



APPENDIX A

CIL FUNDING PROGRAMME 2019/20

CONSULTATION FEEDBACK SUMMARY REPORT

December 2018

Introduction

West Lancashire Borough Council invited comments on the CIL Funding Programme proposals between 12 October and 9 November 2018. The consultation sought comments on two aspects:

- which projects up to £100,000 of the CIL monies retained by the Council in 2018/19 should be spent on in 2019/20; and
- which projects the neighbourhood CIL monies received in 2017/18 within the unparished area of Ormskirk should be spent on in 2019/20.

Cabinet agreed in January 2018, that a total of £100,000 of CIL monies retained by the Council would be allocated each year through the CIL Funding Programme to fund 'smaller' infrastructure projects across the Borough that require no more than £100,000 of CIL funding. The remainder of the monies collected would be used to build up a larger pot for future funding of larger, strategic infrastructure projects (requiring more than £100,000 of CIL funding). It is considered that this strikes an appropriate balance between the delivery of short-term, local projects and larger, strategic schemes in the long-term.

Note that unallocated CIL monies collected between 2014 and 2018 have already been set aside to enable CIL funds to build up and thereby support the delivery of much larger, costlier projects in the future.

Summary of Representations

30 respondents made comments through the consultation; a summary of which are outlined through this feedback report. This report also sets out the Council recommendations stemming from the responses. The consultation responses received are contained within the appendix to this report.

Borough-wide CIL funding

**Do you agree with our shortlist of projects?
What do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why?
Which two projects do you think should be selected?**

Of those respondents who chose to answer this question, all agreed with the shortlist of projects.

Sluice Lane Public Right of Way (PROW)

Respondents supported improvements to the PROW, stating that the path is well-used with people using it as a route to school, the centre of the village, and to access Mere Sands Wood. Some said that the project is vital to maintain this valuable route which is located away from busy roads. Many confirmed that the pathway is currently damaged and in need of repair to avoid the closure of the path. It is considered that the footpath would help encourage walking and cycling to promote health and wellbeing, whilst reducing the number of car journeys taken for short and long distances.

Cheshire Lines

A number of the respondents supported the Cheshire Lines path, and considered that improvements to the cycle path surfacing would encourage greater use.

Hunters Hill

No comments were received that specifically stated support for this project. However, a number of respondents included this in their 'two project selection' preferences.

**Are there any other projects on the IDS you think should be considered for CIL funding?
Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS?
Why should they be included?**

Respondents made the following suggestions:

Existing schemes on the IDS

- Overhaul of the Ormskirk UTMC System, Ormskirk because the gridlock in Ormskirk is having a detrimental effect on the town and is putting off visitors and harming the economy
- Cycle and pedestrian link between Ormskirk rail station and Ormskirk bus station, with further improvements along Ruff Lane (via a complete road re-design) to connect the bus station with Edge Hill University
- Improvements to railway facilities in Burscough, the relocation of Burscough library into the rail interchange office, Heathfields connectivity, improvements on the A570, and cycle/footpath improvements on the industrial estates in Skelmersdale.

New schemes for inclusion on the IDS

- Improvements to footpaths at Mawdesley-Parbold, Parbold-Newburgh
- Improvements to the canal towpath between Rufford and Burscough

Council Response

To acknowledge that all three of the shortlisted schemes gained support.

With regard the Ormskirk traffic system and the cycle/pedestrian links, these have been put forward

for funding in 2019/20 using Ormskirk neighbourhood monies and so do not form part of the strategic funding considerations. The reasons for this were set out in the draft CIL Funding Report.

With regard the Burscough schemes, improvement on the A570 and cycle links in Skelmersdale, these have not been put forward as insufficient information is known in relation to delivery and costs. As further details are provided by the relevant infrastructure providers/partners, then they can be considered in future years. Burscough Parish Council has received significant amounts of neighbourhood CIL monies which they could consider using to fund those schemes in their area.

The suggestions for footpath/towpath improvements are appropriate schemes and will be placed on the IDS, and discussed with Lancashire County Council (as highways provider) and the Canal and Rivers Trust for consideration in the future.

Ormskirk neighbourhood CIL funding

**Do you agree with our shortlist of projects?
What do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why?
Which projects should be selected?**

Overhaul of Ormskirk UTMC system

Support was voiced for this project to ease congestion around the town centre.

Cycle/pedestrian link between Ormskirk bus and rail stations

Some respondents felt that this project was vitally important to help promote walking and cycling alternatives in order to reduce traffic around Ormskirk and to make cycling a better, safer experience. It was considered that it would also help improve the image of the town as people arrive by train.

Some did not consider there was a need for improvement because the proposed route is not amenable to cycles and would endanger pedestrians. Improved pedestrian facilities would be welcomed but there is presently insufficient lighting. Some were concerned that the only way of making improvements would be to remove the trees which would then be harmful to wildlife and the environment.

Improvements at Thompson Avenue

Support was given for improvements at Thompson Avenue, because "parts of it were removed some years ago" and has not had funding since. Facilities that accommodated a wide age range were supported although there were some concerns regarding safety and ensuring "gangs aren't attracted there".

Improvements at Coronation Park

Several respondents thought that Coronation Park has had sufficient money spent on it and does not require any more at present.

Are there any other projects on the IDS you think should be considered for CIL funding?

Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS? Why should they be included?

Some commented that too much money is being spent in Ormskirk and more should be invested in surrounding areas such as Skelmersdale.

Respondents made the following suggestions:

- Boating lake in Church Fields, Ormskirk
- Clean-up of the duck pond in Coronation Park
- Removal of car parking fees in Ormskirk car parks
- Planting of wild flowers on road verges and roundabouts
- Easement of parking issues due to Edge Hill University

Council Response

To acknowledge that the largest levels of support were received for the Ormskirk UTMC system, Thompson Avenue and the cycle/pedestrian links between the rail and bus stations.

This consultation came in two parts – that for CIL monies which can be spent anywhere in the Borough, and that for Ormskirk neighbourhood CIL monies. Ormskirk neighbourhood monies are ‘ringfenced’ in that they may only be spent in Ormskirk in consultation with the local community. To ensure appropriate use of funds, none of the schemes proposed through the draft CIL Funding Programme 2019/20 for the use of borough-wide CIL monies were located in Ormskirk, and instead all schemes in Ormskirk look to CIL neighbourhood funding. Therefore, it is not the case that too much CIL money is being spent in Ormskirk, but instead is in alignment with legislative requirements.

Those others schemes suggested are not appropriate for CIL funding. CIL must be spent on infrastructure required to support new development and cannot be used to remedy existing infrastructure deficiencies, unless they would be made worse by new development. Some of the suggestions received do not fall within the definition of infrastructure. CIL cannot be used for a boating lake, to clean up a duck pond or to plant flowers on road verges. The removal of car parking fees is not related to infrastructure or CIL. The Council are aware of the car parking issues at the University, but this is an issue to be resolved by the University.