirk and Burscough, we question the appropriateness of the term 'long term stability' in reference to these settlements, whereas for Skelemrsdale the appropriate reference is for sustainable growth. To avoid potential misunderstanding, we consider the phrase 'sustainable growth' to apply to all 3 of these towns. The subsequent supporting text needs to reflect this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Comments Noted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Wording amended as suggested.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| csp-680 | Jason and Marcus Bleasdale | |
| Plan Ref | 3.1 | A Vision for West Lancashire 2027 |
| Summary | Jason and Marcus Bleasdale also support the Council's intention to take major steps to secure the long-term stability of Ormskirk/Aughton as part of the Vision for West Lancashire of 2027 but as mentioned previously, consider that Aughton should be treated as a single settlement in planning terms. |
| Response | Comments Noted |
| Recommendation | No Further Action |

| csp-142 | Mr Philip Carter | Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency |
| Plan Ref | 3.2 | Spatial & Strategic Objectives |
| Summary | Support for Strategic Objectives (S) |
| Response | Comments noted |
| Recommendation | No action required |

| csp-221 | Mr Shaun Taylor | Planning Associate Director G L Hearns Property Consultants |
| Plan Ref | 3.2 | Spatial & Strategic Objectives |
| Summary | Objective 5 needs to be re-written, to be SMART, by taking account of delivery issues with PDL sites. (S) |
| Response | It is accepted that some brownfield sites will be difficult to deliver, especially in the short term /current economic climate. Wording has been amended in recognition of this fact. |
| Recommendation | Wording of Objective 5 amended. (See also Rep 534.) |

| csp-229 | Mr D Rimmer | |
| Plan Ref | 3.2 | Spatial & Strategic Objectives |
| Summary | Sites should be allowed to be developed providing it can be proved safe from flooding. (s) |
| Response | PPS25 sets out the correct approach to planning for development at the strategic level and this must be reflected locally. However, where there are cases when flood mitigation measures can be used to help deliver a site for wider benefits then this may be evidenced through a planning application setting out specific parameters of the development. |
| Recommendation | No action required. |

| csp-248 | Mr Francis Williams | member Ormskirk Friends of the Earth |
| Plan Ref | 3.2 | Spatial & Strategic Objectives |
| Summary | The figure that is proposed of 300 new homes per annum we believe it is excessive. (S) |
| Response | At the time of considering this objection, the Council is legally obliged to use the RSS figure, 300 dwellings per annum. Even if this were not the case, it is considered that 300 dwellings per annum is the most appropriate figure for West Lancashire, based on the evidence underpinning the RSS, and also taking into account the latest household projections, plus the ‘RSS deficit’, (the number of housing completions in West Lancashire from 2003-11 compared with the RSS requirement). |
| Recommendation | No change. |

| csp-387 | North West Skelmersdale Owners | |
| Plan Ref | 3.2 | Spatial & Strategic Objectives |
| Summary | Many of the specific objectives are laudable, specifically objective 9 relating to Skelmersdale is supported. |
| Response | Comments noted. |
| Recommendation | No action. |
Summary
The strategic objectives form the link between the high level vision and the detailed strategy. They should expand the vision into the key specific issues for the area which need to be addressed, and how that will be achieved within the timescale of the core strategy. We are satisfied with the list of Objectives cited.

Response
Comments noted.

Recommendation
No action.

Plan Ref 3.2
Spatial & Strategic Objectives

Observations

cspo-398
Wirral to Wyre Team Natural England

Mr Marcus Bleasdale
Bleasdale Investments Ltd

Objective 5 should be revised to acknowledge it will be necessary to release some Green Belt land within the Borough in order to meet the specified development targets. (S)

Response
Releasing Green Belt is not a major objective of the Core Strategy and therefore it is unnecessary to include this within objective 5. Implications for the Green Belt are dealt with elsewhere in the document.

Recommendation
No action.

Plan Ref 3.2
Spatial & Strategic Objectives

Mr Alan Hubbard
Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust

Objective 7 would benefit from a specific reference to the wider settings within which heritage assets site. Suggested wording included.

Response
Comments Noted. Alternative wording added.

Recommendation
Wording changed.

Plan Ref 3.2
Spatial & Strategic Objectives

Ms Judith Nelson
English Heritage

Recommendations for some change in wording (S)

Response
Comments Noted and slight changes made to wording.

Recommendation
Wording amended in light of this, and other comments received.
Plan Ref: 3.2  Spatial & Strategic Objectives

Summary: The 300 dwellings per year target must be the very minimum and a higher figure would greatly assist in the delivery of more affordable homes, identified as a considerable need and political priority. We would therefore support a higher minimum, especially in light of the emerging national planning agenda (S).

Response: Comments noted. The backlog against RSS requirements from 2003 onwards is being taken into account in housing land supply calculations.

Recommendation: Consideration given to comments regarding housing delivery backlog.

---

cspo-681  Jason and Marcus Bleasdale

Plan Ref: 3.2  Spatial & Strategic Objectives

Summary: It explains that these new homes will be concentrated on brownfield sites, where available, in the major urban areas where more houses and transport facilities are greatest. Jason and Marcus Bleasdale consider that this objective should be revised to acknowledge it will be necessary to release some Green Belt land within the Borough in order to meet the specified development targets.

Response: Comments Noted

Recommendation: Consideration given to acknowledge that it may be necessary to release some Green Belt within the Borough in order to meet the specified development targets. This is covered through the planning policies. No change to the objectives.

---

cspo-705  Ms Rose Freeman

Plan Ref: 3.2  Spatial & Strategic Objectives

Summary: We support Objective 3 which includes the provision of social and cultural facilities but suggest that the Glossary (should you decide to have one) or accompanying text for Policy CS13 could include a description of such facilities for clarity.

Response: Comments Noted

Recommendation: No Further action. Policy CS13 does make reference to local social and community services and facilities.

---

cspo-277  Mr Alexis De Pol

Plan Ref: Chapter 4  An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options

Summary: Too much housing directed to the main settlements when some of the more rural settlements have many sustainable features and should take more development. (S)

Response: Comments regarding the comparison of DS4 land with Green Belt land noted. In terms of infrastructure in the northern parishes, other than Rufford, all other villages are accessible only by bus so there is no opportunity for supporting the local rail network in order to secure enhanced services. Furthermore, the highway network into Tarleton and Hesketh Bank is largely dependent upon a one road in one road out arrangement which is already very busy at peak times. Improvement of this arrangement would not be easily achievable and therefore further significant development would be difficult to support from a highways point of view. Finally, in terms of utility infrastructure, due to the flat topography of the northern parishes, both waste and clean water must be pumped. The capacity of this pumping system is now limited and there are no plans for upgrading the system within United Utilities’ spending plans. United Utilities have confirmed that they could not guarantee to provide a good standard of service to this area if significant development was to continue. Issues which may arise as a result of system failure include surface water flooding and low water pressure. The Council acknowledges that significant waste water issues also impact on Ormskirk, Burscough and some of the surrounding areas and is committed to working with United Utilities to support a bid for funds to create a solution to this issue. The reality of the situation is that funding for both issues is unlikely and therefore a solution to support the 2 main service centres within the Borough outside of Skelmersdale must be paramount.

Recommendation: No Action Required

---

cspo-368  Alan Syder

Plan Ref: Chapter 4  An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options

Summary: The level of development require is questionable and green belt land should only be released once all brownfield sites have been used. Further expansion of Edge Hill University should be carefully considered.

Response: 1) Housing targets are developed using population projections, past un-met need as a result of market conditions and household projections which takes account of the number of occupants in dwellings. 2) The Council agrees that the Green Belt should be used as a last resort after all land within the urban settlement areas has been used. 3) The Core Strategy sets out that the overwhelming need to meet housing and employment targets in order to support economic growth and meet housing needs is an exceptional circumstance. Furthermore, the requirement for Green Belt land equates to 0.26% of the significant amount of Green Belt land (over 91% of the Borough) that is designated within the Borough. 4) Sustainable development is central to the Core Strategy and Policy CS1. 5) The Core Strategy and in particular Policy CS7 prioritises Brownfield land over Green Belt. 6) Comments noted. 7) The purpose of managed expansion at Edge Hill is to assist in tackling many of the issues associated with the university including the delivery of on-site student accommodation in order to reduce the pressure on the housing stock of Ormskirk.

Recommendation: No action required.
Green Belt land should not be released unless all non-Green Belt options have been considered first. 4.3.3: It is an oversimplification to say DS4 release is equivalent to Green Belt release. Some DS4 land may be suitable for development, and would not have insurmountable infrastructure constraints. The benefits of the Dispersal Option should be more clearly stated, given this involves 100 fewer dwellings on Green Belt land. More than 100 dwellings could be accommodated on non-Green Belt sites in Banks. (S)

Response Paragraph 4.2.4 makes clear that Green Belt has been considered only because of a lack of available and deliverable land within settlements. Green Belt development is only proposed for release as a "last resort", given the lack of suitable available and viable non-Green Belt sites ("suitable" encompassing such considerations as infrastructure, drainage, sustainability, deliverability, etc). It is considered that the sentence in paragraph 4.3.3 is justified as a generalisation, although it is accepted that there may be individual sites that are exceptions to this generalisation. The paragraph states that "large amounts of development" could not be considered there - not that "no development" could be considered. With regard to infrastructure: the general constraints in the Northern Parishes (drainage, traffic congestion, flood risk) apply to all sites, and whilst a particular site may be deliverable, its development would exacerbate overall infrastructure difficulties for the area. It is agreed that the Core Strategy could have listed a benefit of the Dispersal Option as being 100 fewer dwellings in the Green Belt. Should the Dispersal option ultimately be selected as the preferred one, this point can be clarified.

Recommendation No Action Required

Redrow Homes
Plan Ref Chapter 4 An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options

Ms Judith Nelson English Heritage
Plan Ref Chapter 4 An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options

Mr Roger Bell
Plan Ref Chapter 4 An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options

Mr RA Barnish Ormskirk & Dist Community Council
Plan Ref Chapter 4 An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options

Mrs D Payne
Plan Ref Chapter 4 An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options

Support with conditions

Support

Object
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csps-508</th>
<th>Mrs Pauline Whelan</th>
<th>An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Concerned with the loss of green belt and agricultural land, ruining the approach into Ormskirk and allowing Edge Hill University to expand.</td>
<td>comments noted</td>
<td>no action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csps-513</th>
<th>Mr Frank Whelan</th>
<th>An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Concerned with traffic problems in Ormskirk as a result of any proposed development.</td>
<td>comments noted</td>
<td>no action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csps-551</th>
<th>Mrs Margaret Wiltshire</th>
<th>Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Concerned over the scale of development- will all the houses become occupied? Preferred option is Burscough but draining issues must be resolved. Edge Hill University must expand on the area it already has and then can expand into green belt providing it is kept as small as possible.</td>
<td>The target of 3000 homes is a target the Council felt was deliverable. However, having considered the response on this matter during public consultation, the figures will be reviewed. Comments regarding the Burscough Strategic site noted. Any development in Burscough would go hand in hand with the infrastructure delivery plan which would seek to address the waste water situation. Comments regarding Edge Hill noted</td>
<td>Reduce housing target for Skelmersdale due to concerns over deliverability given the current and fore-seeable economic climate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csps-566</th>
<th>Mr Alan Hubbard</th>
<th>Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>New development should bring with it new or enhanced provision of nature conservation resources. (S)</td>
<td>Protecting the natural environment is a theme running through the entire Core Strategy although it may not be specifically mentioned in every policy. In addition, the Core Strategy has a specific Policy (CS16) on Preserving and Enhancing Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity which does seek to protect biodiversity and habitat and ensure that, where new development does have an environmental impact, this is mitigated as far as is possible.</td>
<td>No further action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csps-629</th>
<th>Robert J. &amp; K. ADA Travis</th>
<th>An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Ormskirk has a bigger capacity to cope with increased development, compared to Burscough and Banks.</td>
<td>Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development</td>
<td>No action required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csps-690</th>
<th>Michael J Horsfall</th>
<th>An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Development would have severe negative impact upon already over-burdened volume of traffic generated by Edge Hill University. The land supports purpose of green belt to prevent urban sprawl between Aughton and Ormskirk. Additionally, I object to the inclusion of the 3 acre field on Ruff Lane [in this proposal] and any development upon it. It has been already ruled against at appeal and I agree with the Inspector's decision.</td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
<td>No further action required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development would have severe negative impact upon already over-burdened volume of traffic generated by Edge Hill University. The land supports purpose of green belt to prevent urban sprawl between Aughton and Ormskirk. Additionally, I object to the inclusion of the 3 acre field on Ruff Lane [in this proposal] and any development upon it. It has been already ruled against at appeal and I agree with the Inspector's decision.

Response

Comments noted

Recommendation

No further action required

CSPO-691

Barbara Horsfall

Chapter 4 An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options

Object

CSPO-692

Phil Southern

Chapter 4 An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options

Object

CSPO-736

Crompton property developments

David Crompton

Chapter 4 An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options

Support

CSPO-754

Paul Cotterill

Chapter 4 An Overview of the Core Strategy Preferred Options

Object

This table is potentially misleading and should be linked to the sustainability appraisal. The objectives should also be linked to a delivery plan (s)

Response

Table 4.1 is intended to illustrate "which objectives each policy is seeking to fulfill" (para 4.4.1) and so is not intended to show positive or negative effects, but simply to show that, taking all the policies together, each objective is addressed by at least one policy in the Core Strategy. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is a key supporting document that influences how the Core Strategy is shaped and is referred to in section 1.3 on p.10 of the CSPO document. The SA Report does not assess each policy individually, as this is not best practice in relation to SA. It is meant to be an assessment of the plan as a whole and it would be misleading to assess each policy individually without considering the wider context of the whole plan off-setting any potential negative impact an individual policy may have. A separate delivery plan is not required for the strategic objectives - the policies themselves in the Core Strategy are the mechanism for delivering the objectives, hence Table 4.1 is showing which objective(s) a policy helps to fulfil.

Response

Table 4.1 is intended to illustrate "which objectives each policy is seeking to fulfill" (para 4.4.1) and so is not intended to show positive or negative effects, but simply to show that, taking all the policies together, each objective is addressed by at least one policy in the Core Strategy. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is a key supporting document that influences how the Core Strategy is shaped and is referred to in section 1.3 on p.10 of the CSPO document. The SA Report does not assess each policy individually, as this is not best practice in relation to SA. It is meant to be an assessment of the plan as a whole and it would be misleading to assess each policy individually without considering the wider context of the whole plan off-setting any potential negative impact an individual policy may have. A separate delivery plan is not required for the strategic objectives - the policies themselves in the Core Strategy are the mechanism for delivering the objectives, hence Table 4.1 is showing which objective(s) a policy helps to fulfil.

Response

Table 4.1 is intended to illustrate "which objectives each policy is seeking to fulfill" (para 4.4.1) and so is not intended to show positive or negative effects, but simply to show that, taking all the policies together, each objective is addressed by at least one policy in the Core Strategy. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is a key supporting document that influences how the Core Strategy is shaped and is referred to in section 1.3 on p.10 of the CSPO document. The SA Report does not assess each policy individually, as this is not best practice in relation to SA. It is meant to be an assessment of the plan as a whole and it would be misleading to assess each policy individually without considering the wider context of the whole plan off-setting any potential negative impact an individual policy may have. A separate delivery plan is not required for the strategic objectives - the policies themselves in the Core Strategy are the mechanism for delivering the objectives, hence Table 4.1 is showing which objective(s) a policy helps to fulfil.
Support the release of small parcels of land within the Green Belt for sustainable development eg Land adjacent (south) to the Morris Dancers, Scarisbrick

Comments noted with regard to the merits of releasing this piece of Green Belt land, although not every point is agreed. It is not the role of the Core Strategy to allocate small sites, nor to release small sites (such as the one suggested) from the Green Belt; if this were to be done, it would be through the DM Policies DPD (settlement boundaries) or the Site Allocations DPD.

No further action.

Review of housing targets and distribution to ensure growth needs are met.

No action required

No action required

No action required

No action required

No action required
Summary 4.2.2 & 4.2.4: Release of green belt land must be carefully considered, however, the release of the New Road site would be within the village boundaries and within a natural boundary (sluice).

Response Acknowledged

Recommendation

Mr Robert W. Pickavance
Mr Marcus Bleasdale
Mr Alan Hubbard
Mr & Mrs B Hughes
Mr David P Gibson

The Core Strategy Preferred Options - Key Messages
Blesdale Investments Ltd
Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust
Options for Green Belt Release
Options for Green Belt Release
Options for Green Belt Release

Object
Support
Support
Object
Observations

No action required
No Action Required
No further action required
No further action
No further action.

Building on Green Belt should not be an option. In particular, the rural setting of Ormskirk should be maintained. (S)

Response Comments noted. Any removal of land from the Green Belt must be justified by â€œvery exceptional circumstancesâ€ and the Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper proposes that the need to begin to resolve any student accommodation, highways and car parking impacts caused by Edge Hill University constitutes those very exceptional circumstances.

Observations

No further action.

Concern about the potential loss for Green Belt adjacent to Ruff Woods. University expansion having a major impact on local residents. Concern about the restricted parking at Ruff Woods and arguments that issue of parking around the University needs to be addressed. (S)

Response Comments noted. Any removal of land from the Green Belt must be justified by â€œvery exceptional circumstancesâ€ and the Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper proposes that the need to begin to resolve any student accommodation, highways and car parking impacts caused by Edge Hill University constitutes those very exceptional circumstances.

No further action.

Page 20
Mr Steven Hopkin

Plan Ref: 4.3 Options for Green Belt Release

Summary: Green Belt should not be used at all, only sites within existing urban area. Increased traffic, pollution and demand on infrastructure is unacceptable. (S)

Response: Comments noted. Ideally, Green Belt should not be developed, but given the housing requirements the Borough faces, the limited number of developable sites in urban areas, and taking into account infrastructure constraints, there exist exceptional circumstances that necessitate the release of a small amount of Green Belt land.

Recommendation: No further action.

Mr P Rothwell

Plan Ref: 4.3 Options for Green Belt Release

Summary: A single large development site (option 1) is unlikely to be successful in view of the major infrastructure issues associated with such a large site. Whilst option 2 is regarded as more acceptable, a clearer definition of the areas where development will take place is necessary. The land to the north west of Parrs Lane should be identified as a single main area for residential development due to the way in which it satisfies all of the requirements for Green Belt land release. (S)

Response: Comments noted. Site-specific comments in relation to Parrs Lane are noted here and being taken into account in the Green Belt Study. It is not agreed that having one large development site would lead to insurmountable infrastructure constraints. Conversely, having one site could make developer contributions simpler and enable infrastructure issues to be addressed in a more straightforward manner. Allocating specific sites is not appropriate for the Core Strategy, except for large Strategic Sites central to the delivery of the Core Strategy. Parrs Lane, even if supported, would not qualify as such a site. 'Areas of search' are appropriate for non-strategic sites, in line with guidance on preparing Core Strategies. These will not lead to uncertainty over the lifetime of the Plan - the precise sites would be chosen as part of the Site Allocations DPD work a couple of years into the Core Strategy period. Although Parrs Lane is not served by the New Lane treatment works, it still suffers sewer infrastructure constraints. This site can be taken into account, along with others, when considering a Preferred Strategy, and / or a 'Plan B' portfolio of sites.

Recommendation: Consider Parrs Lane site as part of the 'Plan B' portfolio of sites.

Mr Clifford Holbert

Plan Ref: 4.3 Options for Green Belt Release

Summary: The site east of Vale Lane would help address the shortfall in employment land as identified in the Core Strategy and would assist in reducing the amount of undefined Green Belt land which is to be taken to the south of the M58. (S)

Response: Comments noted. Site-specific comments in relation to Parrs Lane are noted here and being taken into account in the Green Belt study. More evidence would be required regarding ground conditions before this site could be considered as a deliverable development site. Information the Council obtained from English Partnerships in 2005 showed that the site has been subject to shallow mine workings which could seriously constrain its development and make it unfeasible. If this is proved not to be the case, the site could be considered further in the future.

Recommendation: No action required.

Estate of Mr J Travis

Plan Ref: 4.3 Options for Green Belt Release

Summary: Orrell Lane site scores better when assessed against the 5 purposes of including land in the Green Belt set out in PPG2 than the identified strategic development site at Higgins Lane. Issues associated with Higgins Lane site in terms of infrastructure constraints means that it is unlikely to be developed as envisaged. A smaller site, such as that identified off Orrell Lane, would not generate the same infrastructure issues and would be more likely to be developed over the plan period. The site could be used as housing/community facilities with employment identified on the edge or located elsewhere in the Borough. (S)

Response: Detailed site-specific comments are noted, and are also being taken into account in the Green Belt Study. It is not agreed that having one large development site would lead to insurmountable infrastructure constraints. Conversely, having one site could make developer contributions simpler and enable infrastructure issues to be addressed in a more straightforward manner. This site can be taken into account, along with others, when considering a Preferred Strategy, and / or a 'Plan B' portfolio of sites.

Recommendation: Consider this site as part of the 'Plan B' portfolio of sites.

Mr & Mrs E Ramsbottom

Plan Ref: 4.3 Options for Green Belt Release

Summary: Wording of document should be amended to confirm rounding off of settlement boundaries will take place allowing release of small areas of Green Belt. (S)

Response: Comments noted. However, it is also noted that the Green Belt boundary around the end of Chapel Lane was considered at the 2005 Local Plan Inquiry, and the Inspector ruled that it should not be altered. It is not the role of the Core Strategy to set detailed Green Belt boundaries, except for Strategic Sites. The Development Management Policies DPD will address settlement boundaries, possibly in conjunction with the Site Allocations DPD, and there should be opportunities for representations to be made when consulting on these documents.

Recommendation: No further action.
The area of land bounded by Wellfield Lane and Vicrage Lane, including Ruff Woods, should be incorporated into the settlement area of Ormskirk and be subject to Green Belt release in order to regularise the situation in this area. The removal of Ruff Woods from its Green Belt designation will not lead to any development as it should be subject to a supplementary planning document identifying the restriction on development in this area and explaining its biological heritage and nature conservation significance. (S)

Response: Comments noted. Given the Vicarage Lane/Wellfield Lane area's physical separation from the built-up area of Ormskirk, it was considered more appropriate when setting Green Belt boundaries to 'wash over' this area as Green Belt, rather than include it as a 'finger' extension of the Ormskirk settlement boundary. It is not the role of the Core Strategy to set detailed Green Belt boundaries, except for Strategic Sites. The Development Management Policies DPD will address settlement boundaries, possibly in conjunction with the Site Allocations DPD, and there will be opportunities for representations to be made when consulting on these documents.

Recommendation: No further action

Plan Ref 4.3

Mr Philip Carter Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency

Summary: If Option B is progressed a Level 2 SFRA will be required.

Response: Comments noted

Recommendation: If Option B is selected a Level 2 SFRA will be carried out.

Plan Ref 4.3

Mr Philip Carter Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency

Summary: Functional floodplain located within the Ormskirk Strategic site is also a constraint.

Response: Noted

Recommendation: Include this issue in appraisal of the Ormskirk Site and do further assessment through Level 2 SFRA if option is selected.

Plan Ref 4.3

Mr M Abrams

Summary: Objection to the expansion of Edge Hill into the Green Belt. Concern that increasing University size is having consequential affects on the market town, these affects include traffic congestion and more strain between the University and locals. (S)

Response: Comments noted. The Council seeks to support any attempts to reduce any detrimental impact on local people caused by Edge Hill University. Even if student numbers stay broadly the same, land is required to improve student accommodation, access and car parking on campus to off-set negative impacts on the wider town. It is considered that the area of land identified within the draft Core Strategy will allow for managed and minimal levels of expansion into the Green Belt. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt.

Recommendation: No action required

Plan Ref 4.3

Ms Janet Chaddick

Summary: Objection to non preferred option: Ormskirk reasons include: Highly negative impact on traffic and congestion in Ormskirk and loss of Grade 1 agricultural land and loss of open approach to the town. (S)

Response: Comments noted.

Recommendation: No action required.

Plan Ref 4.3

Mrs J Caunce

Summary: Option 2 would be more acceptable. More development near the A59 would bring more chaos to the main area of Burscough. (S)

Response: Comments noted

Recommendation: No action required.
Response Comments noted. Most of the detail relates to the Green Belt Study, and these comments have been noted and addressed in that Study.

Recommendation Consider site within potential portfolio of "Plan B" sites

---

cspo-196  C/O Agent  WHITBREAD GROUP PLC
Plan Ref  4.3  Options for Green Belt Release

Summary The Council should consider provide a third option which involves the release of small pockets of land elsewhere across the borough. For example, Land adjacent to the Morris Dancers, Scarisbrick (S)

Response Paragraph 4.2.4 does not support the release of "small parcels of Green Belt land for development", but is pointing out that the amount of Green Belt land proposed for release is relatively small in proportion to the overall amount of Green Belt land in the Borough as a whole. A piecemeal release of many small (<1ha) sites is not considered a viable option, because although their individual impact on the Green Belt might be modest, their combined impact would be likely to be significant. Also, the potential for "planning gain" in the form of affordable housing, infrastructure improvements, etc. from a series of small sites would be much less than from a small number of larger sites. Comments regarding the land adjacent to the Morris Dancers have been noted, but are more relevant for the DM Policies DPD (which would set settlement boundaries), or the Site Allocations DPD.

Recommendation No further action.

---

cspo-213  Lt Coln RAR de Larrinaga
Plan Ref  4.3  Options for Green Belt Release  Support with conditions

Summary The rectangular site to the north of Edge Hill University should be regarded as appropriate for residential development in its own right rather than be associated with employment or educational facilities associated with Edge Hill University. (S)

Response Comments noted. This parcel has been submitted individually through other LDF evidence base documents (the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) and will be considered on its own merits through the LDF process.

Recommendation No action required

---

cspo-223  Mr Shaun Taylor  Planning Associate Director G L Hearne Property Consultants
Plan Ref  4.3  Options for Green Belt Release

Summary The Core Strategy must therefore reconsider the need for a greater level of Green Belt release and potential broad locations of such release. (S)

Response We are aware of the risks associated with deliverability of development in Skelmersdale based on consultation feedback and historic development completion rates. In response to this a review is being carried out to ensure the appropriate distribution of development across the Borough to ensure housing delivery is not jeopardised but that the focus remains on Skelmersdale to support regeneration. In terms of concerns regarding "lag time", plan B is currently being developed to ensure that in the the infrastructure upgrades do not take place or Skelmersdale fails to deliver revised growth targets, Plan B will come in to play.

Recommendation Review of housing targets and distribution to ensure growth needs are met.

---

cspo-239  Mr D Rimmer
Plan Ref  4.3  Options for Green Belt Release

Summary DS4 Land should be considered for development before Green Belt land. (S)

Response 30 dwellings per hectare is a "ball park" figure, based on the former national minimum density requirement in PPS3. In some instances, open space (and roads, SUDS, etc.) can be incorporated within a development whilst achieving an overall [gross] density of 30dph, which if applied across the Borough would result in the need for 20ha of land release for housing. In other instances the inclusion of open space, etc. would result in an overall density of less than 30dph and a need for more than 20ha land release. Conversely, it may be possible to achieve an overall density in excess of 30dph, which would result in the need for less than 20ha land release. The approximation in paragraph 4.3.2 is for indicative purposes only. Individual site characteristics will be taken into account when preparing development briefs (including applications and / or the Site Allocations DPD. DS4 land is not afforded the same level of protection as Green Belt land, paragraph 4.3.3 points out the similarities in characteristics and impacts of development on such land. Infrastructure providers have commented that significant development within the Tarleton and Hesketh Bank settlement area would not be appropriate given the road layout and lack of sustainable public transport links. Burscough has 2 rail stations and the main trunk road through the Borough passes through it. Furthermore, United Utilities have advised that hydraulic issues associated with the sewer system within the northern parishes are a limiting factor. Given both this issue and the issues surrounding Burscough and Ormskirk waste water treatment, do not have guaranteed funding, it would be more appropriate for funding to improve the drainage system in order to support the 2 of the 3 most sustainable settlements within the Borough rather than the key sustainable villages which, by their nature and size, have tighter environmental constraints. Comments regarding Banks are noted. However, site allocations are beyond the remit of the Core Strategy and would come at a later stage once we have an adopted Core Strategy.

Recommendation No action required.
We would advocate retention for agricultural purposes of the Green Belt land which is of the most value to food production. (S)

Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk.

No action required.

Edge Hill should not be allowed to swamp Ormskirk, character of the market town should be preserved. Student accommodation should be restricted. (S)

1) Comments noted. Policy CS6 seeks to manage development at Edge Hill and limit the impacts on Ormskirk. 2) Policy CS17 sets out how development must be of good quality design and Policy CS9 seeks to manage and limit where necessary, student accommodation. 3) Comments noted.

No action required.

The council must consider very carefully the consequences before allowing either of the first two proposals for Green Belt release to go ahead. If all issues are considered logically then there can only be one set of decisions. (s)

Comments noted. Managing development at Edge Hill university is central to Policy CS6. Without some controlled development, the Council would struggle to manage the existing impacts on Ormskirk such as Student accommodation and traffic. Comments relating to the Green Belt study are responded to within the Green Belt Study Consultation Response Report. Comments regarding student housing policy are noted.

No further action required.

The Ormskirk option presented itself as the settlement is the second largest settlement in the Borough with many sustainable features including an excellent rail system, town centre with many local facilities and a need for housing, in particular affordable housing to meet local need. Whilst some housing will still need to be located within Ormskirk on land within the settlement boundary, the Council reviewed and considered the impacts of the Ormskirk option for Green Belt release to meet the remainder of housing need and considered that overall the Burscough option for Green Belt release is a better option with less negatives. Housing targets are established through a combination of population projections figures, meeting unmet need that has not been delivered as a result of the slow in the housing market and household projections which set out the likely make up of housing in the future according to trends. All other comments noted but are largely in relation to a proposal which is not set out within this document and is being driven by an independent land owner.

No action required.

Do not support Option 1 (Burscough). Do not support Option 2 (Dispersal). Recommends the non-preferred option for review and adoption. (S)

Comments noted.

No action required.
cspo-280  Mrs Jo Robison  Associate Smiths Gore
Plan Ref  4.3  Options for Green Belt Release  Object

Summary  Disagrees with the sites chosen as Green Belt study has not been consulted on.

Response  The Council accepts that sites located around Ormskirk and Burscough are constrained by waste water treatment issues but considers that overcoming this issue is vital to the future of the Borough and the sustainability of its 2 main settlements outside of Skelmersdale. Although AUG.04 does not have the same waste water issue, its location means that access to the key A roads would be via existing B and unclassified roads which suffer pinch points and would be more problematic in terms of impact on the local highway network. All other Green Belt sites proposed have primary access onto the A59 which is one of the main arterial routes through the Borough.

Recommendation  A Background Technical Paper will be produced setting out the detailed assessments undertaken in arriving at the preferred options for Green Belt release.

cspo-283  Mr Alun Delaney
Plan Ref  4.3  Options for Green Belt Release  Object

Summary  Object to proposed development of green belt in Ormskirk (S)

Response  The Ormskirk option is the Council’s non-preferred option for many of the reasons set out in this objection. The Council appreciates the value of the Green Belt in this location and considers that other Green Belt sites would be more suitable to come forward for development. Whilst we take note of previous comments from Inspectors, the Core Strategy will set out development requirements for the next 15 years, up to 2027. Over this time period we are facing an unprecedented situation whereby the population will continue to grow and the needs of the Borough will place great demand on the existing urban areas creating a need to expand into the Green Belt. Green Belt development is therefore inevitable if we are to meet the needs of a growing Borough, the issue we face is which part or parts of the Green Belt are most suitable for release for future development needs. As stated above, the Ormskirk Strategic Site is the Council’s non-preferred option for this purpose.

Recommendation  No action.

cspo-285  Dave Usher
Plan Ref  4.3  Options for Green Belt Release  Observations

Summary  Concerns on how the options have been developed. (S)

Response  Although the Ormskirk Option has been identified as non-preferred, it has still been included within this consultation. It is clearly set out within all promotional material and the document itself in order to enable the public to express their views regarding the option and to allow them to comment.

Recommendation  No action required.

cspo-288  Mrs Marilyn Bolton
Plan Ref  4.3  Options for Green Belt Release  Object

Summary  Object to expansion of Edge Hill Uni using Green belt release (S)

Response  The Ormskirk Strategic Site is the Council’s non-preferred option for Green Belt release, which means that whilst it has been identified as a possibility, the Council considers that there are more suitable and sustainable sites which could be released for development first. The Green Belt was protected in 1987 for a period of 15 to 20 years to restrict urban sprawl. This designation was always intended to be reviewed depending on the implications of future population growth. 24 years after its designation, we are now having to review existing Green Belt boundaries in order to meet the needs of the Borough’s growing population over the next 15 years. The Council is seeking to identify those areas which offer the lowest Green Belt value to the Borough rather than those which are more valuable and to prioritise those areas first. As stated above, the Ormskirk Strategic Site is considered least sustainable of all the options and therefore is the non-preferred option.

Recommendation  No action.

cspo-293  Mr Callum Hosie
Plan Ref  4.3  Options for Green Belt Release  Object

Summary  I totally oppose any re-designation of (ORM.07) and release of green belt for development without strong justification and evidence (S)

Response  The comments above relate mainly to the analysis of ORM.07 which has been addressed in the Green Belt Study Consultation Response Report (Representation GB 17)

Recommendation  No action required within the Core Strategy. See officer recommendations to the Green Belt Study Consultation Report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csco-296</th>
<th>L Wallbank</th>
<th>4.3</th>
<th>Options for Green Belt Release</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>I am against the development on green belt 100%. (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td>The Borough does not have enough non-Green Belt land to deliver the required growth targets needed to meet the housing and employment need of the existing and future population of the Borough. Therefore, release of less than 1% of the existing Green Belt land will be necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>No action required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csco-303</th>
<th>Mr James Kitchen</th>
<th>4.3</th>
<th>Options for Green Belt Release</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>We at 296 Liverpool road South object to the above planned development in relation to the 600 homes on green belt land (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td>Comment noted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>No action required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csco-305</th>
<th>Mr Stuart Colothan</th>
<th>4.3</th>
<th>Options for Green Belt Release</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>I am writing to express my sincere concerns about the possibility of building 600 more homes in Ormskirk and losing the green belt by Altys Lane. I hope to hear from you soon regarding this matter as I am thoroughly opposed to it. (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td>Concern noted. This is the Council's &quot;Non-Preferred&quot; Option for development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>No action required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csco-306</th>
<th>Renee Bligh</th>
<th>4.3</th>
<th>Options for Green Belt Release</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Should not be allocating agricultural land for development. The pressure of development on infrastructure is a problem, particularly traffic and sewers which cause flooding. Also the additional anti social behaviour associated with new large estates cannot be managed as police are moving out of the area. Brownfield sites should be developed first. (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td>Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. The Core Strategy Preferred Options Document is informed by evidence which reviews all available land within the Borough and assesses its suitability for development. The Council is aware that most of our development requirements will fit within the existing urban settlements and will prioritise brownfield in order to use up this land. However, there is a shortfall of land towards the end of the plan and the Green Belt will need to be considered to meet the remaining housing and employment needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>No action required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csco-318</th>
<th>Mr Ron Rowles</th>
<th>4.3</th>
<th>Options for Green Belt Release</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>I write to state that I am totally opposed to any development of the land situated between St Helens Road and Altys Lane. I am also totally opposed to any further development of the land bounded by Ruff Lane, St Helens Road and Scarth Hill Lane. I am totally in favour of restricting the student occupancy of housing in the town to a maximum of 15%. (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td>The Council wishes to continue to support the Green Belt designation as much as possible due to the benefits associated with protecting the countryside and character of West Lancashire. However, the Core Strategy must manage development and development pressures up to 2027 and in this time it is expected that the University will need some additional land. All of the options presented in the Core Strategy allow for 10ha of expansion land at Edge Hill. It is considered that this will allow for managed and minimal levels of expansion into the Green Belt. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt. Lastly, the University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy and the Council seeks to support its future plans, whilst attempting to reduce any detrimental impact on local people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>No action required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In relation to the Ruff Lane, St. Helen's Rd, and Scarth Hill areas, in 2005 it was stated that "This area performs and important Green Belt Function" why now, are proposals being made to do just the opposite? (s)

Response The Council wishes to continue to support the Green Belt designation as much as possible due to the benefits associated with protecting the countryside and character of West Lancashire. However, the Core Strategy must manage development and development pressures up to 2027 and in this time it is expected that the University will need some additional land. All of the options presented in the Core Strategy allow for 10ha of expansion land at Edge Hill. It is considered that this will allow for managed and minimal levels of expansion into the Green Belt. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt. Lastly, the University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy and the Council seeks to support its future plans, whilst attempting to reduce any detrimental impact on local people.

Recommendation No action required
Summary

Object to Burscough option. (S)

Response

With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1, 2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3, 5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as ‘Considerate Constructors’. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7, 8, 9, 10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the ‘Have Your Say’ leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst ‘new jobs’ is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, ‘high quality business space’ (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. ‘Improved transport’ refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list ‘improved transport’ as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase ‘improved drainage’ refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation

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

Recommendation

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

Recommenda

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

Recommendation: No action.
Response

With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst new jobs is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, high quality business space (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. Improved transport refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list improved transport as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase improved drainage refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation

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

Recommendation No action.
Response

With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1, 2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3, 5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7, 8, 9, 10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business/office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered reasonable to list as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation

No action.

cspo-384

J Berry 4.3 Options for Green Belt Release Support

Summary

My preferred option would be the Burscough one. (S)

Response

Comments noted.

Recommenda-
tion

No action.

cspo-385

Mr Johnn Butterworth 4.3 Options for Green Belt Release Object

Summary

Object to release of green belt in ormskirk particularly.

Response

Comments noted. The LDF Team held a range of events to consult with the public during May and June 2011. This included workshops, exhibitions and consultation with schools. The survey was intended as a simpler method of responding for those not used to the formal representations often associated with planning. However, more general comment forms were also available, along with general representations submitted by email or by letter. It is unfortunate that the Lord Derby Estate scheme was promoted at the same time as the Council’s consultation as the two are completely unrelated. The Council has identified the Ormskirk site as the ‘non-preferred’ option which means it is considered to be most unsustainable when compared with the other options.

Recommendation

No action.
Object to the Ormskirk Strategic Site due to traffic congestion and the purpose of the Green Belt in this location. (S)

Response
Comments noted. And for the reasons highlighted in the response above the Ormskirk Strategic Site has been identified as the non-preferred Option. This means that other identified options are considered more sustainable by the Council.

Recommendation
No action.

Object to the Ormskirk Strategic Site as there is no change since the Public Enquiry in 2005. (S)

Response
Comments noted. This is the Council's non-preferred option as it is considered to be the least sustainable of all of the options for Green Belt release.

Recommendation
No action.

Object to Ormskirk. Support Burscough.

Response
Comments noted. The Ormskirk Option is the Council's non-preferred option for many of the reasons highlighted above. The Council is aware of the confusion caused by the Ormskirk 2027 exhibition, unfortunately this was out of the Council's hands. Support for the Burscough option noted.

Recommendation
No action.

Object to Burscough option (S)

Response
Comments on Burscough Option noted. All of the options pose potential problems in terms of infrastructure and traffic congestion. This will need to be managed working closely with developers to improve the existing situation as development goes ahead. The issue for West Lancs BC is that some land for new housing needs to be found and as assessment must be made as to which area would have the smallest negative impact if developed.

Recommendation
No action.

Object to Ormskirk option and loss of green belt (S)

Response
Comments noted. The Ormskirk Strategic site is the Council's non-preferred option as it is considered the least sustainable option in terms of future use of Green Belt land. This option has, however, still been consulted upon in order to gain the views of the public. In any case, we have allowed for 10ha of expansion land at Edge Hill University. The university campus is now reaching capacity and by allowing for managed expansion of 10ha within the plan, this will help us to avoid future over-development in the Green Belt. Extending the campus will also allow for functions such as a greater proportion of student accommodation on site, reducing pressure on existing housing in Ormskirk for students.

Recommendation
No action.

Object to Burscough (S)

Response
Comments noted. The Council is aware that where ever development in the Green Belt goes ahead there will be some negative impacts such as loss of the function of the Green Belt, increased traffic congestion and pressure on existing infrastructure. We have to aim to manage these negative impacts by working with developers to lessen the impact. We also have to weigh the negative implications with much wider concerns that the future population of West Lancashire will not have access to housing.

Recommendation
No action.
The Draft Green Belt Study which identifies land bounded by Ruff Lane and St Helens Road and adjacent to Edge Hill as ORM.07 is an evidence base document and not a policy document. What this means is that the study was carried out in order to inform planning policy which will be developed through the Local Development Framework process. The important difference is that what is identified within the evidence base may not in all circumstances be carried through as policy and ultimately, the Green Belt Study itself cannot remove land from the Green Belt. It is the Core Strategy which identifies areas of land to be removed from Green Belt and within the latest version, the Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper, the proposals do not propose to remove the whole of the parcel of land known as ORM.07 from the Green Belt. The proposal is for a much smaller area of land (10 ha) within the parcel that is directly adjacent to the existing Green Belt boundary. Furthermore, any removal of land from the Green Belt must still be justified by "very exceptional circumstances" and the Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper proposes that the need to begin to resolve any student accommodation, highways and car parking impacts caused by Edge Hill University constitutes those very exceptional circumstances.

Recommendation
No action.

---

Observations
Options for Green Belt Release

It quite obviously performs the purpose of the Green Belt which is a fact historically strongly supported by the council and ratified by independent government inspectors on at least two occasions.

Response
Comments noted and responded too in detail within the Draft Green Belt Study Consultation Report. In terms of Green Belt release, Policy CS6 proposes that only a 10ha portion of the parcel adjacent to the existing university campus is to be released from the Green Belt. the remainder of the parcel would continue to be designated as Green Belt.

Recommendation
No action required.

---

Observations
Options for Green Belt Release

Support for distribution of dwellings in Ormskirk. High Lane should be identified as a Green Belt site for development, or failing that as safeguarded land for future residential development. (S)

Response
Comments noted. The Council is re-considering all Green Belt options in light of such comments in order to ensure the most sustainable options are put forward within the final draft document. The potential for land at High Lane to deliver some of the housing targets is noted.

Recommendation
Given the need for additional housing due to the revised housing target, it is recommended that a combination of Yew Tree Farm in Burscough and High Lane / Grove Farm in Ormskirk should be considered for release from the Green Belt for new housing.
The Council recognises that wherever new development is directed to within the Green Belt there will be some negative implications such as loss of open land, traffic impacts and infrastructure issues. Nevertheless, there are development targets which need to be met over the next 15 years and the Council must consider what is best for the entire Borough and that means selecting those sites which are considered to have fewest negative impacts when compared to others. All of the submitted comments on the options will be considered in some detail when writing up the amended draft document.

**Recommendation**

No action.

---

cspo-454

Mr Raymond McDonald

Plan Ref 4.3 Options for Green Belt Release

**Summary**

Burscough

**Response**

Comments noted. The Council recognises that wherever new development is directed to within the Green Belt there will be some negative implications such as loss of open land, traffic impacts and infrastructure issues. Nevertheless, there are development targets which need to be met over the next 15 years and the Council must consider what is best for the entire Borough and that means selecting those sites which are considered to have fewest negative impacts when compared to others. All of the submitted comments on the options will be considered in some detail when writing up the amended draft document.

**Recommendation**

No action.

---

cspo-456

Mr Donald C Hudson

Plan Ref 4.3 Options for Green Belt Release

**Summary**

Object to green belt release and note problems caused by university (S)

**Response**

Comments noted.

**Recommendation**

No action.

---

cspo-459

Mr Brian Marsh

Plan Ref 4.3 Options for Green Belt Release

**Summary**

Object to release of green belt in Ormskirk (S)

**Response**

Comments noted. Population projections and the requirements of the Core Strategy (up to 2027) mean that the position has changed since 2005 and the Council must identify some Green Belt land if it is to meet projected housing needs to the end of the plan period.

**Recommendation**

No action.

---

cspo-465

Mr Marcus Bleasdale

Plan Ref 4.3 Options for Green Belt Release

**Summary**

Object to Ormskirk. Support Burscough.

**Response**

Comments noted. We understand the concerns raised in relation to the Ormskirk Strategic Site and the expansion of Edge Hill University. The position the Borough finds itself in has ultimately changed since 2005 and we must find land for additional houses in order to avoid a housing shortage over the next 15 year period. Unfortunately this means identifying some Green Belt land for development and in doing so the Council wishes to identify an area which will have the fewest negative impacts. It is for this reason that Ormskirk is the non-preferred option as it is considered that negative impacts associated with this site will be greater than the Burscough option and the dispersal option. A small area of expansion land at Edge Hill is identified within all the options and this includes a 10ha site on the edge of the existing campus. If the Council does not allow for this managed expansion, which is intended to provide some student accommodation to relieve pressure on the town, then it could be open to challenge and a much greater level of development in the Green Belt.

**Recommendation**

No action.

---

cspo-466

Mr RA Barnish

Plan Ref 4.3 Options for Green Belt Release

**Summary**

Object to Ormskirk. Support Burscough.

**Response**

Comments noted. We understand the concerns raised in relation to the Ormskirk Strategic Site and the expansion of Edge Hill University. The position the Borough finds itself in has ultimately changed since 2005 and we must find land for additional houses in order to avoid a housing shortage over the next 15 year period. Unfortunately this means identifying some Green Belt land for development and in doing so the Council wishes to identify an area which will have the fewest negative impacts. It is for this reason that Ormskirk is the non-preferred option as it is considered that negative impacts associated with this site will be greater than the Burscough option and the dispersal option. A small area of expansion land at Edge Hill is identified within all the options and this includes a 10ha site on the edge of the existing campus. If the Council does not allow for this managed expansion, which is intended to provide some student accommodation to relieve pressure on the town, then it could be open to challenge and a much greater level of development in the Green Belt.

**Recommendation**

No action.

---

cspo-467

Mr Allan D Cunningham

Plan Ref 4.3 Options for Green Belt Release

**Summary**

Object to Ormskirk option

**Response**

Comments noted. The Council considers that the non-preferred option is the least sustainable option at the current time.

**Recommendation**

No action.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csopo-471</th>
<th>Mr William Davis</th>
<th>Options for Green Belt Release</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Object to Burscough (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Comments noted. The Council is aware that there are infrastructure and congestion problems associated with each of the options within the Core Strategy. It is intended that improvements will be made using developer contributions. Without development, such improvements cannot be facilitated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csopo-477</th>
<th>Helen Griffin</th>
<th>Options for Green Belt Release</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Objects to Burscough option</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1.2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3.5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as <strong>Considerate Constructors</strong>. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business/office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the <strong>Have Your Say</strong> leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst <strong>new jobs</strong> is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, <strong>high quality business space</strong> (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. <strong>Improved transport</strong> refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list <strong>improved transport</strong> as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase <strong>drainage</strong> refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csopo-478</th>
<th>Mr Marcus Bleasdale</th>
<th>Bleasdale Investments Ltd</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Options for Green Belt Release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>A reduction of 0.26% of Green Belt land within the Borough represents a negligible change and on this basis, Jason and Marcus Bleasdale consider that the Council should give consideration to releasing additional Green Belt land for development, in particular the site at Little Moor Hall Farm given its 'suitability', 'achievability' and availability for accommodating new housing, which has been established by the March 2010 West Lancashire SHLAA. (s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Suggested site will be considered as an alternative Green Belt option.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Site considered within assessment of potential &quot;Plan B&quot; sites, but found to not be most suitable for either preferred Green Belt release or for inclusion within the portfolio of &quot;Plan B&quot; sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1, 2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3, 5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7, 8, 9, 10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business/office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst new jobs is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, high quality business space (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. Improved transport refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list improved transport as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase improved drainage refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommen- dation

No action.
Response

With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst new jobs is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, high quality business space (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. Improved transport refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list improved transport as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase improved drainage refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation

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

Recommen- dation

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

Recommendation

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

Recommendation

No action.

Plan Ref 4.3 

Options for Green Belt Release
Response
With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1, 2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3, 5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7, 8, 9, 10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business/office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst new jobs is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, high quality business space (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. Improved transport infrastructure refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list improved transport infrastructure as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase improved drainage refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation
No action.
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Recommendation

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

Recommendation

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

Recommen-dation

No action.
Response

With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1, 2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3, 5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as “Considerate Constructors”. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7, 8, 9, 10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business/office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the “Have Your Say” leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst “new jobs” is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, “new, high quality business space” (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. “Improved transport” refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list “improved transport” as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase “improved drainage” refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation

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

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

Recommendation
No action.
Response

With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8. The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business/office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst Have Your Say leaflet is noted, but it is not true that the new jobs are specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, new, high quality business space is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, and Burscough as a whole, not just Burscough. 3. Improved transport refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation

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

Recommendation

No action.
Summary

Object to burscough option (S)

Response

With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst new jobs is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, high quality business space refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list transport as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 3. The phrase improves drainage refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation

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

Recommendation

No action.
Object to Burscough option (S)

Response

With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1, 2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3, 5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors.

4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7, 8, 9, 10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business/office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst new jobs is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, high quality business space (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. Improved transport refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list improved transport as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase improved drainage refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation

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

Recommendation

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

Response

No action.

Recommendation

Check referencing of Evidence Base documents throughout the Core Strategy document
With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst new jobs is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, high quality business space refers to new jobs as a benefit. 3. Improved transport refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list improved transport as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase improved drainage refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation

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

Recommen- dation

No action.

Page 59
With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors". 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business/office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the "Have Your Say" leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst "new jobs" is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, "new, high quality business space" (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. "Improved transport" refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "Improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase "improved drainage" refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

**Recommendation**

No action.
Response

A Cabinet Report was put before Council's Cabinet in January 2010 setting out all the options across the Borough for Green Belt release considered by Council Officers and how the 3 options consulted upon in the CSPO document were arrived at. In preparing the Publication Draft Core Strategy document, a background paper will be prepared to accompany the Core Strategy setting out how the various options for Green Belt release were considered in preparation. In relation to Burscough specifically, the Yew Tree Farm site was identified in the draft Green Belt Study as the only site on the edge of Burscough (of a large enough size to accommodate a Strategic Development Site) that did not fulfil any of the 5 purposes of the Green Belt (cf PPG2). While the quality of the Green Belt is not the only consideration in deciding which areas of Green Belt should be considered for development, it is a key consideration and was supported by other considerations in comparison to other land on the edge of Burscough and Ormskirk / Aughton, such as agricultural land quality, potential accessibility to the major highway routes (the A59 and A5209 in Burscough), accessibility to public transport, proximity to schools and other services, especially the town centre, and accessibility to employment opportunities. While some other potential sites performed better than Yew Tree Farm against some of these criteria, none performed as well overall in relation to all the criteria as Yew Tree Farm. The draft Green Belt Study is only one aspect of the evidence base and it is primarily focused on whether land within the Green Belt fulfils the purposes of the Green Belt, not sustainability. Any land on the edge of Burscough would be faced with similar severe constraints in relation to infrastructure, the most crucial being around the provision of improved waste water treatment capacity for Burscough, surface water flooding in some parts of the town, and the impact of new development on the highway network through the town and beyond. Therefore, these constraints do not solely apply to the Yew Tree Farm Site but any other site in Burscough that may be put forward. The alternative infrastructure-led option is one which has been considered, in initial thinking on options for Green Belt release, but was considered inappropriate due to the scale of housing development that would be required to fund such costly improvements as the Ormskirk bypass and improved rail and road infrastructure in Burscough, with there still being more minor infrastructure needs to address and fund as well. Such a large scale of housing development in the Ormskirk and Burscough areas would not only completely alter the character of these towns, but could also prevent development coming forward in Skelmersdale, therefore stifling the regeneration of the Borough's largest and most deprived town, a key priority for not only the Core Strategy, but the Council as a whole.
With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1, 2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3, 5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7, 8, 9, 10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business/office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst new jobs is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, high quality business space (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. Improved transport refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list improved transport as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase improved drainage refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.
Response

With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst new jobs is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, high quality business space refers to high quality business space (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. Improved transport refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list improved transport as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase improved drainage refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation

No action.
Response

With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1.2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3.5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7.8, 9.10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business/office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst new jobs is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, high quality business space (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. Improved transport refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list improved transport as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation

No action.

cspo-525

Plan Ref 4.3 Options for Green Belt Release

Response

Consider the alternative Green Belt site put forward at Parr's Lane, Aughton.

Recommendation

Site to be included in recommended portfolio of potential "Plan B" sites

cspo-535

Plan Ref 4.3 Options for Green Belt Release

Response

Alternative Green Belt site suggested and will be investigated further.

Recommendation

Site to be included in recommended portfolio of potential "Plan B" sites
Response

With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1, 2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3, 5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7, 8, 9, 10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business/office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst new jobs is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, high quality business space (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. Improved transport infrastructure refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list improved transport as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase improved drainage refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation

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

Recommendation
No action.
Response

With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst new jobs is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, high quality business space (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. Improved transport refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list improved transport as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase improved drainage refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation

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

Recommendation: No action.
Response

With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the 'Have Your Say' leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst 'new jobs' is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, 'new, high quality business space' (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. 'Improved transport' refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list 'improved transport' as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase 'improved drainage' refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation

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

Recommendation

No further action required
Object to burscough option (S)

Response

With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as ‘Considerate Constructors’. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the ‘Have Your Say’ leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst ‘new jobs’ is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, ‘high quality business space’ (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. ‘Improved transport’ refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list ‘improved transport’ as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase ‘improved drainage’ refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation

No further action required
With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions.

3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors.

4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated.

7,8,9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development.

8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry).

9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk.

11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation.

With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst new jobs is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, high quality business space (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. Improved transport refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list improved transport as a benefit from the Burscough Option.

4. The phrase improved drainage refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site.

5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements.

6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommenda- No further action required
Response

With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8,9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst high quality business space (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. Improved transport refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list transport as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase improved drainage refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation

No further action required
Response

With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8,9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business/office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst new jobs is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, high quality business space (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. Improved transport refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list improved transport as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase improved drainage refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommen-
dation

No further action required

---

cspo-552

Plan Ref 4.3 Options for Green Belt Release

Summary Support for resisting release of Green Belt land on the edge of villages, especially in the Northern Parishes. No preference in terms of Green Belt option. (S)

Response Comments noted

Recommen-
dation

No further action required
Response

With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst high quality business space is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.
With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business/office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst new jobs is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, high quality business space (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. Improved transport refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list improved transport as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase improved drainage refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommenda

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

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

Recommenda- tion

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

No further action required

No further action required
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cspo-568</td>
<td>Susan Dunn</td>
<td>Secretary West Lancashire Civic Trust</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support Burscough option (S)</td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
<td>No further action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-571</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs B Wallington</td>
<td></td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Object to release of green belt land in Ormskirk.</td>
<td>Comments noted Although the expansion of Edge Hill has caused issues for residents in Ormskirk this proposed expansion is seen as a realistic opportunity to resolve some of the issues causing nuisance for Ormskirk residents eg car parking. Edge Hill also contributes significantly to the economy of West Lancashire. This is considered a small expansion into the Green Belt which can be controlled through policy.</td>
<td>No further action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-572</td>
<td>Mr I Makin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Object to the Burscough option due to traffic congestion which would be made worse, there is no need for an additional school as places in the existing schools, the pressure on health services in Burscough and Skelmersdale would be unacceptable, the sewer system cannot cope and the loss of green Belt and agricultural land is equally as important in Burscough as in Ormskirk.</td>
<td>Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. The Council has been informed by the local education authority that primary schools in Burscough are near capacity and that with any high level of housing growth these schools will be over capacity. Any large scale development would therefore require a new school. As part of the Council's infrastructure delivery plan we have liaised in detail with the local health providers to ensure that any developments planned can be accommodated. It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. As part of the Council's work on the infrastructure delivery plan sewerage issues are being investigated. Until waste water issues can be addressed development will not take place.</td>
<td>No further action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-574</td>
<td>Ms Michelle Blair</td>
<td></td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>In summary i object to all three options, and in particular to options 1 and 2.</td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
<td>No further action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-575</td>
<td>Mr Peter Vernon</td>
<td>Director Vernon &amp; Co</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>The overarching approach to deliver development on brownfield sites and reduce the need for Green Belt release is supported. The second preferred option would release less Green Belt and the land at Banks could deliver a greater amount of the identified need.</td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
<td>No further action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-584</td>
<td>Carol Judge</td>
<td></td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Objection to an additional 600 homes in Ormskirk due to the congestion this would create and the additional student population which would like fill the new homes.</td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
<td>No further action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>csso-600</td>
<td>Hollins Strategic Land LLP</td>
<td>Plan Ref</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Options for Green Belt Release</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Option 2 is the clear preference for West Lancashire’s Core Strategy. However, more sites need to be included to avoid over reliance on individual land owners. An over reliance on Skelmersdale to deliver housing is a risk as the market is very poor and unlikely to deliver the Council's housing targets. Enough Green Belt should be released for beyond the plan period in order to conform with PPG2. Bath Farm and Grove Farm north of Ormskirk are both sustainable in terms of location and appropriate in terms of Green Belt release. (S)</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Comments Noted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Housing target for Skelmersdale to be reduced following consultation feedback and review of evidence on deliverability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csso-609</th>
<th>Gavin Rattray</th>
<th>Plan Ref</th>
<th>4.3</th>
<th>Options for Green Belt Release</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>In summary i strongly oppose Options 1 and 2.</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Comments noted. It is accepted that all options will create positives and negatives and that some increase in traffic will be observed. However, the Council is conducting initial traffic modelling to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified the Council will seek to, if possible provide appropriate mitigation.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No action required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csso-620</th>
<th>Centre Model Developments</th>
<th>Plan Ref</th>
<th>4.3</th>
<th>Options for Green Belt Release</th>
<th>Support with conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Option 2 is the clear preference for West Lancashire’s core strategy. However, more sites need to be included to avoid over reliance on individual land owners. There is an over reliance on Skelmersdale to deliver housing, which is a risk as the market is very poor and unlikely to deliver the Council’s housing targets. Enough Green Belt should be released for beyond the plan period in order to conform with PPG2. Banks is appropriate for development as it makes use of land other than Green Belt land. Land running west from Hoole Lane, including the former school site and adjoining land in the area between development fronting Station Road and Church Road, is one such site (s).</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>comments noted Site proposed on Hoole Lane involves land currently protected from development and in an area at high risk of flooding and with concerns over the capacity of water infrastructure. Therefore, it is not an ideal location for development, especially given that PPS25 guides Local Authorities to locate development away from areas at risk of flooding if at all possible and the fact that there are alternative sites outside of areas at risk of flooding.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No action required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csso-622</th>
<th>Lloyd and Slack</th>
<th>Plan Ref</th>
<th>4.3</th>
<th>Options for Green Belt Release</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Objections to the nonpreferred option at Ormskirk. It would result in a loss of views across stunning countryside and impact on the character of Ormskirk, loss of agricultural land, increase traffic congestion. Edge Hill should consider a second campus to meet its needs, it should not be allowed to expand into Green Belt for student accommodation.</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Comments noted regarding the non preferred option. Regarding Edge Hill, the Council believe that the proposed expansion represents an opportunity to mitigate against many of the existing issues associated with Edge Hill. Edge Hill also has major economic benefits for West Lancashire.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No action required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csso-624</th>
<th>Mrs Joanna Eley</th>
<th>Plan Ref</th>
<th>4.3</th>
<th>Options for Green Belt Release</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Support the Burscough Option. Object to dispersal option and any development in Banks generally. (S)</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Comments noted regarding Ormskirk and dispersal option. As part of the Council’s work on the infrastructure delivery plan the electricity and sewage network will be assessed.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No action required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csso-627</th>
<th>Mr Ralph Rawsthorne</th>
<th>Plan Ref</th>
<th>4.3</th>
<th>Options for Green Belt Release</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Object to Burscough Option. Preference stated for non-preferred Ormskirk Option. (S)</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Comments noted. However it is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough options. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object to Burscough Option. Other areas, for example Bickerstaffe, should be considered. (S)

Response
Comments noted Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. Unfortunately, wherever development is proposed there will be an increase in traffic and subsequent effect on residents, however, infrastructure improvements will be required to reduce this impact. All areas of the Borough were considered before settling on two preferred options. Other areas were ruled out for a variety of reasons including size of settlements, infrastructure provision, rural character and quality of Green Belt

Recommendation
No action required

Plan Ref
4.3 Options for Green Belt Release

Mr Peter Link

Mrs JM Graham

Mr Daniel Robinson

Mr Andrew Taylor
Response Regarding traffic impacts, initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. Regarding education provision, from speaking to the Local Education Authority the Council have been informed that school capacity in Burscough is limited and that new developments may go above the existing capacity. For this reason the Burscough strategic site development includes a new school. In relation to health, through the Council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan the Council have been liaising with the health authority to ensure that sufficient facilities are in place or will be in place to cope with any new development. The Council are aware that there are issues with the the waste water treatment capacity and that any new development in areas such as Burscough will require upgrading the facilities. The Council has been investigating this issue as part of its Infrastructure Delivery Plan and significant development will not take place until the issue has been resolved. In relation to Green Belt, the Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk.

Recommendation No action required

Response Comments relate to each point set out within the representation; 1. The Draft Green Belt Study forms only part of the evidence base for the LDF and is not a strategy. The study was carried out by Council Officers, not consultants, and was prepared in conjunction with Sefton and Knowsley Councils and validated by Lancashire County Council. Given its influence on the options for Green Belt release, it was considered appropriate to consult on the draft Green Belt Study alongside the Core Strategy Preferred Options. In terms of the inaccuracies pointed out, it would appear that the data sheet for BUR.04 has been misinterpreted. The assessment of the boundary strength is of the existing Green Belt boundary in comparison to the new boundary should the parcel be developed. Whilst the new boundary to the south of the parcel would be a strong road boundary (Pippin Street), the boundary to the west of the parcel and the direction in which development would be extending, is weaker than the existing boundary as it is a narrow track rather the a strong build line. This also applies to the comment relating to BUR14. The Draft Green Belt Study and the methodology does not include land owner discussions regarding future aspirations for the parcels. This information may well be required when considering the deliverability of land through the LDF process. Parcelling up was done using logical existing boundaries and the methodology tests the purposes of including land within the Green Belt as set out in PPG2. Therefore, the use of land as a buffer zone between residential and industrial uses cannot be considered within this study but may form part of the wider LDF process in allocating land for development. 2 The CSPO sets out broadly and strategically where it is realistic to deliver development in the Borough over the next plan period. According to the Council’s evidence base, there is enough available land within the settlement area of Burscough to deliver around 200 dwellings. However, it is apparent that there is a shortfall of land within the existing settlement boundaries of the Borough’s towns and villages and that without considering other land such as Green Belt, development targets will not be achieved. The document sets out 2 options for meeting targets and delivering the additional housing required. Both options include Burscough, one seeks to deliver a large strategic site and around 600 dwellings the other looks to disperse Green Belt development a little more across the Borough and proposes to deliver 300 dwellings on Green Belt land in Burscough. Both options would still require the initial delivery of 200 dwellings in the existing settlement area and development would be prioritised here over Green Belt release. 3 The Core Strategy is a strategic document and must be flexible over the 15 year plan period. Therefore, the document identifies broad areas of search for development rather than pinpointing exactly where development would go. Site identification may be carried out at a later stage and as an additional Site Allocations document to the Core Strategy. The only exception to this is where development in one area is so significant it could be viewed as strategic to the delivery of the entire document. Examples of this are Skelmersdale Town Centre and in the event Preferred option 1 is selected. 4. Comments noted. However, more than two-thirds of development will be located in Skelmersdale.

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

Recommendation
No action required

Response Regarding traffic impacts, initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. Regarding education provision, from speaking to the Local Education Authority the Council have been informed that school capacity in Burscough is limited and that new developments may go above the existing capacity. For this reason the Burscough strategic site development includes a new school. In relation to health, through the Council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan the Council have been liaising with the health authority to ensure that sufficient facilities are in place/ or will be in place to cope with any new development. The Council are aware that there are issues with the waste water treatment capacity and that any new development in areas such as Burscough will require upgrading the facilities. The Council has been investigating this issue as part of its Infrastructure Delivery Plan and significant development will not take place until the issue has been resolved. In relation to Green Belt, the Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk.

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

Recommendation
No action required
### Ms Judith Nelson
**English Heritage**

**Plan Ref:** 4.3  
**Options for Green Belt Release**  
**Observations**

**Summary:** The grade II Bath Lodge, Dark Lane lies adjacent to the area of search, it is essential that the setting of this building is assessed and safeguarded if proposals are developed for this site (F).

**Response:** Comments Noted. If this site is taken forward the setting of the listed building will be assessed.

**Recommendation:** No action required

### Mr Simon Artiss
**Planning Manager Bellway Homes Ltd**

**Plan Ref:** 4.3  
**Options for Green Belt Release**  
**Observations**

**Summary:** Welcome that if the green belt boundaries were restricted, it would act as a constraint to deliver the CS objectives.

**Response:** The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business/office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk.

**Recommendation:** No action required

### Jason and Marcus Bleasdale

**Plan Ref:** 4.3  
**Options for Green Belt Release**  
**Support**

**Summary:** The land at Little Moor Hall Farm does not achieve any of the purposes for including land in the Green Belt. With this in mind, the site should be taken into the next phase of the assessment of the Green Belt Study (Stage 3: site constraints and opportunities) as part of the future updates that are made to the Study.

**Response:** Comments referring to the Green Belt Study have been addressed within the Green Belt Study Consultation. The Core Strategy identifies Green Belt land for potential development based on evidence outlining sustainability, infrastructure and the Green Belt Study which reviews how well parcels of Green Belt land meet the purposes of the Green Belt as set out in PPG2. Through this process, the parcel that is subject to this representation was not considered to fulfil much of this criteria and has therefore, not been identified for further consideration.

**Recommendation:** No action required

### John Evans

**Object**

**Plan Ref:** 4.3  
**Options for Green Belt Release**  
**Observations**

**Summary:** Whilst I do not want option 3 to be the area to be developed, I do request the Council cabinet to extend the consultation with all three options on an equal footing, enabling the public to have a chance to comment.

**Response:** Comments noted.

**Recommendation:** No action required

### Helen Snellgrove

**Object**

**Plan Ref:** 4.3  
**Options for Green Belt Release**  
**Observations**

**Summary:** In my view, this land performs an important function in providing a block to building development to the east of Ormskirk. It seems to me to be good agricultural land as well. I feel strongly that Green Belt land should be held as long as possible because, once gone, history has shown that it is invariably gone forever. There will be many short term, financially driven forces brought to bear to alter the land's status, now and in the future. I look to the Council to take a balanced and long term view and to arrive at a decision which protects this land for future generations.

**Response:** Comments noted.

**Recommendation:** No action required
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cspo-696</td>
<td>Mr L McFarlane</td>
<td>Options for Green Belt Release</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref 4.3</td>
<td>Agricultural Green Belt land should be protected. Issues raised over over Edge Hill expansion (S)</td>
<td>Comments noted regarding Green Belt and Edge Hill university.</td>
<td>No action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-698</td>
<td>Mr John Leadbetter</td>
<td>Options for Green Belt Release</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref 4.3</td>
<td>I strongly oppose the non-preferred option that is being considered. I support Option C with dispersed development representing the greatest gain to the borough with the least disruption</td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
<td>No action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-70</td>
<td>Mr P Waite</td>
<td>Options for Green Belt Release</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref 4.3</td>
<td>We are concerned about Option 2 and exactly where the houses will be sited in relation to the railway line. There are potential traffic safety issues; current volume and speed of traffic are already too high for this road. (S)</td>
<td>Comments noted. The Core Strategy does not allocate specific sites (except for very large developments), so an “area of search” was included for Option 2, which included land to the west and the east of the railway. The Council is aware that there are traffic and access problems associated with land to the east of the railway, and this will be taken into account when choosing a development site, should Option 2 be chosen.</td>
<td>No action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-700</td>
<td>Mr D Atkinson</td>
<td>Options for Green Belt Release</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref 4.3</td>
<td>It is clear as day that the South Ormskirk option, is absolutely NOT an option.</td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
<td>No further action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-702</td>
<td>Ms Gillian Bjork</td>
<td>Options for Green Belt Release</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref 4.3</td>
<td>Improve the infrastructure first, preserve our greenbelt land and utilise brownfield sites, and then the people of Burscough may be more open to discussion about development</td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
<td>No further action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-703</td>
<td>Mrs JA Leadbetter</td>
<td>Options for Green Belt Release</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref 4.3</td>
<td>Object to Ormskirk non-preferred option. Greenbelt land should only be considered for development after all other options have been considered ie: the regeneration of derelict or brown belt land.</td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
<td>No further action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-713</td>
<td>Ms Margaret Gregory</td>
<td>Options for Green Belt Release</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref 4.3</td>
<td>Object to Ormskirk option. Objects to loss of Green Belt and prime agricultural land. Would like to see more consideration of implications of an ageing population and off-campus student accommodation. Do not think existing traffic problems in Ormskirk can be addressed.</td>
<td>comments noted. Implications of an ageing population have been considered in preparing the Core Strategy. Off-campus student accommodation has also been considered.</td>
<td>No action required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The parcel at Parrs Lane (AUG.04 in Green Belt Study) is actually classified as mainly Grade 2 with some graded 3a and 3b. However there is no agricultural land classed as grade 1 as is stated in the Green Belt study. There is no real difference between this parcel and some of those put forward for inclusion within the Core Strategy Preferred Options and this additional information makes it more favourable than some of the sites which are Grade 1 classification. Therefore the site should be carried forward and considered as part of the DPD (s).

Recommendaion
Parr’s Lane site to be considered within the portfolio of potential “Plan B” sites.

Plan Ref 4.3

Observations
The parcel at Parrs Lane (AUG.04 in Green Belt Study) is actually classified as mainly Grade 2 with some graded 3a and 3b. However there is no agricultural land classed as grade 1 as is stated in the Green Belt study. There is no real difference between this parcel and some of those put forward for inclusion within the Core Strategy Preferred Options and this additional information makes it more favourable than some of the sites which are Grade 1 classification. Therefore the site should be carried forward and considered as part of the DPD (s).

Recommendaion
Parr’s Lane site to be considered within the portfolio of potential “Plan B” sites.

Plan Ref 4.3

Supports a variation upon the non-preferred option for an Ormskirk Strategic Development Site and objects to Option 1 for a Burscough Strategic Development Site. (s)

Response
The Core Strategy is in line with the Government’s Growth Agenda, although it is recognised that the deliverability of 3,000 homes in Skelmersdale will need to be revisited, and is not overly prescriptive or inflexible. In addition, the Core Strategy is also consistent with the “presumption in favour of sustainable development” that is expected to be included within the National Planning Policy Framework. The Council has no concerns about the deliverability, suitability or sustainability of the Yew Tree Farm site in Burscough (which the Bickerstaffe Trust refer to in para 4.10 of their representation), other than the need to improve the waste water treatment infrastructure serving the site (which is a constraint that applies equally to all greenfield sites in Ormskirk, Burscough, Rufford and Scarisbrick), and the Bickerstaffe Trust has provided no convincing evidence to say that development of this site is not deliverable, suitable or sustainable. It should also be pointed out that the Sustainability Appraisal carried out on the 3 shortlisted options for Green Belt release identified that all could be said to be sustainable. It should also be noted that the Bickerstaffe Trust representation incorrectly states that the Council’s Sustainable Settlement Study (2010) confirms that Burscough has limited facilities and services and is not as accessible as other larger settlements in the Borough (para 4.7). The study actually makes similar comments about the services and facilities in Burscough as it does about those in Ormskirk. It is fair to point out that the disaggregation of development targets within the CSPO paper does not entirely conform to the Borough’s settlement hierarchy, although only in that Burscough receives more development than the Ormskirk / Aughton urban area. However, ultimately, even with this new development, the Ormskirk / Aughton urban area (indeed Ormskirk alone) will still be larger than Burscough and so the settlement hierarchy will be retained. While it would be usual for settlements to be targeted for new development in line with their place in the settlement hierarchy, it is not always possible to do so, nor is it necessary to do so, as long as the infrastructure is in place to allow more development in a settlement lower down the hierarchy. Therefore, it is the Council’s view that sufficient evidence to justify the spatial options preferred in the CSPO paper has been demonstrated. The Council has considered the evidence that the Bickerstaffe Trust have presented in their representation in support of their new proposals at Altys Lane and, overall, remain to be convinced that it offers a better or more reasonable proposal than either of the preferred options consulted upon in the Core Strategy, or the non-preferred option. This is predominantly due to the fact that the new proposals offer less benefits compared to the non-preferred option (because of the removal of employment development and student accommodation) while still having the same impact on Green Belt and views and, potentially, still having a negative effect on traffic congestion on St Helens Road, local country roads and Ormskirk town centre.

Recommendation
No Action Required

Plan Ref 4.3

Object
Object to the areas of search for housing and employment land.

Response
Object to the areas of search for housing and employment land.

Recommendation
Continue to review all possible land which may meet development needs.
The Council has failed to consider land at Fine Jane's Farm, Moss Road, Birkdale as an appropriate site for Green Belt release. (S)

Response
The Core Strategy is not able to consider specific sites unless they are of "strategic" importance, for example Skelmersdale Town Centre (Policy CS2) or the Burscough Strategic Development Site (Policy CS3). Therefore, it cannot make specific reference to the Fine Jane's Farm site. However, in arriving at the two preferred options for development on Green Belt, the Council did consider a wide range of locations for Green Belt release, including areas on the Southport / Birkdale boundary. However, in considering this general area, it was considered that the openness of the area would be unduly harmed by locating significant development within it and that the presence of areas of flood risk, deep peat and grade 1 agricultural land made this location less appropriate for development. The Council has assessed the Green Belt on the Borough's rural boundaries in the draft Green Belt Study available for consultation alongside the Core Strategy Preferred Options and it has found only one site (not Fine Jane's Farm) that does not meet any of the purposes of the Green Belt (as established within PPG2) of those assessed on the Sefton boundary. Given that Fine Jane's Farm is not large enough to be considered a "strategic" site, even if it were considered to be a "major" development site in the Green Belt (based on PPG2's definition in Annex C), it could not be specifically addressed in the Core Strategy. Any policy guidance that is needed for such a "major" site would be provided in a subsequent Development Plan Document under the Local Development Framework. However, as the Core Strategy is reviewed prior to preparing the next version of the document or as the remainder of the LDF is prepared, Fine Jane's Farm should be considered as any site-specific matters are dealt with.

Recommendation
Consider Fine Jane's Farm for inclusion within the "Plan B", as this aspect of the Core Strategy is refined.

---

Summary
The Core Strategy is not able to consider specific sites unless they are of "strategic" importance, for example Skelmersdale Town Centre (Policy CS2) or the Burscough Strategic Development Site (Policy CS3). Therefore, it cannot make specific reference to the Fine Jane's Farm site. However, in arriving at the two preferred options for development on Green Belt, the Council did consider a wide range of locations for Green Belt release, including areas on the Southport / Birkdale boundary. However, in considering this general area, it was considered that the openness of the area would be unduly harmed by locating significant development within it and that the presence of areas of flood risk, deep peat and grade 1 agricultural land made this location less appropriate for development. The Council has assessed the Green Belt on the Borough's rural boundaries in the draft Green Belt Study available for consultation alongside the Core Strategy Preferred Options and it has found only one site (not Fine Jane's Farm) that does not meet any of the purposes of the Green Belt (as established within PPG2) of those assessed on the Sefton boundary. Given that Fine Jane's Farm is not large enough to be considered a "strategic" site, even if it were considered to be a "major" development site in the Green Belt (based on PPG2's definition in Annex C), it could not be specifically addressed in the Core Strategy. Any policy guidance that is needed for such a "major" site would be provided in a subsequent Development Plan Document under the Local Development Framework. However, as the Core Strategy is reviewed prior to preparing the next version of the document or as the remainder of the LDF is prepared, Fine Jane's Farm should be considered as any site-specific matters are dealt with.

Recommendation
Consider Fine Jane's Farm for inclusion within the "Plan B", as this aspect of the Core Strategy is refined.

---

Mr Robert Kewley

Observations
The Core Strategy does not allocate specific sites for development unless they are strategic in nature. The Site Allocations DPD will allocate specific sites in due course. However, "The Pads" are currently designated as a Local Nature Conservation Site.

Recommendation
No Action Required.

---

Mr Brian Culshaw

Summary
Objects to non-preferred (Ormskirk) option. (S)

Response
Comments noted. It is agreed that there are negative impacts associated with the non-preferred option. These were taken into account by Members when considering whether or not to support this option.

Recommendation
No change required.

---

Mr Shaun Taylor

Summary
It is clear (for the reasons set out elsewhere in these representations), that the objectives will not be met by this Core Strategy as currently written. (f)

Response
Comments noted

Recommendation
No action required.

---

Mr Martin Backhouse

Summary
I am strongly against the idea to release Green Belt land for development by Edge Hill University. (S)

Response
Comments noted. At the time of the 2005 Local Plan Inquiry, the Council considered Edge Hill had not made a robust case for the need for expansion onto Green Belt land. Since then, the Council has accepted that the University does have a robust case for needing to expand, hence the change. The University has undergone a period of redeveloping its existing campus to ensure best use of space and is now reaching a point where it will shortly need further land to accommodate not only its increasing number of faculties but also to accommodate student accommodation, taking the pressure off existing houses in Ormskirk. The Core Strategy allocates 10ha of land for managed expansion over a 15 year period up until 2027. Without this allocation, the Council could expose itself to challenge and more significant development in the Green Belt over the plan period.

Recommendation
No further action.
Summary
I am strongly against the idea to release Green Belt land for development by Edge Hill University. (S)

Response
Comments noted. The University has undergone a period of redeveloping its existing campus to ensure best use of space and is now reaching a point where it will shortly need further land to accommodate not only its increasing number of faculties but also to accommodate student accommodation, taking the pressure of existing houses in Ormskirk. The Core Strategy allocates 10ha of land for managed expansion over a 15 year period up until 2027. Without this allocation, the Council could expose itself to challenge and more significant development in the Green Belt over the plan period.

Recommendation
No action required.

Plan Ref
Chapter 5 Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites

Cspo-104
Mrs D Backhouse
Object

Cspo-105
Carol O'Brien
Object

Cspo-124
Dr Carol Stott
Support

Cspo-14
Mr JA Lewis
Object

Cspo-16
Susan O'Halloran
Object

Response
Area of Search to the north of Ormskirk - potential traffic impacts of development on the eastern half of this area of search will be a key factor in considering which part of the area of search is allocated for development if the dispersal option is taken forward in the Core Strategy. Any impact of development within the town will also be factored into any traffic assessments. Edge Hill University and Student Accommodation - comments noted - any expansion of the University will need to provide student accommodation to cope with the growth in the University.

Recommendation
No Action Required

Plan Ref
Chapter 5 Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites

Summary
The non-preferred option could not be supported by roads and would be a poor use of agricultural land. (S)

Response
Noted

Recommendation
No Action Required
cspo-18
Plan Ref Chapter 5
Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites
Object
Summary We are against the dispersal option due to issues with traffic and vehicular access. We support for the non-preferred option, to allow Edge Hill Uni to provide more student accommodation out of town. (S)
Response Comments and Views Noted
Recommendation No Action Required

Dr Paul Morris
Support
Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites
Summary If there is no other option then I think the non-preferred option should be reconsidered. This would have positive benefits in freeing up affordable accommodation for people in the town. Parking is also likely to improve (S)
Response Comments noted - should the non-preferred option be taken forward in the future, detailed proposals to address access, highways impacts and environmental impacts will be considered.
Recommendation No Action Required

Carol Smith
Object
Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites
Summary I would like to express my concerns regarding the non-preferred option. The site is home to wildlife, and possibly orchids. An Environmental Impact Assessment should be carried out. Elm Place is narrow and it would be dangerous to use this road as an access point to such development. Major traffic congestion would also be an issue. (S)
Response Comments noted
Recommendation No Action Required

Mrs Mary Blackhall
Object
Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites
Summary I would submit that a revised Option A (ORMSKIRK) could also help limit or relieve the problem of both short term construction traffic and town traffic until such time as long awaited A580 Bypass can be built, with planned improvements to suit the added requirements of Edge Hill access etc. Ormskirk cannot afford to lose this opportunity of enlargement and development to allow it to sustain a large University (S)
Response In arriving at the Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper, the Council has taken into account the potential traffic impacts of all development options, including those of the Yew Tree Farm option, but is currently undertaking further traffic modelling work to better understand these impacts. While the Council are aware of Sefton Council's initial strategic options for their Core Strategy, it is not yet at a stage where a true assessment of increased traffic along the A570 from Southport can be carried out, especially in light of the approved Thornton to Switch Island link road in Sefton which it is anticipated will alleviate some pressure on the A570. The Ormskirk bypass has not been vetoed by the Council, but is in fact supported by the Core Strategy (cf CS12). However, the Council recognises that it may be difficult to deliver the bypass in the Core Strategy period due to funding constraints. The Council welcomes Mr Dickinson's revised proposal for the non-preferred option, and any consideration of phasing of development will be considered within detailed proposals for the site, should that option be taken forward in the future.
Recommendation Council officers are continuing to monitor Sefton Council's proposals for development and how they might affect highways in West Lancashire, especially cumulatively with West Lancashire development proposals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Ref</th>
<th>Mr Paul Moy</th>
<th>Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>I object to Option 2 of 200 houses in Ormskirk on Green Belt land (S).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Comments Noted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No Action Required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Ref</th>
<th>Mr Roger Clayton</th>
<th>Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>We object to the description of Skelmersdale as a Regional Town (S).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Acknowledged.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Ref</th>
<th>Mr Roger Clayton</th>
<th>Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>We believe that many more dwellings could (and should) be delivered on small sites of mainly affordable or retirement housing, according to local needs, within the Eastern and Western parishes. The Skelmersdale target should be reduced to a level which is a) deliverable, b) meets only the needs of the Skelmersdale population without trying to attract migration from other areas or other countries. (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>The deliverability of Skelmersdale housing targets is currently under review as a result of consultation feedback and historic completions evidence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Review housing targets and distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Ref</th>
<th>Dr Anthony Evans</th>
<th>Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Object to option 2. And 3000 new homes in Skelmersdale. (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Comments noted. The Council has a housing target it is currently legally required to meet. This housing needs to be directed to the most sustainable locations. The proposed locations have been chosen taking account of a range of issues including infrastructure provision, impact on the environment, land availability, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Ref</th>
<th>Mrs Julie Broadbent</th>
<th>Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>We object to the non-preferred option (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No change required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Ref</th>
<th>Mr Robin Agnew</th>
<th>Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>With regard to the 200 houses at Ormskirk (Dispersal Option), they should go to the west of the railway, not the east. (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Comments noted. It is agreed that access to the site to the west of the railway is less problematic than to the site to the east of the railway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No action required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Ref</th>
<th>M B Howard</th>
<th>Clerk of the Council Newburgh Parish Council</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>We would be concerned about any future major increase in traffic, from employment or residential areas, without the development of new and appropriate infrastructure to avoid further impact on rural villages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Comments noted. Adequate infrastructure provision and the impact of traffic are both important factors when considering suitable locations for new development and these are topic areas that continue to be considered in some detail as the LDF progresses. The impact on rural villages is a further important consideration and therefore development directed to these areas is to be minimal in the interests of sustainability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Council should resist development on the Green Belt. The proposed housing is not needed. (S)

Response
Comments noted. The Council's evidence base shows housing is required, even taking into account the downturn in the housing market. Green Belt development is proposed because there is insufficient land within settlement areas to accommodate all the required housing. This is a different approach from Development Control, in which unplanned development on non-allocated Green Belt is usually resisted.

Recommendation
No action required.

Plan Ref
Chapter 5
Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites

---

cspo-59
Mr Norman Smith

Object

Summary
Option 2 (Dispersal) is the most balanced and sustainable of the three presented, although I'd prefer none. Edge Hill University should not be allowed to keep expanding to the detriment of the town. Concern expressed about the effect of the University expansion on residential accommodation within Ormskirk, and the conversion of town centre shops to bars. (S).

Response
Views on the Dispersal Option, traffic issues, and Edge Hill University expansion noted. With regard to the final two points: 1. Policy CS9 seeks to minimise the impact of the University on residential accommodation within Ormskirk by constraining the percentage of HMOs in individual streets, although the Council's powers are limited in this respect. Please also see the Council's response to Representation 60 for more comments about Edge Hill University. 2. Policy CS11 seeks to maintain town centre viability by requiring a certain percentage of units within town centres to be Class A1 retail (as opposed to uses such as A4 drinking establishments). The Council would support initiatives to improve Ormskirk Town Centre.

Recommendation
No action required.

Plan Ref
Chapter 5
Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites

---

cspo-62
Mrs J Jupp

Object

Summary
I object to the non-preferred option on the grounds of Green Belt, the impact of Edge Hill University and no need for a sports village. (S)

Response
Comments noted.

Recommendation
No change.

Plan Ref
Chapter 5
Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites

---

cspo-63
Mrs J White

Object

Summary
I object to the non-preferred option on the grounds of Green Belt, impact of Edge Hill University and no need for a sports village (S)

Response
Comments noted.

Recommendation
No change.

Plan Ref
Chapter 5
Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites

---

cspo-636
Mr Chris Seddon

Observations

Summary
Support development in Appley Bridge

Response
Comments noted

Recommendation
No action required.

Plan Ref
Chapter 5
Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites

---

cspo-64
Dennis Sutton

Support

Summary
My preferred option is Ormskirk, followed by dispersal. (S)

Response
Comments noted

Recommendation
No change.
Mrs Ros Wess

I vote for Preferred Option 2: Dispersal. I object most strongly to any further building in Parbold because of the sewer/drainage problems we have (especially surface water) I object most strongly to Green Belt land being used for building. I think WLBC were wrong to throw out the Ormskirk option. (F) (F)

Response Comments noted. It is considered that there is scope for a small amount of infill development in Parbold (but no major development or Green Belt release).

Recommendation No action required.

Plan Ref Chapter 5 Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites

Summary I support Option 2 (in principle). However, I do not support the aspect allowing the expansion of Edge Hill into the Green Belt, (eastwards) nor indeed the erosion of any of the green belt, nor the housing target of 4,500 new homes. The housing requirement of 300 dwellings a year needs to be scrutinised. (S)

Response Comments noted regarding the options and Edge Hill University expansion. Edge Hill University has undergone a period of rapid growth and has been working to make space utilisation on site more efficient. It has now reached a point whereby all space on the existing campus will soon be fully utilised. The Core Strategy must provide for development over the next 15 year period and by allowing small-scale expansion (of 10ha) the Council considers that this will avoid larger scale development which may occur if we do not allow for this managed growth over the plan period. Re. housing requirements: Following a Court of Appeal ruling in May 2011, the intention to abolish the Regional Spatial Strategy (“RSS”, which set our housing requirement of 300 dwellings per annum) cannot be taken into account when Councils are considering the adoption of new Development Plan Documents such as Core Strategies, until such time as a Strategic Environmental Assessment of RSS abolition has been concluded. Thus the Council is obliged to use the 300 dwellings per annum housing requirement in the Core Strategy. Housing requirements for West Lancashire will be looked at once RSS abolition is beyond doubt, although it is the Council’s view at present that the 300pa requirement is the most appropriate for West Lancashire.

Recommendation Check the Core Strategy is sufficiently flexible to allow for a change in housing requirements in future (e.g. Policies CS1, CS7, Chapter 10).

Plan Ref Chapter 5 Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites

Summary The further development of Skelmersdale has a key growth area is to be welcomed. Preferred Option 2: Dispersal would be the most advantageous as it would strengthen communities and minimise impact on Green Belt. The non-preferred option is not supported. The provision of land for commercial and industrial development is crucial. (S)

Response Comments noted

Recommendation No action required.
cspo-90  Plan Ref  Chapter 5  Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites  Object
Summary  We support the rejection of the Ormskirk option (S)
Response  Comments noted.
Recommendation  No action required.

cspo-95  Plan Ref  Chapter 5  Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites  Object
Summary  We wish to object to all 3 options proposed by WLBC to develop 800+ new houses in Burscough and Ormskirk. Burscough in particular suffers from transport and infrastructure problems. (S)
Response  Comments noted.
Recommendation  No change required.

cspo-96  Plan Ref  Chapter 5  Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites  Object
Summary  We object to Option 2, in particular development north of Ormskirk due to impact on agricultural land, highways, landscape and nature conservation. (S) We support Option 1. (S)
Response  Comments noted. (If the Nursery Avenue site ended up being chosen for development, housing would not be likely to extend as far as Bath Farm and its access avenue.)
Recommendation  No further action.

cspo-97  Plan Ref  Chapter 5  Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites  Object
Summary  We object to Option 2; Ormskirk site is ideal as close to the motorway. (S)
Response  Comments noted.
Recommendation  No further action.

cspo-98  Plan Ref  Chapter 5  Core Strategy Preferred Options: Over-arching Spatial Strategy and the Strategic Sites  Object
Summary  Object to non-preffered option. Support to dispersal option 2. (S)
Response  Comments noted
Recommendation  No further action.

cspo-112  Plan Ref  Policy CS1  A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire  Observations
Summary  Object to the methodology of categorising green belt boundaries.
Response  This comment relates to the Green Belt Study. However, the methodology used an established boundary hierarchy which assessed the features of the boundary and how prominent they were. The approach has been validated by Lancashire County Council and the measure of features as strong or weak was shared by the neighbouring authorities and other authorities nationwide. Therefore, it is considered appropriate to consider a ditch, track or line of trees weak in comparison to say a river, main road or woodland.
Recommendation  No change required to either Core Strategy or Green Belt Methodology.

cspo-146  Plan Ref  Policy CS1  A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire  Object
Summary  Inclusion of protection of water quality is required. (S)
Response  Comments Noted
Recommendation  Changes will be made to the policy to reflect any recommendations set out within the SA.
Mr Philip Carter  
Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency

Support for Policy CS1 subject to the inclusion of protection of water quality (S).

Comments noted

No further action

Appley Bridge should be identified as a Key Sustainable Village. The current distribution of housing is unrealistic and should take into account the sustainable development benefits of expanding settlements such as Appley Bridge which has a railway station and other facilities. (S)

The Councils current evidence base work suggests that whilst Appley Bridge benefits from reasonable proximity to Wigan, service infrastructure in general is not the most sustainable. Furthermore, the draft Green Belt study did not identify any parcels of land which do not fulfil at least one purpose of the Green Belt as set out in PPG2.

Comments noted and further infrastructure work will be carried out along with refining work to the Green Belt Study in order to inform the next stage of the Core Strategy.

We would not wish Skelmersdale to lose its "green" image through development. The River Tawd is a neglected asset. Unused land should be returned to agriculture. (S)

The Core Strategy Preferred Options document prioritises brownfield land over green field land. However, where there is a shortfall in bornfield land and a surplus of underused poor quality green field land, the Council would wish to see that land be put to better use and any financial contributions generated from doing so used to improve the remaining open spaces that require improvements. Evidence in the Open Space Study 2009 relating to Skelmersdale supports this approach. The inclusion of a large part of the River Tawd valley within the Skelmersdale Town Centre Strategic Site in Policy CS2 is in part, to assist with the much needed management, public access and environmental improvements.

No action required.

Strongly objects ot Green Belt areas of search and that development should be prioritised to brownfield land (S)

The parcels of Green Belt land identified have been informed by evidence identifying infrastructure, environmental limits and sustainability along with a review of Green Belt land. The Council prioritises brownfield land for development and Policy CS7 allows for non brownfield sites to be brought forward where there are no suitable available brownfield sites and this can be evidenced.

No action required.

How are utility constraints to be overcome. Issues with the highway network should also be noted. (S)

The Core Strategy is not the place to set out the detail of how infrastructure constraints should be overcome - it is sufficient for this strategic policy to only reference the fact that they should be overcome before new development is completed. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will set out the details of how such constraints will be overcome. Other policies in the Core Strategy address highway constraints (e.g. Policy CS12 - promotes other forms of travel than the private car). However, if background highway modelling work currently being undertaken for the Council identifies any major highways constraints to new development, consideration should be given to including reference to highways constraints in Policy CS1.

No action.
The justification offers no proper detailed rationale for the proposed distribution of housing and employment land in particular between Ormskirk and Burscough. Nor does it present any data on the implications on settlement growth for each settlement as compared to 2010 baseline. (s)

Summary

The Settlement Hierarchy in Policy CS1 does recognise a distinction between Ormskirk/Aughton (Borough Town) and Burscough (Market Town) although it does classify both as Key Service Centres. As the paragraph previous to the settlement hierarchy in Policy CS1 (discussed in CSP0-531) states, new development should be promoted in accordance with this hierarchy. The Council acknowledges that Ormskirk is a more sustainable settlement than Burscough but consideration must be given to other factors as well, especially when weighing up the loss of Green Belt and agricultural land. In addition, Burscough has sufficient level of service provision to be considered sustainable enough to accommodate a significant level of new development and any infrastructure issues that new development would create would be expected to be resolved prior to completion of the development, as best as possible. It should also be noted that Ormskirk and Burscough suffer from very similar infrastructure constraints and that many observers would actually say that Ormskirk suffers more greatly than Burscough in relation to highways congestion in particular (although the Council awaits the completion of modelling work on our highways capacity to confirm or contradict this perception) and that this constraint is perhaps the most difficult to resolve in this particular case (due to the funding and delivery of new highways and public transport infrastructure and the difficulty of changing people’s travel habits). Therefore, in making a final decision on where Green Belt land should be released for development in the Core Strategy, the Council will weigh all these factors, including the existing scale of the towns, into consideration. While Skelmersdale and Burscough will take the vast majority of new employment development (Use Class B) under the existing proposals in the CSP0 document, some employment development will take place in other rural locations and at Simonswood. Burscough was selected as a secondary focus due to the benefits of having a critical mass together with the existing provision of employment land and due to the need to expand the existing provision to meet existing and anticipated demand in Burscough. Ormskirk was not highlighted as a location for new employment development in the CSP0 document due to the lack of suitable land for Use Class B development within the urban area and in the locations considered for Green Belt release on the edge of the urban area, although a small amount of high quality employment is included in the non-preferred option. While Ormskirk is a more accessible town than Burscough, it does not have an existing significant market for providing Use Class B accommodation, unlike Burscough. It should be noted that in discussing employment land, this does not incorporate other Use Classes whose users employ people, for example Edge Hill University and retail provision, and these particular types of development are covered by Policies CS6 and CS11 respectively.

Response

No previous consultation on these targets has taken place until this public consultation. Indeed none was possible given the recent changes surrounding the RSS and the Localism Bill. It should also be noted that the RSS has not yet been abolished. The CSP0 consultation provided the first, and most appropriate, opportunity to consult on these proposed targets, which must be based on robust and reasonable evidence of housing need.

Recommendation

No Action Required
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cspp-570</th>
<th>Mr Keith Keeley</th>
<th>Policy CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>There are no locally supported documents listed. The Strategic Development Site at Burscough is not shown on this Key Diagram. There is no discussion about the important relationship between existing and proposed infrastructure and development. (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td>The Core Strategy will effectively be setting the new local planning policy for the Borough and so will replace any existing local planning policy that addresses the over-arching spatial strategy for the Borough. The Area of Search under the Dispersal option covers the same area as the Burscough Strategic Site - it would just involve less housing, and therefore less land within the area of search. A Proposals Map will be produced alongside a Publication / Submission version of the Core Strategy - one cannot be prepared until the Council have made their final decision on options. Draft Policies CSPO11 to CSPO14 cover all infrastructure and services and highlights the need to link new development in with infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>No Action Required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cspp-711</th>
<th>Crompton property developments</th>
<th>David Crompton</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan Ref</strong></td>
<td>Policy CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Full Submission of Crompton Property Developments - see also CSPO712, 719-728 and 736-738. (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td>See individual comments on response CSPO712, 719-728 and 736-738.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>See Recommendations for CSPO712, 719-728 and 736-738.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cspp-715</th>
<th>Ms Deborah McLaughlin</th>
<th>Executive Director North West Homes and Communities Agency</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan Ref</strong></td>
<td>Policy CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>The HCA welcomes the categorisation of Skelmersdale as a Key Service Centre and a priority location for new development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>No action required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cspp-728</th>
<th>Crompton property developments</th>
<th>David Crompton</th>
<th>Support with conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan Ref</strong></td>
<td>Policy CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Policy CS1 is supported, but the approach to Green Belt and the release of land could be more clearly set out. The distribution of development with the strategic employment site at Burscough is supported. It is likely to be essential for a strategic site to be released in advance of all brownfield sites so that it can be properly planned for. It is considered that Burscough has better sustainable transport connections given its rail links (S).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td>The Core Strategy Publication Version will clearly identify where revisions to the Green Belt boundary will take place as part of any strategic site or will identify areas of search within which Green Belt boundaries will be revised through a Site Allocations DPD. Any sites or locations included in the final &quot;Plan B&quot; for the Core Strategy will be consulted upon through the Publication version of the Core Strategy, but it is recognised that, where Green Belt boundaries will be affected by these locations, formal revision of the boundaries will need to take place in either the Core Strategy or another DPD should &quot;Plan B&quot; be enacted. Development on any greenfield site in Ormskirk, Burscough, Rufford and Scarisbrick will be constrained by the waste water treatment infrastructure, and so any development of Green Belt in these areas will not be able to take place until this issue is resolved. Therefore, while it may be appropriate in certain circumstances that development of a strategic site on Green Belt could come forward before all land in the urban area has been developed, it will still be constrained and limited by the waste water treatment infrastructure issue. It is recognised that both Ormskirk and Burscough have good access to sustainable public transport connections, and this is a key contributing factor to both settlements being considered Key Service Centres. This is reflected in paragraph 5.1.17 of the CSPO paper. It is considered that Ormskirk's sustainable public transport connections are a little better than Burscough's simply due to the frequency of services and the variety of locations across the Borough in particular that there are direct connections to from Ormskirk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>No action required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cspp-9</th>
<th>Mr Howard Courtley</th>
<th>Courtley Consultants Ltd</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan Ref</strong></td>
<td>Policy CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Policy CS1 fails to consider sustainable patterns of development available adjoining other settlements outside its District (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td>The Council has considered the option of providing for development on its boundaries adjoining other settlements outside the Borough but in the case of the Borough's boundaries with Sefton, have found that the impact of urban sprawl from Sefton into West Lancashire would be unacceptable. The Core Strategy Preferred Options has set a relatively low target for housing in the Western Parishes to ensure that the rural character of this area is not diminished. Specific sites, other than those that are considered &quot;strategic&quot;, cannot be considered specifically within the Core Strategy - that is for a later Development Plan Document such as a Site Allocations DPD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>No Action Required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr Philip Carter Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency

Plan Ref 5.1 Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire

Summary Level 2 SFRA required to justify areas of search in flood zones (S).

Response Comments noted. Level 2 SFRA will be carried out if development is allocated in areas at risk of flooding.

Recommendation Carry out Level 2 SFRA if development is allocated in areas at risk of flooding (see also reps 139, 143)

Mr Shaun Taylor Planning Associate Director G L Hearn Property Consultants

Plan Ref 5.1 Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire

Summary Too much emphasis placed on housing delivery within Skelmersdale at the early phase of the Core Strategy. Smaller scale Green Belt releases should be considered around Ormskirk and Burscough. (S)

Response As previously noted, we are aware of the risks associated with deliverability of development in Skelmersdale and in response to this will review housing targets and location to ensure an appropriate balance is struck which will ensure housing delivery is not jeopardised but that the focus remains on Skelmersdale to support regeneration. The SHLAA has evidenced that there is a supply of land within the urban areas of the Borough which will meet a large proportion of the required housing and employment land targets. Therefore, it would be inappropriate to support Green Belt release ahead of Brownfield land.

Recommendation Review housing targets and spread to ensure growth needs are met.

Mr Andrew Taylor Planning Director David Wilson Homes

Plan Ref 5.1 Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire

Summary Undeliverable housing over provision in Skelmersdale. (s)

Response We are aware of the risks associated with deliverability of development in Skelmersdale based on consultation feedback and historic development completion rates. In response to this a review is being carried out to ensure the appropriate distribution of development across the Borough to ensure housing delivery is not jeopardised but that the focus remains on Skelmersdale to support regeneration.

Recommendation Review of housing targets and distribution to ensure growth needs are met.

Mr D Rimmer

Plan Ref 5.1 Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire

Summary There is a disproportionate amount of development is being directed towards Skelmersdale & Up Holland, Ormskirk & Aughton and Burscough, with insufficient housing and development being directed to the Northern Parishes. Safeguarded land and open land on the urban fringe should be considered ahead of Green Belt release. (S)

Response Over-reliance on Skelmersdale and deliverability of the housing and employment targets is under review. However, reasons for not concentrating significant amounts of development within the Northern Parishes have been set out in response to Rep 280.

Recommendation Review of housing targets and distribution to ensure growth needs are met.
Summary: Housing targets are welcomed, however, viability should play a key role in identifying housing sites. Recommends changing wording of policy.

Response: Simply stating "other" sites does not give enough certainty to developers or the Council in terms of what constitutes acceptable "other" sites. The Core Strategy's existing approach notes that applicants may propose residential development on Greenfield sites but they must evidence that there are no suitable Brownfield and / or allocated sites available to provide a similar number of units, either individually or collectively.

Recommendation: No action required.

---

Summary: we would suggest that it is not suitable to specifically set out two preferred options if these options - and all reasonable alternatives â€“ have not been properly considered as part of a robust assessment. (S)

Response: Comments noted.

Recommendation: no action required.

---

Summary: Object to settlement hierarchy. Appley Bridge is a higher order settlement. Also object to proposed housing distribution, with a focus on Skelmersdale. Suggested amendments included. (S)

Response: It is acknowledged that Appley Bridge is integrated with Shevington Vale. However, within the Wigan Borough Council Core Strategy, Shevington Vale is only identified as a local or neighbourhood centre having limited facilities to support local convenience. The Sustainable Settlement Study 2010, which informed the settlement hierarchy, indentified Appley Bridge as a "small local service centre". The Settlement Study does make reference to the association with Shevington but the overall findings determine the role of Appley Bridge as providing limited local services. Concerns regarding the deliverability of so much development within Skelmersdale are being addressed through a revision of housing targets and distribution. However, it is unlikely that a significant amount more would be allocated to the rural villages as this is contrary to PPS1 and the principles of locating development in the most sustainable settlements first.

Recommendation: No action required.

---

Summary: Firstly, policy CS1 should include a revised housing requirement from 2010. The shortfall from 2003 should also be included as that is the start date for the RSS. Secondly, all references to Skelmersdale in policies CS1 and CS7 (and throughout the Core Strategy) should be referred to as Skelmersdale (Up Holland). What this means is that Up Holland is part of the Key Service Centre and is not a Key Sustainable Village. (S)

Response: With regard to the status of Up Holland, the Council generally agrees with the comments made by the Objector, and the Core Strategy should be amended to clarify that Up Holland is considered alongside Skelmersdale as part of the Key Service Centre, and any housing in Up Holland counts towards the Skelmersdale target. Secondly, with regard to the start date of the Plan, and the deficit in housing completions compared with RSS requirements from 2003, this deficit is being taken into account in Core Strategy housing calculations, along with development requirements and housing completions from 2010-2012. Assuming the RSS will have been abolished at the time of the Core Strategy examination, the Council also considers it appropriate to take account of the most recent evidence available, i.e. the 2008-based household projections. Overall, this will result in a higher housing requirement, although not as high as the figure stated by the Objector.

Recommendation: Amend Core Strategy to clarify that Up Holland and Skelmersdale are treated as one settlement. Amend housing requirement to take account of RSS deficit and development between 2010 and 2012. (See also response to Rep. 729.)

---

Summary: This states that Rufford is a rural, sustainable village, therefore development could be permitted

Response: Acknowledged

Recommendation: No action required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csno-353</th>
<th>Mr Robert W. Pickavance</th>
<th>Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>5.1.18: The New Road site is ideal as it is within the village, it also has excellent transport links and it is not liable to flood risk as it is on a slight incline, with free draining to the Sluice at the bottom of the site. 5.1.19: New Road site is within the settlement boundary and in the “call for sites” it was identified as a site which should have already been developed. (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Acknowledged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No action required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csno-354</th>
<th>Mr Robert W. Pickavance</th>
<th>Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>5.1.34: I support the overall feeling that development should be across the Borough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Acknowledged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No action required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csno-372</th>
<th>Ms Kathleen M Prince</th>
<th>Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>So far Banks has managed to retain its village character but cannot continue to do so if housing development is allowed to expand further. (s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Comments noted. The limitations of Banks as a location for further large scale development is recognised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csno-382</th>
<th>North West Skelmersdale Owners</th>
<th>Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>The Council’s selection of its Area of Search repeats the error of the earlier Local Plan. At that time the Local Plan Inspector was not convinced of the Council’s approach. The draft Core Strategy repeats these errors. My clients are prepared to work with the Council to find an acceptable solution at North West Skelmersdale. (s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Development of the land to the North West of Skelmersdale would constitute a very large extension of Skelmersdale into the Green Belt and the objector has raised this as an alternative both to a Burscough Strategic Development Site and an area of search for employment to the south of Skelmersdale. It is the Council’s view that this would be an inappropriate extension into the Green Belt compared to the options put forward in the CSPO paper, extending Skelmersdale significantly out into the Lathom countryside. While there are infrastructure constraints in Burscough, the Council are confident that these can be adequately resolved to enable development in that area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No Action Required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csno-388</th>
<th>North West Skelmersdale Owners</th>
<th>Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>The allocation of land at Burscough for both housing and employment is flawed without a demonstration of how essential infrastructure can be achieved and is viable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Comments noted. The Council is aware of infrastructure issues in this area, and indeed in many other parts of the Borough. Only with development can significant amounts of investment be gained in order to deal with these issues. Any development in this location will be required to address such issues as part of development proposals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csno-400</th>
<th>Wirral to Wyre Team Natural England</th>
<th>Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>We are pleased to see a broad overarching strategic policy that facilitates appropriate development while the valuable biodiversity, landscape, heritage and green infrastructure assets of the Borough will be protected and, where appropriate, enhanced. However, we question the use of the term ‘valuable’. PPS9 promotes the conservation and enhancement of all biodiversity, as does the European landscape Convention (ELC) promote the conservation and enhancement of all landscapes. We therefore respectfully ask that ‘valuable’ be removed in order to tie the policy in with National Policy and the ELC. (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Comments noted. It is considered that ‘valuable’ has been interpreted wrongly by this reader. The wording suggests that all biodiversity is valuable rather than that only ‘valuable biodiversity’ will be protected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plan Ref 5.1 Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire

Summary
Support the designation of Banks as a Key Sustainable Village, and the sequential approach to land release with Green Belt being considered last. Objections: 1. The plan needs to be in conformity with the RSS. The deficit in completions against targets between 2003 and 2010 needs to be added to the overall requirement. 2. The plan’s base date should be 2010, with development between 2010 and 2012 needing to be taken into account. 3. The plan should specify that the housing target can be exceeded. 4. 3,000 dwellings are not deliverable in Skelmersdale. 2,250 is a more realistic target. 5. More development should be permitted in the Northern Parishes. 6. Paragraph 5.1.21 - it is not appropriate to restrict development (200dpwa target in early years) whilst need exists. (S)

Response
1. It is agreed that the deficit in completions against RSS targets from 2003 needs to be taken into account - the Core Strategy does in fact do so. This will be made more clear in the next version of the CS. 2. Whist the CS base date is 2012, development targets and performance between 2010 and 2012 will be taken into account. 3. It is agreed that the housing target can be exceeded (where appropriate) - this will be specified in the next version of the CS. 4. The Skelmersdale target will be reviewed in the light of representations received on this matter. The target for the town (and Borough) needs to be deliverable. 5. Comment noted. The Northern Parishes has constraints in terms of flood risk, water and drainage infrastructure, and road capacity (Tarleton /Hesketh Bank) and thus the scope for significant amounts of further development there is considered limited, especially taking into account recent grants of permission and pending planning applications. 6. The low targets for early years are in recognition of difficulties associated with delivering the required number of housing completions in early years of the Core Strategy, given infrastructure constraints and the current economic situation. This lower target will not be a “maximum” and can be exceeded. Thus it is not “restraint” as such, but an attempt to set a deliverable target.

Recommendation
Reduce Skelmersdale’s housing target from 3,000 to 2,400 to take account of deliverability concerns expressed through CSPO consultation. Deficit in completions against RSS targets will now be taken into account in recalculating housing target. Housing far

---

Plan Ref 5.1 Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire

Summary
It is suggested that in addition to impacts on the character of the surrounding area policy on wind energy should also specifically mention impacts on the setting of heritage assets. Care must be taken that restricting development to existing built up areas within existing settlement boundaries does not result in village cramping. (S)

Response
Comments noted. The paragraphs referred to set out the general approach to development within settlements of different sizes. It is not considered appropriate to single out the impact on heritage within this part of the document as many other impacts would then also have to be addressed here.

Recommendation
No action.

---

Plan Ref 5.1 Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire

Summary
Support for housing targets and general distribution of housing across the Borough. However, should allow some flexibility in when Green Belt sites can come forward to ensure delivery of necessary housing. Reference should also be made to the need for safeguarding land beyond the LDF period. (S)

Response
Comments noted. We appreciate concerns regarding the amount of development directed towards Skelmersdale to what is a relatively weak housing market compared to other parts of the Borough. Promotion of the High Lane site also noted. Safeguarded land for use beyond the plan period is currently being considered.

Recommendation
Reduce Skelmersdale’s housing target from 3,000 to 2,400 to take account of deliverability concerns expressed through CSPO consultation.

---

Plan Ref 5.1 Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire

Summary
Object to the proposed distribution of housing between Burscough and Ormskirk. Ormskirk is a larger settlement so is a more sustainable location. (S)

Response
Comments noted. Although Ormskirk is a larger settlement there is much more to consider in terms of sustainable residential development. Congestion associated with the University means that parts of Ormskirk already suffer from very high levels of traffic. Whilst development of housing, particularly in the Green Belt, will have some negative impacts where ever it is developed, it is considered that Burscough has a role to play in terms of future housing provision given the nature of Green Belt land available in the area and also in terms of supporting Burscough’s important employment function.

Recommendation
Amend split of housing between Ormskirk and Burscough.
We support the identification of Halsall and Haskayne as rural sustainable villages but there is concern regarding the restricted development potential in such settlements. 80 dwellings seems extremely low and there is no proposed new development for new employment sites in the Western Parishes. We question this underdevelopment.

Response
Comments noted. It is not considered appropriate to allow Green Belt development on the edge of small rural villages, or settlement extensions, but development on appropriate sites within appropriate sustainable settlements will be supported.

Recommendation
Reconsider development figure for Western Parishes area. Should it be specified that this is not a maximum?

Summary
It is not clear from this policy what the justification is for the level of proposed development at Burscough.

Response
See Comments on Response CSPO-472 - even the highest level of development proposed at Burscough is not out of scale in comparison to historic delivery of housing in Burscough, but if a Burscough option is ultimately selected for Green Belt release, a more in-depth justification and explanation will be provided. This was not required at this time, as the Council are only consulting on options. Wording quoted from CS1 will be reviewed to make meaning clearer.

Recommendation
Amend wording in 2nd sentence of Policy CS1 as follows: “New development will be promoted in accordance with the following Settlement Hierarchy, with those settlements higher up the hierarchy, in general, taking more development than those lower down and n

Summary
This should at least include a statement subject to available infrastructure.

Response
Comment Noted

Recommendation
Amend 6th para of Policy CS1 to include reference to the provision of appropriate infrastructure required for specific development proposals.

Summary
concerns that Brown Edge/Pool Hey has been inaccurately labeled a rural sustainable village. Also concerned about caveats within policy which may undermine the honourable intent of the policy. Supports Skelmersdale masterplan.

Response
Comments noted. The boundary for Skelmersdale Town Centre has changed to include part of the Tawd Valley Park. This has been done to encourage greater links and recreational opportunities.

Recommendation
No further action required
The Non Preferred Option should not be supported as it would waste good agricultural land and worsen congestion issues around St Helens Road and parking in Ormskirk town centre.

Response
Comments noted.

Recommendation
No action required.

Plan Ref 5.1
Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire

SLP considers that it is both important and appropriate that the Core Strategy should recognise the role that Skelmersdale plays, both at a regional level and within the Borough, through the overarching development framework, thus providing a strategic context for other policies and future development. As such this policy is supported by SLP.

Response
Comments noted.

Recommendation
No action required.

Plan Ref 5.1
Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire

CS1 should mention setting of heritage assets. Care must be taken not to village cram and preserve character and appearance, particularly in conservation areas.

Response
Comments noted. Policy CS1 sets out the general strategic aims of the plan but is not intended to provide detail on every aspect. This is dealt with separately later on within individual policies on each topic area. The policy refers to the importance of protecting the Borough's heritage assets and this is considered sufficient for this policy.

Recommendation
No action required.

Plan Ref 5.1
Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire

We object to policy CS1 and in particular its proposed distribution of housing between the settlements. Specifically we object to the provision of two-thirds of residential development in Skelmersdale. We consider there should be development of more dwellings in Burscough (and Ormskirk/Aughton) and less in Skelmersdale. We have doubts about the deliverability of the proposed numbers of dwellings in Skelmersdale during the plan period and therefore the soundness of any Core Strategy dependent upon this. We support the option for a Strategic Development Site that allows the delivery of no fewer than 800 dwellings in Burscough. We object to the alternative dispersal of Green Belt housing development that delivers only 500 dwellings in the town.

Response
Comments noted regarding housing numbers in Skelmersdale, however in order to assist with the regeneration of the town Skelmersdale must be the focus of housing delivery.

Recommendation
Amendments to be made to the distribution of housing in Skelmersdale, Ormskirk and Burscough in light of the comments provided.

Plan Ref 5.1
Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire

Amendments proposed to policy wording and table.

Response
It is agreed that the housing target should be a "minimum" figure and the wording of CS1 should be amended to show this. Whichever option the Council ultimately select for Green Belt release, the table within Policy CS1 will be amended accordingly. The Council sees no reason to delete the wording in the last paragraph on p.45 regarding the constraints of waste water treatment infrastructure for Ormskirk, Burscough, Rufford and Scarisbrick. This is a key issue for the Core Strategy and one which must be resolved before greenfield development takes place in these areas. Therefore, limiting development on greenfield sites in these areas in the first part of the Core Strategy period is essential.

Recommendation
Amend wording of Policy CS1 to refer to the housing target as a "minimum" figure.
### Summary
The Core Strategy should acknowledge that surface coal resources are present within the Plan area, in particular in relation to the greenfield sites around Skelmersdale, and as part of taking forward development / redevelopment proposals within these resource areas, it will be necessary for any sterilisation effects on the coal resource to be considered, as well as whether the prior extraction of the coal would be appropriate. (S)

### Response
Comments noted. It is agreed that coal (and other mineral) -related issues (sterilisation and mining-related legacy) need to be taken into account in the Core Strategy, and that the Core Strategy wording should be added to acknowledge this fact. Consider the insertion of an appropriate sentence at this point of the Plan to acknowledge these issues.

### Recommendation
Insert appropriate wording into the Core Strategy to acknowledge that surface coal resources are present within parts of the Plan area. See also the Coal Authority’s recommended wording in Rep. 75.

### csp-75 Plan Ref 5.1 Policy Area CS1: A Sustainable Spatial Development Framework for West Lancashire

#### Summary
The issue of mining legacy needs to be acknowledged in the Core Strategy. The Coal Authority would suggest that the 10th paragraph of this policy be amended to read as suggested in full response. (S)

#### Response
Comments noted. It is agreed that it would be appropriate to add text to the Plan to acknowledge the issue of mining legacy, although the wording suggested by the Coal Authority in this instance may be over-long, especially if the matter is to be mentioned elsewhere in the Policy (see rep. 74).

#### Recommendation
The Coal Authority suggests that the 10th paragraph of this policy be amended to read as follows: "While new development that is in accordance with this Core Strategy will be promoted in the appropriate locations, the valuable biodiversity, landscape..."
Skelmersdale's image problem is associated primarily with its most deprived wards. These need to be tackled first of all.

The plan is failing to provide a comprehensive cohesive development plan for Skelmersdale. (S)

The overall aim of the Core Strategy is to improve and regenerate Skelmersdale as a whole, including both the more deprived and less deprived wards. This will be through targeted physical regeneration and improvements to the existing built environment but also improving access to services and facilities for the local population to improve their overall well-being, economic activity and educational attainment. The intended regeneration will therefore address all aspects of deprivation in the town. The Core Strategy sets out the broad aspirations of this work; however the detail will be worked up in subsequent LDF documents.

No action.

Mrs EA Broad
Parish Clerk Lathom South Parish Council

Mrs Shirley O'Hara
Skelmersdale Town Centre - A Strategic Development Site

Mr Shaun Taylor
Planning Associate Director G L Hearn Property Consultants

Ms Deborah McLaughlin
Executive Director North West Homes and Communities Agency
Summary Detailed comments regarding Skelmersdale Town Centre. Can be summarised as: Maintain Skelmersdale as a green and pleasant well-landscaped town with good roads and footpaths. Extend development policies to the whole of the former New Town area. (S)

Response Comments and support noted. Responses as below:
1. Noted. 2. Noted. 3. The Core Strategy identifies Skelmersdale as a strategic development site. Not all of the land identified within the boundary will be developed for housing, and indeed a major thrust of the policy seeks to improve the existing park and access to pleasant green space. 4. Comments noted. The broad uses proposed will be considered in greater detail as part of a masterplan for the site. 5. Comments noted. 6. Residential uses in the town centre are considered important to the sustainability of a modern town centre. However, we note the comments made and we realise that aspirations must be realistic. We also appreciate that housing development in the wider Skelmersdale area should have a positive impact on users of the town centre. 7. In order to meet broader housing targets there will need to be some new housing development in Skelmersdale, that is in addition to improving existing housing stock. Therefore, the housing market has a role to play. 8. ‘High Street’ is a descriptive term for the link we want to encourage between the concourse and ASDA, the name will no doubt be formalised as the project continues. Skelmersdale currently lacks an important primary route/pedestrian area that most towns have as a focus for retail/leisure functions. 9. Comments noted. A linear pedestrian area is one of the aspirations for the town. The Concourse will remain in place as an important retail function. 10. Comments noted. Despite its strengths the policy must identify what needs to change, building on existing services and positive aspects. 11. Comments noted. The night time economy is considered crucial to the viability of the town centre and this is severely lacking at the current time. 12. The regeneration of existing housing estates in Skelmersdale is addressed through Policy CS1.

Recommendation No action.

Summary Impact of development in Skelmersdale on Dalton needs to be considered (S)

Response Comments noted. The aim of the Core Strategy is to regenerate Skelmersdale over a 15 year period in order to address many of the issues raised above. It is intended that this regeneration will have positive benefits for all aspects of the town whether this be employment opportunities or educational facilities and achievement. The Core Strategy is a broad level document and the details will be addressed in further LDF documents. In terms of the Dalton site, this is currently protected from development (Policy DS4), and the intention is to keep it undeveloped due to its landscape importance. If the Whalleys North sites are developed, some sort of landscape buffer (including tree planting) will be necessary to screen it from Dalton. The issue of traffic travelling northwards from residential development in the Whalleys/Cobbs Clough area of Skelmersdale is recognised now, but it is considered most appropriate to address the details when allocating specific sites /dealing with development briefs or planning applications.

Recommendation No action.

Summary Policy CS2 is a key policy. This policy is supported in principle for the regeneration of Skelmersdale town centre. The extension of the town centre boundary will be supported if this makes the proposal viable and deliverable. (F)

Response Comments noted.

Recommendation No action.

Summary We acknowledge and support the role of greenspace to sustainable communities. The policy refers to development of a park. We would welcome a broader reference to the role of such a park and any other green space to the broader plan for GI in the borough. Whilst the green spaces are shown on the diagram, it would appear that links and green corridors are also needed to prevent fragmentation and provide an overall strategy. We would also welcome inclusion of biodiversity within this policy. Conserving and enhancing biodiversity should be an integral part of developing a sustainable community, and here where there are opportunities for green infrastructure a key item to include alongside recreation and access to such spaces. (f)

Response Comments noted.

Recommendation Reference to more general Green Infrastructure to be added to policy CS2. Wording to read, 'In addition, general improvements will be made to green infrastructure in the town along with conserving and enhancing biodiversity'.
Plan Ref Policy CS3

Summary Policy CS3 is unrealistic and undeliverable. There is an over-reliance on Skelmersdale throughout the Core Strategy. (S)

Response Delivery in Skelmersdale over the past three years has been affected by the recession, and as the economy picks up, general housing rates are expected to increase. The Council anticipates in the order of 800 new dwellings in the town centre (not 1,000 as stated by the Objector), and it is considered that whilst it may be challenging to deliver this many units in a difficult market area, it should be possible over a 15 year period, especially if this is in tandem with major investment in the town centre regeneration programme. Overall figures for Skelmersdale will be carefully considered in the light of representations made. The Council does not consider that incorporating scope for a "Plan B" into the Core Strategy demonstrates an admission that the plan is likely to fail, but provides flexibility as the plan is prepared in uncertain economic times.

Recommendation Reduce Skelmersdale’s housing target from 3,000 to 2,400 to take account of deliverability concerns expressed through CSP0 consultation.

cspo-646 Skelmersdale Limited Partnership

Plan Ref 5.3 Policy Area CS2: Skelmersdale Town Centre

Summary The adopted town centre masterplan and SPD is supported by SLP and is considered to provide an appropriate and suitably robust policy framework to ensure that future development proposed as part of the regeneration of the town centre achieves an integrated and cohesive centre which remains viable and vital in the long-term. The emerging policies contained within the Core Strategy now seek to materially alter this approach such that the vitality and viability of the town centre is threatened. The policy approach is not considered to be consistent with the Council’s stated Key Principle of making Skelmersdale a leisure, recreation and retail centre of excellence within the North West. (s)

Response Points noted. The Council has commissioned an up to date Retail Study due this autumn and the retail floorspace figure for the town centre will be amended in accordance with the latest evidence in the Retail Study. The issue of the Nye Bevan pool is that removing the building is not deliverable in financial terms, therefore the Core Strategy would be unsound to promote such an aspiration knowing it is highly unlikely to be demolished.

Recommendation The following wording will be added at the start of the bullet point which refers to an improved western entrance to the Concourse Centre: ‘To ensure maximum practical integration...’:

Housing numbers to be considered as final draft document prepared.

cspo-663 Mr Simon Artiss Planning Manager Bellway Homes Ltd

Plan Ref 5.3 Policy Area CS2: Skelmersdale Town Centre

Summary 1,000 new homes in Skelmersdale town centre is too much and not considered deliverable. (S)

Response Point noted.

Recommendation Housing numbers to be considered as final draft document prepared.

cspo-91 Mr Barry Eckersley Hope

Plan Ref 5.3 Policy Area CS2: Skelmersdale Town Centre

Summary I am concerned about the development of housing in the Whalleys / Cobbs Clough area of Skelmersdale, and in particular the impact of traffic travelling northwards from this area along Lower Beacon Lane, Higher Lane Dalton and the A5209. (S)

Response It is agreed that site-specific traffic impacts need to be addressed for housing sites. This will take place primarily when the allocation of individual sites is carried out, and when planning applications are submitted for the development of such sites. Impacts of new housing on existing infrastructure - for example nearby rural lanes - needs to be minimised to an acceptable level wherever possible. New homes are targeted for Skelmersdale for several reasons, including the need to generate investment in the town to support regeneration proposals for the town and the fact that as the Borough’s largest town it has most key services and these will be improved by the proposals for the town centre. Skelmersdale also has significantly more capacity in terms of existing road infrastructure than all other parts of the Borough. In addition, there is land available in Skelmersdale for new development, whereas much of the rest of the Borough has limited land available within towns and villages and so even more development would need to be provided in the Green Belt than is currently proposed in the Core Strategy if development was diverted from Skelmersdale to areas such as Ormskirk and Burscough. The Core Strategy supports the provision of a range of new facilities and infrastructure in Skelmersdale and the town centre proposals (Policy CS2) set out these improvements, including a new bus station, new retail and leisure facilities and improvements to the Tawd Valley for recreation. The Core Strategy also supports a new rail link for Skelmersdale (Policy CS12) but this is not something the Council can deliver and there may be difficulties gaining funding for such a proposal.

Recommendation No action required at present. Consider traffic impacts when assessing proposals for residential development at Whalleys / Cobbs Clough.

cspo-150 Mr Philip Carter Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency

Plan Ref Policy CS3 Burscough Strategic Development Site

Summary In relation to the â€œmeasures to address the surface water drainage issues in Burscoughâ€, we request that this is changed to â€œmeasures to address the foul and surface water drainage issues in Burscoughâ€. (F).

Response Comments noted. The wording of Policy CS3 will be amended as recommended.

Recommendation Change CS3 from â€œmeasures to address the surface water drainage issues in Burscoughâ€, to â€œmeasures to address the foul and surface water drainage issues in Burscoughâ€.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Ref</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSP-187</td>
<td>Irene Melling</td>
<td>Policy CS3 Burscough Strategic Development Site</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>No further action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSP-230</td>
<td>Mr Shaun Taylor Planning Associate Director G L Hearn Property Consultants</td>
<td>Policy CS3 Burscough Strategic Development Site</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Review housing targets and distribution to ensure that growth needs are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSP-27</td>
<td>Mr Arthur Stout</td>
<td>Policy CS3 Burscough Strategic Development Site</td>
<td>Support with conditions</td>
<td>No Action Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSP-314</td>
<td>Mr Luke Garrett</td>
<td>Policy CS3 Burscough Strategic Development Site</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>No action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSP-386</td>
<td>North West Skelmersdale Owners</td>
<td>Policy CS3 Burscough Strategic Development Site</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>No action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSP-389</td>
<td>North West Skelmersdale Owners</td>
<td>Policy CS3 Burscough Strategic Development Site</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>No action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object to the Burscough option due to: traffic congestion, lack of infrastructure, pollution, financial incentives reportedly offered to the council, detrimental impact on the value of homes, increased social housing, loss of farmland and wildlife habitat and the early dismissal of the Ormskirk Option. (S)

Response With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as “Considerate Constructors”. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business/office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the “Have Your Say” leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst “new jobs” is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, “high quality business space” (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. “Improved transport” refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list “improved transport” as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase “improved drainage” refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation: No action.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csps-472</th>
<th>Mr Keith Keeley</th>
<th>Policy CS3</th>
<th>Burscough Strategic Development Site</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Concerned that necessary infrastructure improvements are considered and planned in a comprehensive manner and in accordance with Government advice. (s)</td>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td>See comments on CSPO Responses 510, 515, 520, 526, 531, 555, 558, 563, 565, 567, 570, 573, 577, 583, 586, 589, 591, 595, 599, 605, 606, 608, 614, 615, 616 and 618 - the attached schedule of comments has been broken down and individual comments attached to the relevant part of the CSPO document. In response to the general concern stated that infrastructure improvements are considered and planned in preparing the Core Strategy in accordance with Government advice, the Council have been undertaking a wide range of work relating to infrastructure planning over recent years, and continue to do so. The combined understanding created by this work has fed into the proposals put forward in the CSPO document, particularly in relation to what can be accommodated within the existing built-up areas of the Borough and the decision to focus the vast majority of new development in Skelmersdale. However, in relation to the options for development on Green Belt, all the options consulted upon, including the non-preferred option, are affected by similar infrastructure constraints - most notably waste water treatment infrastructure and potential highways constraints. Therefore, whichever option is ultimately selected, it will be necessary to improve infrastructure serving Ormskirk and / or Burscough, where possible. Until the Council have settled on the most appropriate Green Belt option, it is difficult to define the precise infrastructure improvements that will be required, and therefore it is difficult to complete a robust IDP to reflect the final proposals. However, where the Council is aware of infrastructure issues affecting the options for Green Belt sites, these have been discussed in either Chapter 4 or Chapter 5 of the CSPO document when discussing the different options / strategic sites and the over-arching spatial strategy. In relation to the need to make explicit the reasoning behind focusing development on Burscough as opposed to Ormskirk, this would only be necessary if the strategic development site at Yew Tree Farm is ultimately pursued in the Core Strategy. At the moment the Council has not made this decision and the whole reason for consulting on 3 options was to gain public input on those 3 options before any final decision is reached. Both Ormskirk and Burscough are similarly constrained and both are Key Service Centres, and both towns would require Green Belt release if they were to be a secondary focus for development after Skelmersdale. In either case the level of development proposed will not be significantly higher than in previous years. The maximum level of development proposed overall in Ormskirk and Burscough under any option is 900 units and 800 units respectively. This can be compared with historic delivery of new housing between 1992-2007 (i.e. an equivalent 15 year period before the housing market downturn) of 702 units and 747 units respectively. In relation to helping local residents to understand complex planning documents such as the Core Strategy, the Council has done all that it can to make the document as accessible as possible and have undertaken a very extensive consultation programme during the 6 week period that has gone well beyond the minimum requirements set out in our SCI and national guidance. Should any local residents and local community groups ever require support and clarification in understanding the CSPO document, or any other planning document, the Council’s Officers will always make themselves available to support within the resources available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>No Action Required relating to the general observation - any action relating to comments in attached schedule will be addressed separately in above CSPO Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csps-573</th>
<th>Mr Keith Keeley</th>
<th>Policy CS3</th>
<th>Burscough Strategic Development Site</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>My concerns largely relate to the potential impacts on infrastructure, and ensuring that any proposed major housing and employment development result in a sustainable and improved Burscough in terms of its infrastructure provision, and in particular transportation, waste water, and community facilities.</td>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td>Given that the Council is still effectively consulting on options for the Core Strategy as part of the CSPO document, it was not possible to include all the information referred to in CSPO-573, but this information will be available alongside a Publication / Submission version of the Core Strategy for any strategic sites. At this stage, the Council were seeking the public’s views on the concept of the different options for Green Belt release.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>Known infrastructure requirements for strategic sites included in policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csps-577</th>
<th>Mr Keith Keeley</th>
<th>Policy CS3</th>
<th>Burscough Strategic Development Site</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Policy CS3 is unsound as there is no guarantee infrastructure improvements will take place. (s)</td>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td>See comments on CSPO Responses 510, 515, 520, 526, 531, 555, 558, 563, 565, 567, 570, 573, 577, 583, 586, 589, 591, 595, 599, 605, 606, 608, 614, 615, 616 and 618 - the attached schedule of comments has been broken down and individual comments attached to the relevant part of the CSPO document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>No Action Required relating to the general observation - any action relating to comments in attached schedule will be addressed separately in above CSPO Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csps-583</th>
<th>Mr Keith Keeley</th>
<th>Policy CS3</th>
<th>Burscough Strategic Development Site</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Publication of the Preferred Options document have been delayed until the full potential impacts of the development were known and mitigation measures presented in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (s)</td>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td>Should any location in Burscough (or elsewhere) be selected for development of a strategic scale and included in the Council’s Publication version of the Core Strategy, all such infrastructure details will be provided within that document or the accompanying IDP. The Strategic Development Site at Yew Tree Farm, Burscough would not have been put forward by the Council if all evidence collated to date indicated that infrastructure constraints could not be overcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>No Action Required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary
The requirement for an SPD should be more explicit. Alternatively, the Policy should require a comprehensive planning application for the whole site which should be accompanied by a detailed masterplan. This would ensure that piecemeal development does not take place.

Response
Comments Noted. The policy refers to the need for a masterplan and this is considered sufficient for the purposes of the policy in order to ensure a flexible approach depending on the market and timescales for delivery.

Recommendation
No action.

---

cspo-586
Mr Keith Keeley

Plan Ref Policy CS3 Burscough Strategic Development Site

Summary
The alternatives Option does not include an appraisal of locating development (or part) to the north and west of Burscough Bridge railway station. Why has no consideration been given to possible alternative options which would benefit from and directly contribute towards the provision of the Ormskirk by-pass? No IDP has been published for the strategic site and there is therefore no way that the community can determine that no negative impacts or depletion to the quality of existing infrastructure will result.

Response
Within the "alternatives" section for each policy, only those alternatives that were seemed realistic were included. Various locations for Green Belt release were considered before narrowing down to the 3 options consulted upon, but most were ruled out as undeliverable for various reasons. Areas to the north and west of Burscough were considered but ruled out on the grounds of impact on the Green Belt (urban sprawl) and highways accessibility / impact on the highway network because these locations had an unsuitable highways access and / or would have added traffic to the A59 to the north of the town centre or directly into the town centre and so would have had a greater impact on congestion in the town centre. A full technical paper will be provided alongside the Publication Draft Core Strategy setting out how the final Green Belt locations for development have been identified, including an explanation of those locations ruled out early on in the process. A larger infrastructure-led option has already been discounted - see response to representation CSPO-520. Policy CS3 is in conformity with Policy CS13, because Policy CS13 goes on to state that "[proposals for development should] contribute towards improvements to existing infrastructure and provision of new infrastructure, as required to support the needs of the development", i.e. if the existing infrastructure is not sufficient to accommodate the proposed development, the new development will be required to provide improvements to infrastructure to ensure that the needs of the development are catered for.

Recommendation
A Technical Paper has been prepared on selecting the most appropriate location for Green Belt release.
I support the attached letter (II items) in its entirety. Having attended the meeting at Burscough Wharf, organised by the parish council on Monday 20th June I will add my view. With regard to the mounting congestion on our roads, I believe everyone at the meeting except to learn that measurements have exceeded those pronounced acceptable to Brussels and this for three months in the last 12. We understand there has not yet been a proper feasibility study in relation to road capacity. Any sizeable increase in residential and industrial activity will surely exacerbate our existing traffic flow problems. This at a time when Lancashire Constabulary have announced that manpower cuts are coming and that our local part time police station is likely to be sold! I wonder if Mrs Cooper realises how the future security situation looks to us. To me it would seem that all three over stretched emergency services may well find prompt response a mounting concern. Is she totally aware of serious infrastructure problems - eg drainage that obtain at this time! A dire consequence of poor evaluation for additional construction in this area is the loss of agricultural land. This is the nation that came close to being starred to death in th 2nd world war because of Hitlers highly effective U-boat strategy. At that time with a population of 40 million we were nearly 50% self sufficient in food production. I well remember how public parks and playing fields were requisitioned for growing vital food. The Ministry of Food exported us to use every inch of available space, even window boxes for this purpose! Can it really be that people, at my level of insignificance, should deem it necessary to remind those paid by us to have responsibility for our welfare that we may we be in a very dangerous situation. I refer to the highly volatile state of relations in Europe, Africa, the middle east, Asia etc. The economic climate is jittery to say the least. We are now so reliant on imported food stuffs that concerns about fuel for road transport are probably only secondary! We have all witnessed what happened when the filling stations run short. Do the men and women of Westminster really ‘grasp the nettle’ about the situation if so many is experiencing the same sort of problems for a long time! Finally, many of us would like to know who the individuals are who stand to profit from this, who, for example, is Mr Crompton? I am reliably informed that he has purchased a fairly large area of land within the proposed site. This is as puzzling as to why so much land appears to be fallow. Are we, as rate paying residents, entitled to know about the track record/background of people who may well be intricately concerned in the quality of all our future lives and indeed those who will inevitably succeed us? I would like to single out two people who whom I do not admire for something to boost my flagging morale! Mrs Cynthia Dereli was a truly heartening sight at an otherwise dreadfully depressing meeting on Monday night. I know that we have at least one totally reliable representative is cheating. I was also impressed by the patience and courteous extended to me by Mr Cropper, our Lancashire County Councillor, who phoned me back late on Tuesday evening after a long day because of late meetings etc. I hope that in due course Mrs Cooper will be able to give me some comments about my views and hopefully some hint that she will be doing her best for the huge majority of people in her constituency who rely upon her in stressful times such as this! I would hope that more public discussion, in a more suitable venue, will be arranged. I am well aware that councils, at parish and borough level, are convinced that adequate provision has already been made. As in so many situations where communication is of the essence, we, the public, do not share that opinion. How totally appropriate that even the beloved Victoria football ground is also in the mix. Cromwells people were very active hereabouts in the 1640s. He was a renowned killjoy and would surely have been gratified to see his legacy lives on. ---------------- RE: West Lancashire Local Development Framework- Option 1- Burscough I refer to the above and wish to object to the proposed declassification of Green Belt land for the development of both residential and commercial property at the site of Yew Tree Farm, Higgins Lane, Burscough for the following reasons: General Concerns 1. The housing development alone will create thousands of additional vehicle movements per day increasing congestion and pollution on our already congested roads. During the councils exhibition held at Burscough Wharf on the 04/06/2011 one of the planning officials admitted that they had not yet undertaken a traffic review. Therefore, the council appear to be throwing weight behind developments without accurate knowledge as to the likely impact of the same. This development will significantly affect the many residents right to their properties. 2. The council have failed to secure suitable transport infrastructure capable of accommodating the existing nor expected future traffic problems eg bypass and as such the proposed development is flawed. 3. The development would result in significant dust, dirt and noise for the period of the development which is expected to last a number of years. This would significantly affect the quality of residents lives who have chosen to live in a semi rural area adjacent to land thought to have been protected from such developments. 4. There is a rumour that the developer has offered financial incentives to the council well above the average for infrastructure costs. Can you confirm that the choice of development has not yet been driven by financial incentives? 5. A significant development such as this has the very real potential to affect the value of residents homes in the immediate area and may indeed prevent the sale at a reasonable value for many years to come. This is because many potential buyers are expected to wait and purchase a new home rather then purchase an existing home particularly one in which they would be required to endure all the negative effects experience during construction work. This is an unacceptable position to place the community for whom you serve particularly due to the long term timescales involved. In addition to providing generous infrastructure costs to the council is the developer prepared to set aside a compensation fund for payment to the affected residents for both the financial and personal loss?? 6. At least 1/3rd of the housing development will be designated as social housing and it is certain that considerable housing would be provided to local residents in reality it would instead be provided to people living outside the immediate area who are already in such housing but would understandably prefer a nice new âœœupgradeâœ in a better area. Burscough has already had more than its fair share of development in recent years so is it not fair that other areas share the burden?? 7. The council threw out the Ormskirk option earlier in the year on the grounds that it would increase traffic in Ormskirk and would be built on high quality agricultural land. However, the same arguments apply in respect of the Burscough option. In fact unlike Ormskirk (which has a major road leading away from the proposed site directly to Junction 3 on the M58), traffic from Burscough would be required to travel through built up residential areas to Junction 27 of the M6 via Newburgh on far more unsuitable roads over a longer distance, affect a greater number of people and ultimately cause even more chaos than is currently experienced. Is it not true that the real reason why the Ormskirk option (Altrus Lane/Scarth Hill Lane) was withdrawn is that there was too much significant from local residents living in this affluent area?? 8. The land provides a natural break between both residential housing and commercial developments and hence urban sprawl which would be lost should the development proceed. 9. The proposed development site contains good class arable farm land in an area renowned for arable farming. The loss of such valuable land will only serve to limit production for consumption in the local area leading to an increased need to import the same from elsewhere increasing further traffic and pollution. Further, this area of the country has not been subject to the same...
effects of climate change as other parts such as the South. Therefore, reducing the production capacities in this area could be viewed as negligible long term. 10. The land offers a natural habitat for wildlife which is currently thriving. The proposed development will result in the reduction of suitable habitats in the area. 11. As a local resident of Burscough I can see no personal benefit to me or my family as a result of this development and only a benefit to those already living outside the immediate area. Should the local council not look after the rights of its local council tax paying residents? Concerns relating to the council's publication entitled Have Your Say I have concerns that the council have little real interest in the views of the public evidenced by the following: 1. The Ormskirk option was withdrawn before full public consultation and only partially reintroduced following public pressure. 2. Option 1 (Burscough) states as a benefit of this option only. Surely wherever commercial developments are constructed this would increase the potential (but no guarantee) employment in the relevant area. Further, the increased employment will be proportional to the increase in population and hence overall have a zero impact on the employment prospects of existing residents. 3. Option 1 (Burscough) states as a benefit and yet transport is unlikely to be improved without significant investment eg long awaited bypass, to accommodate the many thousands of additional vehicle movements per day. 4. Option 1 (Burscough) states as a weakness. Whereas Non preferred option Ormskirk states traffic congestion in Ormskirk would be likely to get worse. Surely increased traffic and congestion are likely for both options in which case why not state the same? 6. Non preferred option states an extension of Edge Hill University as a benefit but fails to highlight the significance of this employer to the area and that an extension would likely lead to more employment and provide additional accommodation to students relieving local Ormskirk residents of the problems associated with some student behaviour. I trust the district council will give my views your most careful consideration.

Recommen-

dation

No action required

cspo-699

Plan Ref

Policy CS3 Burscough Strategic Development Site

Summary

In summary I strongly oppose Options 1 and 2.

Response

Comments noted

Recommend-

dation

No action required

cspo-712

Plan Ref

Crompton property developments

Summary

Support for the Burscough Strategic Development Site. (s)

Response

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

Recommen-

dation

No action required.

cspo-732

Plan Ref

Bickerstaffe Trust

Summary

Delete policy relating to Burscough Strategic Site and replace with Ormskirk Strategic Site. (S)

Response

The Council will be considering which option to select for Green Belt release and, depending on which option is selected, Policy CS3 may be retained with minor amendments, substantially changed (e.g. to refer to a different site) or may be deleted completely. However, at this time, the council's view is that the non-preferred option for an Ormskirk Strategic Development Site is not appropriate given its impacts on traffic and the Green Belt.

Recommen-

dation

No Action Required
Response With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess mitigation. Recommendations

Summary The Burscough and Dispersal options are unacceptable. The Ormskirk or 'non preferred' option is the most suitable. (S)

Response Comments noted regarding the merits/disadvantages of each option. This consultation period has provided people with the opportunity to comment on the Ormskirk option. With regard to specific comments made about the Burscough option: - The Council is aware of traffic and infrastructure problems associated with the site. These need to be addressed if the site is to be chosen for development, although it is noted that traffic-related issues apply not just to Burscough. - The proposed park is required to meet deficiencies in open space provision - The new primary school is needed for the site, according to the education provided (Lancashire County Council) - The same Green Belt and agricultural land arguments do not apply equally to all three options: landscape impact and agricultural land grade are lower for the proposed Burscough site than for the non-preferred and the dispersal option sites elsewhere in the Borough. See also response to Rep. 124

Recommendation No further action

---

cspo-129 Dr Carol Stott
Plan Ref 5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm Object

Summary Development will increase traffic congestion, with the development creating significant dust, dirt and noise pollution. Impact on the value of residents homes in the area. Land currently offers natural habitat for wildlife. Land provides a natural break and prevents urban sprawl. Development would be built on good class arable farm land. (S)

Response With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be provided for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business/office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. Whilst is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation No further action

---

cspo-133 D R Gadsby
Plan Ref 5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm Object

Summary Development will increase traffic congestion, with the development creating significant dust, dirt and noise pollution. Impact on the value of residents homes in the area. Land currently offers natural habitat for wildlife. Land provides a natural break and prevents urban sprawl. Development would be built on good class arable farm land. (S)

Response With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be provided for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business/office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. Whilst is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, refers to high quality business space (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. Improved transport refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation No further action
Summary

Object to Burscough Option. Development will increase traffic congestion, and create significant dust, dirt and noise pollution. Impact on the value of residents' homes in the area. Land currently offers natural habitat for wildlife. Land provides a natural break and prevents urban sprawl. Development would be built on good class arable farm land. Strategy fails to provide secure suitable transport infrastructure. Concern that the social housing outlined in the residential development will not be allocated local residents.

Response

With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as ÌœConsiderate ConstructorsÌ. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business/office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the ÌœHave Your SayÌ leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 3. Ìœimproved transportÌ refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list Ìœimproved transportÌ as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase Ìœimproved drainageÌ refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation

No further action
Development will increase traffic congestion, and create significant dust, dirt and noise pollution. Impact on the value of residents homes in the area. Land currently offers natural habitat for wildlife. Land provides a natural break and prevents urban sprawl. Development would be built on good class arable farm land. Strategy fails to provide secure suitable transport infrastructure. Concern that the social housing outlined in the residential development will not be allocated local residents. (S)

Response

With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1, 2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3, 5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as ‘Considerate Constructors’. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7, 8, 9, 10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the ‘Have Your Say’ leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst “new jobs” is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, “new, high quality business space” (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. “Improved transport” refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list “improved transport” as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase “improved drainage” refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommenda- tion

No further action
Summary

Development will increase traffic congestion, and create significant dust, dirt and noise pollution. Impact on the value of residents homes in the area. Land currently offers natural habitat for wildlife. Land provides a natural break and prevents urban sprawl. Development would be built on good class arable farm land. Strategy fails to provide secure suitable transport infrastructure. Concern that the social housing outlined in the residential development will not be allocated local residents. (S)

Response

With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8,9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business/office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst new jobs is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, high quality business space (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. Improved transport refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list improved transport as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase improved drainage refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation

No further action
Summary

Development will increase traffic congestion, and create significant dust, dirt and noise pollution. Impact on the value of residents homes in the area. Land currently offers natural habitat for wildlife. Land provides a natural break and prevents urban sprawl. Development would be built on good class arable farm land. Strategy fails to provide secure suitable transport infrastructure. Concern that the social housing outlined in the residential development will not be allocated local residents. (S)

Response

With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as ‘Considerate Constructors’. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the ‘Have Your Say’ leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst ‘new jobs’ is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, ‘high quality business space’ (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. ‘Improved transport’ refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list ‘improved transport’ as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase ‘improved drainage’ refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation

No further action
Summary

Development will increase traffic congestion, and create significant dust, dirt and noise pollution. Impact on the value of residents homes in the area. Land currently offers natural habitat for wildlife. Land provides a natural break and prevents urban sprawl. Development would be built on good class arable farm land. Strategy fails to provide secure suitable transport infrastructure. Concern that the social housing outlined in the residential development will not be allocated local residents. (S)

Response

With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as â€œConsiderate Constructorsâ€. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the â€œHave Your Sayâ€ leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst â€œnew jobsâ€ is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, â€œnew, high quality business spaceâ€ (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. â€œImproved transportâ€ refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscoughâ€™s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list â€œimproved transportâ€ as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase â€œimproved drainageâ€ refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation

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

Recommen-dation

No further action
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### cspo-156

**Plan Ref:** 5.4  
**Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm**  
**Object**

**Summary**  
Development will increase traffic congestion, and create significant dust, dirt and noise pollution. Impact on the value of urban sprawl. Development would be built on good class arable farm land. Strategy fails to provide secure suitable transport infrastructure. Concern that the social housing outlined in the residential development will not be allocated local residents. (S)

**Response**  
With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Improve Considerate Constructors. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be provided for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst new jobs is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, high quality business space refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

**Recommendation**  
No action required

---

### cspo-161

**Plan Ref:** 5.4  
**Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm**  
**Object**

**Summary**  
Objection to development of Yew Tree Farm Site, as it is high quality agricultural land and would have adverse consequences to services, access and transport etc. (S)

**Response**  
Views noted. It is recognised that there are adverse impacts associated with Yew Tree Farm, and these have been taken into account when determining what are to be the preferred options.

**Recommendation**  
No further action

---

### cspo-17

**Plan Ref:** 5.4  
**Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm**  
**Support**

**Summary**  
We support Option 1 on your consultation document 2027. (F)

**Response**  
Noted

**Recommendation**  
No Action Required
### csso-175
**Mr Mike Williams**  
**Plan Ref:** 5.4  
**Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm**  
**Object**  
**Summary**  
Object to development as infrastructure as it currently stands could not cope with more traffic and could lead to serious congestion. (S)  
**Response**  
Comments noted.  
**Recommendation**  
No change

### csso-177
**Julie Dale**  
**Plan Ref:** 5.4  
**Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm**  
**Object**  
**Summary**  
The proposed development would permanently alter the rural character of Burscough. The development would destroy many acres of valuable arable land. The proposed development would not provide for any buffer between the site of the Industrial Estate and the surrounding housing. Both options one and two would put significant strains on the existing infrastructure. The A59 and A5209 are particularly vulnerable to congestion. The proposed development (both options one and two) would represent a significant incursion into the green belt. (S)  
**Response**  
Comments noted. Housing requirement reflect need (related to demographics, etc), but recent demand has also been taken into account to a small extent. The Ormskirk option is being consulted upon, albeit as a non-preferred option.  
**Recommendation**  
No further action

### csso-178
**Mrs Doreen Williams**  
**Plan Ref:** 5.4  
**Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm**  
**Object**  
**Summary**  
Object to proposals to develop at Yew Tree Farm. (S)  
**Response**  
Comments noted. With regard to specific points raised: 1. It is accepted that new infrastructure will be necessary if this site were to go ahead. It is not assumed to go ahead before United Utilities deal with sewerage /drainage capacity for Burscough as a whole. 2. The Council is aware of traffic issues on the A59. Improvements would be necessary to cope with extra traffic if 600 new houses were built. 3. Ormskirk was rejected by Members on account of the degree of its likely negative impacts. 4. The need for housing, plus shortage of suitable non-Green Belt sites, constitute the exceptional circumstances for releasing Green Belt. 5. Noted. 6. Noted. Infrastructure provision should be bound up in a legal agreement to ensure it happens. 7. The "employment uses" will tend to be business class, rather than manufacturing types of industry. 8. All options have pros and cons. It is the degree of pros and cons that have influenced the choice of preferred options.  
**Recommendation**  
No action required.
Development will increase traffic congestion, and create significant dust, dirt and noise pollution. Land currently offers natural habitat for wildlife. Land provides a natural break and prevents urban sprawl. Development would be built on good class arable farm land. Strategy fails to provide secure suitable transport infrastructure. (S)

Response With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1, 2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3, 5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as “Considerate Constructors”.

4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7, 8, 9, 10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business/office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the “Have Your Say” leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst “new jobs” is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, “high quality business space” (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. “improved transport” refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list “improved transport” as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase “improved drainage” refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation No further action
Development will increase traffic congestion, and create significant dust, dirt and noise pollution. Impact on the value of residents homes in the area. Land currently offers natural habitat for wildlife. Land provides a natural break and prevents urban sprawl. Development would be built on good class arable farm land. Strategy fails to provide secure suitable transport infrastructure. Concern that the social housing outlined in the residential development will not be allocated local residents. (S)

Response

With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as “Considerate Constructors”. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the “Have Your Say” leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst “new jobs” is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, “high quality business space” (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. “Improved transport” refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list “improved transport” as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase “improved drainage” refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation

No further action
### csapo-182

**Plan Ref:** 5.4  
**Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm**

#### Summary
Development will increase traffic congestion, and create significant dust, dirt and noise pollution. Impact on the value of residents homes in the area. Land currently offers natural habitat for wildlife. Land provides a natural break and prevents urban sprawl. Development would be built on good class arable farm land. Strategy fails to provide secure suitable transport infrastructure. Concern that the social housing outlined in the residential development will not be allocated local residents. (S)

#### Response
With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8,9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business/office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disadvantages. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst new, high quality business space (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. Improved transport refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list improved transport as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase drainage refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

#### Recommendation
No action required

### csapo-22

**Plan Ref:** 5.4  
**Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm**

#### Summary
feel the use of green belt land is a total waste when there are brown belt land sites available. The increase in traffic and disruption from this option would be detrimental to the whole of Burscough. (S)

#### Response
All suitable land within the built-up areas of the Borough has already been accounted for in setting housing targets and this still leaves a need to deliver 600 homes, which can therefore only be accommodated in the Green Belt. Traffic implications of any proposed development will need to be resolved as much as possible by detailed design of those proposals.

#### Recommendation
No Action Required

### csapo-23

**Plan Ref:** 5.4  
**Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm**

#### Summary
My wife and I support preferred option 1 as we believe this will assist the regeneration and viability of Burscough and enable it to become a more independent self supporting centre. (F)

#### Response
Noted

#### Recommendation
No Action Required
Summary We think the Ormskirk non-preferred option would cause major traffic problems. We have an area of woodland next to our house and feel that this should be preserved to protect the animals that live there. Our Preferred Option would be Burscough (S).

Response Comments noted - should the non-preferred option be taken forward in the future, detailed proposals to address access, highways impacts and environmental impacts will be considered.

Recommendation No Action Required

Plan Ref 5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm

Mr B Bennett

Summary Object to Burscough option

Response Housing targets are based on population projections, unmet need that has not been fulfilled as a result of the slow-down in the market, and household projections which identifies trends in house hold make up. In terms of food supply, ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. All other points noted.

Recommendation No action required

Plan Ref 5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm

Mr S Garrett

Summary Object to Burscough option

Response It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. Comments regarding Edge Hill are noted and Policy CS6 specifically addresses some of these issues.

Recommendation No action required

Plan Ref 5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm

Mr Chris Clandon

Summary Support for Burscough Option.

Response Comments regarding support for Burscough noted. Comments relating to the Green Belt study are addressed within the Green Belt Study Consultation Report.

Recommendation No action required

Plan Ref 5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm

Mr A Smith

Summary Support for Burscough Option.

Response Comments regarding support for Burscough noted. Comments relating to the Green Belt study are addressed within the Green Belt Study Consultation Report.

Recommendation No action required

Plan Ref 5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm

Francis Barnes

Summary Infrastructure cannot cope under Burscough option (S)

Response Comments noted

Recommendation No change
The Council understands concerns relating to air pollution. As part of the process of locating development, traffic congestion is a key concern, particularly given the rural nature of the Borough. Therefore, focusing development on the most sustainable areas of the Borough (the main towns and key settlements) should allow people the opportunity to make sustainable transport choices. Burscough does benefit from 2 rail stations, and although the services that operate from them are not the most frequent, the infrastructure is in place, presenting opportunities to improve the services. Furthermore, as it stands, Ormskirk Town Centre is currently the only designated Air Quality Management Area within the Borough. This was one of the factors considered when the Council recommended the Ormskirk Option should be Non-Preferred. In terms of traffic congestion, this is likely to be an issue regardless of where development is located within the Borough. This is as a result of the rural nature of the Borough which leads to car dependency. Currently further work is being carried out to assess the full impact of traffic on the highways network and to given an indication of mitigation measures that may be implemented to relieve the pressure. Again this is the reason for focusing development on the most sustainable locations which benefit from some form of accessible public transport links. The majority of development is coming forward over the next 15 years will be located in Skelmersdale, with the remaining being directed to Ormskirk and Burscough and then a smaller amount to the rural settlements. To choose not to locate any further development within Burscough would be ignoring the needs of future generations and limiting the housing supply which will exacerbate affordability issues. The Council has developed a relationship with United Utilities and through the local planning process has raised the awareness of the issues that currently surround Burscough and Ormskirk in relation to waste water treatment. It is intended to continue to drive this dialogue in order to push West Lancashire up the agenda with United Utilities. However, ultimately it is the responsibility of the utility company to deliver such improvements and the regulatory framework within which they work, requires a degree of certainty before bill payers money can be invested. Comments relating to the consultation process are noted. However, the Non-preferred option has also been presented to the public and comments and views on this option have been welcomed. The only key difference is that the option has been identified by the Council as being non-preferred for the specified reasons. In response to comments relating to the differences between land at Burscough and land at Ormskirk, the parcel identified to the west of Burscough is, according to the Councils evidence, of a lower grade agricultural land and more enclosed by built development (Burscough Industrial Estate) than the Ormskirk option. These reasons, along with the more acute concerns relating to traffic congestion, particularly on Ormskirk Town centre, are why the Council considers the Ormskirk Option to be a non-preferred. Notwithstanding this point, the option has been presented to the public in the same depth as the other options and comments relating to this option have been welcomed.

Recommendation No action required

The Council set out within the latest Core Strategy document which of the proposed options it prefers and why these options are beneficial along with what the negatives may be. However, the non-preferred option has also been included within this public consultation to ensure that the public can express their views regarding the Ormskirk option. In response to the comment that Aughton, Up Holland, Scarisbrick, Parbold and Rufford do not form any part of the options for delivering development in the Borough, this is to ensure the plan focuses on delivering development sustainably. The majority of the Boroughs development is directed towards the most sustainable settlements to ensure the most is made of existing infrastructure and service capacity and that the impact on the environmental constraints of the smaller villages and settlements (including Scarisbrick, Parbold and Rufford) is limited. Aughton and Up Holland are included in the wider settlement areas of Ormskirk and Skelmersdale. Comments relating to the Green Belt study noted. Comments relating to Health and Safety are noted. Planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts, sets out five purposes of including land in Green Belt. It is clear that the policy is intended to prevent areas from merging and that this is in relation to towns rather than parcels of land belonging to the same settlement. Furthermore, landscapes are also of importance within PPG2 but this is in relation to the preserving the setting and special character of historical towns rather than attractive landscapes near to where people live. I would agree that one of the clear purposes of the Green Belt is to protect the countryside from encroachment. However, in line with PPG2, Green Belt boundaries may be altered only when exceptional circumstances exist. The Council considers the need to meet growth targets and deliver development to meet the needs of the existing and future population to be "exceptional". Furthermore, the fact that 91% of the Borough is designated as Green Belt and the actual amount of Green Belt land required is around 0.26% contributes further to the exceptional circumstances. Rather than ignoring the advice within the commissioned studies such as the SHLAA, the Council is acting on the outcomes. The SHLAA identifies available land which will support the delivery of housing for the Borough. It is clear to see that there is not enough available land within the existing settlement boundaries to deliver housing needs for the full length of the plan and so the Council considers it necessary to review other land for delivery purposes including Green Belt. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is currently being finalised with our partners and stakeholders who are responsible for infrastructure provision in the Borough. Any shortfalls in infrastructure capacity are identified within this document which will form the basis of delivery and sit alongside the Local Development Framework. The IDP initially focuses on critical infrastructure such as utilities and roads but it does include an overview of social infrastructure which covers all of the points made in the representation. Through additional development it is expected that contributions to and the delivery of many community facilities can be achieved. It is in this context that some of the known requirements have already been included in Policy CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Ref</th>
<th>Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Object to the Burscough option and the Disperal Option, both of which involve development in Burscough which is not capable of accommodating any further development. Feels that the non-preferred option has been excluded from the process too early on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>The Council set out within the latest Core Strategy document which of the proposed options it prefers and why these options are beneficial along with what the negatives may be. However, the non-preferred option has also been included within this public consultation to ensure that the public can express their views regarding the Ormskirk option. In response to the comment that Aughton, Up Holland, Scarisbrick, Parbold and Rufford do not form any part of the options for delivering development in the Borough, this is to ensure the plan focuses on delivering development sustainably. The majority of the Boroughs development is directed towards the most sustainable settlements to ensure the most is made of existing infrastructure and service capacity and that the impact on the environmental constraints of the smaller villages and settlements (including Scarisbrick, Parbold and Rufford) is limited. Aughton and Up Holland are included in the wider settlement areas of Ormskirk and Skelmersdale. Comments relating to the Green Belt study noted. Comments relating to Health and Safety are noted. Planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts, sets out five purposes of including land in Green Belt. It is clear that the policy is intended to prevent areas from merging and that this is in relation to towns rather than parcels of land belonging to the same settlement. Furthermore, landscapes are also of importance within PPG2 but this is in relation to the preserving the setting and special character of historical towns rather than attractive landscapes near to where people live. I would agree that one of the clear purposes of the Green Belt is to protect the countryside from encroachment. However, in line with PPG2, Green Belt boundaries may be altered only when exceptional circumstances exist. The Council considers the need to meet growth targets and deliver development to meet the needs of the existing and future population to be &quot;exceptional&quot;. Furthermore, the fact that 91% of the Borough is designated as Green Belt and the actual amount of Green Belt land required is around 0.26% contributes further to the exceptional circumstances. Rather than ignoring the advice within the commissioned studies such as the SHLAA, the Council is acting on the outcomes. The SHLAA identifies available land which will support the delivery of housing for the Borough. It is clear to see that there is not enough available land within the existing settlement boundaries to deliver housing needs for the full length of the plan and so the Council considers it necessary to review other land for delivery purposes including Green Belt. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is currently being finalised with our partners and stakeholders who are responsible for infrastructure provision in the Borough. Any shortfalls in infrastructure capacity are identified within this document which will form the basis of delivery and sit alongside the Local Development Framework. The IDP initially focuses on critical infrastructure such as utilities and roads but it does include an overview of social infrastructure which covers all of the points made in the representation. Through additional development it is expected that contributions to and the delivery of many community facilities can be achieved. It is in this context that some of the known requirements have already been included in Policy CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No action required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cspo-308  Chris and Pauline Ambrose  
Plan Ref  5.4  Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm  
Summary  Object to Burscough Option. State preference for the non-preferred Ormskirk Option. (S)  
Response  Comments noted. Further work is underway to assess the full impact of traffic and it is proposed that any new development would need to incorporate features to manage surface water flooding as well as a solution to improve the wider problem of flooding.  
Recommendation  No action required

Cspo-309  Mr Steve Thompson  
Plan Ref  5.4  Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm  
Summary  Object to Burscough Option due to: 1) Traffic congestion 2) Increased pressure on Burscough Town Centre 3) Increased traffic would create hazards for school children 4) Burscough by-pass required in advance of any new residential development 5) Additional schools needed 6) Increased pressure on Burscough Health Centre 7) Increased demand for parking at the two railways stations 8) No capacity within existing utilities infrastructure 9) Flood risk issues in this part of Burscough 10) Location of proposed park is poorly placed 11) Safety issues due to proximity to Burscough Industrial Estate (S)  
Response  1 - 4) It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough options and further work is currently underway to assess the exact impact of this. At this stage there is no proposal for a Burscough bypass in order to overcome any of the existing or potential traffic impacts of development. However, it is likely that junction improvements could improve the situation. This is subject to the further work being carried out. 5) Policy CS3 does provide for a new primary school. 6) Central Lancashire Primary Care Trust have reviewed the Core Strategy and consider the health centre would be able to support the growing population and may even benefit from some planning contributions through development in order to upgrade the existing facilities. 7) No indication has been provided at this stage as to the amount of additional parking required to support both Burscough stations. 8) There is currently a programme in place to ensure a secure water supply for West Lancashire. However, issues associated with waste water treatment have been identified within the Core Strategy Preferred options Document. 9) According to the Environment Agency flood Risk Maps, Burscough does not suffer from significant risk of flood. However, there are incidents of surface water flooding that we are aware of and this would need to be resolved through any development that is brought forward. 10) The location of any feature is purely indicative at this stage and would be subject to a master planning exercise at a later stage. The exercise would include the community. 11) Through the master planning exercise, a substantial buffer would need to be maintained between the residential and employment uses.  
Recommendation  No action required

Cspo-310  Laura and Natalie Porter  
Plan Ref  5.4  Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm  
Summary  I would like to object to the proposed development of 800+ houses on the greenbelt land at Yew Tree Farm in Burscough. (F)  
Response  Comments noted  
Recommendation  No action required

Cspo-317  Mr Antony Beahan  
Plan Ref  5.4  Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm  
Summary  I would like to object to the proposed development of 800+ houses on the greenbelt land at Yew Tree Farm in Burscough. (F)  
Response  Comments noted  
Recommendation  No action required
Summary
Concerns over road congestion, unsuitable transport infrastructure, air pollution, unfair financial incentives from developers to the council, the affect of development on the value of residents homes, soical housing, the loss of arable farm land and a habitat for wildlife.

Response
With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as “Considerate Constructors”. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8,9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the “Have Your Say” leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst “new jobs” is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, “new, high quality business space” (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. “Improved transport” refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list “improved transport” as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase “improved drainage” refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation
No action required

Plan Ref
5.4
Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm

Object
Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm

Cspo-330
M Roughley
Summary
Concerned about road congestion, the lack of suitable transport infrastructure, air pollution, unfair financial incentives from the developer to the council, development will impact the value of residents homes, social housing, the use of high quality agricultural land for development and impact on the habitat of wildlife.

Response
With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as “Considerate Constructorsâ€”. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8, 9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business/office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the “Have Your Sayâ€” leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst “new jobsâ€” is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, “high quality business spaceâ€” (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. “Improved transportâ€” refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscoughâ€™s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list “Improved transportâ€” as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase “improved drainageâ€” refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation
No action required
Concerned over the increased traffic congestion, unsuitable transport infrastructure, air pollution, unfair financial incentives from the developers to the council, developments will affect the value of residents property, social housing, the use of agricultural land for development and a loss of wildlife habitat.

With regard to the general concerns highlighted:
1. Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions.
2. Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as "Considerate Constructors".
3. The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives.
4. Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated.
5. It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development.
6. The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business/office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry).
7. Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Ormskirk is of lesser quality than the land at Burscough.
8. The wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements.
9. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements.
10. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list "improved transport" as a benefit from the Burscough Option. The phrase refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen.

Recommendation: No action required.
Response

With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1, 2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3, 5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors.

4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7, 8, 9, 10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business/office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, a new, high quality business space (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. The phrase refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation

No action required

csp-350  T.P. McVeigh
Plan Ref  5.4  Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm
Summary  I would fully support 'Option 1' as the last way forward. (F)
Response  Comments noted
Recommendation  No action required

---

csp-356  Julie Hotchkiss
Plan Ref  5.4  Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm
Summary  I support Preferred Option 1 - the development at Yew Tree Farm in Burscough, this seems a good rounded development, with school, shops and park, as well as the new housing. I'd be very interested to know more about the renewable energy network. As we have passed peak oil, we all have to think about on own use, and generation, of energy. I'm very pleased to see such a consideration in the LDF.
Response  Comments noted and welcomed. More information will be provided regarding renewable energy networks either through master planning exercises which may be carried out on any strategic sites within the final Publication Core Strategy or an additional supplementary planning document designed to guide developers in this area.
Recommendation  No Action required
Response Comments noted. The Council makes every effort to consult with residents and has carried out 2 rounds of consultation.

Response Comments noted and welcomed. More information will be provided regarding renewable energy networks either through master planning exercises which may be carried out on any strategic sites within the final Publication Core Strategy or an additional supplementary planning document designed to guide developers in this area.

Recommen-dation No action required

Plan Ref 5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm

Summary I support Preferred Option 1 - the development at Yew Tree Farm in Burscough, this seems a good rounded development, with school, shops and park, as well as the new housing. I’d be very interested to know more about the renewable energy network. As we have passed peak oil, we all have to think about own use, and generation, of energy. I’m very pleased to see such a consideration in the LDF.

Recommen-dation No action required

Plan Ref 5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm

Summary With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1,2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3,5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors®. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7,8,9,10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst new jobs are specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, high quality business space (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. Improved transport refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list improved transport as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommen-dation No action required

Plan Ref 5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm

Summary I would like to express my objection to the proposal of West Lancashire Local Development Framework Option 1 - Burscough I am unhappy that we have not been better informed of the proposals and the council have not taken time to listen to the views of the residents before putting these new developments forward. I have sent a written object to your offices and I will fight with other residents to ensure these developments do NOT go ahead!!! (F)

Recommen-dation No action required.
The greatest concern with the proposed development however is the impact that it will have on our roads and how our schools and nurseries will cope with the additional demand. There are so many issues with this site I could mention; drainage problems, access problems, air pollution reaching unacceptable levels, resale value of homes dropping massively, sewerage issues, policing challenges, road safety for pedestrians, not to mention the huge traffic problems. 

Response

Whilst the Council sympathises with the concerns of local residents in relation to house prices and views, these issues are considerations outside of the planning system. Concerns regarding traffic congestion have been noted and further work is currently ongoing to assess the full impact. All community infrastructure is planned for within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and any identified needs must be delivered in line with development. Comments noted regarding Ormskirk Option.

Recommen-dation

No action required

Plan Ref 5.4

Chris Whitehead

Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm

Summary

Concerned with traffic congestion, the linking of the houses between Higgins Lane, Liverpool Road South etc. with Burscough Industrial Estate that the proposed developments would bring about, not enough community facilities for more people and drainage and sewerage problems. (S)

Response

Comments regarding Health and Safety are also noted. In the event the Burscough Strategic site is the preferred option then a Master planning exercise would need to be carried out to ensure an appropriate buffer was maintained between conflicting uses. Comments regarding emissions are also noted. Community facilities are planned for through the Infrastructure Delivery plan and where there is a shortfall identified, it would need to be delivered in line with the development. Surface water drainage is a concern of the Council’s and United Utilities and would need to be managed and mitigated through the development of any sites within Burscough. Policy CS3 sets out the requirement for any development on the Strategic Site to incorporate measures to address the surface water issues in Burscough.

Recommen-dation

No action required

Plan Ref 5.4

Lawrence and Janice McNabb

Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm

Summary

Object to Burscough site.

Response

Comments and concerns noted and considered when assessing sites for development.

Recommen-dation

No action.

Plan Ref 5.4

Mrs J Tennison

Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm

Summary

I object to the Burscough option. Green Belt needs to be preserved. (S)

Response

Comments noted. It is intended to develop the Ainscough’s Mill site (Junction Lane) whether or not the Yew Tree Farm site is chosen.

Recommen-dation

No change.

Plan Ref 5.4

Mr Lee Richardson

Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm

Summary

Supports Burscough Option with the Dispersal Option as Plan B. Non-preferred option unsuitable due to impact on traffic and insufficient infrastructure. (S)

Response

Noted

Recommen-dation

No Action Required

Plan Ref 5.4

Ailsa Bell

Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm

Summary

We are disappointed that conserving and enhancing biodiversity, landscape, recreation opportunities and access to green spaces has not been included as an integral part of this policy. We welcome its revision to include them, especially with reference to development and the new park. This is also an opportunity to include references to green infrastructure (GI) as a broader approach to planned GI to enhance existing opportunities.

Response

Comments noted, however these requirements are dealt with elsewhere in the plan and it is not considered necessary to repeat this information here. This policy seeks to set out the the main uses that will be located on this site.

Recommen-dation

No action required.
CS3 - Neither the policy nor the justification draw attention to the existence of nearby listed buildings and it will be important to assess the importance of the open space behind these buildings to their setting.

Response: Comments noted and protection of the nearby listed buildings will be covered by the provisions of Policy CS17. As the buildings do not fall within the site it is considered that adding such wording to Policy CS3 is inappropriate.

Recommendation: No action.

Further consideration should be given to the Alternative Option 1 (i.e. the ‘Dispersal’ Option), in particular the use of non-Green Belt land in Banks, which has capacity for more than 100 dwellings.

Response: It is agreed that wherever possible, non-Green Belt land should be developed before Green Belt development is contemplated. The Council also accepts that in theory, more than 100 dwellings could be accommodated on non-Green Belt and non-flood risk land within the Banks "area of search". However, the extra impact resulting from significantly more than 100 dwellings on drainage, local services, highways, etc. is considered prohibitive, and an important factor in justifying Green Belt release. It is not accepted that no reason was given for rejecting "Alternative Option 1" : paragraph 7.1.24 gives the reason for rejection as: "this approach, with its lack of control, could lead to unsustainable patterns of development, with attractive small rural settlements likely to be more popular for developers than the main, most sustainable settlements. Skelmersdale in particular may not attract the levels of investment needed to deliver regeneration."

Recommendation: No change.

Support for Burscough but number of issues need to be addressed - including infrastructure, car parking, roads and timing of delivery.

Response: Comments noted. The Council is well aware of all of the issues associated with large scale development where ever it is directed within the Borough, and specifically the issues in Burscough. It is considered that these can genuinely be overcome with developer contributions which will be managed carefully.

Recommendation: No action.

Support for Burscough option. Concerns raised about parking if Edge Hill University expands.

Response: Opinion noted for Option 1 (Burscough Strategic Development Site). Policy CS6 requires the University to incorporate measures to address traffic impacts and parking issues in any proposals they may put forward for expansion of the existing campus.

Recommendation: No Action Required.

I support Option 1 (Burscough). I am totally against the non-preferred option (Ormskirk).

Response: Comments noted.

Recommendation: No action required.
Summary

Concerned over traffic congestion due to new developments, unsuitable infrastructure which will also add to the traffic congestion, air pollution, an affect on the value of residents homes, social housing and losing valuable agricultural and Green Belt land.

Response

With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3:5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate ConstructorsScheme. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business/office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. Whilst it is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, high quality business space refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list transport improvements as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase drainage refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just mitigation for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted.Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. Farming Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. Sewerage The Council is aware of the current capacity issues of the sewerage/waste water network and are working with industry partners United Utilities to identify solutions. This is being done through the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Recommendation

No action required.

---

cspo-623

Robert J. & K. ADA Travis

Plan Ref 5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm

Object

Summary

Concerns over road congestion, the effects on farming and increased flooding and sewage problems.

Response

Traffic Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. Farming Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. Sewerage The Council is aware of the current capacity issues of the sewerage/waste water network and are working with industry partners United Utilities to identify solutions. This is being done through the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Recommendation

No action.

---

cspo-628

Mrs Jeannie Pritchard

Plan Ref 5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm

Object

Summary

I object to the Burscough option owing to flooding and traffic concerns, the length of time building will take place, and loss of Green Belt. (S).

Response

Comments noted.

Recommendation

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

Page 139
Summary
Concerns over traffic congestion, air pollution, the effect of development on house prices, social housing and the use of agricultural land and Green Belt for development.

Response
With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1, 2: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 3, 5: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructors. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be to provide for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (e.g. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7, 8, 9: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst new jobs is not specifically stated for the non-preferred Ormskirk option, new, high quality business space (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. Improved transport refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough’s traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list improved transport as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase improved drainage refers to improvements to the sewerage infrastructure for Burscough as a whole, not just for the development site. 5. It is considered that, given traffic congestion is currently worse in Ormskirk than in Burscough, the wording of the leaflet is justified. However, it is accepted that the same phrase could reasonably have been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

Recommendation
No action required

Plan Ref 5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm
Object

Plan Ref 5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm
Object

Plan Ref 5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm
Object

Plan Ref 5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm
Object

Plan Ref 5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm
Object
**Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm**

### Summary
Concerned over the use of Green Belt for development, traffic congestion, a decreased value on residents homes, air pollution and increased pressures on services.

#### Response
With regard to the general concerns highlighted: 1: Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. 2: Unfortunately, people living near to any building site will suffer upheaval temporarily during construction. This could only be avoided if new housing were built remotely from other development, which is clearly not a sustainable option. Impact of construction can be minimised through planning conditions, e.g. on working hours, and through schemes such as Considerate Constructorsâ€…. 4: The Council can confirm that the choice of development site has not been driven by financial incentives. 6: Any social housing constructed in Burscough will be provided for local needs, and will be offered firstly only to those on the waiting list living in Burscough, then to those with a recognised connection to Burscough (eg. they grew up in Burscough before moving away). Any remaining units would be offered to people from elsewhere, but only once the above two groups have been accommodated. 7, 8, 9, 10: It is recognised that there are negative traffic impacts associated with both the Ormskirk and Burscough sites. Similarly, development on either site would have impacts upon views, the openness of the Green Belt, prime agricultural land, and wildlife. The Burscough site scores better in some respects, the Ormskirk site in other respects, but, weighing up all relevant factors, the Council considers the Burscough site is the better one to propose for development. 8: The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business/office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). 9: Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk. 11: The Core Strategy is required to meet the needs of the Borough as a whole. It is accepted that certain development sites will unfortunately have negative impacts, and it is the role of the Plan, whilst constrained by a significant range of factors, to choose a development strategy that provides the maximum possible benefits and minimum disbenefits. The concerns listed relating to the Have Your Say leaflet are noted, but it is not true that the Council have little real interest in the views of the public. The Council will pay close attention to all representations received during the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation. With regard to the specific points listed: 1. Comments noted. 2. Comments noted. Whilst new jobs is listed as a benefit from the Burscough Option, refers to high quality business space (which implies new jobs) is listed as a benefit. 3. Improved transport refers to highways and public transport improvements that would be paid for if the Burscough site were to be chosen. It is recognised that significant additional expenditure would be required to solve Burscough's traffic problems; however, it is considered reasonable to list improved transport as a benefit from the Burscough Option. 4. The phrase has been used for both settlements. 6. Comments noted. Whilst not explicitly stated on the leaflet, one of the factors taken into account when deciding which options would be preferred or non-preferred was the benefits associated with University expansion.

#### Recommendations
- **csp0-688**
  - **Plan Ref**: 5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm
  - **Summary**: Support for Option 1 - Burscough as its infrastructure would be better suited to the changes suggested. No further dwellings should be allowed in Banks until United Utilities have rectified the sewerage & drainage problems. (S)
  - **Response**: Comments noted. The Council is aware that there are infrastructure issues in Banks.
  - **Recommendation**: No action required.

- **csp0-69**
  - **Plan Ref**: 5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm
  - **Summary**: No action required.
  - **Response**: Mr Carl Gore-Herbert
  - **Recommendation**: No action required.

- **csp0-7**
  - **Plan Ref**: 5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm
  - **Summary**: Supports Burscough option. Banks has too many problems with infrastructure. (S)
  - **Response**: Views Noted
  - **Recommendation**: No Action Required

- **csp0-701**
  - **Plan Ref**: 5.4 Policy Area CS3: Burscough Yew Tree Farm
  - **Summary**: Improve the infrastructure first, preserve our greenbelt land and utilise brown field sites, and then the people of Burscough may be more open to discussion about development.
  - **Response**: Comments noted
  - **Recommendation**: No further action required
Summary I am writing to voice my concern over the planning proposals that have been put forward for the Yew Tree Farm site in Burscough.

Response Re Traffic Initial traffic modelling is being conducted by the Council to assess the impact of the Preferred Options. Where issues are identified, the Council will seek to provide appropriate mitigation measures and/or transport improvements, including through developer contributions. Education From speaking to the Local Education Authority the Council have been informed that school capacity in Burscough is limited and that new developments may go above the existing capacity. For this reason the Burscough strategic site development includes a new school Health Through the Councils Infrastructure Delivery Plan the Council have been liaising with the health authority to ensure that sufficient facilities are in place/ or will be in place to cope with any new development. Infrastructure The Council are aware that there are issues with the the waste water treatment capacity and that any new development in areas such as Burscough will require upgrading the facilities. The Council has been investigating this issue as part of its Infrastructure Delivery Plan and significant development will not take place until the issue has been resolved. Green Belt The Burscough site is effectively surrounded by development. As such, it is considered that its development would have the least impact upon the West Lancashire Green Belt out of all sites considered. If chosen for development, buffers would be provided between residential and employment uses (which are likely to be business /office uses, rather than manufacturing and heavy industry). Ideally, the Council would prefer not to lose any of its prime agricultural land, which is a recognised valuable resource. However, given housing requirements and supply, some agricultural land will need to be developed. Information from DEFRA states that the land at Burscough is of lesser quality than the land at Ormskirk.

Recommendation No action required

Response Comments noted. The 'area of search' is broad, and if a specific site is eventually chosen south of the M58, the precise findings of the Green Belt study, plus the existence of hazardous waste sites, etc. would be taken into account. With regard to the need for the land: Based on past take up rates and future economic projections, along with population projections, a future land take has been calculated for the Core Strategy period. Whilst the intention is to prioritise re-use of existing vacant employment sites or underused sites, it has been calculated that this will not be sufficient to sustain the economy of the Borough up until 2027. To this end, further employment land has been identified within the Green Belt to meet these needs. It is essential that enough employment land is identified in order that West Lancashire does not merely neglect the future needs of the Borough. The intention is to broaden the economic base in West Lancashire to become a residential area for commuters working in other nearby towns and cities. This would be wholly unsustainable and would neglect the future needs of the Borough. The intention is to broaden the economic base in West Lancashire to include specialised industries linked to Edge Hill University and also the Green Economy, as well as building on existing strengths.

Recommendation No action required.
The location of new employment land to the south of Skelmersdale has been defined using various sources of evidence. The Green Belt Study identified a site to the north of Skelmersdale which was no longer fulfilling the purpose of the Green Belt, however other factors such as accessibility and sustainability need to be taken into account when selecting sites for future development. The identified area of search for new employment is considered to be sustainable and accessible given its proximity to the M58, proximity to other employment areas and proximity to a local workforce in Skelmersdale and the wider Borough.

Mrs Jackie Liptrott

Observations

Policy CS4 The Economy and Employment Land

Object

Policy CS4 The Economy and Employment Land

Object

Policy CS4 The Economy and Employment Land

Object

Crompton property developments

Object

The Economy and Employment Land

Object
Summary I wish to object to the strategic development options identified in the Core Strategy paper on the basis that the identified options unnecessarily constrain the possible larger scale employment development of the south Skelmersdale area of employment land throughout the identified areas in the borough is correct, particularly in view of the acknowledged infrastructure issues which have been identified in the consultation paper. (S)

Response It is considered appropriate and sustainable to focus much of the regeneration of existing employment sites and development of new employment uses in Skelmersdale. However, it is also necessary to ensure that new employment community and whilst existing employment sites may be smaller than those in Skelmersdale they still have an important role in terms of the Borough's economy. Such areas must be protected and enhanced in future, rather than neglected. We do appreciate support for the majority of new development to be focused in Skelmersdale, and this is indeed emphasised within the Core Strategy document, however, some employment land must be provided elsewhere in the Borough in appropriate locations.

Recommendation No action.

cspo-202 Mrs Anne-Sophie Bonton Planning Officer
Plan Ref 6.1 Policy Area CS4: The Economy and Employment Land
Summary Supportive of Policy CS4 and location of employment sites in rural areas, however, concern over transport issues. (s)
Response We appreciate the comments regarding traffic congestion and this is something that we have considered throughout the Core Strategy document, in all chapters. When deciding on the location for new development, sites or broad areas have been identified which are considered to be most sustainable in terms of access and public transport provision and this will be further clarified as specific sites are identified within subsequent development plan documents. Accessibility to jobs, particularly to the local population, is a key issue which the Core Strategy and the wider Local Development Framework seeks to address.

Recommendation No action.

cspo-313 IKO Plc
Plan Ref 6.1 Policy Area CS4: The Economy and Employment Land
Summary Suggest a less restrictive policy which allows for the release of older employment sites for residential development whilst at the same time allowing businesses to relocate to more suitable modern premises. Suggested wording included. (S)
Response Appreciate the thrust of the comments and viability of older existing employment sites is something that the Council is considering within emerging policy. We accept that some of the proposed changes may be helpful, for instance the sentence 'Redevelopment of employment sites for residential or mixed-uses will be supported where this is in the overall interest of economic growth, environmental improvement and housing supply' may be a useful addition. However, we are conscious that the Core Strategy sets out the broad approach to future employment development and we consider that the wording in the draft largely reflects the Council's position as the presumption will remain on protecting existing employment sites unless there is a strong viability case against this.

Recommendation Changes to be made to the policy to allow for greater flexibility for the redevelopment of older employment sites for residential uses where they are not part of major existing employment areas or future allocated sites, and where a viability case can be

cspo-393 North West Skelmersdale Owners
Plan Ref 6.1 Policy Area CS4: The Economy and Employment Land
Summary The Council's 'Area of Search' for Green Belt release is flawed. This land is remote from the main urban area, built south of M58. The land offers no long-term defensible boundary other options offer an improved prospect.
Response It is considered that the area of employment land to the south of Skelmersdale is appropriate for sustainable economic growth up to 2027. It is accessible in terms of proximity to M58, other significant employment areas and it is close to a sizeable workforce in Skelmersdale and beyond.

Recommendation No action.

cspo-404 Wirral to Wyre Team Natural England
Plan Ref 6.1 Policy Area CS4: The Economy and Employment Land
Summary Again, we are disappointed that conserving and enhancing biodiversity, landscape, recreation opportunities and access to green spaces has not been included as part of this policy. We are welcome its revision to include them, especially with reference to the role of any development in planning networks of greenspace, along with the provision of such links where they can be used for sustainable transport networks. A further opportunity to include references to green infrastructure (GI) as a broader approach to planned GI to enhance existing opportunities and contribute to sustainable development. (f)
Response Green infrastructure, landscape and bio-diversity is dealt with through a separate policy and applies to the whole Borough, where appropriate. This reference is not considered necessary within Policy CS4.

Recommendation No action.
Peel would like the Council to reconsider its new employment allocations and distribution as stated in Policy CS4. Peel believes that the expansion of Simonswood Employment Area to include the 21 ha south of Stopgate Lane would help the Council meet its objectives as stated in the Core Strategy without the need to use Green Belt.

Response: The Council does not consider that further employment development at Simonswood is a sustainable approach. Simonswood is not the most accessible area in the Borough being at the southern most point. Indeed, it is relatively close to the motorway network but, given its proximity to Kirkby it is likely to serve the population of Knowsley more than those from West Lancashire. Simonswood does not have adequate services or population to support major employment growth.

Recommendation: No action.

Mr Alan Hubbard
Land Use Planning Adviser
The National Trust

Response: Support approach to so response.

Recommendation: No action.

Mrs Margaret Wiltshire
Planning Volunteer, Treasurer
CPRE (West Lancs Group)

Response: The Core Strategy seeks to promote a suitable mix of employment functions and B8 distribution units are likely to fall within this mix. We are however aware of the implications in terms of low ratio of employees to size of unit and also the traffic implications associated with distribution. The intention of the Core Strategy is to broaden the economic base of the Borough, to increase the number of offices and start up units for higher tech industries and also to development green technologies where possible.

Recommendation: No action.

Mr Martyn Coy
Planner British Waterways

Response: Points considered.

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

Response Agree with the general thrust of comments made and the Core Strategy Preferred Options broadly supports them. The Core Strategy sets out the vision and strategy for how we want West Lancashire to develop up to 2027. Specific development control issues regarding the conversion of derelict former farm buildings will be dealt with within subsequent DPDs. The importance of protecting the rural economy and surrounding communities is identified within the Core Strategy.

Recommendation No action.

Plan Ref 6.2 Policy Area CSS: The Rural Economy

Observations

Policy Area CS5: The Rural Economy

Summary The importance of the tourism economy is not emphasised within CS5 policy. A separate tourism policy would be useful. The policy should be amended to reflect the role of heritage within the tourism and visitor economies and to reflect the potential importance to the tourism and visitor economy of the Ribble Coast and Wetlands Regional Park (which encompasses the heritage features referred to above as well as a range of important natural assets). The Park is referred to in the text but with the incorrect name of Ribble Estuary Regional Park. Amended policy wording suggested. (S)

Response Appreciate the emphasis on heritage assets and their contribution to the rural economy, in addition to natural assets. The policy will be amended as suggested above. 

Recommendation Amend policy wording as suggested and change name of Ribble Coast and Wetlands Regional Park on page 74.

Plan Ref 6.2 Policy Area CSS: The Rural Economy

Observations

Policy Area CS5: The Rural Economy

Summary This policy should also address the future of traditional farm buildings, taking a flexible approach to their sensitive adaptation and re-use. The document list could usually refer to the English Heritage guidance The Conversion of Traditional Farm Buildings: a guide to good practice as well as PPS5. (F)

Response See CSPO_427 - repeated rep.

Recommendation See CSPO_427 - repeated rep.

Plan Ref 6.2 Policy Area CSS: The Rural Economy

Observations

Policy Area CS5: The Rural Economy

Summary The LDF does not offer enough support for the rural economy

Response Comments noted. Proposed Policy CS5 seeks to promote the rural economy, albeit in line with the wider national policy agenda, in order to allow the rural economy to prosper and diversify where appropriate. The policy specifically refers to employment, residential and community uses being suitable within rural areas, particularly those which are linked to the agricultural use of land - small and related retail functions of this nature would therefore likely be deemed appropriate. Restrictions must be imposed, however, for larger scale retail uses in such rural areas, which would contravene national policy in relation to sustainable development. It is important that aspirations for broadband internet remain part of the policy in order to improve such facilities in rural areas.

Recommendation No action.

Plan Ref 6.2 Policy Area CSS: The Rural Economy

Observations

Policy Area CS6

Summary I object to the expansion of the Edge Hill campus into green Belt. I am against the use of Green Belt in any context. I wish to preserve the unique nature of Ormskirk as an attractive Market Town in an agricultural setting. (S)

Response Comments noted. At the time of the 2005 Local Plan Inquiry, the Council considered Edge Hill had not made a robust case for the need for expansion onto Green Belt land. Since then, the Council has accepted that the University does have a robust case for needing to expand. Any removal of land from the Green Belt must be justified by â€œvery exceptional circumstancesâ€ and the Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper proposes that the need to begin to resolve any student accommodation, highways and car parking impacts caused by Edge Hill University constitutes those very exceptional circumstances.

Recommendation No further action
Objection to the expansion of Edge Hill into the Green Belt and also housing in the Green Belt. Particular concern for the Green Belt bounded by Ruff Lane, St Helens and Scarth Hill Lane. Opposed to the ‘sprawl’ of Edge Hill University. (S)

Response

Edge Hill University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy, to the tune of approximately £60m. Whilst we appreciate the concerns of local residents in terms of student accommodation and services taking over the town, the Council must try to deliver a strategy which meets the needs of all local stakeholders. By identifying a limited area for expansion in the Green Belt over a 15 year period (10 ha of expansion land), the Council will not only have a greater say on the scale of future development but can also request that a greater amount of student facilities, such as new accommodation, can be provided on campus. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt.

Recommendation

No action.

---

Policy CS6

Mr G Leather

Summary

Objection to the expansion of Edge Hill into the Green Belt and also housing in the Green Belt. Particular concern for the Green Belt bounded by Ruff Lane, St Helens and Scarth Hill Lane. Opposed to the ‘sprawl’ of Edge Hill University. (S)

Response

Edge Hill University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy, to the tune of approximately £60m. Whilst we appreciate the concerns of local residents in terms of student accommodation and services taking over the town, the Council must try to deliver a strategy which meets the needs of all local stakeholders. By identifying a limited area for expansion in the Green Belt over a 15 year period (10 ha of expansion land), the Council will not only have a greater say on the scale of future development but can also request that a greater amount of student facilities, such as new accommodation, can be provided on campus. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt.

Recommendation

No action.

---

Mr Paul W

Summary

Edge Hill Uni should collaborate and develop with Ormskirk. (S)

Response

No comments - support.

Recommendation

No action.

---

Mr Francis Williams

Summary

We look to continued uncertainty in the HE sector, and counsel caution in considering demands on adjacent land placed by the University. (S)

Response

Concerns in relation to the future of Edge Hill University are noted and indeed it remains unknown how student numbers will fair in the immediate future. The Core Strategy does, however, need to deal with development up to 2027 and in this time it is expected that the University will need some additional land, even if student numbers stay broadly the same. All of the options presented in the Core Strategy allow for 10ha of expansion land at Edge Hill. It is considered that this will allow for managed and minimal levels of expansion into the Green Belt. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt. Lastly, the University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy and the Council seeks to support its future plans, whilst attempting to reduce any detrimental impact on local people.

Recommendation

No action.

---

Mr Edward Hunt

Summary

I wish to object to the proposed extension of Edge Hill into the green belt area up to Scarth Hill Lane and Ruff Lane. A market town is being changed into a University town without notice being taken of the Ormskirk population wishes. (F)

Response

The Core Strategy Preferred Option document is not suggesting built development up to Scarth Hill Lane and Ruff Lane. The plan which shows a new university sports facility up to Scarth Hill Lane, which would remain in the Green Belt, is the Council’s non-preferred option for Green Belt release as it is considered to be the least sustainable of all the Green Belt options. A 10ha expansion site for Edge Hill is identified within all of the options, however, this ‘area of search’ sits alongside the existing built up area and does not reach as far as Scarth Hill Lane. By identifying a small area for expansion of the built part of the University campus, the Council can manage the level of development on this site and request facilities such as student accommodation on campus, thereby reducing some negative impacts on the town of Ormskirk. The alternative is that we do not allow for any expansion into the Green Belt within the Core Strategy and this way the Council is opening itself up to unmanaged growth at the University and the potential receipt of planning applications which it may not be able to refuse. This could lead to more development and a greater impact on the Green Belt.

Recommendation

No action.
Response

We appreciate the concerns regarding expansion land at Edge Hill University, the Core Strategy has to consider development over the next 15 year period up to 2027. We have been working closely with the University to ascertain details on predicted student numbers over this period. Whilst it is difficult to be precise with the current changing nature of the Higher Education sector, the University considers that even without growth in student numbers further development will be required to ensure it has the facilities it requires on campus to operate efficiently and improve its offer. For example, some of this additional land is likely to be developed for on-campus student accommodation, relieving pressure on housing in Ormskirk more generally. If we do not allocate some land for Green Belt release in order to ensure a managed approach to development at Edge Hill University, we may open the area up to more significant development in the Green Belt as the Council could be challenged on the refusal of any broader planning applications for not allowing for some development within the adopted development plan. This could have significant detrimental impacts on the Green Belt and is something we want to avoid by agreeing an approach upfront with the University.

Recommendation

No action.

cspo-595

Mr Keith Keeley

Policy CS6  Edge Hill University

Summary

Alternative sites for a satellite campus should be considered across the district and possibly Southport to spread economic benefits across the Borough. (S)

Response

Edge Hill promotes itself as a single campus University and this is embedded in its approach to Higher Education which distinguishes it from the other mainly city centre universities. Whilst this is an option that has been considered, it is felt that with minimal development into the Green Belt, the University's needs can be accommodated for the foreseeable future. Regardless of this, the Core Strategy seeks to spread the benefits of having this major institution in Ormskirk throughout the remainder of the Borough. This is to be achieved by linking the University with growing employment sectors and providing more jobs generally within the Borough either through directly working for the University, or working within one of the key service areas which has developed as a result of the University.

Recommendation

No action.

cspo-697

Mr L McFarlane

Policy CS6  Edge Hill University

Summary

Objections raised to Edge Hill University's expansion and to development on Green Belt (S)

Response

We appreciate the comments and concerns about the expansion plans and indeed the Council operates in order to achieve a common ground for all stakeholders and needs to balance the benefits of the University with the loss of open Green Belt. Edge Hill University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy, contributing in excess of £60 million per year and therefore is a major consideration in terms of the Core Strategy going forward. However, we agree that the town of Ormskirk should not be 'consumed' by the University and we consider that the best approach is to allow for small-scale managed growth within the Core Strategy document. The Core Strategy covers a 15 year period until 2027 and must plan for requirements within this time. The University has undergone a major redevelopment programme over the last 10 years in order to make better use of existing space, however it has identified that even without growth in student numbers a small amount of additional land will be required up to 2027 in order for the University to operate most effectively. One potential use for the additional land is to provide more on-campus student accommodation, thereby relieving some of the existing pressures on the Ormskirk housing market. The alternative to allowing for some small-scale expansion in the Core Strategy is to not provide for any and then open ourselves up to criticism, challenge and the risk of receiving planning applications for larger scale development in the Green Belt which we may not be able to refuse. The approach adopted is therefore considered to be the best way to manage and limit development at the University and wider impacts on the town, whilst ensuring that it continues to be a major contributor to the local economy. It is intended that any expansion plans will also need to provide necessary infrastructure to alleviate traffic problems.

Recommendation

No action.

cspo-85

Mr Ian Yates

Policy CS6  Edge Hill University

Summary

I oppose the proposal that we should allow Edge Hill to develop into the Green Belt. (S)

Response

We consider that the approach identified in the Core Strategy is the best means of ensuring a managed approach to the growth of the University. By identifying a limited area for expansion over a 15 year period (10 ha of expansion land), the Council will not only have a greater say on the scale of future development but can also request that a greater amount of student facilities, such as new accommodation, can be provided on campus. Without this provision, the Council will have no policy on which to refuse future planning applications that the University may submit and could be exposed to much bigger expansion plans with a much greater impact on the surrounding Green Belt.

Recommendation

No action.
The University is our area’s best asset and offers local residents access to leisure and entertainment as well as training professionals who often stay and work around the West Lancashire area. We should be proud of having such an asset within West Lancashire and help it to continue to grow.

Response
Comments Noted.

Recommendation
No action.

Mrs Amanda Boult
Plan Ref 6.3 Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University
Summary
Since Edge Hill University underpins much of the economy in Ormskirk its development should be encouraged. This would alleviate pressure on housing in the area, increase employment opportunities and disperse traffic. (S)
Response
Comments noted.

Mrs Jackie Liptrott
Plan Ref 6.3 Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University
Summary
Totally against: 1. Increase in housing by 600 dwellings 2. Increase in student numbers 3 Destruction of Green Belt for profit I wish to remain in Ormskirk and bring up my young family here for many years but feel people will be driven away if it becomes a soulless ghost town of a place. A bypass is needed. (S)
Response
Much of the above comment is in relation to the Green Belt options - comments noted. However, in relation to the comments on Edge Hill University, which it is stated should not be allowed to expand, the response is as follows: Edge Hill University is a major contributor to the Borough’s economy, to the tune of approximately Â£60m. Whilst we appreciate the concerns of local residents in terms of student accommodation and services taking over the town, the Council must try to deliver a strategy which meets the needs of all local stakeholders. By identifying a limited area for expansion over a 15 year period (10 ha of expansion land), the Council will not only have a greater say on the scale of future development but can also request that a greater amount of student facilities, such as new accommodation, can be provided on campus.

Recommendation
No action.

Mr Steve Mansell
Plan Ref 6.3 Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University
Summary
Further expansion will have such a negative impact on the real tax paying people living in Ormskirk in many, many ways. NO to build upon GREEN BELT. It’s outrageous to even consider this. (S)
Response
Edge Hill University is a major contributor to the Borough’s economy, to the tune of approximately Â£60m, and the Council seeks to support its future plans, whilst attempting to reduce any detrimental impact on local people. Concerns in relation to the future of Edge Hill University are noted and indeed it remains unknown how student numbers will fair in the immediate future. The Core Strategy does, however, need to deal with development up to 2027 and in this time it is expected that the University will need some additional land, even if student numbers stay broadly the same. It is considered that the area of land identified within the draft Core Strategy will allow for managed and minimal levels of expansion into the Green Belt. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt.

Recommendation
No action.
Summary Firstly, EHU must accept that enough is enough - the vast majority of Ormskirk residents have become weary of its endless, obdurate 'expansion' saga. Secondly, the Council should close the door on any expansion by EHU into green belt, before it is too late, and insist that EHU make more intensive use of existing facilities.

Response Edge Hill University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy, to the tune of approximately Â£60m, and the Council seeks to support its future plans, whilst attempting to reduce any detrimental impact on local people. Concerns in relation to the future of Edge Hill University are noted and indeed it remains unknown how student numbers will fair in the immediate future. The Core Strategy does, however, need to deal with development up to 2027 and in this time it is expected that the University will need some additional land, even if student numbers stay broadly the same. It is considered that the area of land identified within the draft Core Strategy will allow for managed and minimal levels of expansion into the Green Belt. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt. The Draft Green Belt Study which identifies land bounded by Ruff Lane and St Helens Road and adjacent to Edge Hill as ORM.07 is an evidence base document and not a policy document. What this means is that the study was carried out in order to inform planning policy which will be developed through the Local Development Framework process. The important difference is that what is identified within the evidence base may not in all circumstances be carried through as policy and ultimately, the Green Belt Study itself cannot remove land from the Green Belt. It is the Core Strategy which identifies areas of land to be removed from Green Belt and within the latest version, the Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper, the proposals do not propose to remove the whole of the parcel of land known as ORM.07 from the Green Belt. The proposal is for a much smaller area of land (10ha) within the parcel that is directly adjacent to the existing Green Belt boundary. Furthermore, any removal of land from the Green Belt must still be justified by âœvery exceptional circumstancesâ and the Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper proposes that the need to begin to resolve any student accommodation, highways and car parking impacts caused by Edge Hill University constitutes those very exceptional circumstances. In relation to space utilisation, the University has been through a programme of redveloping and improving its existing campus as part of the University's estates strategy. Whilst this is still being completed to improve utilisation of the campus, it is considered by the university that a further 10ha of land will be required up until 2027 regardless of changes in student numbers.

Recommendation No action.

cspo-195 Mrs EA Broad Parish Clerk Lathom South Parish Council

Plan Ref 6.3 Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University

Summary The Parish Council object to the proposal to remove from Green Belt all of the land up to Scarth Hill Lane owned by Edge Hill. It would be better for West Lancashire if any expansion of the university is accommodated in the Skelmersdale area. This would stop the current policy of concentrating higher educational opportunities and consequently better quality employment in Ormskirk and creating a âœthem and usâ scenario. It would also relieve the traffic issues around the university. (S)

Response The reference to an area of housing fronting Ruff Lane is taken from the Ormskirk 'non-preferred' option for development in the Green Belt. The Council has identified this as a non-preferred option due to traffic and sustainability issues and also due to the value of the Green Belt in this area, particularly land around Alty's Lane. This means that at the current time the Council does not wish to pursue this option. Edge Hill University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy, to the tune of approximately Â£50m, and the Council seeks to support its future plans, whilst attempting to reduce any detrimental impact on local people. The Core Strategy does, however, need to deal with development up to 2027 and in this time it is expected that the University will need some additional land, even if student numbers stay broadly the same. It is considered that the area of land identified within the draft Core Strategy will allow for managed and minimal levels of expansion into the Green Belt. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt. The Core Strategy sets broad policy themes and identifies 'areas of search' for particular uses. Land allocations are indeed not fixed until a later stage. Whilst the idea of locating some of the University facilities in Skelmersdale has much merit, the University are opposed to such a course of action.

Recommendation No action.

cspo-212 Mr Paul Greenwood

Plan Ref 6.3 Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University

Summary I strongly support the further expansion of Edge Hill and all the financial, employment and community engagement benefits that it will bring (S)

Response No comments - support.

Recommendation No action.

cspo-215 Mr Gareth Lougher

Plan Ref 6.3 Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University

Summary Allow each application to encroach into Green Belt areas to be judge on the merits of the application. (S) Allowing Edge Hill to prosper and continue to progress will enable Ormskirk and the borough to gain the benefits of a University town.

Response No comments - support.

Recommendation No action.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csso-275</th>
<th>Sue Evans</th>
<th>Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Further expansion of the university into the green belt should be abandoned until future trends can be more easily predicted. (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Concerns in relation to the future of Edge Hill University are noted and indeed it remains unknown how student numbers will fair in the immediate future. The Core Strategy does, however, need to deal with development up to 2027 and in this time it is expected that the University will need some additional land, even if student numbers stay broadly the same. All of the options presented in the Core Strategy allow for 10ha of expansion land at Edge Hill. It is considered that this will allow for managed and minimal levels of expansion into the Green Belt. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt. Lastly, the University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy and the Council seeks to support its future plans, whilst attempting to reduce any detrimental impact on local people. Options such as having a split campus have been raised with the University in the past, however, it is not considered to be viable at the current time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csso-276</th>
<th>Ray Craig</th>
<th>Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Objection to expansion of Edge Hill Uni using green belt release. (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Edge Hill University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy, to the tune of approximately Â£60m. Whilst we appreciate the concerns of local residents in terms of student accommodation and services taking over the town, the Council must try to deliver a strategy which meets the needs of all local stakeholders. By identifying a limited area for expansion in the Green Belt over a 15 year period (10 ha of expansion land), the Council will not only have a greater say on the scale of future development but can also request that a greater amount of student facilities, such as new accommodation, can be provided on campus. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt. Lastly, the University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy and the Council seeks to support its future plans, whilst attempting to reduce any detrimental impact on local people. Options such as having a split campus have been raised with the University in the past, however, it is not considered to be viable at the current time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csso-281</th>
<th>Mary Hill</th>
<th>Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>I object to the proposed release of 10ha of Green Belt Land for yet more development by the university. University development should be spread to other towns (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>We appreciate the concerns of local residents regarding the changing nature of Ormskirk and the Core Strategy recognises the needs of all stakeholders. The University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy and the Council seeks to support its future plans, whilst attempting to reduce any detrimental impact on local people. All of the options presented in the Core Strategy allow for 10ha of expansion land at Edge Hill. It is considered that this will allow for managed and minimal levels of expansion into the Green Belt. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt. Appreciate the comments on directing further expansion of the University to other parts of the Borough and the Council has previously suggested this course of action to the University, however, it is not considered financially viable or attractive to prospective students given the already peripheral location of Edge Hill University.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csso-286</th>
<th>Mr David Berry</th>
<th>Ormskirk Green Belt Conservation Group</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan Ref</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Given the economic climate and the results of the 2005 Public Inquiry, the release of green belt land should not proceed within this ldf plan. (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Concerns in relation to the future of Edge Hill University are noted and indeed it remains unknown how student numbers will fair in the immediate future. The Core Strategy does, however, need to deal with development up to 2027 and in this time it is expected that the University will need some additional land, even if student numbers stay broadly the same. All of the options presented in the Core Strategy allow for 10ha of expansion land at Edge Hill. It is considered that this will allow for managed and minimal levels of expansion into the Green Belt. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt. Lastly, the University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy and the Council seeks to support its future plans, whilst attempting to reduce any detrimental impact on local people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>No action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response Concerns in relation to the future of Edge Hill University are noted and indeed it remains unknown how student numbers will fare in the immediate future. The Core Strategy does, however, need to deal with development up to 2027 and in this time it is expected that the University will need some additional land, even if student numbers stay broadly the same. All of the options presented in the Core Strategy allow for 10ha of expansion land at Edge Hill. It is considered that this will allow for managed and minimal levels of expansion into the Green Belt. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt. Directing some of the University campus to areas such as Skelmersdale would be ideal from a regeneration perspective, however the University wishes to remain on one campus due to cost and reputation.

Recommendation
No action.

Response Edge Hill University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy, to the tune of approximately Â£60m. Whilst we appreciate the concerns of local residents in terms of student accommodation and services taking over the town, the Council must try to deliver a strategy which meets the needs of all local stakeholders. By identifying a limited area for expansion over a 15 year period (10 ha of expansion land), the Council will not only have a greater say on the scale of future development but can also request that a greater amount of student facilities, such as new accommodation, can be provided on campus. This will in turn take pressure off the town providing these facilities independently. Concerns in relation to the future of Edge Hill University are noted and indeed it remains unknown how student numbers will fare in the immediate future. The Core Strategy does, however, need to deal with development up to 2027 and in this time it is expected that the University will need some additional land, even if student numbers stay broadly the same. All of the options presented in the Core Strategy allow for 10ha of expansion land at Edge Hill. It is considered that this will allow for managed and minimal levels of expansion into the Green Belt. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt. Directing some of the University campus to areas such as Skelmersdale would be ideal from a regeneration perspective, however the University wishes to remain on one campus due to cost and reputation.

Recommendation
No action.
Response Comments Noted

Recommendation No action.

---

cspo-333

Mr Roger Clayton

Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University

Observations

Summary The wording is ambiguous between the first and second bullet points. 1) Does the policy allow for expansion beyond 10 hectares of Green Belt land or not and 2) does the borough accept the demands of Edge Hill to continue submitting applications for expansion into Green Belt areas before it will join in any masterplanned approach? (F)

Response Appreciate the point re ambiguity of the first and second bullet points. The expansion or 10ha of land into the Green Belt will comprise of releasing this parcel of land from Green Belt restrictions and therefore allowing it to become part of the built-up area of the University. This could comprise further academic buildings or residential accommodation. In addition to this the University is able to submit planning applications for development within the Green Belt beyond this 10ha parcel, though acceptable uses here will be limited to those suitable within the Green Belt (in this case likely to be for sports and recreation). The Masterplanned approach identified within the policy is how the Council would ideally like see any further development on the site come forward over the plan period and the University agrees that this is the best approach.

Recommendation No proposed change.

---

cspo-34

Dr Anthony Evans

Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University

Object

Summary Given tuition fees, will Edge Hill remain viable? Expansion plans should be put on hold indefinitely. (S)

Response Concerns in relation to the future of Edge Hill University are noted and indeed it remains unknown how student numbers will fare in the immediate future. The Core Strategy does, however, need to deal with development up to 2027 and in this time it is expected that the University will need some additional land, even if student numbers stay broadly the same. All of the options presented in the Core Strategy allow for 10ha of expansion land at Edge Hill. It is considered that this will allow for managed and minimal levels of expansion into the Green Belt. The other alternative is that we do not provide such a policy in the Core Strategy and then expose ourselves to future applications from the University which we then cannot refuse, which could potentially have wider negative impacts on the surrounding Green Belt. Lastly, the University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy and the Council seeks to support its future plans, whilst attempting to reduce any detrimental impact on local people.

Recommendation No action.

---

cspo-361

New Way Tenants Residents

Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University

Support with conditions

Summary As far as possible students must be taken out of residential areas; Edgehill Uni should be given permission to build STUDENT ACCOMMODATION ONLY on green belt land adjacent to the campus; W.L.B.C. should seek strategies and policies to monitor and control the number of H.M.O.'s in any one area; More Affordable Housing, particularly for young families and first time buyers. (s)

Response Comments noted and the Core Strategy seeks to address these concerns, though more detail will follow in some cases in further LDF documents.

Recommendation No action.

---

cspo-474

Ms Erika Price

CPRE

Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University

Object

Summary Object to release of green belt for EHU (S)

Response Edge Hill University has a single campus philosophy which it does not wish to alter. Contributing over Â£60m to the Borough's Economy, the Council needs to work with Edge Hill to ensure the best outcome is reached for all stakeholders. All of the options within the Core Strategy Preferred Options document allow for 10ha of expansion land into the Green Belt at Edge Hill University. The University has undergone a process of refurbishment and improving its space utilisation on campus over the last 10 years and it now requires a small area of land into the Green Belt which the Council agrees is necessary to meet the University's needs over the next 15 years. This parcel of land is required regardless of any growth in student numbers and can be used to provide student accommodation and other facilities which would greatly relieve some pressure on facilities in Ormskirk. The University is committed to reducing the reliance upon car use where it is practically possible and has introduced a range of measures in order to make other modes of transport more appealing. However, there will always be a relatively high dependency on the car to access the University given its location and student catchment area. The important thing is managing these car users to ensure that they only come to the campus when absolutely necessary. Providing adequate parking on site will stop on-street parking which is a real nuisance to local people.

Recommendation No action.
cspo-495  Mr M Abrams  
Plan Ref 6.3  Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University  
Summary  Objection to the expansion of Edge Hill University due to the impacts in the community such as traffic congestion, social impacts and loss of Green Belt. (S)  
Response  By identifying a small area for expansion (10ha over 15 years) of the built part of the University campus, the Council can manage the level of development on this site and request facilities such as student accommodation on campus, thereby reducing some negative impacts on the town of Ormskirk. The alternative is that we do not allow for any expansion into the Green Belt within the Core Strategy and this way the Council is opening itself up to unmanaged growth at the University and the potential receipt of planning applications which it may not be able to refuse. This could lead to more development and a greater impact on the Green Belt.  
Recommendation  No action.

--

cspo-500  Martin Walsh  
Plan Ref 6.3  Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University  
Summary  Objects to expansion of Edge Hill University in light of changing role of universities. Do not want to allow expansion then have redundant buildings to deal with following the demise of the University. (S)  
Response  Whilst we appreciate the concerns regarding expansion land at Edge Hill University, the Core Strategy has to consider development over the next 15 year period up to 2027. We have been working closely with the University to ascertain details on predicted student numbers over this period. Whilst it is difficult to be precise with the current changing nature of the Higher Education sector, the University considers that even without growth in student numbers further development will be required to ensure it has the facilities it requires on campus to operate efficiently and improve its offer. For example, some of this additional land is likely to be developed for on-campus student accommodation, relieving pressure on housing in Ormskirk more generally. Edge Hill University is in a very strong financial position, and it has been suggested that with an increase in tuition fees students will opt to live at home with parents and study at a local university, Edge Hill has a high proportion of students who already do this and it could be argued that it will continue to attract high numbers of students. Obviously this is something that will be monitored closely throughout the Core Strategy period.  
Recommendation  No action.

--

cspo-585  Mrs Margaret Wiltshire  Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)  
Plan Ref 6.3  Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University  
Summary  Concerned over Edge Hill- they must build on their own available land first and then build on green belt only if the development is kept small.  
Response  We appreciate the concerns regarding loss of Green Belt land in this location. The proposed strategy to allow for the release of 10ha of Green Belt land over the Core Strategy period up until 2027 has been worked out in consultation with Edge Hill. The University has undergone a redevelopment process over the last 10 years whereby the existing campus has been made more efficient in terms of space utilisation. The University is now at a stage where remaining development opportunities on site are limited and, albeit there are still some small plots remaining, looking forward to the next 15 years more land will be required for development. The University maintains that even without growth in student numbers the 10ha of additional land would assist in helping the campus operate more efficiently and it would help to meet some of the desperately needed on site student accommodation - this would in turn reduce the negative impact on housing within Ormskirk. If this 10ha site is not identified within the emerging Core Strategy then the Council may be open to greater challenge by the University and this could result in a far greater proportion of Green Belt being developed that we consider is appropriate. Therefore, we strongly feel that agreeing this approach with the University up front makes the boundaries clear and will protect the local environment over the next 15 years.  
Recommendation  No action.

--

cspo-60  Mr Norman Smith  
Plan Ref 6.3  Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University  
Summary  Edge Hill should not be allowed to expand. (S).  
Response  Much of the above comment is in relation to the Green Belt options. However, in relation to the comments on Edge Hill University, which it is stated should not be allowed to expand, the response is as follows. Edge Hill University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy, to the tune of approximately Â£60m. Whilst we appreciate the concerns of local residents in terms of student accommodation and services taking over the town, the Council must try to deliver a strategy which meets the needs of all local stakeholders. By identifying a limited area for expansion over a 15 year period (10 ha of expansion land), the Council will not only have a greater say on the scale of future development but can also request that a greater amount of student facilities, such as new accommodation, can be provided on campus.  
Recommendation  No action required.

--

cspo-625  Mrs Joanna Eley  
Plan Ref 6.3  Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University  
Summary  Support for expansion plans at Edge Hill University. Plans would ease congestion and student housing issues and facilitate significant economic growth. (S)  
Response  Comments noted.  
Recommendation  No action.
Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University

**Summary**
Object to expansion of Edge Hill into Green Belt. (S)

**Response**
Edge Hill university has a single campus philosophy which is an important element of its higher education offer. Having redeveloped the majority of the campus over the last 10 years in order to improve space utilisation, the University has almost reached a point whereby it needs further land in order to operate effectively, this additional land will certainly be needed over the 15 year period which the Core Strategy deals with. Whilst it is never ideal to develop in the Green Belt, there are wider concerns which allowing some minimal development will help to address. For example, it is intended that part of the land to be released would be used for on-campus student accommodation, thereby relieving some of the existing pressures on Ormskirk town centre. By allowing for this expansion in the Core Strategy, the Council has a greater ability to control future development, without this provision the area could be exposed to more significant Green Belt release.

**Recommendation**
No action.

---

Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University

**Summary**
EHU policies have short timescales, up to 10years. There needs to be a balancing force, having a timescale greater than 20 years and possibly up to 100 years, which considers what is in the best interests of Ormskirk in the future. History shows that once the Green Belt has gone, it has gone forever. I believe it is the Council's role to be this balancing force.

**Response**
Appreciate the comments and indeed the Council operates in order to achieve a common ground for all stakeholders. Edge Hill University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy, contributing in excess of Â£60 million per year and therefore is a major consideration in terms of the Core Strategy going forward. However, we agree that the town of Ormskirk should not be 'consumed' by the University and we consider that the best approach is to allow for small-scale managed growth within the Core Strategy document. The Core Strategy covers a 15 year period until 2027 and must plan for requirements within this time. The University has undergone a major redevelopment programme over the last 10 years in order to make better use of existing space, however it has identified that even without growth in student numbers a small amount of additional land will be required in order for the University to operate most effectively. One potential use for the additional land is to provide more on-campus student accommodation, thereby relieving some of the existing pressures on the Ormskirk housing market. The alternative to allowing for some small-scale expansion in the Core Strategy is to not provide for any and then open ourselves up to criticism and the risk of planning applications for larger scale development in the Green Belt. The approach adopted is therefore considered to be the best way to manage development at the University and wider impacts on the town, whilst ensuring that it continues to be a major contributor to the local economy.

**Recommendation**
No action.

---

Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University

**Summary**
I do not oppose the university, but it has already eroded much of what was/is our historic market town. Too much litter, student housing issues and too many shops catering for students and not the community. If it continues, the community will no longer be a community and the town will have been completely out grown by the university. The council needs to act on behalf of the community they represent and oppose any further expansion before we lose our market town.

**Response**
Appreciate the comments and indeed the Council operates in order to achieve a common ground for all stakeholders. Edge Hill University is a major contributor to the Borough's economy, contributing in excess of Â£60 million per year and therefore is a major consideration in terms of the Core Strategy going forward. However, we agree that the town of Ormskirk should not be 'consumed' by the University and we consider that the best approach is to allow for small-scale managed growth within the Core Strategy document. The Core Strategy covers a 15 year period until 2027 and must plan for requirements within this time. The University has undergone a major redevelopment programme over the last 10 years in order to make better use of existing space, however it has identified that even without growth in student numbers a small amount of additional land will be required in order for the University to operate most effectively. One potential use for the additional land is to provide more on-campus student accommodation, thereby relieving some of the existing pressures on the Ormskirk housing market. The alternative to allowing for some small-scale expansion in the Core Strategy is to not provide for any and then open ourselves up to criticism and the risk of planning applications for larger scale development in the Green Belt. The approach adopted is therefore considered to be the best way to manage development at the University and wider impacts on the town, whilst ensuring that it continues to be a major contributor to the local economy.

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

| cspo-739 | Mr Richard Jones | Object |
| Summary  | Object to expansion of Edge Hill (S) |
| Response | Comments noted. The option which identifies all land up to Ruff Lane, St Helens Road and Scarth Hill Lane is the Council's non-preferred option as it is considered the least sustainable. In every option, 10ha of land at Edge Hill is included for expansion and this is to allow for a managed approach to future development at the University over the next 15 years. If this managed approach is note adopted then the Council could be subject to challenge resulting in much more development in the Green Belt over the next 15 years. |
| Recommendation | No action. |

| cspo-740 | Mr Ed Dickinson | Support |
| Summary  | Support for development of Green Belt for sports facilities as EHU (S) |
| Response | Comments noted. |
| Recommendation | No action. |

| cspo-741 | Alan and Sarah Bowness | Object |
| Summary  | Object to Edge Hill University expansion. (S) |
| Response | Comments noted. The option which identifies all land up to Ruff Lane, St Helens Road and Scarth Hill Lane is the Council's non-preferred option as it is considered the least sustainable. In every option, 10ha of land at Edge Hill is included for expansion and this is to allow for a managed approach to future development at the University over the next 15 years. If this managed approach is note adopted then the Council could be subject to challenge resulting in much more development in the Green Belt over the next 15 years. |
| Recommendation | No action. |

| cspo-742 | Mr Chris Whitfield | Object |
| Summary  | Object to Edge Hill (S) |
| Response | Comments noted. The option which identifies all land up to Ruff Lane, St Helens Road and Scarth Hill Lane is the Council's non-preferred option as it is considered the least sustainable. In every option, 10ha of land at Edge Hill is included for expansion and this is to allow for a managed approach to future development at the University over the next 15 years. If this managed approach is note adopted then the Council could be subject to challenge resulting in much more development in the Green Belt over the next 15 years. |
| Recommendation | No action. |
Object to Edge Hill expansion. (S)

Response
Comments noted. The option which identifies all land up to Ruff Lane, St Helens Road and Scarth Hill Lane is the Council's non-preferred option as it is considered the least sustainable. In every option, 10ha of land at Edge Hill is included for expansion and this is to allow for a managed approach to future development at the University over the next 15 years. If this managed approach is not adopted then the Council could be subject to challenge resulting in much more development in the Green Belt over the next 15 years.

Recommendation
No action.

---

cspo-743
Mr M Abrams
Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University

---

cspo-744
Mr Eric Vrain
Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University

---

cspo-745
R Nanson
Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University

---

cspo-746
Mr Dave Mutch
Environmentla Group Ormskirk Community Partnership

---

cspo-747
Sue Butterworth
Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University

---

cspo-748
Mr Austen Robinson
Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University
Object to Edge Hill expansion. (S)

Response
Comments noted. The option which identifies all land up to Ruff Lane, St Helens Road and Scarth Hill Lane is the Council's non-preferred option as it is considered the least sustainable. In every option, 10ha of land at Edge Hill is included for expansion and this is to allow for a managed approach to future development at the University over the next 15 years, including allowing for some development of student accommodation on site. If this managed approach is not adopted then the Council could be subject to challenge resulting in much more development in the Green Belt over the next 15 years.

Recommendation
No action.

Mr Matthew Robinson

Plan Ref 6.3 Policy Area CS6: Edge Hill University

Summary
Expansion of Edge Hill University is supported. (S)

Response
Comments noted

Recommendation
No action required.

Mr & Ms K Jennings & Moffatt

Plan Ref Chapter 7 Core Strategy Preferred Options: Providing for Housing and Residential Accommodation

Summary
Non-preferred option (but without University expansion) seems the best available. Need to address problems with HMOs and provide more purpose-built student accommodation. Any plan that provided better facilities, more employment opportunities, more affordable housing, and a restraint on students in residential areas would be good but we are unsure as to whether any of the 3 plans put forward would truly address these. (S)

Response
Comments noted. With regard to student HMOs, the Council's powers are limited. Policy CS9 seeks to restrain future conversions to HMOs. A 5% limit is proposed for most streets, but it is considered that 10% or 15% would be appropriate in certain streets.

Recommendation
No action required.

Mr Peter Banks

Plan Ref Chapter 7 Core Strategy Preferred Options: Providing for Housing and Residential Accommodation

Summary
The agricultural land in West Lancashire is some of the most fertile in the country and should be retained as a valuable resource for food production, and to conserve wildlife. Edge Hill University should free up existing housing (HMOs) by building additional on-campus accommodation. (S)

Response
It is agreed that prime agricultural land is an important resource that must be protected wherever possible. Unfortunately, the amount of non-agricultural housing land available is not enough to meet housing requirements to 2027, and thus some agricultural land will need to be developed. Taking into account a wide range of considerations, the Plan is seeking to meet its requirements by allocating land that will provide as high a level of benefits as possible, whilst simultaneously causing as little harm as possible. In terms of University accommodation, see response to Representation CSPO-169.

Recommendation
No change.

Mrs Anne-Sophie Bonton Planning Officer

Plan Ref Chapter 7 Core Strategy Preferred Options: Providing for Housing and Residential Accommodation

Summary
Student HMOs have a significant impact on Ormskirk town centre, with the associated increase in car users being a major problem. The University should consider a Travel Plan to solve this problem. (S)

Response
Comments noted.

Recommendation
No change.

Mr Andrew Taylor Planning Director David Wilson Homes

Plan Ref Chapter 7 Core Strategy Preferred Options: Providing for Housing and Residential Accommodation

Summary
Over emphasis of housing numbers in Skelmersdale. Such housing figures are not deliverable commercially. Provision needs to be made elsewhere for the inevitable shortfall. This will require greater Green Belt releases. Such releases should be proposed on a sustainability criteria following a thorough re-examination of the possible sites. (S)

Response
Comments noted. The Council has paid careful attention to the comments made in the developers’ forum, and it is agreed that the Core Strategy must be demonstrated to be deliverable. The Skelmersdale figure should be reduced from 3,000 dwellings to a more deliverable figure.

Recommendation
Reduce the Skelmersdale / Up Holland housing requirement from 3,000 dwellings to 2,400 dwellings.
Summary
Policy CS7 Generally support this policy particularly with regards to development in the Key and Rural Sustainable Villages, however the number should be increased at the expense of Skelmersdale. (F)

Response
Comments noted. It is agreed that the target of 3,000 dwellings for Skelmersdale may be unachievable, and it is proposed to be reduced, along with the recalculation of targets for villages, taking into account sites with extant planning permissions.

Recommendation
Reduce the Skelmersdale / Up Holland housing requirement from 3,000 dwellings to 2,400 dwellings. Amend villages figures as follows: Northern Parishes 400 dwellings; Eastern Parishes 100 dwellings; Western Parishes 150 dwellings.

Summary
New Road site, Rufford would be suitable for development (S).

Response
Comments noted. The Northern Parishes housing figure allows for some development in Rufford. It is evident that constraints exist in Banks, Tarleton and Hesketh Bank, although there is still expected to be some development in these villages over the Plan period.

Recommendation
No change.

Summary
1. Housing land supply may be overstated. The requirement should be raised to 5,500 to reflect the period 2010-12. 2. The requirement should be able to be exceeded. 3. There is an over-reliance on development in Skelmersdale. 4. It is not appropriate to restrict development in the early years of the Core Strategy period. (S)

Response
1. Development between 2010-2012, along with the RSS deficit from 2003, has been taken into account in housing land requirement calculations. This will be specified in the updated Plan. 2. It is recognised that the target may be exceeded. The wording of the updated Plan will be amended to reflect this. 3. It is agreed that the housing figure for Skelmersdale must be deliverable and should be reduced from 3,000 in the light of comments received. The Council will take into account all representations made on this matter, in addition to its evidence base. 4. Given the current economic circumstances and infrastructure constraints in the Borough, it is appropriate to have lower development targets in the early years of the Core Strategy. Given infrastructure constraints and other factors, it is also considered appropriate to restrict the development of certain sites in order to encourage the development of other sites, and to facilitate a sustainable pattern of development. (However, the restrictions associated with the "Management of housing land supply" part of Policy CS7 in early years of the Core Strategy will be extremely unlikely to apply in early years of the Core Strategy, given the current completions deficit, infrastructure problems and economic situation.)

Recommendation
1. Specify that the Plan takes into account development requirements and performance from 2003 onwards. 2. Specify that housing targets are minimum targets and can be exceeded. 3. Reduce Skelmersdale target from 3,000 to 2,400. 4. Retain the scope for the...
Response 1. Whilst total remodelling of Skelmersdale might seem a good idea in theory, the Core Strategy must be shown to be deliverable, and there is simply not the time nor the money (and possibly not the will) to remodel the whole town’s estates and road system. The proposals for the town centre regeneration, including a net increase of 800 dwellings in and around the centre, are along the lines of what is suggested by the Objector. Open space is an important feature of Skelmersdale (not ‘wasted’), and much of this is unsuitable for residential development. Even taking into account the potential for higher density development (see 2), allocated/safeguarded land in north Skelmersdale is still considered necessary to help meet the Borough’s housing requirements. Using such land reduces the need for Green Belt development elsewhere. Whilst non-car transport links to and from new and existing estates need to be improved, the current road system works well and is not considered to be in need of remodelling. 2. The housing density figure in paragraph 4.3.2 is simply a ‘ball park’ figure based on the former national minimum density requirement in PPS3. It is recognised that this density could (and should) be exceeded wherever appropriate, taking into account issues such as decreasing average household sizes, as mentioned by the Objector. However, there are a number of caveats: - For "suburban" type developments, densities much higher than 30dw/ha are not usually achievable (e.g. the market for typical high density housing, i.e. apartments and townhouses, is now very weak). Recent development at Ashurst is typically at a density of 20-22 dw/ha; - Allowances need to be made e.g. for access roads, open space, and any land that cannot be built upon (e.g. undermined land in Skelmersdale); - Housing should be in keeping with the surrounding area, and high density development will often be inappropriate in many areas; - Even taking into account the potential for densities higher than 30 dw/ha to be achieved, this will not negate (nor even significantly lessen) the need for Green Belt release. It should be noted that the major housebuilders have not objected to the assumption that new housing will typically be at a density in the order of 30 dwellings per hectare. A more detailed residential density Development Management policy will be included in the LDF. 3. It is agreed that affordable housing should be treated as a key component of housing development. However, for clarity, it is considered preferable to list affordable housing requirements in a separate policy. The Dynamic Viability model is too detailed to include in the Core Strategy, and thus it will be outlined in an SPD. This is not an ‘afterthought’. The appropriateness of including the DV model within an LDF was not certain at the time of writing the Core Strategy Preferred Options document, but the model has recently been “found sound” in the Shropshire LDF examination.

Recommendation  No change.

Plan Ref  Chapter 7  Core Strategy Preferred Options: Providing for Housing and Residential Accommodation

Summary  3900 new homes are not needed. Green Belt should not be released. Agricultural land should be used for food production (S)

Response  The housing requirement is based upon nationally agreed figures published by government, and takes into account changing demographics (people living longer, more people living on their own, etc) as well as migration and travel to work patterns, etc. The Council considers that the requirement of 300 new dwellings per annum is appropriate. In any case, at present the Council is required by law to use the RSS (Regional Plan) housing requirement, so in that sense, the figure is non-negotiable. It is agreed that prime agricultural land should be protected wherever possible. Ideally we would not need to release any such land for development, but owing to infrastructure and other constraints, there is unfortunately a need to release some land. In selecting a preferred site, the quality of agricultural land is one of the important factors being taken into account, and where land is released, it should be of the lowest possible agricultural grade.

Recommendation  No change.

Plan Ref  Policy CS7  Residential Development

Summary  The Council’s “Key & Rural Sustainable” Settlements should include those locations adjacent to existing sustainable settlements. (S)

Response  The existing small areas of development adjacent to the Southport/Birkdale/Ainsdale boundary are already included within the hierarchy of settlements in Policy CS1. In arriving at the preferred options for Green Belt release, consideration was given to including within these settlement boundaries some adjacent areas of Green Belt, and sites in the locations mentioned by the Objector have been assessed through the Green Belt Study. The Council is safeguarding some Green Belt sites as ‘Plan B’ sites that would be considered for development if delivery rates fall more than 20% below housing requirements over the periods 2012-17 and 2017-22. Fine Jane’s Farm can be considered as one of these ‘Plan B’ sites.

Recommendation  Propose the Fine Jane’s Farm site as a potential ‘Plan B’ site.
Summary

1. 3,000 houses in Skelmersdale is a disproportionately high figure, and gives the lowest return in terms of affordable housing. 2. Housing in Skelmersdale is likely to be for people from other Boroughs or immigrants, and will not solve housing need problems. 3. There is no mention of bringing empty homes back into use, nor matching development to local needs. (S)

Response

1. Skelmersdale is the highest settlement in the West Lancashire settlement hierarchy and thus it is appropriate to locate the largest proportion of development there. There is land and, crucially, infrastructure capacity to accommodate the proposed amount of development. 2. The housing need figures have been calculated to meet West Lancashire's needs. Whilst a small proportion of this need is to accommodate in-migration, it is not true that the majority of housing in Skelmersdale will be occupied by people from outside the Borough or abroad. It is recognised that there are needs in the rest of the Borough, which is why a number of dwellings have been assumed for these areas. Housing locations are influenced not just by need, but by availability of sites, infrastructure and services. 3. The proportion of empty homes in West Lancashire is exceptionally low, and the scope for contribution towards housing land supply from this source is limited. Bringing empty homes back into use can be mentioned in the residential development policy justification.

Recommendation

Mention in the policy justification the bringing back into use of empty properties.

cspo-191 Mrs EA Broad Parish Clerk Lathom South Parish Council
Plan Ref Policy CS7 Residential Development

Summary

Response

The land at Firswood Road has been safeguarded in the current Local Plan to meet longer-term development needs. This is agreed that the Core Strategy must be demonstrated to be deliverable. It is agreed that the figure for Skelmersdale should be less than 3,000. It is not agreed, however, that Green Belt release will in principle need to be early in the Core Strategy period, although there may be exceptional cases where this is appropriate. Land east of Ormskirk suffers from sewerage infrastructure constraints, as does land at Burscough, and it is unlikely that development can take place there before 2020, unless infrastructure constraints are addressed sooner.

Recommendation

Reduce Skelmersdale housing target from 3,000 to 2,400.

cspo-208 Mr Shaun Taylor Planning Associate Director G L Hearn Property Consultants
Plan Ref Policy CS7 Residential Development

Summary

Response

Comments noted. The Council has paid careful attention to the comments made in the housing developers’ forum, and it is agreed that the Core Strategy must be demonstrated to be deliverable. It is agreed that the figure for Skelmersdale should be less than 3,000. It is not agreed, however, that Green Belt release will in principle need to be early in the Core Strategy period, although there may be exceptional cases where this is appropriate. Land east of Ormskirk suffers from sewerage infrastructure constraints, as does land at Burscough, and it is unlikely that development can take place there before 2020, unless infrastructure constraints are addressed sooner.

Recommendation

No change.

cspo-232 Mrs EA Broad Parish Clerk Lathom South Parish Council
Plan Ref Policy CS7 Residential Development

Summary

Response

The land at Firswood Road has been safeguarded in the current Local Plan to meet longer-term development needs. This land is required in the forthcoming Core Strategy period. Being adjacent to Skelmersdale, it is considered appropriate to count any housing developed on this site as part of the total for Skelmersdale.

Recommendation

No change.

cspo-233 Anglo International Up Holland Ltd
Plan Ref Policy CS7 Residential Development

Summary

Response

The special circumstances relating to St Joseph's College are acknowledged, in particular the Inspector's ruling in 2007 that the need to save the listed St Joseph's College building was an overriding consideration when assessing proposals for 205 new 'enabling' dwellings in the Green Belt. If a subsequent enabling scheme were submitted as a planning application, the particular circumstances and planning history of this site, including the 2007 appeal decision, would be taken into consideration. It is not considered necessary to amend Policy CS7 to specify the fact that the saving of heritage assets could be a circumstance in which enabling residential development would be judged appropriate, nor is it considered necessary or appropriate to name specific heritage assets. The Core Strategy is a general overarching document, rather than a detailed, site-specific document.

Recommendation

No change.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csso-599</th>
<th>Mr Keith Keeley</th>
<th>Policy CS7 Residential Development</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Please see previous comments in respect to Policy CS1 and CS3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Please see Mr Keeley's other representations on Policy CS1 and CS3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>No Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csso-717</th>
<th>Ms Deborah McLaughlin</th>
<th>Executive Director North West Homes and Communities Agency</th>
<th>Support with conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>The HCA welcomes the principle of 3,000 new dwellings in Skelmersdale. The Whalleys site (including Cobbs Clough) could eventually deliver up to 50 completions per annum in favourable economic conditions. HCA is willing in principle for the Whalleys site to cross-subsidise development at Firbeck /Findon, subject to conditions. Further clarification is necessary regarding how the development of greenfield sites should ‘directly support the Town Centre regeneration programme’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Comments noted. The wording of the policy with regard to greenfield sites is to change, and the reference to ‘directly support’ removed. Section 106 funding is likely to be used to contribute towards Town Centre regeneration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Alter wording of residential development policy with regard to greenfield sites directly supporting the Skelmersdale Town Centre regeneration programme.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csso-720</th>
<th>Crompton property developments</th>
<th>Policy CS7 Residential Development</th>
<th>Support with conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Support the requirements for residential development, but is concerned about 1. Deliverability in Skelmersdale 2. The Council's intention to control supply of housing and 3. The requirement to meet the Lifetime Homes Standard. (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>1. The Council agrees that flexibility is required in the Core Strategy to cope with eventualities such as Skelmersdale not being delivered as anticipated. The [revised] Plan will contain a “Plan B” setting out alternative sites and triggers for the Plan B to be implemented. 2. In the light of the government's new Growth Agenda, the Council will review the section on management of housing land supply (and the related section in Appendix E), to tone down the section to say something along the lines of, &quot;The Council may consider restraint,...&quot;: Given the current housing completions deficit, economic situation, and infrastructure constraints, it is unlikely that the Council is going to be in a position where there is an unacceptable oversupply of deliverable housing land, and where restraint would be necessary, at least not for several years. However, the Plan spans a long period, and it is considered prudent for there to be a &quot;hook&quot; that could be used, if necessary in extreme circumstances, to restrain housing development if circumstances change radically at some point during the Plan period, even if this &quot;hook&quot; turns out never to be needed. Restraint may be needed for individual settlements, even if not for the Borough as a whole. 3. Comments regarding the Lifetime Homes standard noted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>a) Prepare a more robust ‘Plan B’ with clear triggers, timescales and actions for its implementation. b) Tone down the “Management of housing land supply” section of the Policy, and remove the ‘mechanism’ section in Appendix E. b) Allow for the Lifetime H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csso-733</th>
<th>Bickerstaffe Trust</th>
<th>Policy CS7 Residential Development</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>1. Table p.82, replace &quot;Total Dwellings&quot; column with ‘minimum dwellings’; 2. Replace figures for Ormskirk/Aughton with 900 whatever the scenario; 3. Replace figures for Burscough with 200, whatever the scenario; 4. Change key and rural sustainable villages figure to read 400 (delete 500 and the word ‘total’); 5. Delete the section of the policy on ‘Management of housing land supply’. (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>With regard to the specific requests: 1. The dwelling targets for each settlement area will be treated as a minimum requirement. 2/3/4. The totals for Ormskirk/Aughton, Burscough and the villages will be amended in the light of the sites chosen for allocation and updated housing land supply figures, although not to the figures recommended by the objector. 5. In the light of the government’s new Growth Agenda, the Council will review the section on management of housing land supply (and the related section in Appendix E). The section will be toned down to say something along the lines of, “The Council may consider restraint...”. Given the current housing completions deficit, economic situation, and infrastructure constraints, it is unlikely that the Council is going to be in a position where there is over seven years’ supply of deliverable housing land, and where restraint would be necessary, at least not for several years. However, the Core Strategy spans a long period, and it is considered prudent for there to be a “hook” that could be used, if necessary in extreme circumstances, to restrain housing development if circumstances change radically at some point during the Plan period, even if this “hook” turns out never to be needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Amend settlement development targets in the light of the revised development strategy and updated housing land supply figures. Specify that these targets are a minimum. Amend (tone down) the “Management of housing land supply” section of the residential d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csso-115</th>
<th>Messrs Ramsbottom, Halliwell, &amp; Jacton Etc.</th>
<th>Policy Area CS7: Residential Development</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Support for identification of Firswood Road as one of the key sites for residential development in Skelmersdale. (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Comments noted. This land was safeguarded in the previous (2006) Local Plan to meet development needs beyond 2016, and it is now proposed as a housing site to meet development needs during the Plan period (2012-2027).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>No action required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response Comments noted. The Council has taken account of the traffic issues associated with the Nursery Farm area of search for housing. In the light of these issues, the land behind Nursery Avenue is no longer being promoted as a housing site through this emerging Plan.

Recommendation Remove "Area of Search" designation from Nursery Avenue site.

cspo-162
Mr & Mrs P Suggett
Plan Ref 7.1 Policy Area CS7: Residential Development
Summary Strong objection against more houses being built in Burscough and on the Green Belt. Concern that traffic and congestion will increase and that there aren’t enough services in the area to meet the demand if more housing was built. (S)
Response Comments noted. The planning permission at Ainscough’s Mill has been taken into account when considering housing development. This Plan attempts to do the same. However, in the light of the NPPF, and the low number of greenfield sites capable of accommodating more than 10 units which are within settlement boundaries and not subject to other policies, it is now considered appropriate to remove the limit of 10 dwellings on such greenfield sites. 5,7-12: Comments noted. It is recognised that the Northern Parishes area is subject to various constraints. The total for this area takes into account extant and pending permissions for housing, as well as “acceptable” SHLAA sites. Comments made during the consultation regarding the capacity of Banks to take more development have been taken into account. Some housing is being assumed to be delivered in Rufford in recognition of the village’s reasonable sustainability. 6. In previous local plans, the principle of the development of safeguarded land for longer-term needs has been agreed. The land is needed now to meet these “longer-term needs”, and it is considered entirely appropriate to assign it the same status as greenfield land within the Key Service Centres and Key /Rural Sustainable Villages. Safeguarded land is counted as being within settlements.
Recommendation Remove the limit of 10 dwellings on greenfield sites in Key and Rural Sustainable Villages in the Residential Development policy.
Mr Francis Williams, member Ormskirk Friends of the Earth

Plan Ref 7.1 Policy Area CS7: Residential Development

Summary
Priority should be given for affordable homes as it is the greatest need. (S)

Response
Comments noted. The Council agrees that affordable housing is a priority.

Recommendation
No change.

Mr Alexis De Pol

Plan Ref 7.1 Policy Area CS7: Residential Development

Summary
1. More development should be directed to key and rural sustainable villages. 2. The limit of 10 units on greenfield sites should be removed. 3. The requirement for brownfield sites to be considered before non-allocated greenfield sites should be amended. 4. The policy should clarify what constitutes "major greenfield development". (S)

Response
1. Comments noted; this issue is being addressed in the overarching sustainable development framework policy. 2. Taking into account latest government policy and statements, it is agreed that within the boundaries of reasonably sustainable settlements, it would be appropriate to allow the development of greenfield sites, provided they are not subject to other policies that would limit development, for example open space designations. 3. It is agreed that the residential development policy should be amended to remove the "sequential approach" with regard to the development of greenfield sites within sustainable settlements. 4. Rather than defining what constitutes "major" greenfield development, the policy should be amended to remove the word "major".

Recommendation
1. Amend development targets for settlement areas. 2. Remove the limit of 10 dwellings for development on greenfield sites within Key Service Centres and Key / Rural Sustainable Villages. 3. Amend the policy wording to remove the requirement for a sequent

Mr John Lloyd

Plan Ref 7.1 Policy Area CS7: Residential Development

Summary
Support the prioritisation of development brownfield land for housing, subject to housing numbers being amended as set out under ‘spatial strategy’. (S)

Response
Comments noted. The Council has paid careful attention to the comments made by the various individuals and organisations during the consultation programme, and the target number of dwellings for Skelmersdale is proposed to be reduced from 3,000 to 2,400, whilst the target for villages is to increase from 400 to 650 (of which 100 are for the Eastern Parishes area, which includes Appley Bridge). With regard to housing development on employment sites, the general approach is to protect employment land. The employment land policy should be amended to cover proposals for residential development on employment sites.

Recommendation
Amend target numbers of dwellings for settlement areas in the Borough. (This will be set out in the Sustainable Development Framework policy, rather than the Residential Development policy.) Amend employment development policy to cover proposals for resid

IKO Plc

Plan Ref 7.1 Policy Area CS7: Residential Development

Summary
Support with conditions

Response
Comments noted. The Council is unable to influence ... [elderly persons' accommodation] schemes coming forward... as stated in para 7.1.16. To fall back onto the suggested wording in Policy CS7, and the Lifetime Homes Standard is ignoring the problem in West Lancashire. (S)

Recommendation
Amend residential development policy to include a requirement that 20% of homes in developments of 15 units or more be designed specifically for the elderly.
Response Comments noted. 1. Skelmersdale is the top settlement in the hierarchy, with sufficient infrastructure capacity to accommodate more development, and it is therefore considered appropriate to direct most development there. It is accepted that the target of 3,000 is too high and should be reduced. 2. The land at Firswood Road was safeguarded in the Local Plan for development needs beyond 2016. The land is now required to help meet the Borough’s development needs to 2027. It is considered appropriate, given its location directly adjacent to Skelmersdale, for this land to contribute towards the Skelmersdale target. 3. The wording of the policy with regard to the development of greenfield sites in Skelmersdale is considered to be unambiguous. The policy is to be re-worded with regard to greenfield development in Skelmersdale, and this section can be clarified if necessary. 4. With regard to protected open land and Green Belt, affordable housing will be allowed, subject to there being no sites in "higher order settlements". The limit is per site, not per settlement. Minor amendments to the wording of the policy will be considered to make this more clear.

Recommendation Reduce Skelmersdale’s housing target from 3,000 to 2,400 to take account of deliverability concerns expressed during CSPO consultation. Reword the Policy with regard to greenfield development in Skelmersdale. Clarify wording with regard to “very limited”

---

cspo-355  Mr Robert W. Pickavance
Plan Ref 7.1  Policy Area CS7: Residential Development  Observations
Summary Comments on suitability of New Road site.
Response Comments noted. This site is not considered large enough for a specific allocation in the Plan. The Northern Parishes total allows for housing development in Rufford.
Recommendation No change required.

---

cspo-375  Ms Kathleen M Prince
Plan Ref 7.1  Policy Area CS7: Residential Development  Observations
Summary Banks Parish Council, in its submission document assessing housing needs states that account has been taken only of the demand for houses and not the supply of properties which might be empty and available for occupation. This is clearly unsound from the viewpoint of economic analysis and, if other parishes in the Borough have used the same method of calculation will have resulted in a serious overstatement of housing needs. This certainly appears to be the case in Banks, as evidenced by the fact that both the recent Housing Association developments of affordable housing™ are occupied, in the main, by people who were not resident in the village before those developments took place. (F)
Response Comments noted. It is correct to take account of empty properties when calculating housing requirements. A small number of empty properties are necessary for the housing market to function efficiently. Overall, West Lancashire’s proportion of empty homes is much lower than average (the lowest in the north of England), and the scope for reducing housing requirements as a result of filling empty homes is very limited. Empty homes can be mentioned in the policy justification.
Recommendation Mention in the policy justification the bringing back into use of empty properties. See also rep 191.

---

cspo-406  Wirral to Wyre Team Natural England
Plan Ref 7.1  Policy Area CS7: Residential Development  Observations
Summary Would like to see garden land protected more from development. (s)
Response The principle of garden development was considered in spring 2010 when the Interim Housing Policy was being prepared. The amount of garden development in West Lancashire has been relatively low over recent years (contrary to incorrect government statistics released in 2010), and it is not considered to be a significant issue. Thus Policy CS7 allows garden development in principle, subject to various safeguards. If it becomes evident that a significant amount of garden development is taking place, the policy can be reviewed in future. The policy can be amended to require that development of greenfield sites (which include gardens) must be in accordance with other Plan policies (which include policies relating to the natural environment, green infrastructure, climate change, etc.). The justification text could be amended to make reference to some of the issues raised by the Objector, although cross-reference to other policies is not considered appropriate.
Recommendation Amend policy to require that development of greenfield sites must be in accordance with other Plan policies.

---

cspo-428  Ms Judith Nelson  English Heritage
Plan Ref 7.1  Policy Area CS7: Residential Development  Observations
Summary CS7: The section of the policy on the development of garden land should also include consideration of impacts on the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. It is suggested that “heritage” is added after biodiversity... .
Response Impact on the setting of heritage assets is covered in national policy and does not need to be repeated in the Core Strategy. The phrase in CS7: “including, but not limited to” allows for heritage to be considered.
Recommendation No change.
Response

Taylor Wimpey considers that the restrictions on the delivery of the housing target should be based on a robust and credible evidence base justifying the reduced release over the early years of the plan. (S)

Recommendation

Consider the issues mentioned by the Objector in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Plan Ref 7.1
Policy Area CS7: Residential Development
Observations

Summary

Taylor WimpeyUK Limited supports the proposed management of the housing land supply in Policy CS7 in order to deliver the Plan's housing requirement.

Recommendation

Mark Grove Farm as a proposed housing allocation. 1. Reduce Skelmersdale's housing target from 3,000 to 2,400 to take account of deliverability concerns expressed through CSPO consultation. 2. Revise Ormskirk/Aughton housing totals. 3. Add more detail to supporting evidence base.

Plan Ref 7.1
Policy Area CS7: Residential Development
Object

Summary

High Lane should be identified as a Strategic Site or Area of Search for housing. Objections: 1. Too much housing is assumed for Skelmersdale, which suffers from poor market conditions. 2. More housing should be directed to Ormskirk/Aughton. 3. There is a need to identify the strategy for release of Green Belt and greenfield sites. 4. Object to requirement to meet the Lifetime Homes Standard without sound evidence base. (S)

Response

Comments noted with regard to High Lane (Grove Farm). With regard to the specific objections: 1. Skelmersdale should be the primary focus for development, although it is agreed that the housing target for Skelmersdale must be achievable over the lifetime of the Plan. 3,000 is likely to be unachievable, and a target of 2,400 is more realistic. 2. It is agreed that Ormskirk is a highly sustainable location. In response to representations received on housing and related matters, the Council will revisit the housing targets for the various settlements. 3. It is agreed that the strategy for releasing Green Belt and greenfield sites needs to be set out. Once the choice of sites has been finalised, and the infrastructure delivery plan completed, such a strategy can be devised. 4. The evidence the Council possessed suggests that the cost of achieving Lifetime Homes standards if incorporated at design stage is relatively low (<£1,500 per dwelling). Also, the population is ageing, and people of retirement age will comprise roughly a third of the population by 2030, and 40% of households in West Lancashire by 2033. It is considered that a robust policy on the Lifetime Homes Standard is prudent at this stage, although it is accepted that it may not always be appropriate to require the Lifetime Homes Standard for every dwelling.

Recommendation

No change.

Plan Ref 7.1
Policy Area CS7: Residential Development
Support

Summary

The approach to residential development in the Key Sustainable Villages should be different to that in the Rural Sustainable Villages to support the sequential approach set out in Policy CS1. In Key Sustainable villages the approach should be to permit development of more than 10 units on Brownfield sites and on Greenfield sites not protected by other policies, rather than as stated in the policy. (F)

Response

Given the relatively small number of greenfield sites not protected by other policies in Key Sustainable Villages in West Lancashire, and the provisions of the emerging National Planning Policy Framework, it is considered acceptable to amend the policy as requested by the Objector.

Recommendation

Amend residential development policy to allow for the development of greenfield sites of more than 10 units within Key Sustainable Villages, provided these sites are not protected by other policies.

Plan Ref 7.1
Policy Area CS7: Residential Development
Support with conditions

Summary

We would raise concerns over the restrictive level of development within the Rural Service Villages. Flexibility is needed with regard to underused agricultural buildings - see CS1 response also. (S)

Response

Support for the "Plan B" noted. With regard to development in villages and agricultural building conversions, please see response to the same issue raised in Rep. 52 (Policy CS1). Barn conversions and live-work units are permissible under the Rural Economy policy.

Recommendation

No change to residential development policy. (But see Rep. 52 regarding conversion of redundant rural buildings.)
Can assurance be given that any neighbouring borough's housing needs are not going to be met in West Lancashire?

Response

The housing requirement in the Core Strategy is to meet West Lancashire’s housing needs only. If any formal approach were ever made to this Council by a neighbouring Borough to meet part of their housing needs, this would presumably require an alteration to the Core Strategy, and would be subject to full consultation/environmental appraisal, etc. as well as requiring approval by Members.

Recommendation

No change

Plan Ref 7.1

Policy Area CS7: Residential Development

Observations

Policy Area CS7: Residential Development

Observations

The section of the policy on the development of garden land should also include consideration of impacts on the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. It is suggested that heritage is added after biodiversity. (S)

Response

This appears to be a duplicate of Ref 428. Same response: Impact on the setting of heritage as sets is covered in national policy and does not need to be repeated in the Core Strategy. The phrase in CS7: "including, but not limited to" allows for heritage to be considered. The word 'Heritage' could be added to the policy justification.

Recommendation

No change.

Plan Ref 7.1

Policy Area CS7: Residential Development

Observations

We consider that Ormskirk, as the second largest town, with a proposed share of just 300 units (just 6% of total supply), must be allocated a greater proportion of total new housing to reflect its status and the fact that it is a sustainable location. Realistically, a reduced level to Skelmersdale Town centre and Burscough Strategic Site will merit an increased need for more housing land in Ormskirk. (s)

Response

Comments noted. The various targets for the Borough’s settlements are to be revised in the light of updated housing land supply figures, and comments received during the Consultation period.

Recommendation

Revise housing requirements for the Borough's settlement areas.

Plan Ref 7.1

Policy Area CS7: Residential Development

Support with conditions

Summary

We support Policy CS7 only if it includes a total of not less than 800 dwellings for Burscough and facilitates residential development on Green Belt covered by a Strategic Development Site.

Response

Comments noted.

Recommendation

No change.
Plan Ref Policy Area CS7: Residential Development

Summary
- All references to Skelmersdale in policies CS1 and CS7 (and throughout the Core Strategy) should be referred to as Skelmersdale (Up Holland). What this means is that Up Holland is part of the Key Service Centre and is not a Key Sustainable Village. - Th

Response
1. It is agreed that Skelmersdale and Up Holland are to be treated together as a Key Service Centre, rather than Up Holland as a Key Sustainable Village. This should be explicitly stated in the Plan, although not necessarily at every reference to Skelmersdale. 2. Development requirements and housing completions from 2010-2012 (in fact from 2003-2012) are being taken into account in the Core Strategy housing calculations. 3. Currently, it is agreed that the Core Strategy should be in conformity with the RSS. If this is the case at the time of the CS examination, then housing targets would need to be increased. However, if as expected, the RSS has been abolished by the time of the examination, the Council considers it is more appropriate to take account of the most recent evidence available, i.e. the 2008-based household projections, along with the RSS deficit from 2003-2012, as the housing requirement. 4. See above. It may not be feasible to meet the RSS deficit in the shorter term, given infrastructure constraints, and the ability of the market to deliver the required number of dwellings in the current economic situation. It is more realistic to spread the deficit over the Plan period, rather than the short term - an approach agreed by the Inspector at the Central Lancashire Core Strategy examination. 5. The appeal decisions quoted are noted. In the light of the government's new Growth Agenda, the Council will review the section on management of housing land supply (and the related section in Appendix E). This is likely to lead to the section being toned down to say something along the lines of, "The Council may consider restraint...". Given the current housing completions deficit, economic situation, and infrastructure constraints, it is unlikely that the Council is going to be in a position where there is an unacceptable oversupply of deliverable housing land, and where restraint would be necessary, at least not for several years. However, the Core Strategy spans a long period, and it is considered prudent for there to be a "hook" that could be used, if necessary in extreme circumstances, to restrain housing development if circumstances change radically at some point during the Plan period, even if this "hook" turns out never to be needed. Housing targets for the different parts of the Borough are not enough in themselves to restrain development, especially as these totals can be exceeded. When considering supply, it is "deliverable" supply that is assessed (sites with permission are not necessarily deliverable), and thus undeliverable sites, even those with planning permission, should not still be development as claimed by the objector. 6. Now that the Council is pursuing a Local Plan, sites will be proposed for allocation in a shorter timescale than anticipated for a Site Allocations DPD. Applications submitted before the adoption date of the Plan on sites proposed for allocation will be treated on their merits, taking into account a range of factors including land supply, infrastructure, and current/emerging policy. 7. A requirement of 3,875 dwellings for Skelmersdale /Up Holland is considered undeliverable over the Core Strategy period, given market constraints in particular. Amending Policy CS7 to state that current "Protected" (Policy DS4) land in Skelmersdale /Up Holland can be developed is not considered appropriate. Whatever the merits of the Objector's Client's Chequer Lane site, there is DS4 land adjacent to Dalton that would appear to be inappropriate to develop for a number of reasons. Policy DS4 land is being reviewed as part of the Local Plan preparation process, and it is anticipated that most such land will remain protected from development or safeguarded for development beyond 2027.

Recommendation
1. Amend CS1 to reflect Skelmersdale / Up Holland being treated as one Key Service Centre. 2. Clarify the Plan's wording to specify that development requirements and performance from 2010-12, as well as the RSS deficit, is being taken into account. 3. Tonic...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Policy Area CS8: Affordable &amp; Specialist Housing</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cspo-243</td>
<td>Mr Andrew Taylor</td>
<td>Planning Director</td>
<td>Threshold too low, percentages too high. (s)</td>
<td>Comments noted. The Council's evidence on viability concludes that an affordable housing requirement could be applied to developments as small as 3 units whilst maintaining viability. To raise the threshold to 15 would result in the loss of a significant potential number of affordable housing units. The proposed threshold of 8, more than double the minimum viable figure, is considered to strike an appropriate balance between securing as much affordable housing as possible from market schemes, and maximising the provision of housing in general. The affordable housing policy allows for lower percentages of affordable housing if it is demonstrated that a scheme would not be viable with the proposed policy requirement. Furthermore, the use of the Dynamic Viability model should ensure that only a viable proportion of affordable housing is required for each housing proposal.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-252</td>
<td>Mr D Rimmer</td>
<td></td>
<td>CS8 - 35% affordable housing provision is too high. This will deter landowners releasing land and affect developers sales rates. (F)</td>
<td>The evidence base (Viability Study) concludes that 35% is viable. Each case will be treated on its merits, and any robust viability information provided by the applicant that demonstrates that the Core Strategy requirement would make that particular scheme unviable will be taken into account.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-33</td>
<td>Mr Tony McAteer</td>
<td>McAteer Associates Ltd</td>
<td>Specific allocation of sites for elderly accommodation is needed (S)</td>
<td>In writing the policy, the expectation was that accommodation for the elderly would be provided as market conditions dictate. The allocation of sites specifically for affordable and/or old people's housing has been considered, but judged unnecessary. Affordable and older people's accommodation will instead be achieved through the requirements for such accommodation as a percentage of the overall number of units in market housing developments, as set out in the relevant policies, and through schemes specifically for such accommodation being submitted and approved. (100% affordable housing schemes have been delivered in West Lancashire over recent years.) Elderly persons' accommodation and affordable housing schemes would be expected to be within settlements, rather than in the countryside.</td>
<td>No change required to the affordable housing policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-335</td>
<td>Mr Roger Clayton</td>
<td></td>
<td>By planning for so much development in Skelmersdale (with maximum provision of 20% and no provision at all on sites of fewer than 15 units) the 35% target would be very significantly under-achieved across the borough. Whatâ€™s more, the council proposes a â€œget outâ€‌ clause for developers to avoid these requirements by saying that their schemes would be unviable if they were to include provision of affordable housing. In our view, it is up to the Council to enforce such requirements, not to provide for developers to drive a coach and horses through the policy. (S)</td>
<td>Whilst the Housing Needs study suggests an annual need which is 70% of the overall housing requirement, the Viability Study states that 35% is the maximum requirement for which schemes will be viable. PPS3 and subsequent Case Law make clear that affordable housing targets must be demonstrated to be viable/deliverable, hence the overall limit of 35%, the lower requirement in Skelmersdale, and the allowance for viability of individual schemes to be taken into account. Taking account of viability will not usually result in there being no affordable housing, but evidently there will be less than 35% overall.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cspo-358</td>
<td>Mr Robert W. Pickavance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Need to review affordable housing policy.</td>
<td>Comments noted. There are a number of reasons as to why less affordable housing than needed has been built in West Lancashire over recent years. It is not considered necessary to change the paragraphs referred to by the Objector. Policies CS7 and CS8 take into account viability, and allow for schemes comprising a mix of development in settlements such as Rufford. The Core Strategy &quot;leaves the door open&quot; for the allocation of sites for 100% affordable housing (which can be viable, or else can be made deliverable with external funding), but it does not make the decision to do so. This decision will be made as part of the Site Allocations DPD process.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response 1. Our evidence base concludes the threshold for requiring affordable housing could go as low as 3. Given the proposed

Response 2. The requirement of up to 35% reflects the findings of the Council’s viability study carried out on our behalf by specialists in

Response 3. The majority of affordable housing being granted permission and completed in the Borough in recent years has been through 100% affordable housing schemes. Grant funding can make schemes viable, and the new “affordable rent” tenure should also increase viability and, possibly as a consequence, land values. Allowing market housing as part of affordable housing schemes would be inappropriate in some areas, e.g. Green Belt. It is considered that the residential development policy allows market housing in an appropriately wide range of settlements, and that this range does not need to be expanded.

Response 4. The Council’s Housing Viability Study states that the maximum viable target is 35%, even though the need is for a higher percentage. Consideration has been given to a lower threshold than 8, but taking into account all relevant factors, including the likelihood of developers bringing forward small schemes if an element of affordable housing were required, the threshold of 8 is considered most appropriate. 100% affordable housing schemes are still encouraged and expected during the Plan period. p196 refers to relaxing other requirements for providers of 100% affordable housing (for example the Lifetime Homes requirement) in order to make it easier for them to deliver affordable housing. It is not about relaxing affordable housing requirements.

No change with regard to affordable housing requirements. Changes to the policy to reflect the effects of affordable rent will be necessary.

No change. Changes to the policy to reflect the effects of affordable rent will be necessary.

No change with regard to affordable housing requirements. Changes to the policy to reflect the effects of affordable rent will be necessary.

No change. Changes to the policy to reflect the effects of affordable rent will be necessary.

No change with regard to affordable housing requirements. Changes to the policy to reflect the effects of affordable rent will be necessary.
Policy CS8 - we welcome the account to be taken to viability which continues to play a significant role in delivering development including affordable homes.

Response Comments noted.

Recommendation No change required.

Mr Simon Artiss  
Planning Manager Bellway Homes Ltd

Policy Area CS8: Affordable & Specialist Housing

We object to policy CS8 and its requirement to deliver a minimum proportion of 35% affordable housing. We consider that this is not sufficiently flexible inclusion in the Core Strategy and that it may have a significant impact on the deliverability of housing through the plan period.

Response The 35% requirement is based on the findings of the West Lancashire Viability Study. There is flexibility, both on account of the viability of individual schemes being taken into account, and the proposed use of the Dynamic Viability model.

Recommendation No change.

Mr C Smith  
Mr C Smith

Policy Area CS8: Affordable & Specialist Housing

Observations

Summary We object to policy CS8 and its requirement to deliver a minimum proportion of 35% affordable housing. We consider that this is not sufficiently flexible inclusion in the Core Strategy and that it may have a significant impact on the deliverability of housing through the plan period.

Response The 35% requirement is based on the findings of the West Lancashire Viability Study. There is flexibility, both on account of the viability of individual schemes being taken into account, and the proposed use of the Dynamic Viability model.

Recommendation No change.

Ms Linda Hill  
Ormskirk Community Partnership

Policy CS9  
Provision of Student Accommodation in Ormskirk and Aughton

Support with conditions

Summary I am totally in favour of restricting the student occupancy of housing in the town to a maximum of 15%.

Response Comments noted.

Recommendation No change.

Mr Ron Rowles  
Provision of Student Accommodation in Ormskirk and Aughton

Policy CS9

Summary 1. New student accommodation must not result in increased numbers of students at the University. 2. Greenfield land should not be released for University expansion whilst brownfield sites are available. 3. Tuition fees may have an impact on student numbers in future. (S)

Response 1. The Council is aware of the possibility of new accommodation meaning that the University can increase the number of first year students, who would subsequently need accommodation in their remaining years, which could exacerbate current problems. The student accommodation policy has a requirement that new on-campus accommodation would only be supported if evidence of the need for increased provision was demonstrated. Accommodation elsewhere must be shown to demonstrably reduce demand for the conversion of existing dwelling houses to HMOs. Wording to the policy justification can be added to the effect that the Council will seek reassurance that any extra student accommodation provided on the campus will not lead to an increase in demand for HMOs in residential areas, for example from students staying in on-campus accommodation in their first year and needing to find off-campus accommodation elsewhere in subsequent years. 2. Only a small number of brownfield sites are available within walking distance of the University, and these tend to be part of the housing land supply. Whilst student accommodation may be acceptable on such sites, losing these sites to student accommodation would result in a need for more housing land, probably on greenfield sites, giving a similar net result. 3. The Council accepts that the increased tuition fees may result in a drop in student numbers, and / or in shorter courses. This situation needs to be closely monitored over the next few years, and policies written at this point in time with respect to Edge Hill University carefully worded so that any greenfield land allocated or safeguarded for University expansion remains undeveloped unless the University robustly demonstrates the need for more land at some point in the future.

Recommendation Add the following to the policy justification: The Council will seek reassurance that any extra student accommodation will not lead to an increase in demand for HMOs in residential areas (for example from students staying in on-campus accommodation in the

Mr Robert Kewley  
Provision of Student Accommodation in Ormskirk and Aughton

Policy CS9

Summary Additional student accommodation should be built on campus to eliminate student occupation of HMOs. (S)

Response Comments noted. The Student Accommodation Policy supports the provision of accommodation on campus, although the amount of development land within the campus is limited. The Council has no legal powers to influence the conversion of student HMOs back to residential use.

Recommendation No change.

Mr Peter Banks  
Provision of Student Accommodation in Ormskirk

Policy Area CS9: Provision of Student Accommodation in Ormskirk

Observations

Summary Additional student accommodation should be built on campus to eliminate student occupation of HMOs. (S)

Response Comments noted. The Student Accommodation Policy supports the provision of accommodation on campus, although the amount of development land within the campus is limited. The Council has no legal powers to influence the conversion of student HMOs back to residential use.

Recommendation No change.
Summary: Objects to Council's policy to limit student HMOs (S)

Response: An "outright ban" is not considered appropriate - some student HMOs can be accommodated within residential areas without an unacceptable effect on amenity. There is a need for a limited amount of student accommodation in Ormskirk. The proposed policy sets stringent limits on the number of HMOs that would be allowed in particular streets (in most cases 5%). Many streets already exceed that proportion, and thus in such cases, the policy is tantamount to an "outright ban".

Recommendation: No change.

---

cspo-258

Mr Francis Williams  
member Ormskirk Friends of the Earth

Plan Ref 7.3  
Policy Area CS9: Provision of Student Accommodation in Ormskirk  
Object

Summary: Overall support for the policy with some recommended changes, in particular: Para. 7.3.5 - reference to "growth" is misleading - the University is concentrating on meeting current un-met needs for existing students - amendment requested. Revised policy wording supplied.

Response: Comments noted. The clarification on student numbers and the University's approach is welcomed, and appropriate changes will be made to the wording of the paragraphs referred to, in order to reflect this clarification. However, the Council considers it appropriate to retain within the policy the requirement that the need for increased provision of student accommodation associated with Edge Hill University should be demonstrated by evidence.

Recommendation: Change the "Context" and "Justification" sections of this policy area to reflect the University's clarification regarding current and future student numbers. Replace the word "expansion" with "extension" in the first sentence of the Policy.

---

cspo-329

Edge Hill University

Plan Ref 7.3  
Policy Area CS9: Provision of Student Accommodation in Ormskirk  
Support

Summary: When considering %s on certain streets of HMOs, the Council should also take into account the number of students in the HMOs. (S) e.g. an HMO may only have 3 occupants however an HMO may have 24 or more occupants (I ask you to look at 198 Burscough Street, who firstly wanted 36 students, then 24 students- never mind parking issues). There are other examples. The number of students in one HMO alone could unbalance a community. (F)

Response: Comments noted. The term "HMO", as used in the Core Strategy, refers to the central government definition of HMO, which limits numbers to between 3 and 6 students. The proposed accommodation at 198 Burscough Street falls within a different Use Class, and would be assessed differently. It is agreed that an HMO for 6 students would have a greater impact than an HMO for 3 students, and that the potential numbers of students in any proposed HMO would be taken into account when assessing planning applications for HMOs.

Recommendation: Amend wording of policy justification to highlight that HMOs or purpose-built student accommodation of differing sizes have differing impact on their surroundings.

---

cspo-363

Ms Jane Thompson

Plan Ref 7.3  
Policy Area CS9: Provision of Student Accommodation in Ormskirk  
Observations

Summary: When considering %s on certain streets of HMOs, the Council should also take into account the number of students in the HMOs. (S) e.g. an HMO may only have 3 occupants however an HMO may have 24 or more occupants (I ask you to look at 198 Burscough Street, who firstly wanted 36 students, then 24 students- never mind parking issues). There are other examples. The number of students in one HMO alone could unbalance a community. (F)

Response: Comments noted. The term "HMO", as used in the Core Strategy, refers to the central government definition of HMO, which limits numbers to between 3 and 6 students. The proposed accommodation at 198 Burscough Street falls within a different Use Class, and would be assessed differently. It is agreed that an HMO for 6 students would have a greater impact than an HMO for 3 students, and that the potential numbers of students in any proposed HMO would be taken into account when assessing planning applications for HMOs.

Recommendation: Amend wording of policy justification to highlight that HMOs or purpose-built student accommodation of differing sizes have differing impact on their surroundings.

---

cspo-464

Mr D Tunstall

Plan Ref 7.3  
Policy Area CS9: Provision of Student Accommodation in Ormskirk  
Object

Summary: Unsatisfactory to have poorly maintained student housing in Ormskirk (S)

Response: Comments noted. This is one reason why the proportion of dwellings allowed to convert to HMOs is set relatively low.

Recommendation: No change.

---

cspo-507

New Way Tenants Residents

Plan Ref 7.3  
Policy Area CS9: Provision of Student Accommodation in Ormskirk  
Observations

Summary: Better control over student accommodation is required. More family and affordable housing is urgently required in Ormskirk. (S)

Response: Comments noted. With regard to specific points raised: 1. A small percentage of students is considered appropriate within residential areas, to achieve mixed communities, but it is agreed that the number should be limited. 2. The Council agrees that the most appropriate place for purpose-built student accommodation is on the University Campus, but may not go as far as restricting development on any campus extension solely to student accommodation. 3. The Council does not have the legal powers to reduce the numbers of HMOs, only to limit their increase. If the "other authorities' policies" are available, this Council would be interested to see them. An amendment to the student accommodation policy to discourage clustering would be appropriate. 4. Similarly, it is beyond planning powers to require HMO owners to apply to the Council to continue use of a building as an HMO if it changes hands. 5. Comment noted - the Council agrees that there is a need for affordable housing. Loss of cheaper properties to HMOs exacerbates this problem.

Recommendation: Amend Student Accommodation Policy to presume against "clustering", even within the percentage limits.
Object to setting limits on number of pitches and number of sites, which should be determined by need and considered against criteria set out in a policy in the Core Strategy not the Development Management DPD. Concerned over restricting sites to ‘broad locations’, especially if this applies to planning applications, but if there is need arising in these areas it is acceptable to prioritise search for allocations in those areas.

Response

Although the Core Strategy provides a maximum number of pitches the policy also states that sites should be able to accommodate a compound increase of 3% between 2016 and 2027. The targets set are based on locally determined targets based upon local evidence including local need. West Lancashire currently has no authorised sites for gypsies and travellers and has not decided to expand the existing unauthorised sites. The Core Strategy is a strategic document and does not allow for individual sites to be identified. Although Circulars 01/2006 and 04/2007 do say that the Core Strategy should set out criteria for the location of sites the Council believe that a criteria based policy would be more appropriate in the Development Management DPD. Instead the broad locations identified are based upon established need within the Borough.

Recommendation

Criteria for Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites will be added to the Core Strategy Policy in accordance with the advice contained within Circulars 01/2006 and 04/2007. This guidance will incorporate advice contained within the Government Plan Ref Policy CS10

Mrs Alice de la Rue NFGLG

Provision for Gypsies & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

cspo-30

Summary

If your implicit intention is to retain the existing long-term sites (7.4.2), authorize them and be able to exercise some control over conditions when required, it should not cause undue alarm or problems to nearby residents. We note that the two gypsy sites are in the Green Belt.

Response

Comments Noted.

Recommendation

No Further Action Required.

Plan Ref 7.4

Mrs Margaret Wiltshire Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)

Policy Area CS10: Provision for Gypsies & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Observations

cspo-590

Summary

The intended approach as set out here is noted and appears appropriate subject to subsequent detailed consideration of criteria as part of the Development Management DPD. (F)

Response

Comments Noted

Recommendation

No Further Action Required

Plan Ref 7.4

Mr Alan Hubbard Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust

Policy Area CS10: Provision for Gypsies & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Observations

cspo-607

Summary

Object to location of Gypsy site at White Moss simply because it is an unauthorised site.

Response

The Core Strategy does not allocate any specific sites in order to provide for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. It simply identifies broad areas of search based on evidence base which suggests that the areas identified are either known through routes used by Gypsies, Travellers or Travelling Showpeople or where there is an established or settled family or group within the area.

Recommendation

No action required

Plan Ref 7.4

Paul Cotterill

Policy Area CS10: Provision for Gypsies & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Object

cspo-758

Summary

CS11 - Support to promote development in Banks Village Centre. Currently the village has suffered massive delcine and dispersement of services away from the village centre. If increased residential land is released in this area it would increase the viability and therefore vitality of the village centre. (F)

Response

Comments noted. It is important to ensure that residents of new housing provided are encouraged to integrate with the existing community, for example by using local services. An improved Centre should help this cause.

Recommendation

No change.

Plan Ref Policy CS11

Mr D Rimmer

Maintaining Vibrant Town and Village Centres

Support
This policy focuses on retail matters and does not provide guidance for other town centre uses that contribute to vibrant town centres reflecting PPS4. (F)

Policy CS11 states that "Retail and other appropriate town centre uses will be encouraged..." Thus the policy guidance amounts to a presumption in favour of appropriate town centre uses. The Policy does not imply or assume that only the provision of shops can provide vibrancy for a town or village. The Core Strategy should not repeat national policy (PPS4), so it is not considered necessary for Policy CS11 to contain more detail on other town centre uses. Consideration will be given to amending the policy justification to make clear that other appropriate uses in addition to retail can provide vibrancy for a town or village centre.

Amend policy justification to state that uses other than retail can contribute towards a town, local or village centre's vitality/viability.

Amend town centres policy to provide support for residential and other uses above shops and in other appropriate locations in town centres.

Specific reference should be made in Policy CS12 to the use of towpaths in providing alternative means of walking and cycling facilities. Suggested wording provided. (S)

Policy wording to be amended to include reference to canals and the towpath network. Fig 8.1 to be amended to include reference to canal network "improve community health and well-being by providing alternative means of transport such as walking and cycling.

Policy CS12 is supported but should acknowledge the potential for Appleby Bridge railway station to be the focal point for the provision of sustainable growth based upon sustainable transport. (F)

Comments noted however the purpose of the policy is to shape transport choices through development. It is not entirely necessary to note the function of all existing transport modes within the Core Strategy, this level of detail and summary is more appropriate in the evidence base documents such as the infrastructure delivery plan.

Amend policy justification to state that uses other than retail can contribute towards a town, local or village centre's vitality/viability.
Mr D Rimmer
Policy CS12 Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice
Observations
Summary
Applauds the aims but is concerned about execution and funding. To realistically suggest places like Skelmersdale should have massive growth before regenerating the town centre and providing a railway station is unlikely to happen and therefore opportunities for development elsewhere in the Borough will be missed. (F)
Response
Comments noted however the aim of this policy it to shape transport choices through development. It is not entirely necessary to note the function of all existing transport modes within the Core Strategy, this level of detail and summary is more appropriate in the evidence base documents such as the infrastructure delivery plan.
Recommendation
No Further Action Required

Mr Keith Keeley
Policy CS12 Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice
Observations
Summary
There is no reference to IDP/CIL or Policy CS3 or how proposed infrastructure will be delivered. There is no mention of a Burscough By-Pass. (s)
Response
Policy CS12 makes it clear that the Council supports any proposals to improve rail infrastructure serving Burscough. However, the Council cannot guarantee its delivery, nor can it say that such improvements will be essential to accommodate new development until a final decision has been made on how much development will be promoted in Burscough or whether such rail improvements will actually create a benefit in relation to highways traffic. Should these improvements be feasible or required, more detail will be provided in the IDP. A Burscough by-pass is not being promoted by the Council at this time.
Recommendation
No Action

Mr David W Cheetham
Policy CS12 Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice
Support with conditions
Summary
I support this policy and in particular improvements to the rail linkages across the Borough and the proposed branch line to Skelmersdale Town Centre. 1. Improvements to park and ride facilities supported. 2. Consideration should be given to providing park and ride facilities for people commuting out of Skelmersdale. 3. Any rail route to Skelmersdale should be accompanied by electrification of the Kirkby - Wigan railway. 4. The Burscough Curves reinstatement and electrification of the two Burscough lines is supported. (S)
Response
Comments noted. Improvements to transport infrastructure are supported by the Council; the main issue is funding. Re. park and ride: Policy CS12 says that the Council will support 'Any potential park and ride schemes associated with public transport connections'. This may include extensions and improvements to existing as well as new park and ride at facilities at train stations.
Recommendation
No Further Action Required

Mrs Anne-Sophie Bonton Planning Officer
Policy Area CS12: Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice
Observations
Summary
We welcome this policy with the exception of the need for an Ormskirk bypass. We believe need for a railway station in Skelmersdale is urgent. (S)
Response
Comments noted
Recommendation
No action required

Mr Francis Williams member Ormskirk Friends of the Earth
Policy Area CS12: Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice
Observations
Summary
We welcome this policy with the exception of the need for an Ormskirk bypass. We believe need for a railway station in Skelmersdale is urgent. (S)
Response
Comments noted
Recommendation
No action required
Summary WLBC should have regard to the RUS when formulating the Core Strategy.

Response Comments Noted. However consideration was given to the RUS when formulating this Policy. Schemes for the reinstatement of the Burscough Curves and an appropriate link to Skelmersdale were taken from the Merseyside and Lancashire and Cumbria RUS 2009 and 2008 respectively.

Recommendation No Further Action Required

---

cspo-337
Town Planning Team LNW
Observations
Plan Ref 8.2 Policy Area CS12: Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice
Summary The Ormskirk bypass is a longstanding aspiration for the Council and although there may not currently be available funding this is a strategic plan lasting for up to 15 years when funding may be available. Fig 8.1 does not specifically mention Skelmersdale or Lathom instead both are included within the eastern parishes. Only the built up areas are shaded on the map and as Lathom is located on the boundary of Skelmersdale they appear as one area (along with Up Holland)

Response Comments Noted

Recommendation No Further action Required

---

cspo-407
Wirral to Wyre Team Natural England
Observations
Plan Ref 8.2 Policy Area CS12: Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice
Summary We welcome inclusion of a sustainable transport policy to enhance and pressve sustainable transport in the borough to give travellers a range of sustainable transport options. We also welcomethe list of specific delivery priorities to give the Borough a locally meaningful policy direction to deliver on the ground and in turn be monitored.

Response Comments noted

Recommendation No further action required

---

cspo-412
C Clex
Observations
Plan Ref 8.2 Policy Area CS12: Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice
Summary It is clear that the major commuting routes are to Liverpool, Sefton and Greater Manchester. Currently rail provides good service from Ormskirk to Liverpool, and from Burscough to Southport and Greater Manchester. This leaves some significant gaps. It is suggested that a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) has the potential to assist in delivering at least part of these new rail connections. (S)

Response comments noted With regards to 2.1.20 regarding patterns of movement for travel to work the Council have classed Wigan as seperate to the rest of Greater Manchester as Wigan is particularly close to West Lancashire being a neighbouring authority and has an important role to play in its own right. This is a consistent approach the Council have taken with Sefton and St Helens also being classed seperately from the Liverpool City Region and also Central Lancashire being classed seperately from the rest of Lancashire. Comments regarding costing of schemes noted.

Recommendation No further action

---

cspo-445
Mr Roger Bell
Observations
Plan Ref 8.2 Policy Area CS12: Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice
Summary It is clear that the major commuting routes are to Liverpool, Sefton and Greater Manchester. Currently rail provides good service from Ormskirk to Liverpool, and from Burscough to Southport and Greater Manchester. This leaves some significant gaps. It is suggested that a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) has the potential to assist in delivering at least part of these new rail connections. (S)

Response comments noted With regards to 2.1.20 regarding patterns of movement for travel to work the Council have classed Wigan as seperate to the rest of Greater Manchester as Wigan is particularly close to West Lancashire being a neighbouring authority and has an important role to play in its own right. This is a consistent approach the Council have taken with Sefton and St Helens also being classed seperately from the Liverpool City Region and also Central Lancashire being classed seperately from the rest of Lancashire. Comments regarding costing of schemes noted.

Recommendation No further action

---

cspo-451
Mr Roger Bell
Observations
Plan Ref 8.2 Policy Area CS12: Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice
Summary In terms of Skelmersdale, a number of options are being examined by the rail industry. We strongly believe that a central station, as near to the town centre as possible, is by far the preferred option. For the Burscough option, it is clear that extension of the electric train service from Liverpool to Ormskirk into Burscough would provide a strong solution. While improved rail service is vital in connecting communities in West Lancashire with opportunities for employment, shopping and leisure, it is equally important that for shorter distance travel within communities that an adequate bus service is provided.

Response Comments Noted

Recommendation No Further Action Required
Support sustainable modes of transport but Policy CS12 requires a long list of infrastructure and delivery is unclear. Infrastructure Delivery Plan required. (S)

Response: As identified the Infrastructure delivery plan will help identify which schemes are deliverable in the short to medium term, however, the CS document is a strategic document with a 15 year life span and during the life of the CS funding for these schemes may become available.

Recommendation: No further action required

Observations: Mr Andrew Thorley Strategic Land Manager Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

Plan Ref 8.2 Policy Area CS12: Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice

Observations: Mr D Tunstall

Plan Ref 8.2 Policy Area CS12: Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice

Observations: Mrs Margaret Wiltshire Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)

Observations: Mr Alan Hubbard Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust

Observations: Mr Jackie Liptrott

Plan Ref Policy CS13 Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure

Observations: Mr Philip Carter Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency

Plan Ref Policy CS13 Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure
Policy CS13 will support protection and enhancement of inland waterways. Additional information is available to assist with decision making and planning conditions. (S)

Response
Comments noted

Recommendation
Distribute information to planning teams to raise awareness of wider guidance.

---

cspo-210
Mr Martyn Coy
Planner British Waterways
Policy CS13 Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure
Support with conditions

Summary
CS13 should acknowledge the benefits of developing other sustainable settlements such as Appley Bridge which have spare capacity. (S)

Response
The Council's current evidence base work suggests that whilst Appley Bridge benefits from reasonable proximity to Wigan, service infrastructure in general is not the most sustainable. Furthermore, the draft Green Belt study did not identify any parcels of land which do not fulfil at least one purpose of the Green Belt as set out in PPG2.

Recommendation
Further infrastructure work still being carried out along with refining work to the Green Belt Study.

---

cspo-606
Mr Keith Keeley
Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure
Object

Summary
The policy is toothless unless it is backed up by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Major development should not be allowed to proceed in phases unless the total infrastructure requirements are known.

Response
The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan first draft should be completed by the end of the summer and will be shared with all infrastructure providers to ensure it is accurate and realistic. The document will then be made publicly available during the next round of consultation alongside the Publication Core Strategy. It is intended that this document will be a living tool to assist in the future delivery of infrastructure and directing revenue that is received through the Community Infrastructure Levy. It will be an important component to the Local Development Framework and will assist in guiding development. The time taken now to establish a robust and maintainable process for infrastructure planning will result in greater longevity of the process throughout the life of the plan.

Recommendation
No action required in relation to Core Strategy. Infrastructure Delivery Plan first draft to be finalised.

---

cspo-723
Crompton property developments
Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure
Observations

Summary
United Utilities have a statutory duty to deliver appropriate waste water capacity and the Council should work within the context of this. (s)

Response
Comments noted

Recommendation
No action required

---

cspo-154
Mr Philip Carter
Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency

Plan Ref 8.3
Policy Area CS13: Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure
Observations

Summary
Support for this part of the policy

Response
Noted

Recommendation
No action required

---

cspo-370
Ms Kathleen M Prince
Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure
Observations

Plan Ref 8.3
Policy Area CS13: Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure

Summary
Certain key aspects of the infrastructure, notably sewerage and electricity, which are now completely inadequate and failing to meet the demands of existing properties in Banks, remains a serious public health issue and ANY extra development will cause additional problems. (s)

Response
Upgrade and improvement of utility infrastructure is the responsibility of the utility providers such as United Utilities and Electricity North West. This is largely out of the Councils hands and when granting planning permission it is difficult for planners to refuse permission for development on the grounds of utility infrastructure deficiencies as other legislation governs the delivery of such requirements. However, the Council is aware of the pressure on this fundamental infrastructure and through the Infrastructure Delivery plan process is engaging with all utility providers. This information is helping to direct development to places where infrastructure capacity exists and in instances where capacity is limited it sets out what improvements are required and how they will be delivered.

Recommendation
No action required.
Support the general strategic direction of the Core Strategy subject to the following:

1. Reference to reinstatement of the Burscough Curves
2. Reference to the electrification extension from Ormskirk to Burscough
3. Reference and support for a rail link to Skelmersdale
4. Support for a new real-time information system - working together though may not need specific reference? (S)

Response: Comments noted. All of the noted schemes are identified within Policy CS12 Enabling Sustainable Transport Choice.

Recommendation: No action required

---

Wirral to Wyre Team Natural England

Summary: We would welcome additional text to give more clarity on definition of infrastructure and services and provision/access to green infrastructure. We are disappointed that the policy wording makes it generic and has little meaningful delivery for West Lancs. (s)

Response: Comments noted

Recommendation: No action required

---

Mr Roger Bell Consultant for National Grid National Grid

Summary: In meetings with United Utilities, it has been stated that a housing development of sufficient size could generate a sound business case for a substantial investment in the type of improvements that would go a long way to resolving this issue. Either the Burscough or Ormskirk options appear to satisfy this need but not the Dispersed Option. (S)

Response: Comments noted

Recommendation: No action required

---

Mr Damien Holdstock Consultant for National Grid National Grid

Summary: The Preferred Options document identifies the potential to remodel the Simonswood Industrial Estate, to provide an additional 5 hectares of employment land. National Grid’s ZU line crosses through the south eastern corner of the industrial estate. National Grid requests that consideration be given to these assets through planning and that they are consulted on any future DPDs and planning applications which may impact on their infrastructure.

Response: Comments noted

Recommendation: No action required

---

Mrs Margaret Wiltshire Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)

Summary: We are pleased to see Green Infrastructure featuring explicitly in the strategy.

Response: Comments noted

Recommendation: No action required

---

Mrs Joanna Eley

Summary: Support for any plans to look at public transport routes around the region, in particular the joining of the railway lines between Southport and Burscough (The Burscough Curves). (S)

Response: Comments noted

Recommendation: No action required
we would suggest that an additional paragraph be inserted to read The loss of an existing facility will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that the facility is no longer needed, or it can be established that the services provided by the facility can be served in an alternative location or manner that is equally accessible by the community.

Response Comments noted

Recommendation Include the protection of community facilities which may be at risk through change of use.

cspo-718 Jillian Walker United Utilities

Plan Ref 8.3 Policy Area CS13: Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure

Summary Thank you for your Core Strategy Options Paper. We can look at each application on an individual basis as they are submitted. In relation to the Skelmersdale area we would not be able to supply additional waters into the area until our proposed Royal Oak WTW is constructed. We do have areas of low pressure but within standards of service around the Tarleton area due to the late spring/summer draw offs for the local market gardens. With regards to Edge Hill University we do have several trunk mains in the vicinity of the site which proposed development may impact on our easements. Again we would look at this on an individual basis through the consultation process.

Response comments noted

Recommendation no action required

Plan Ref 8.3 Policy Area CS13: Accessibility and Provision of Local Services and Infrastructure

Summary UUW cannot confirm if capacity is available until the connection point[s] and flows are confirmed, therefore the LPA should work closely with UUW and other utility providers to ensure funding and infrastructure plans are secured with their Regulators before granting planning approval. There are a number of waste water capacity issues in West lancashire which require comprehensive planning. Surface water requires sustainable solutions and on previously developed land, a reduction of at least 30% will be sought, rising to a minimum of 50% in critical drainage areas. Development adjacent too or impacting infrastructure assets should be discouraged.

Response The LPA have built up a strong working relationship with United Utilities and intends to progress this continually alongside the LDF process. Development of a joint partnership agreement is designed to assist with delivering a comprehensive approach to the infrastructure difficulties associated with waste water treatment in and around the Ormskirk and Burscough settlement areas. It is disappointing that UUW cannot give greater detail regarding capacity as this would assist with the infrastructure planning process and support the evidence for delivery of the Core Strategy.

Recommendation Continue to work closely with United Utilities in the production of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

cspo-110 Mrs Jackie Liptrott

Plan Ref Policy CS14 Developer Contributions

Summary Developers who propose to enhance employment opportunities in the borough should not pay developer contributions. In order to encourage potential developers/employers to choose this area there should not be a financial penalty for bringing jobs.

Response A full viability assessment will be carried out in order to inform the CIL charging schedule, this will ensure that rates set for each type of development and geographical area are realistic and affordable and will not stifle the delivery of development.

Recommendation No action required
Summary
The County Council raises concerns as to the significant impact upon its library service of the planned residential expansion of Burscough and the need to explicitly acknowledge this by reference to its policies CS3 and CS14. (S)

Response
Specific facility requirements will be picked up within the Infrastructure Delivery plan and in particular the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule. This will be used to inform the expenditure of S106 and CIL monies. From liaison with the County Council we understand that Skelmersdale library has recently been improved but requires accessible public toilets. This will also be identified within the IDP. In terms of its inclusion within the Skelmersdale Town Centre Regeneration, this will be explored further through the master planning of the town centre which will take place separately to the Core Strategy.

Recommendation
No action required

Plan Ref Policy CS14

Mr Brian Sheasby Principal Planning Review and Planning Contributions Officer Lancashire County Council Property Assets

Observations

Developer Contributions

Text to be amended to include “canal” in the description of transport infrastructure.

Plan Ref Policy CS14

Mr Martyn Coy Planner British Waterways

Response Comments noted

Recommendation

Text to be amended to include "canal" in the description of transport infrastructure.

Plan Ref Policy CS14

Mr Shaun Taylor Planning Associate Director G L Hearn Property Consultants

Observations

Developer Contributions

CIL cannot be implemented through an SPD. (s)

Response Greater clarification on CIL is now available and the Council is aware that an SPD will not be appropriate to set out the requirements of CIL. This will be achieved through a CIL Charging Schedule.

Recommendation
Remove reference to a CIL SPD

Plan Ref 8.4

Mr Roger Clayton

Object

Policy Area CS14: Developer Contributions

Wirral to Wyre Team Natural England

Observations

Policy Area CS14: Developer Contributions

We note the list of matters for which contributions would be requested. We ask that you consider the inclusion of conserving and enhancing biodiversity; landscape (including townscape) character and quality; and public realm in the list.

Response How CIL contributions are spent will be subject to regulations which control the CIL and what the Council sets out within its list of infrastructure to be funded. Green Infrastructure is included within the the infrastructure list which will assist in supporting the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity. The expenditure of CIL must be on infrastructure, it is difficult to make direct links between the definition of infrastructure and landscape quality. However, other policies in the Core Strategy are capable of protecting and enhancing landscape quality.

Recommendation
Include public realm in the list of infrastructure.
### Summary

The policy should include a bullet point covering developer contributions relating to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment, for example mitigating adverse impacts on the historic environment or enhancing the public realm. It is also important that the definition of green infrastructure acknowledges the important contribution of the historic environment, through, for example, registered parks and garden, the grounds of listed buildings or green spaces in conservation areas.

### Response

Given the amount of varying pieces of infrastructure that can be considered within each of the infrastructure typologies, it is intended to place the detail within the IDP and make broad reference to infrastructure types within the policy. This will ensure what is considered infrastructure is not limited, thus reducing the flexibility of the policy which must last 15 years.

### Recommendation

No action required.

---

### Summary

We assume that an appropriate infrastructure for basic water, waste treatment, energy and heat supply would be a pre-requisite. Beyond the essentials, it is important that any funding of non-essentials is spread across the Borough as a whole, including the rural areas. Provision of, and access to, facilities for children and young people is particularly important.

### Response

The requirement for all infrastructure including that listed as "basic" here, is set out within Policy CS13. How CIL contributions are spent will be subject to regulations which control the CIL and what the Council sets out within its list of infrastructure to be funded. However, due consideration will be given to the points made in terms of spreading the funds across the Borough.

### Recommendation

No action required.

---

### Summary

Flexibility is therefore required with regard to developer contributions to ensure that the scheme is still viable following potential Section 106 agreements or CIL requirements. Gaining planning consent for a proposed development is one thing; however, delivering the actual scheme is another. The Council must assess each scheme of their individual merits to ensure development can and will take place.

### Response

A full viability assessment will be carried out in order to inform the CIL charging schedule; this will ensure that rates set for each type of development and geographical area are affordable and do not stifle the delivery of development. Policy CS14 includes flexibility for developers to deliver infrastructure themselves rather than financial contributions, it also makes provision for reduced contributions in order to support development within Skelmersdale. Viability is a key issue with all S.106 obligations and all policy areas requiring obligations are caveated with the ability to take account of development viability.

### Recommendation

No action required.

---

### Summary

The Core Strategy should not be directing development to areas with known infrastructure constraints unless an accompanying infrastructure delivery plan explains what these constraints are. The Council should prepare a Community Infrastructure Levy document.

### Response

Wider sustainability benefits can include the need to support and create a sustainable local economy or housing supply in areas where existing infrastructure capacity may require some upgrades. Greater clarification on CIL is now available and will allow us to refine the wording of the policy in line with the broader developer contributions framework. Several references to the IDP are already made within the justification for Policy CS14 and Policy CS13. Furthermore, Paragraph 8.4.7 makes direct cross linkages with other policies in the Core Strategy for which, Policy CS14, will be a delivery mechanism. Now that Central Government have confirmed their support for CIL, the Council are exploring the preparation of a CIL Charging Schedule and will either submit it for consideration by the Planning Inspecteate alongside the Core Strategy or as soon as is practicable afterwards. It is not mandatory that the two documents must be examined at the same time.

### Recommendation

Include wording “and inform the core strategy” in relation to the role of the IDP.
This policy should include a bullet point covering developer contributions relating to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. It is also important that the definition of green infrastructure acknowledges the important contribution of the historic environment.

Response

Given the amount of varying pieces of infrastructure that can be considered within each of the infrastructure typologies, it is intended to place the detail within the IDP and make broad reference to infrastructure types within the policy. This will ensure what is considered infrastructure is not limited, thus reducing the flexibility of the policy which must last 15 years.

Recommendation

No action required to Core Strategy, expand IDP

Policy Area CS14: Developer Contributions

Summary

Policy CS14 - we refer you to recent appeals in respect of policies that pursue a tariff, where Inspectors conclude that CIL is the appropriate mechanism. As for the scope and amount of developer contributions, this needs to accord with national advice on proportionality and relevance, etc, as well as needing to respect viability considerations in order to deliver new homes, especially in the Borough's priority locations.

Response

A full viability assessment will be carried out in order to inform the CIL charging schedule. This will ensure that rates set for each type of development and geographical area are affordable and do not stifle the delivery of development.

Recommendation

No action required

Policy Area CS14: Developer Contributions

Summary

Please include leisure facilities in the brackets for Community Infrastructure which will be essential for Skelmersdale.

Response

Given the amount of varying pieces of infrastructure that can be considered within each of the infrastructure typologies, it is intended to place the detail within the IDP and make broad reference to infrastructure types within the policy. This will ensure what is considered infrastructure is not limited, thus reducing the flexibility of the policy which must last 15 years.

Recommendation

No action required

Policy Area CS14: Developer Contributions

Summary

We are pleased to see one of the five broad topic areas include “Sustaining the Borough's Environment and Addressing Climate Change”.

Response

Comments noted

Recommendation

No action required

Policy Area CS14: Developer Contributions

Summary

The decision not to adopt alternative approach 1 is fully supported.

Response

Comments Noted

Recommendation

No action required

Policy Area CS14: Developer Contributions

Summary

We welcome this policy, but believe that there should be a presumption in favour of renewable energy projects, whether they be in the Green Belt or not.

Response

Comments noted

Recommendation

No action required
Concerns over duplication of national policy and the use of an SPD to provide detail on policy. (s)

The Council accepts that it is the government's intention for CSH and BREEAM to be driven through the changes to building regulations. However, the changes to the building regulations only go so far in achieving the various levels of the CSH and BREEAM, and it is vital that planning policy goes that step further to create a supportive framework for the delivery of low carbon development. The Policy builds in a certain degree of flexibility in that it requires the latest up to date national standards in the event the current standards are superseded. The Council also considers it appropriate to deal with a policy area that is so fluid and changeable within a SPD as this has often been the case for other policy areas and is indeed supported by Central Government. The SPD is likely to be used to draw out the threads from the Core Strategy and set out how low carbon design may be achieved locally and in accordance with any up to date national development policies. It will not replace or re-write the existing Core Strategy Policy. All other comments noted.

The list of requirements set out in paragraph 9.1.6 has been removed and reference is now made to the validation checklist for planning applications.

We feel that there are a number of discrepancies within the chapter wording and that Policy CS15 is not sufficiently robust to deliver the scale of renewable energy generation targets specified in the regional and city regional evidence bases. A number of discrepancies need to be resolved (S).

Comments noted. There will be a further review of the renewable energy evidence base which has developed further since the drafting of this document. Also, at this stage, the most up to date evidence is still being devised and therefore it would be inappropriate to include areas least constraint most suitable for wind development. The Council does not consider that this will disadvantage developers seeking spatial direction as the process used to identify constraints is one which is widely used by many renewable technology developers when scoping areas of search for possible developments. Targets will also be removed from the justification, pending the most up to date evidence base work currently being produced by SQW which will set out the amount of deployable renewable energy in the Borough. The policy justification will make reference to the reliance upon evidence base studies in assisting the decision making process. Comment regarding viability noted.

Relate the policy to national targets for renewable energy. Remove the targets in the policy justification, pending the results of the most up to date evidence base work currently being produced by SQW which will set out the amount of deployable renewable energy.

Support for Policy CS15. However, additional information should be supplied within the justification to demonstrate how the local targets set out relate to national targets and how they will be delivered. Information relating to wind turbine types, scale and output within the justification is factually incorrect. The Policy should be clear that targets are a minimum and exceeding them should not be discouraged. A more comprehensive criteria-based policy would therefore be supported. Financial viability is a matter of consideration for developers and not planning. The wording of the policy should be changed as detailed above.

Remove the targets in the policy justification, pending the results of the most up to date evidence base work currently being produced by SQW which will set out the amount of deployable renewable energy.

Support with conditions

Renewable Energy targets are not realistic for housebuilders and will impact on delivery. (S)

The Government intends to drive low carbon development and design through scheduled changes to the building regulations. However, these amendments do not go far enough in order to meet the targets for zero carbon by 2016 (2019 for non-domestic). Furthermore, it could be problematic to simply grant planning permissions for development without any real understanding of its carbon footprint, thus leading to a difficulty in achieving the required building regulation standards. Therefore, the Core Strategy must create a supportive framework which will assist in the delivery of the building regulation requirements in relation to carbon and add to the building regulations to ensure the gap between regulation requirements and zero carbon may be achieved.

No action required

If, as stated, &lt;compliance with the energy hierarchy is essential&gt; the policy should not include an escape clause which allows developers to claim that it is not viable. We suggest &lt;that it would be prohibitively expensive &gt; would be a better form of wording (F)

Comments noted although the outcome would not be entirely different and the evidence required to support both statements would be the same.

No action required
### Plan Ref 9.1: Policy Area CS15: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csopo-414</th>
<th>Wirral to Wyre Team Natural England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Natural England welcomes policy support for renewable energy, but would want to see a commitment to developing an evidence base to understand the landscape and environmental capacity of the district to accept such development. (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td>Some evidence base constraint work has already been carried out within the Liverpool City Region Renewable Energy Capacity Study. This and other more up to date evidence will be reviewed in order to ascertain the appropriate targets and capacity for renewable and low carbon development in the Borough and to identify the areas of least constraint. The Council currently utilises evidence from the Natural Areas and Areas of Landscape History Importance SPG. This will be referenced in the justification to the policy. Comments regarding PPS9 noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>Make reference in the justification to the use of Natural Areas and Areas of Landscape History Importance SPG in assessing acceptability of renewable energy proposals. Amend the wording of the policy so that proposals must demonstrate that they will not r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csopo-455</th>
<th>Mr Andrew Thorley Strategic Land Manager Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan Ref</strong></td>
<td>9.1 Policy Area CS15: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>More evidence is required to justify current policy approach. (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td>Contrary to the submission, Policy CS15 was informed by the evidence base document &quot;Liverpool City Region Renewable Energy Capacity Study&quot; which is available for viewing on the website and referenced within the justification for the policy. Additional evidence has since been produced and a review of both of these will be carried out in order to inform the future iterations of this policy. Comments regarding the financial burden of renewable technologies noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>The latest evidence base documents are referenced within the policy justification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csopo-457</th>
<th>Mr Andrew Thorley Strategic Land Manager Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan Ref</strong></td>
<td>9.1 Policy Area CS15: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Taylor Wimpey UK Limited objects to Policy CS15 as the inclusion of low carbon development requirements such as the Code for Sustainable Homes Standards and BREEAM are outside planning control and this overall approach and policy is flawed. (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td>The Government intends to drive low carbon development and design through scheduled changes to the building regulations. However, these amendments do not go far enough in order to meet the targets for zero carbon by 2016 (2019 for non-domestic). Furthermore, it could be problematic to simply grant planning permissions for development without any real understanding of its carbon footprint, thus leading to a difficulty in achieving the required building regulation standards. Therefore, the Core Strategy must create a supportive framework which will assist in the delivery of the building regulation requirements in relation to carbon and build on the building regulations to ensure the gap between regulation requirements and zero carbon may be achieved. The purpose of an SPG would be to give greater detail and clarity to developers and to provide guidance rather than set new policy. This approach is supported by Government and is in line with national policy. Comments regarding viability are noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>Review the policy in relation to viability and contribution to ensure it fits with the latest national guidance on Allowable Solutions and Zero Carbon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csopo-46</th>
<th>Mr Tony McAteer McAteer Associates Ltd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan Ref</strong></td>
<td>9.1 Policy Area CS15: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>The Council should not seek to impose a higher requirement than nationally without evidence to support such an approach. Higher requirements could compromise development targets being achieved. (S) than that set out in national policy without having any evidence base to support it. (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td>Comments noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>Set standards for low carbon development in line with national guidance until more localised guidance provides evidence to allow and improvement on these standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>csopo-564</th>
<th>Mrs Cath Ibbotson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan Ref</strong></td>
<td>9.1 Policy Area CS15: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>The Policy wording is too stringent and not in accordance with PPS22. The targets set should be a minimum and this should be written within the text. There is no link between the targets within the document and national targets. There are no maps relating to the Renewable Energy Study showing the constraints considered when considering delivery of onshore wind. These should be available for transparency. Areas of least constraint for wind energy should be set out in order to provide direction and guidance for developers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td>1) Comments noted and consideration to be given to the wording including the need to balance harm with benefits. 2) Comments noted. Reference to targets as a minimum will be considered. 3) Comments noted. Targets require reviewing to ensure they are in keeping with the existing and latest evidence which has been developed since the drafting of this policy. 4) Maps illustrating constraints and supporting the Arup study are available on the Council website in the LDF evidence base and identified as Appendix G to the Stage 2 report. 5) Comments regarding spatial policies are noted but may be reviewed in line with the latest evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>Amend wording of policy from &quot;mitigation&quot; to &quot;addressed&quot;. Remove the targets in the policy justification, pending the results of the most up to date evidence base work currently being produced by SOW which will set out the amount of deployable renewable e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary 9.1.3
It is good to read of "the Council's commitment in delivering energy security and climate change initiatives" and their aim to seek "to create a proactive and supportive environment" in these matters. We hope that this attitude may extend to overcome the extreme caution evident in other parts of the local planning system.

#### Response
Comments noted

#### Recommendation
No action required

### Observations Policy Area CS15: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure

#### Plan Ref 9.1
Mrs Margaret Wiltshire Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)

#### Summary
9.1.3 It is good to read of "the Council's commitment in delivering energy security and climate change initiatives" and their aim to seek "to create a proactive and supportive environment" in these matters. We hope that this attitude may extend to overcome the extreme caution evident in other parts of the local planning system.

#### Response
Comments noted

#### Recommendation
No action required

### Observations Policy Area CS15: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure

#### Plan Ref 9.1
Mr Simon Artiss Planning Manager Bellway Homes Ltd

#### Summary
Policy CS14 - we refer you to recent appeals in respect of policies that pursue a tariff, where Inspectors conclude that CIL is the appropriate mechanism. As for the scope and amount of developer contributions, this needs to accord with national advice on proportionality and relevance, etc, as well as needing to respect viability considerations in order to deliver new homes, especially in the Borough's priority locations.

#### Response
Comments noted

#### Recommendation
No action required

### Observations Policy Area CS15: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure

#### Plan Ref 9.1
Charnwick Ltd

#### Summary
The policy should reflect the fact that there may be situations where a loss or partial loss of biodiversity or nature conservation sites could be regarded as appropriate. (S)

#### Response
Comments noted. The Policy changes suggested may be more suitable to consider in the Development Management Policies DPD

#### Recommendation
Additional wording will be added to include making reference to river and wetland habitat corridors alongside associated bankside habitats.

### Observations Policy Area CS15: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure

#### Plan Ref 9.1
Mr Philip Carter Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency

#### Summary
Although we support Policy CS16 in principle, we would recommend expanding the support for strategic green links and wildlife corridors to include the retention of river and wetland habitat corridors alongside associated bankside habitats. (S)

#### Response
Comments noted.

#### Recommendation
Additional text will be included to include making reference to river and wetland habitat corridors alongside associated bankside habitats.

### Observations Policy Area CS15: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure

#### Plan Ref 9.1
Mr Martyn Coy Planner British Waterways

#### Summary
Suggest an amendment to paragraph 9.2.1 to identify the role of the inland waterway network in providing open spaces and natural assets. (S)

#### Response
Comments noted.

#### Recommendation
Additional wording will be added to include inland waterways and canal network.

### Observations Policy Area CS15: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure

#### Plan Ref 9.1
Mr Nick Sandford The Woodland Trust

#### Summary
The policy on ancient woodland protection which is currently in the West Lancashire Local Plan, should be carried forward into the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy should refer to the specific benefits provided by trees and woodland as a key component of green infrastructure. It is imperative that the Core Strategy makes a commitment to significant new planting and creation of new woodland. (S)

#### Response
Comments noted regarding strengthening wording. However some of the comments are too detailed for the Core Strategy which is a strategic document. Some of the comments may be more appropriate a development management dpd

#### Recommendation
Additional wording will be added to strengthen the policy 'Development will not be permitted that would directly or indirectly damage existing mature or ancient woodland, veteran trees or species-rich hedgerows.'

### Observations Policy Area CS15: Low Carbon Development and Energy Infrastructure

#### Plan Ref 9.2
Skelmersdale College

#### Summary
The policy does not recognise there may be situations where a loss of green space is appropriate in terms of development proposals. The policy and justification wording should be altered to reflect situations where loss of green space can be regarded as acceptable subject to suitable safeguards.

#### Response
The Policy makes reference to the delivery of a Green Infrastructure and Open Space Strategy. It is within this document that the relevant deficiencies and surpluses in green space will be identified. The role of the policy would then be to manage development in consultation with this strategy so the appropriate outcomes are delivered in all spatial areas.

#### Recommendation
No action required
A range of policies should be adopted to promote a more diverse flora and fauna across West Lancashire as a whole, both in urban and rural areas, rather than just in isolated pockets - a more holistic approach.

**Response**
Policy CS16 seeks to provide a network of green corridors that will provide habitats to support biodiversity and prevent fragmentation and prevent fragmentation of the natural environment. The Core Strategy is a strategic document and as such provides overarchig policies. Although the comment has been noted this level of detail is not appropriate in the Core Strategy.

**Recommendation**
No action required.

---

**Observations**

**Policy Area CS16: Preserving and Enhancing Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity**

- Mr Francis Williams, member Ormskirk Friends of the Earth: Support with conditions
- Mr Roger Clayton: Support with conditions
- Wirral to Wyre Team Natural England: Additional comments regarding biodiversity/geodiversity and SAC’s will be added to the Policy.
- Ms Judith Nelson, English Heritage: Comments noted with reference to biodiversity and geodiversity. Additional wording to be included including including SAC’s
- Mr Alan Hubbard, Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust: Comments noted
- Mr Alan Hubbard, Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust: We will include include a reference to the historic environment and its contribution to GI.
- Crompton property developments: Comments noted
- David Crompton: Observations

---

**Summary**
Natural England believes that Green Infrastructure policies in Core Strategies should commit to developing a delivery framework for an integrated network of multi-functional green infrastructure, with specific sites identified for conservation, enhancement or inclusion in the network. Policies should also seek to realise the potential of greenspace for multi-functional use and benefits.

**Response**
Comments noted with reference to biodiversity and geodiversity. Additional wording to be included including including SAC’s

**Recommendation**
Additional comments regarding biodiversity/geodiversity and SAC’s will be added to the Policy.
### Summary

**cspo-342**
Mr Roger Clayton  
Plan Ref 9.3  
Policy Area CS17: Enhancing West Lancashire’s Distinctive Character and Ensuring Sustainable Design  
Support with conditions

**Response**
Comments noted and changes will be considered.

**Recommendation**
Change text to accord with above suggestion and ensure positive contribution to landscapes.

---

### Observations

---

**cspo-416**
Wirral to Wyre Team Natural England  
Plan Ref 9.3  
Policy Area CS17: Enhancing West Lancashire’s Distinctive Character and Ensuring Sustainable Design  
Observations

**Summary**
Natural England welcomes specific Core Strategy policies for conservation and enhancement of landscape character and quality in general for all landscapes in support of the European Landscapes Convention (ELC), along with specific features and character areas identified as particularly sensitive to development. Detailed polices that are informed by locally specific evidence through a Landscape Character Assessment. Unfortunately we do not consider that the policy does any of this. The policy is weak, and unspecific. We would welcome further research into baseline information and a re-write of the policy.

**Response**
Comments noted.

**Recommendation**
All policies in Chapter 9 will be reviewed to ensure they are in line with PPS7, PPS9, PPG17 and locally specific.

---

**cspo-431**
Ms Judith Nelson, English Heritage  
Plan Ref 9.3  
Policy Area CS17: Enhancing West Lancashire’s Distinctive Character and Ensuring Sustainable Design  
Observations

**Summary**
Policy CS17 is supported however it is suggested that it could benefit from being more place specific and proactive. (s)

**Response**
Comments noted. Consideration given to including a statement explaining how the local authority will respond to English Heritage Building’s At Risk register.

**Recommendation**
Include in the justification of this policy that the Council maintains an "At Risk Register" which it will continue to monitor and keep up to date.

---

**cspo-617**
Mr Alan Hubbard, Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust  
Plan Ref 9.3  
Policy Area CS17: Enhancing West Lancashire’s Distinctive Character and Ensuring Sustainable Design  
Support

**Summary**
Support the encouragement of good quality design. Support the section of policy relating to recognising heritage assets. Support promotion of the active use of the Borough’s landscapes. (S)

**Response**
Comments noted

**Recommendation**
Registered Historic Parks and Gardens is included in the list in the first bullet point under Cultural and Heritage Assets.

---

**cspo-662**
Ms Judith Nelson, English Heritage  
Plan Ref 9.3  
Policy Area CS17: Enhancing West Lancashire’s Distinctive Character and Ensuring Sustainable Design  
Observations

**Summary**
The policy is supported however it is suggested that it could benefit from being more place specific and proactive. Consideration needs to be given to existing heritage strategies and area appraisals (S)

**Response**
Comments noted. Consideration given to including a statement explaining how the local authority will respond to English Heritage Building’s at Risk register.

**Recommendation**
It is stated within the justification that the Council’s At Risk Register will be maintained up to date.

---

**cspo-751**
David Sherratt, Local Development Framework Lead United Utilities  
Plan Ref 9.3  
Policy Area CS17: Enhancing West Lancashire’s Distinctive Character and Ensuring Sustainable Design  
Observations

**Summary**
United Utilities encourages the use of water efficient designs and development wherever this is possible. LPA and developers should consider the total carbon impact of future developments; not only the footprint of the development but also the carbon impact for additional infrastructure assets; their associated treatment processes and their future maintenance and operation requirements.

**Response**
Comments noted

**Recommendation**
No action required
The Coal Authority would suggest that the 6th bullet point in the policy should be amended to read: “…minimise the risk from all forms of pollution and contamination and land instability.”

Reason – In order to comply with the national policy advice in PPG14 in relation to development on unstable land this requires both a strategic and development management policy framework. (S)

Response Change of wording request noted

Recommendation Amend the 6th bullet point to include land instability.

---

cspo-211
Plan Ref Chapter 10 - Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a “Plan B”

Summary Plan B should identify that Appley Bridge is capable of delivering sustainable residential development without harm to the overall purposes and openness of the green belt.

Response The Council’s current evidence base work suggests that, whilst Appley Bridge may benefit from reasonable proximity to Wigan, service infrastructure in general is not the most sustainable within Appley Bridge. Furthermore, the draft Green Belt study did not identify any parcels which do not fulfill at least one purpose of the Green Belt as set out within PPG2.

Recommendation No Action Required

---

cspo-244
Plan Ref Chapter 10 - Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a “Plan B”

Summary Plan B needs to be part of the main residential strategy, as it will definitely be required. It should be considered on a wider basis than currently proposed. (S)

Response Comments noted

Recommendation Housing targets for Skelmersdale to be reduced to a more deliverable level. A more robust and detailed “Plan B” to be set out to ensure flexibility.

---

cspo-300
Plan Ref Chapter 10 - Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a “Plan B”

Summary Plan B is not the most appropriate or sustainable as it relies on further Green Belt release. Alternative non-Green Belt opportunities should be explored, including the development of land on the urban fringe of the Key/Rural Sustainable Villages.

Response Comments noted

Recommendation A more robust and detailed “Plan B” to be set out to ensure flexibility.

---

cspo-47
Plan Ref Chapter 10 - Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a “Plan B”

Summary The Council’s approach is contrary to national planning policy by having a ‘Plan B’ from the outset. The Northern Parishes, especially Banks, can take more development than suggested in the draft Plan. The plan should recognise that the Northern Parishes and Banks in particular can play an important role in delivering the Council’s objectives. (S)

Response The Council considers that it is appropriate to include within the Core Strategy a variation in the course of action, should the original preferred course of action prove impossible to deliver within the plan’s timescales. Although labelled ‘Plan B’, it is not a completely different plan, but a variation of the strategy. Building such flexibility into the plan would avoid the need for “frequent updating”, contrary to the claims of the Objector. The approach set out in the Core Strategy is considered to be in line with paragraphs 4.14 and 4.15 of PPS12. However, the Council agrees with the Objector that, as far as is possible at present, any doubts should be resolved in the Core Strategy whilst it is being prepared. With regard to the Northern Parishes, the Core Strategy recognises the potential for development in this area. If the Dispersal option were chosen, Banks would have an extra 100 dwellings. However, given infrastructure constraints, the settlement of Banks is not appropriate for significant amounts of development, certainly not enough to deliver the equivalent of a ‘Plan B’. Northern Parishes residents have tended to express the view that significant amounts of development should not be directed to this area.

Recommendation A more robust and detailed “Plan B” should be proposed within the Core Strategy, including in what circumstances the “Plan B” may be triggered.

---

cspo-533
Plan Ref Chapter 10 - Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a “Plan B”

Summary Plan B is not sound enough as the option has not been tested.

Response Comments noted

Recommendation A more robust and detailed ”Plan B” to be set out to ensure flexibility.
Summary
Flexibility is important (S)
Response Comments noted. It is considered that the Core Strategy has scope for flexibility, as suggested.
Recommendation
No action required

Plan Ref Chapter 10 Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a “Plan B”

Observations

Mr Keith Keeley
Plan Ref Chapter 10 Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a “Plan B”
Summary Generally this section is difficult to understand and may be improved by addition of flow diagram/s
Response Comments Noted
Recommendation
A more robust and detailed “Plan B” to be set out to ensure flexibility.

Mr Simon Artiss Planning Manager Bellway Homes Ltd
Plan Ref Chapter 10 Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a “Plan B”
Summary Chapter 10 (Plan B) - in our experience Inspectors seek greater detail on alternative delivery scenarios than you provide here, and we hope that the above comments assist in this.
Response Comments Noted
Recommendation
A more robust and detailed “Plan B” to be set out to ensure flexibility.

Crompton property developments
Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a “Plan B”

Summery Generally supports need for a fall-back position for development. (s)
Response Comments Noted
Recommendation
No Action Required

Bickerstaffe Trust
Plan Ref Chapter 10 Delivery and Risk in the Core Strategy - a “Plan B”
Summary The Council should revise its fall-back policy in order to provide sufficient flexibility and ensure delivery of housing. If not chosen as the strategic development site, Alty’s Farm should be included in a formal policy which deals with “Plan B”. (S)
Response Once a preferred location(s) for Green Belt release have been selected for the Core Strategy, the Council will be reviewing its “Plan B” for the Core Strategy and ensuring that it is consistent with the latest Government policy and advice. The Alty’s Farm site, along with all other sites previously considered or put forward through representations to the CSPO consultation, will be considered for inclusion in an improved “Plan B”.
Recommendation
A more robust and detailed “Plan B” to be set out to ensure flexibility.

Mr Philip Carter Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency
Plan Ref 10.1 Maintaining Flexibility in the Core Strategy
Summary Plans A and B are equally constrained by sewage capacity issues at New Lane. Widespread use of private treatment plants, septic tanks, etc is not supported in a sewered area. If considering any growth at Banks, a Level 2 SFRA would first be required. (S)
Response Comments noted. It is agreed that failure to secure the upgrading of the New Lane WWTW (or to secure increases in capacity elsewhere) needs to be taken into consideration when considering a ‘Plan B’.
Recommendation
The “Plan B” should incorporate sites that are not affected by the constraint issue at New Lane WWTW, to generate flexibility if infrastructure improvements are delayed.

Mr Shaun Taylor Planning Associate Director G L Hearne Property Consultants
Plan Ref 10.1 Maintaining Flexibility in the Core Strategy
Summary Plan B should be fully integrated into the Core Strategy to ensure delivery of core objectives, it should not be a back up plan. (S)
Response Comments noted
Recommendation
Housing targets for Skelmersdale to be reduced to a more deliverable level. A more robust and detailed “Plan B” to be set out to ensure flexibility.
**cspo-615**  
**Plan Ref:** Chapter 11  
**Observations**  
**Summary:** No mention of Community Infrastructure Levy DPD?  
**Response:** At the time of going to press the Council had not taken any formal decision to prepare a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging schedule. Since then, the Government have lent their support to CIL and so the Council have now begun exploring the preparation of a CIL Charging Schedule. The CIL Charging Schedule is not itself a Development Plan Document (DPD) but will be informed by other DPD's and evidence with the LDF.  
**Recommendation:** No Action Required

| **cspo-597** | **Mr Keith Keeley**  
| **Plan Ref:** Chapter 12  
| **Observations**  
| **Summary:** There is no explanation of Infrastructure Delivery Plan or Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)  
| **Response:** Comments noted  
| **Recommendation:** Add definitions of IDP and CIL into Glossary  

| **cspo-598** | **Mrs Margaret Wiltshire**  
| **Plan Ref:** Appendix B: The Spatial & Strategic Objectives  
| **Observations**  
| **Summary:** Various comments about correcting or removing certain areas of Appendix B.  
| **Response:** Comments noted  
| **Recommendation:** No change.  

| **cspo-206** | **Mrs Anne-Sophie Bonton**  
| **Plan Ref:** Appendix C: Planning Policy Background  
| **Observations**  
| **Summary:** References to LTP should be updated as LTP3 (2011-2021) was adopted by the Full Council Thursday 28th May 2011. (S)  
| **Response:** Comments noted  
| **Recommendation:** LTP3 and other emerging policy background documents will be reviewed and included within the next stage of the Core Strategy.  

| **cspo-601** | **Mrs Margaret Wiltshire**  
| **Plan Ref:** Appendix C: Planning Policy Background  
| **Observations**  
| **Summary:** p.168 Revise, replace or remove the section on Regional Plans. p.170 Revise, now LTP3 is out.  
| **Response:** Comments noted  
| **Recommendation:** The Planning Policy Background section will be revised and updated through the next stage of the Core Strategy. This will reflect the most up to date planning policy background and in particular the status of Regional Planning.
Query as to allocated land on Cobbs Clough Road (S)

Response

Under the Preferred Options Cobbs Clough is being considered as a non employment area i.e an area for housing. Despite marketing, Cobbs Clough has failed to deliver as an employment site and the Council believe that an employment site adjacent to the M58 would be more attractive to developers given its improved transport connections to the motorway network. Regardless of this fact if Cobbs Clough was maintained as an employment area Green Belt release would still be required in Skelmersdale for housing.

Recommendation

No action required.

cspo-343

Mr Roger Clayton

Response

Evidence explained in detail throughout the various supporting studies (eg JELPS & SHLAA). No action required.

Recommendation

No action required.

cspo-345

Mr Roger Clayton

Response

Target reviewed but proposed level of housing is required. Selection of sites to minimise loss of agricultural land and impact on rural character.

Recommendation

Target reviewed but proposed level of housing is required. Selection of sites to minimise loss of agricultural land and impact on rural character.

cspo-603

Mrs Margaret Wiltshire Planning Volunteer, Treasurer CPRE (West Lancs Group)

Response

The possibility of, and mechanism for, restraint will be revisited. It is considered prudent to have some means whereby restraint can be applied at a future point in the Core Strategy period, should a genuine need for restraint arise, therefore Appendix E should not be deleted altogether. However, the Council accepts that restraint is unlikely to be required for the foreseeable future in terms of housing land supply, especially given the current government “growth agenda”. In terms of rural settlements, the possibility of restraint may be more real, given that settlements tend to have an “environmental capacity” which, if exceeded, could result in harm to the settlement, its function, amenity and environment, contrary to the principles of sustainable development. This is especially the case given infrastructure (utilities /roads, etc.) constraints in a number of the rural settlements in West Lancashire. Therefore, it is considered appropriate for there to be some means by which restraint could be justified, if necessary, at some point in the future. However, the wording of Appendix E will be amended, so that restraint ‘may be considered’ rather than automatically applied, and that it will only be considered if the targets are exceeded by a significant amount, and if there is robust evidence that more housing would cause demonstrable harm. (Please note that settlement targets are not minima.)

Recommendation

Tone down the section of the residential development policy regarding the possibility of restraint once settlement (or spatial area) development targets are exceeded by a significant amount. Remove the section on the mechanism for restraint in Appendix E.
Recommendations for re-wording (S).

Response
Comments Noted. The reference about low demand is referring to developer interest as Appendix E is about deliverability and this is dependent upon developers bringing land forward. The Council is maintaining a focus on Skelmersdale throughout the document in order to facilitate much needed regeneration by creating a supportive framework for actions which may well be driven by processes outside of planning.

Recommendation
No Action Required

Observations
Appendix E: Delivery & Risk in the Core Strategy

cspo-347
Mr Roger Clayton

Observations
Appendix E: Delivery & Risk in the Core Strategy

Summary
Recommendations for re-wording (S).

Response
Comments Noted. The reference about low demand is referring to developer interest as Appendix E is about deliverability and this is dependent upon developers bringing land forward. The Council is maintaining a focus on Skelmersdale throughout the document in order to facilitate much needed regeneration by creating a supportive framework for actions which may well be driven by processes outside of planning.

Recommendation
No Action Required

Observations
Appendix E: Delivery & Risk in the Core Strategy

Summary
p.199 Enabling sustainable transport choice Why not enlist the help of Parish Councils to elicit what transport the rural community needs (rather than would like occasionally)? In some cases a local minibus service would fit the bill on, if more people can be persuaded out of their cars onto buses, the LCC subsidy and hence the rural bus services would be less at risk.

Response
The Borough Council have consulted Parish Council’s as part of this consultation process and are happy to continue to work with parish Council’s. However the Core Strategy is a strategic document and cannot address individual local schemes. It should also be noted that Lancashire County Council are the transport authority for West Lancashire who implement individual scheme and these comments may be more relevant aimed at Lancashire County Council.

Recommendation
No Further Action Required

Observations
Appendix E: Delivery & Risk in the Core Strategy

Summary
The delivery strategy is inadequate and does not meet the minimum soundness requirements as set out in PPS12. (s)

Response
comments noted

Recommendation
Review Appendix E and ensure it is consistent with the latest advice on the Delivery Strategy.

Observations
Appendix E: Delivery & Risk in the Core Strategy