

CIL Funding Programme Consultation (October 2016)

Representations received

Rep Number	1
Name	Joanne Harrison
Organisation	-
Response method	Email
Date received	5-10-2016
Comments	After looking at all the options I think OPTION 4 would be the best, as this will enable to build the amount for another 12 months and be able to look at some match funding for some of the projects and the money go further
WLBC Response	Comments noted

Rep Number	2
Name	Marcus Dunning
Organisation	-
Response method	Email
Date received	5-10-2016
Comments	<p>Would just like to add to the refurbishment of the Haskayne Pavilion. A lot of local residents are really happy about this project going ahead, as the children/youth and some adults around Haskayne do not have much in facilities to do anything. The Youth club would bring back youth from sitting in their houses on iPads, xbox, playstation etc. and get them out and about like the days before internet etc. came about.</p> <p>As for the Rehearsal music studio, people are coming forward in there droves asking about the possibilities of playing there music in a private studio and not pester their neighbours with guitars, drums and singing noises, having this studio on their own doorstep is a massive boost to our community, as the nearest studios are in Ormskirk and some are charging disastrous prices for just a few hours, where as the Haskayne Music Studio is a community run project, and is a non-profit organisation.</p> <p>The former L.O Jeff site has 88 plus homes, with 78% of them having children/youths. We recently hear that more homes could be built next to Chisnall Brook in the coming years, at least 60 more homes, so the population will increase in the future when this development finally arises.</p>
WLBC Response	Support for Haskayne Pavilion noted.

Rep Number	3
Name	Diane Clarke
Organisation	Network Rail
Response method	Email
Date received	5-10-2016
Comments	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback to the proposed policy.</p> <p>Network Rail is the public owner and operator of Britain's railway infrastructure, which includes the tracks, signals, tunnels, bridges, viaducts, level crossings and stations – the largest of which we also manage. All profits made by the company, including from commercial development, are reinvested directly back into the network.</p> <p>Network Rail would comment as follows:</p> <p>The Regulation 123 list includes: <i>Strategic transport and highways improvements or provision to include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - cycle network provision and improvements - footpaths - bus stops <p>Network Rail would request that the Regulation 123 list going forward includes the following within the Strategic Transport and Highways provision:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CIL contributions for facilities at railway stations required due to increased patronage from developments 2. CIL contributions for mitigation measures at level crossings required due to increased usage from developments
WLBC Response	<p>At this time we are NOT consulting on the Regulation 123 statement (adopted July 2014). We ARE consulting on the CIL Funding Programme for 2017/18. As your comments relate to the R123 list and not the CIL Funding Programme they cannot be considered through this consultation.</p> <p>To clarify, the R123 list supports the expenditure of CIL on strategic transport improvements and provision and the listed example infrastructure is not exhaustive. Therefore your suggestions could be considered for CIL funding without the need to revise the R123 list.</p>

Rep Number	4
Name	Warren Hilton
Organisation	Highways England
Response method	Email
Date received	6-10-2016
Comments	Thank you for offering us the opportunity to comment upon the proposed expenditure of CIL monies within West Lancashire. Having reviewed the documentation, there are no comments that we feel we need to make.
WLBC Response	Comments noted

Rep Number	5
Name	Jacqui Salt
Organisation	Natural England
Response method	Email
Date received	12/10/2016
Comments	<p>Natural England has no specific comments to make on the draft CIL Charges, however would like to make the following general comments, which we hope are helpful.</p> <p>Natural England is not a service provider, nor do we have detailed knowledge of infrastructure requirements of the area concerned. However, we note that the National Planning Policy Framework Para 114 states “Local planning authorities should set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure.” We view CIL as playing an important role in delivering such a strategic approach.</p> <p>As such we advise that the council gives careful consideration to how it intends to meet this aspect of the NPPF, and the role of the CIL in this. In the absence of a CIL approach to enhancing the natural environment, we would be concerned that the only enhancements to the natural environment would be ad hoc, and not deliver a strategic approach, and that as such the local plan may not be consistent with the NPPF.</p> <p>Potential infrastructure requirements may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to natural greenspace. • Allotment provision. • Infrastructure identified in the local Rights of Way Improvement Plan. • Infrastructure identified by any Local Nature Partnerships and or BAP projects. • Infrastructure identified by any AONB management plans. • Infrastructure identified by any Green infrastructure strategies. • Other community aspirations or other green infrastructure projects (e.g. street tree planting). • Infrastructure identified to deliver climate change mitigation and adaptation. • Any infrastructure requirements needed to ensure that the

	Local Plan is Habitats Regulation Assessment compliant (further discussion with Natural England will be required should this be the case.)
WLBC Response	West Lancashire are NOT consulting on the draft CIL charges. CIL has already been adopted and is not subject to a review of the charges at this time. The natural environment is included within our adopted R123 list. Comments noted.

Rep Number	6
Name	Margaret Heslegrave
Organisation	-
Response method	Email (via customer services)
Date received	13/10/2016
Comments	Would like the council to spend the available money on dropping the kerbs on the roads leading to Ormskirk town centre, Chapel Street, St Helens Road Altys Lane and in the town centre, for people accessing the town centre on disability scooters.
WLBC Response	CIL must be spent on new infrastructure, required to support new development. Dropping of kerbs is not a requirement of new development.

Rep Number	7
Name	Gillian Laybourn
Organisation	Historic England
Response method	Email
Date received	17/10/2016
Comments	Thank you for sending this to Historic England. We have no comment to make on how CIL monies should be spent.
WLBC Response	Comments noted.

Rep Number	8
Name	Alan Fleming
Organisation	-
Response method	Letter
Date received	14/10/2016
Comments	Thank you for the information in this letter. As I am 78 years young, I would like to stay in Skem even after I leave this world, so how about a cemetery to rest my head. We do need one, close to home and no transport needed for visits. Please!
WLBC Response	Support for a Skelmersdale cemetery noted.

Rep Number	9
Name	John B Gray
Organisation	-
Response method	Comments proforma
Date received	14/10/2016
Comments	<p>I would like to express my appreciation of the WLBC's action in giving us this opportunity to make our feelings known.</p> <p>Which option do you support most? Do you agree with that proposed? Support Option Three: Having walked the towpath and observed its use, on a number of occasions, I appreciate the need for its improvement, and its utility for residents and visitors. Though I have not myself used the Cheshire Lines path, comments I have heard, suggest similar reasons apply here as to the Canal suggestion.</p> <p>Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Having read the consultation documents, I would judge all the projects listed to be worthy of serious consideration, but I agree that a selection has to be made. I agree with the choice suggested in Option 3, with the addition suggested below.</p> <p>Are there any other projects on the IDS you think should be considered? I would like to see support given also the Mere Sands Wood Visitor Centre, to encourage greater use of this potentially very valuable amenity, not least, on grounds of public health.</p> <p>Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes for inclusion on the IDS? -</p>
WLBC Response	Support for Option 3 (Canal towpath and Cheshire Lines) noted. Support for Mere Sands Wood Visitor Centre noted.

Rep Number	10
Name	Mrs S Burns & Mr J Dolan
Organisation	-
Response method	Comments proforma
Date received	17/10/2016
Comments	<p>Which option do you support most? Do you agree with that proposed? Support Option Two: I feel as a user of the towpath in question that this type of project is long overdue. Ideally I would like the whole of the towpath from the wharf to Parbold and beyond be improved right to the boundary of Wigan. This will encourage more people to use it as at the moment the path is often boggy and overgrown. I cycle regularly the path from Burscough to Wigan and many people from Wigan cycle it to Burscough. There is a marked difference in the towpath on the West Lancs side – the Wigan side is paved and is a pleasure to walk and ride it. If it was paved like Wigan it could be promoted as alternative eco-</p>

	<p>friendly transport link between the villages along its route.</p> <p>Option three comments: Would prefer the money to be invested in the one big project.</p> <p>Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Agree with the shortlisted projects</p> <p>Are there any other projects on the IDS you think should be considered? IDS Project 22 New Library for Burscough</p> <p>Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes for inclusion on the IDS? -</p>
WLBC Response	<p>Support for Option two (canal towpath) noted. Support for a new library in Burscough noted.</p> <p>Lancashire County Council have recently announced the relocation of the existing Burscough library to The Grove due to County funding restrictions. The Borough Council will continue to work with LCC to identify need and the ability to deliver a new library.</p>

Rep Number	11
Name	Margaret Atherton
Organisation	Hilldale Parish Council
Response method	Email/IDS proforma
Date received	18/10/2016
Comments	Submission of proposal for IDS – Hilldale Jubilee Playing field and footpath
WLBC Response	Added to IDS as project number 127

Rep Number	12
Name	JW Rothwell
Organisation	-
Response method	Phone call
Date received	19/10/16
Comments	No objection in principle to raising of funds through CIL. Council should make decision and declare any interests. Council should keep some of the CIL money in a 'reserve' pot for emergencies.
WLBC Response	Comments noted.

Rep Number	13
Name	Julie Bell
Organisation	Lancashire County Council (Libraries)
Response method	Email
Date received	20/10/16
Comments	We have no comments to add . Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
WLBC Response	Comments noted.

Rep Number	14
Name	Deborah Smith
Organisation	-
Response method	Letter
Date received	24/10/2016
Comments	Concerning CIL monies, I would like you to consider a footpath of some description on the A5209 road in between Moss Bridge Lane and the Tawd Vale Scout Camp. This is a notoriously busy road and incredibly dangerous to walk down. To watch all the children and young scouts and guides walking along this stretch of the road your heart is in your mouth, and I would like one of the Councillors just to try it for themselves. I have complained about the litter along this stretch of the road only to be told it is just too dangerous for a council worker to pick up the litter. If that isn't straight from the horses mouth I don't know what is. I will leave this with you to consider this suggestion.
WLBC Response	CIL monies must be used to fund infrastructure required to support NEW development. Whilst new development may increase the volume of traffic using the borough's roads, this issue relating to pedestrian safety along the A5209 is a pre-existing problem and one that occurs in other areas of the Borough. Your letter will be passed onto Lancashire County Council for their consideration. If they consider it to be an appropriate and feasible project, they can request its inclusion on the IDS.

Rep Number	15
Name	Nick Eckersley
Organisation	NRE Surveyors Ltd
Response method	Email
Date received	25/10/2016
Comments	We refer to the CIL consultation document which refers to the above. We act for the owners of the Yew Tree Farm Strategic Development site and there is a resolution to grant planning for allotments on this site. Our client, Crompton Property Developments Ltd are currently in discussions with West Lancs Borough Council and the S.106 Agreement and we can confirm that we have every intention of providing new allotments as part of our development proposals for

	the site.
WLBC Response	Comments noted.

Rep Number	16
Name	Bryan Pready
Organisation	-
Response method	Email / proforma
Date received	25/10/2016
Comments	<p>Which option do you support most? Do you agree with that proposed?</p> <p><i>Do you support Option ONE?</i></p> <p>YES. This is an important project because it helps to fully establish the “Pier to Pier” cycle route between Southport and Wigan, which is also part of the National Cycle Network under the designation Route 562. Both Sefton and Wigan Councils have upgraded the route within their boundaries and another section, within West Lancs, has already been upgraded using a government grant. Improvement is needed on this section because it is very popular with both walkers and cyclists. A better surface is needed so all users can fully enjoy it. The project will need to be followed up in future years with further investment to improve other substandard sections, such as in the Parbold area, where the surface is often very muddy after rain.</p> <p><i>Do you support Option TWO?</i></p> <p>No . RE: Improvements at Cheshire Lines: Yes but I would judge that this rural route is a lower priority than the tow path at Burscough, which is used by large numbers of visitors to the Borough, as well as locals.</p> <p><i>Do you support Option THREE?</i></p> <p>YES. In addition to the Canal Towpath improvements at Burscough, I would choose Improvements to cycle path / footpaths at Cheshire Lines, Great Altcar / Downholland.</p> <p><i>Do you support Option FOUR?</i></p> <p>No. I think it is important to start using the CIL fund so that local people can see that some benefit has come from recent planning approvals. Too often in the past has money that the council has received from developers remained unused for years on end.</p> <p>Do you agree with our shortlist of projects?</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Are there any other projects on the IDS you think should be considered?</p> <p>No.</p> <p>Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes for inclusion on the IDS?</p> <p>The whole length of the Canal towpath from Burscough to the</p>

	boundary with Wigan needs to be improved. Wigan Council put in place an all-weather surface many years ago that has stood the test of time, whereas much of the towpath in West Lancashire gets very muddy and slippery in wet weather. The route is used by many walkers and cyclists from inside and outside the Borough. It is level and suitable for all ages and abilities, and there is potential for it to be developed as a “spine” for other off-road routes, linking to destinations such as Martin Mere, Rufford and Ormskirk.
WLBC Response	Support for the canal towpath option noted.

Rep Number	17
Name	Fiona Pudge
Organisation	Sport England
Response method	Email / proforma
Date received	27/10/2016
Comments	<p>Which option do you support most? Do you agree with that proposed?</p> <p><i>Do you support Option ONE?</i> -</p> <p><i>Do you support Option TWO? -</i></p> <p><i>Do you support Option THREE?</i> New changing facilities at Whittle Drive playing fields, Ormskirk – this is contained as an action within the current 2015 Playing Pitch Strategy and has the support of Sport England and the pitch sport national governing bodies</p> <p><i>Do you support Option FOUR?</i> -</p> <p>Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? -</p> <p>Are there any other projects on the IDS you think should be considered? CIL 123 lists should only include defined projects and not use generic statements such as 'Indoor Sports Provision' and 'Outdoor Sports Provision'. Our understanding of the legal position is that where a generic statement is used for a facility type then all provision is caught within CIL and therefore none can be delivered via S106 (to avoid double dipping). Whilst there is some clarity re. what S106 will cover (providing clarity in those instances only) the fact that no projects have been listed under the CIL column for CIL funding will mean all outdoor sports projects not listed in the S106 column will by default be expected to be funded by CIL therefore the LA will be prevented from seeking S106 funding for anything other than clear mitigation on those sites listed. Sport England therefore suggests the CIL column is revised in terms of both Indoor and Outdoor Sports Provision to include ONLY SPECIFIC PROJECTS THAT CAN REASONABLY BE FUNDED THROUGH CIL.</p>

	<p>Reference should be made to both the Playing Pitch Strategy Action Plan and the Leisure Strategy to identify “big ticket” items. Clarification needed that S106 agreements will be used to secure new sports facilities needed to meet new demand arising from development for sports facilities (indoor and outdoor) where not already sought through the CIL (e.g. CIL may be used to fund a new leisure centre to meet growth in demand for swimming pool BUT S106’s would be used to fund all outdoor sport).</p> <p>CIL 123 lists should be kept to a list of major key priority projects and not seek to deliver all infrastructure. These projects should be the big ticket items where S106 pooling restrictions prevent S106 agreements being a practical tool and where CIL receipts are sufficient to deliver within a reasonable timescale. The project list should exclude smaller projects/improvement schemes that are simpler/quicker/more enforceable for developers/LAs to deliver on or off site via S106 agreements where delivery can become a planning requirement.</p> <p>Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes for inclusion on the IDS?</p> <p>-</p>
WLBC Response	<p>Support for Whittle Drive playing fields noted.</p> <p>It is the Council’s intention for CIL to fund those items as set out by the R123 list and this includes generic provision, rather than listing individual projects.</p>

Rep Number	18
Name	Gemma Jackson
Organisation	Environment Agency
Response method	Email
Date received	2/11/2016
Comments	<p>We have no comments to make on the proposed shortlisted projects and the division of funding. However, for future CIL shortlisting and allocating funding you may wish to consider the following:</p> <p>CIL Regulation 123 list September 2013</p> <p>We know that this document dictates that flood alleviation measures are not part of the regulation 123 list and that going forward it is proposed that funding for flood alleviation measures will be secured through section 106 agreements on a site by site basis. Considering the recent flooding in December 2015 which affected parts of the borough, you may wish to consider the use of CIL funding for wider more strategic flood alleviation schemes where appropriate.</p> <p>We would welcome opportunities for working together in partnership on such projects.</p> <p>CIL Funding Programme 2017/18 Consultation October 2016 document</p>

	We note that within this document there are several medium-term delivery projects that were not shortlisted. Included within this are the Ormskirk to Skelmersdale linear park and the River Douglas linear park. Whilst these are not shortlisted there may be opportunities to bring them forward through partnership working and again we would welcome opportunities to work together on such projects.
WLBC Response	Comments noted.

Rep Number	19
Name	Wilf MacDonald
Organisation	-
Date received	1/11/2016
Comments	<p>Which option do you support most? Do you agree with that proposed?</p> <p>Do you support Option ONE? No. Not in my area.</p> <p>Do you support Option TWO? Stanley Park – No Whittle Drive – YES Cheshire Lines – No</p> <p>Do you support Option THREE? Whittle Drive changing rooms are an eyesore, as are other aspects on Scott Estate.</p> <p>Do you support Option FOUR? -</p> <p>Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? -</p> <p>Are there any other projects on the IDS you think should be considered? -</p> <p>Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes for inclusion on the IDS? -</p>
WLBC Response	Support for Whittle Drive noted.

Rep Number	20
Name	Mr Leslie Jones
Organisation	-
Date received	31/10/2016
Comments	Which option do you support most? Do you agree with that proposed?

	<p>Do you support Option ONE? -</p> <p>Do you support Option TWO? I support Option Two</p> <p>Do you support Option THREE? -</p> <p>Do you support Option FOUR? -</p> <p>Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? -</p> <p>Are there any other projects on the IDS you think should be considered? -</p> <p>Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes for inclusion on the IDS? -</p>
WLBC Response	Support for Option Two noted.

Rep Number	21
Name	Jane Thompson
Organisation	-
Date received	31/10/2016
Comments	<p>Which option do you support most? Do you agree with that proposed?</p> <p>Do you support Option ONE? -</p> <p>Do you support Option TWO? Yes. Option Two.</p> <p>Do you support Option THREE? -</p> <p>Do you support Option FOUR? -</p> <p>Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? I support Option Two.</p> <p>Are there any other projects on the IDS you think should be considered? -</p>

	Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes for inclusion on the IDS? -
WLBC Response	Support for Option Two noted.

Rep Number	22
Name	Richard Sharples
Organisation	Lancashire County Council
Response method	Email
Date received	2/11/2016
Comments	<p>Thank you for consulting Lancashire County Council on the proposed use of West Lancashire CIL monies.</p> <p>I would support an option where some of the money was used now to deliver quick win projects, but saves most of the money for later. The infrastructure delivery schedule lists a significant amount of infrastructure, and there is a very large finding [sic.] [funding] gap threatening the delivery of these schemes.</p> <p>I would suggest West Lancashire adopt a more long term strategic approach to identifying their spending priorities for CIL money, considering a period at least 3-5 year into the future. This way it is clear how much money is expected based on current and anticipated permissions, and so a more constructive discussion can be had around what infrastructure can or should be delivered with this money. It would also facilitate a discussion on the long term benefits of saving some or all of the CIL money to deliver larger schemes.</p> <p>The West Lancashire Route Management Study is moving forwards to identify and appraise options, mainly around the A570 corridor (such as junction improvements, bus/rail connectivity improvements, cycling infrastructure), with a view to having a set of schemes identified by March 2017.</p> <p>These will be funded through LTP money, but will need a level of match funding from CIL, and other sources. I will keep you up to date on the progress of this work, so that it can be included in future CIL work if appropriate.</p>
WLBC Response	Support noted for use of some monies now with the rest reserved for funding strategic projects in the future. WLBC will await the recommendations and projects arising from the route management study. Any projects can then be included in the IDS and considered in the 2017/18 annual process for expenditure in 2018/19.

Rep Number	23
Name	Ann Parr
Organisation	-
Date received	2/11/2016
Comments	<p>Which option do you support most? Do you agree with that proposed?</p> <p><i>Do you support Option ONE?</i> -</p> <p><i>Do you support Option TWO?</i> -</p> <p><i>Do you support Option THREE?</i> Support canal towpath at Burscough and improvements to cycle path / footpaths at Cheshire Lines, Great Altcar. Both promote healthier lifestyles.</p> <p><i>Do you support Option FOUR?</i> -</p> <p>Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? -</p> <p>Are there any other projects on the IDS you think should be considered? -</p> <p>Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes for inclusion on the IDS?</p>
WLBC Response	Support for canal towpath and Cheshire Lines noted.

Rep Number	24
Name	Colin Wareing
Organisation	-
Date received	3/11/2016
Comments	<p>Which option do you support most? Do you agree with that proposed?</p> <p><i>Do you support Option ONE?</i> -</p> <p><i>Do you support Option TWO?</i> -</p> <p><i>Do you support Option THREE?</i> -</p> <p><i>Do you support Option FOUR?</i> -</p> <p>Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Yes,</p> <p>The canal tow path has been in serious need of up grading following the upgrade of the stretch on the other side of Burscough from New Lane to Burscough Wharf.</p> <p>This length is very well used by walkers between the two places of interest, The Wharf and the Top locks along with The Ship pub.</p>

	<p>It also is the length of canal that visiting boaters use to moor at to access the facilities and services within the village, thus supporting business within the village. There are permanent moorings along the next stretch of canal towpath which makes to discourages boaters to moor to use the village.</p> <p>If this option is chosen could you please encourage the Canal and River Trust to install mooring bollards or rings as part of the improvements in order to protect the tow path as boaters won't have to knock mooring pins into the newly improved tow path.</p> <p>Are there any other projects on the IDS you think should be considered? No</p> <p>Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes for inclusion on the IDS?</p>
WLBC Response	Support for the canal towpath improvements noted.

Rep Number	25
Name	Helen Hartley
Organisation	Nexus Planning (on behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)
Date received	3/11/2016
Comments	<p>Which option do you support most? Do you agree with that proposed?</p> <p><i>Do you support Option ONE?</i> Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd consider Option One (<i>prioritise one strategic project – Canal Towpath Improvements between Burscough Wharf and Glovers Swing Bridge</i>) to be the most appropriate option for spending CIL monies in 2017/18.</p> <p>Given the commitment of the Canal and River Trust to the Towpath Improvements, there can be confidence this project will be delivered within the short term and within the 2017/18 period. Burscough is a focus for growth in the Local Plan, with new housing and employment development anticipated to come forward in the next few years. The Towpath Improvements will therefore directly support development within Burscough, and represent a highly appropriate use of CIL monies in line with the requirements of the CIL Regulations.</p> <p>The Canal Towpath Improvements project is closely aligned with the Council's Corporate Priorities, in particular promoting health and wellbeing through improving recreational facilities for residents and providing greater opportunities for the use of sustainable modes of transport. The project will also improve the local environment and enhance the Canal in Burscough as a visitor attraction. As set out in the consultation documents, the project sits within the draft Green Infrastructure & Cycling Strategy and will bring benefits to a wide area. We note as well that through recent surveys for the emerging</p>

Burscough Neighbourhood Plan, residents expressed general support for canal improvements and recognised the value of the canal as an important greenspace.

Do you support Option TWO?

In considering Option Two (*prioritise several smaller projects*), and having regard to the information provided in the consultation document, Taylor Wimpey consider these projects to be less suitable for the spending of CIL monies in 2017/18. Whilst the Stanley Coronation Park Play Area Improvements might be deliverable before March 2018, there has not been substantial development in this area in recent years and so this project will not be directly supporting new development in the short term. Similarly, we would query whether the improvements to Cheshire Lines Cycle/ Footpath in Great Altcar and Downholland are the most appropriate use of CIL monies in the short term given their distance from any development.

Splitting the monies collected across three smaller projects, which on the face of it are not closely related to development coming forward, would seem to dilute the actual and perceived benefits of CIL in only the fourth year since the levy was adopted in West Lancashire, and only the second year the Council have been in a position to allocate the funding.

With regard to the significant and strategic nature of several of the projects within the medium-term delivery category, Taylor Wimpey consider that in preference to spending CIL monies on the small projects under Option Two, it would be more appropriate to save some of the monies collected in 2016/17 for spending on these medium-longer term schemes.

Do you support Option THREE?

In light of our comments above regarding Option Two and the desirability of saving some of the CIL monies, we do not consider Option Three to be an appropriate approach.

Do you support Option FOUR?

Option Four would see all of the CIL monies to be collected in 2016/17 to be saved for spending on future years. However, given there is a level of new development being delivered in the Borough in the short term, we do not consider it appropriate to hold back **all** CIL monies for saving on as yet unspecified projects in future years.

Conclusion

Overall, Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd consider that Option One presents the best balance between saving CIL monies for significant strategic projects in future years, and using some of the monies collected from the development being delivered in the Borough towards a relatively high profile project which will directly support that development in a manner which fits with the wider priorities of the Council and aspirations of the local community in Burscough.

Do you agree with our shortlist of projects?

Taylor Wimpey broadly agree with the shortlist of the projects and the methodology followed to assess the suitability of each scheme, as

	<p>summarised in paragraph 2.3 of the consultation document.</p> <p>Are there any other projects on the IDS you think should be considered? Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd have no further comments in relation to this question.</p> <p>Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes for inclusion on the IDS? Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd have no further comments in relation to this question.</p>
WLBC Response	Support for Option One noted.

Rep Number	26
Name	Irene Roberts
Organisation	Aughton Parish Council
Date received	3/11/2016
Comments	<p>Which option do you support most? Do you agree with that proposed?</p> <p><i>Do you support Option ONE?</i> -</p> <p><i>Do you support Option TWO?</i> Support Cheshire Lines project, in particular</p> <p><i>Do you support Option THREE?</i> -</p> <p><i>Do you support Option FOUR?</i> -</p> <p>Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Support for the shortlist of projects – leisure facilities</p> <p>Are there any other projects on the IDS you think should be considered? No</p> <p>Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes for inclusion on the IDS? No</p>
WLBC Response	Support for option two, and the Cheshire Lines project noted.

Rep Number	27
Name	Jan Lennon
Organisation	-
Date received	4/11/2016
Comments	Which option do you support most? Do you agree with that proposed?

	<p>Do you support Option ONE? -</p> <p>Do you support Option TWO? These 3 options are reasonably well spread if tending to prioritise the south. I think they support national and local initiatives to improve health through activity. I would have liked to see a further small project for the Burscough area. I t [sic]</p> <p>Do you support Option THREE? -</p> <p>Do you support Option FOUR? -</p> <p>Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? I think the issue of local libraries closing deserved a more significant reaction. I know Lancashire County has been open to suggestions and costs might well have been with CIL scope.</p> <p>Are there any other projects on the IDS you think should be considered? -</p> <p>Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes for inclusion on the IDS? -</p>
WLBC Response	<p>Comments and support for Option Two noted.</p> <p>WLBC are aware of the decision of LCC to close, or relocate, libraries across the Borough due to financial constraints. However, CIL monies must be used to support new development, and so, given that libraries are pre-existing services, CIL cannot be spent on extending current library provision without significant justification for the growth of a local area. That said, Burscough library is identified as a project on the IDS, to support the anticipated growth of Burscough as a result of development of the strategic site at Yew Tree Farm. Therefore, the Council will be liaising with the developer and County Council at that time to identify need and respond accordingly. Similarly, Up Holland library has recently closed and there are early suggestions that the library could be run by the community. There has been sufficient development in Up Holland to justify use of CIL monies in the area, but discussions are at a too early stage and therefore the project will be retained on the IDS for consideration across future years.</p>

Rep Number	28
Name	Sandra Jones
Organisation	Newburgh Parish Council
Response method	Email
Date received	4/11/2016
Comments	The proposed use of Community Infrastructure Levy monies in

	2017/18 was discussed at our recent Parish Council meeting. I was asked to contact you to confirm that although Newburgh Parish Council feels that all the shortlisted projects are worthy schemes, our view is that the canal towpath improvements between Burscough Wharf and Glovers Swing Bridge should be given priority. The main reason is that this is the only scheme that will have any kind of impact on the lives of Newburgh residents as many use the canal towpath as a safe route to walk between Newburgh and Burscough. Newburgh Parish Council is keen to support any project that will encourage more residents to keep healthy by exercise and reduce car usage, which this scheme will help to achieve if it goes ahead.
WLBC Response	Support for Canal towpath improvements at Burscough noted.

Rep Number	29
Name	Stephen McCloskey
Organisation	-
Date received	4/11/2016
Comments	<p>Which option do you support most? Do you agree with that proposed?</p> <p><i>Do you support Option ONE?</i> -</p> <p><i>Do you support Option TWO?</i> -</p> <p><i>Do you support Option THREE?</i> -</p> <p><i>Do you support Option FOUR?</i> -</p> <p>Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? I think the suggestion of “New changing facilities at Whittle Drive playing fields, Ormskirk” would benefit too few people generally to be considered viable.</p> <p>Are there any other projects on the IDS you think should be considered? -</p> <p>Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes for inclusion on the IDS? I would like to strongly urge the council to consider that road safety infrastructure in Burscough benefit from CIL monies.</p> <p>Burscough features greatly in the current adopted Local Plan, and this will see Burscough increasing in size and population of between an estimated 25 and 33% in a staggeringly short period of time. The Booths supermarket at one end of Burscough draws a lot of traffic/visitors from out of town, as does the tesco supermarket at the other end. The A59 continues to get busier and busier. However, there have been few improvements to the road safety infrastructure in recent years, and the South end of Burscough only has one pedestrian crossing.</p>

	<p>There are no crossings in the vicinity of Booths, which also has a Nursery and Retirement home immediately adjacent. Likewise, the north end of Burscough only sports one zebra crossing immediately adjacent to red Cat Lane. The safety of residents must be considered to be of paramount importance. Burscough needs more pedestrian crossings.</p> <p>I would also urge the council to consider spending some CIL money on flood defences. We now see 'once in 30 year events' happening regularly. It doesn't even need heavy rain for our area to flood- it just takes prolonged spells of rain for as little as 2 hours. As stated above, Burscough is destined to face a massive influx of building shortly, with United Utilities making none of the required £20 Million worth of infrastructure improvements. Therefore it would be wise to spend some CIL money on flood defences, because there WILL be repeats of the Boxing Day flooding occurring sooner rather than later, especially when nearby pumping stations are decommissioned.</p>
WLBC Response	<p>Comments regarding Whittle Drive noted.</p> <p>The adopted CIL Regulation 123 list sets out those infrastructure items CIL monies can be spent on. The purpose of this is to prevent 'double-charging' of developers through both CIL and planning obligations. Flood defences are excluded from the R123 list and so CIL monies cannot be used to deliver flood mitigation, instead it must be secured through planning conditions or planning obligations on specific sites.</p> <p>However, highways improvements are listed on the R123 list and there has been/will be sufficient growth in Burscough to justify improvements, particularly along Liverpool Road South which has seen development of the retail park at Pippin St and a number of proposed residential developments along the main arterial road. The need for highway improvements will be discussed with LCC, as the Highways Agency, for any suitable projects to be identified and included on the IDS. Alternatively, it may be that such improvements can be delivered through S278 agreements, or planning conditions, secured through planning applications.</p>

Rep Number	30
Name	Tim Bettany-Simmons
Organisation	Canal & River Trust
Response method	Email
Date received	4/11/2016
Comments	<p>Thank you for your recent consultation in respect of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Funding Programme 2017/18.</p> <p>The Canal & River Trust (the Trust) is a charity entrusted with the care of over 2000 miles of canals, rivers, docks and reservoirs in England and Wales. These historic, natural and cultural assets form part of the strategic and local green infrastructure network, linking urban and rural</p>

	<p>communities as well as habitats. Our waterways contribute to the health and well-being of local communities and economies, creating attractive and connected places to live, work, volunteer and spend leisure time.</p> <p>The Trust is very pleased to see a proposal of £150,000 of CIL monies towards towpath improvements at the Burscough to Glovers Swing Bridge stretch of canal and would very much wish to see this project prioritised for funding in the forthcoming year.</p> <p>It is considered that the implementation of this project would deliver considerable social, economic and environmental benefits to the wider area and local communities and help to deliver the Councils corporate objectives protecting and improving the environment and promoting leisure, culture and healthier communities as well as helping to meet one of the Councils' Strategic Transport Priorities.</p> <p>The Trust can confirm that if we were successful in securing £150,000 of CIL funding we would be in a position to deliver this towpath enhancement scheme by the end of March 2018.</p> <p>With regards to the current West Lancashire Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which set out a number of waterway projects within Chapter 3 at paragraph 3.3.33, 3.3.34 (relating to Burscough Wharf) and 3.3.35 (relating to the Rufford Branch) we are pleased to advise that these projects have all been completed.</p> <p>In terms of future projects on our waterways, the Trust is proposing to undertake a programme of spot dredging in the West Lancashire area on the Leeds and Liverpool Canal and a number of culvert improvements on the Rufford Branch.</p> <p>In addition, the Trust is aware of several sections of towpath which would benefit from upgrading/re-surfacing works and which could be potential future projects. These include the Rufford Branch up to Fettle's Wharf Marina; the section of towpath from Parbold Bridge back towards Burscough and a section in the Scarisbrick area between Coxheads Bridge and Plex Lane. None of these have however been costed yet but if appropriate costings can be provided on these in due course to inform the IDP.</p>
WLBC Response	We note that the Canal and River Trust confirm they can deliver the towpath enhancement scheme by March 2018, subject to receiving CIL monies and the scheme being selected for funding.

Rep Number	31
Name	Carolyn Cross
Organisation	Wrightington Parish Council
Date received	4/11/2016
Comments	Which option do you support most? Do you agree with that proposed?

	<p>Do you support Option ONE? -</p> <p>Do you support Option TWO? -</p> <p>Do you support Option THREE? -</p> <p>Do you support Option FOUR? -</p> <p>Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Yes</p> <p>Are there any other projects on the IDS you think should be considered? No</p> <p>Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes for inclusion on the IDS? The Parish Council feel that Option 1 is the preferred option however, they would like to see this project extended so that the improvements to the canal towpath be extended towards the Parbold and Appley Bridge direction. This would mean that rather than carrying the balance from this project forward, it could be used to extend the improvements thereby benefitting more people in the long run.</p>
WLBC Response	Support for Option One noted. Comments noted that improvements should be extended along the canal towpath towards the Wigan boundary. Such extensions are included as infrastructure schemes within the IDS, although Canal and River Trust confirm these are still to be costed up, and therefore there is still insufficient details available relating to cost and delivery to enable them to be accurately assessed for CIL funding. They will remain on the IDS and be considered in future years, as the relevant information is provided.

Rep Number	32
Name	Cllr Bob Pendleton
Organisation	On behalf of Tanhouse Community Enterprise Ltd
Response method	Email
Date received	4/11/2016
Comments	<p>Bid for All-weather & bowling green</p> <p>£80,000 is required for this project, of which £33,000 is requested from S106/CIL monies. The project is to construct a new community bowling green on land rear of the Tanhouse Community Centre, up-grade to an all-weather surface to enable more diverse use, up-grade the Skate Park, teenage shelter and landscape surrounding area.</p> <p>The Board engages with community and key partners within the Neighbourhood to identify projects which will improve the environment they live in and their quality of life.</p>

The Board has worked in partnership with West Lancashire Borough Council since its formation delivering community activities and has continued to work and Build stronger working relationships with the following partners; Lancashire County Council, Lancashire Fire, Lancashire Police, West Lancs C.V.S, P.C.T, Probation Service, The Community payback team, The Princes Trust, Oakes Church, Tanhouse Action Group, Local primary Schools, Glenburn high School, User Groups. All the partners play their part in delivering projects

Construction of new community bowling green. Refurbish All-Weather play Area Skate Park & Landscaping

The construction of drainage system, erection of perimeter fencing ,planting hedgerow to development of bowling green

This land is owned by West Lancashire Borough Council (WLBC), the Board have an excellent relationship with the Council's Grounds Maintenance and Assistant Director Community Service Manager who has already given support for this project however this will be made more formal before this project starts.

Charges to be developed in conjunction with user groups and Tanhouse Community Enterprise Board

The Board alongside the community Volunteers and members of the bowling club with support from West Lancs B C will be responsible for maintaining the Project Following Completion

The activity will be suitable for a wide section of the community, including people with disabilities and health related problems, promoting an active lifestyle and providing a community social activity.

By improving the physical environment within the Neighbourhoods Contribute to improving their wellbeing. As local residents, community and user groups will be encouraged to take part in the design of the area and this will encourage them to take ownership of the project areas and resulting them helping the council to maintain the area. The Board will continue its work in the community post project this will give the community a sense of pride as well.

Public opinion surveys have shown that people living in deprived areas are just as concerned about the environment as other people, and listed pollution, poor public transport and lack of outdoor facilities in their neighbourhoods as major concerns (Social Exclusion Unit, 1998). By reenergising local "landscape grot spots" this will make a difference to the whole environment as it will encourage people living there to be involved It has also been proven that a poor environment can affect the health and wellbeing of the residents living in it.

Communication

Through the local press, local community newsletters, sent out in school letters. including resident living in the Neighbourhood, User groups of the community centres, members of local faith groups, the

	Police, Lancs Fire and Rescue, the local Housing provider, Age Concern, Officers from both local authorities including Young Peoples services, this group is used as a way of communicating information both from and into the community. The Board will also runs information days this will also be used to cascade information about this project into the wider community.
WLBC Response	Comments noted. The scheme is already contained within the IDS (#118). The updated information provided has been reflected in the updated IDS (especially regarding funding and required CIL/S106 monies).

Rep Number	33
Name	-
Organisation	Scarisbrick Parish Council
Response method	Email
Date received	5-11-2016
Comments	At last night's meeting it was resolved that Option 2 was the choice of Scarisbrick Parish Council. The Councillors supported Option 2 on the basis that monies be shared around rather than priority being given to one strategic project which would take away all of the funding available. Option 2 would also enable a portion of monies to be carried forward. The Council did not want to make any other comment than that above.
WLBC Response	Comments noted

Rep Number	34
Name	Lindsay Beaton
Organisation	Lancashire Wildlife Trust (Mere Sands Wood Nature Reserve)
Response method	Email
Date received	13-11-2016
Comments	I have set out below an outline of our revised plans for the re-development of the Visitor Centre at Mere Sands Wood. Phase 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of the "Cabin in the Woods". This will be a pre-fabricated modular building sited in what is currently a picnic area beside the car park. It will have toilets, a kitchenette and store room and 60m2 of classroom space. It will be used mainly for our education activities but also for evening talks and other events eg craft sessions • Conversion of the current classroom into a decent space for volunteers to meet, change and take breaks; and two staff offices • Demolition of the old wooden section of the visitor centre.

	<p>The estimated total cost of this is £80,000. We have applied for £30,000 from the Greenbank Trust; £30,000 from the Lancashire Environmental Fund and have £30,000 from an appeal. The Greenbank Trust have said it is possible they may be able to grant us more money than £30,000, as the fund is being wound up and they will need to spend reserves. If we raised more money for this phase we would upgrade the specification of the new building.</p> <p>Therefore a CIL contribution of about £3,000 in Phase 1 would be helpful.</p> <p>We plan to start work on this project in April 2017 (The LEF funding decision is due in March 2017 so we could not start work before then).</p> <p>Phase 2 Creation of a cafe and an activity room on the footprint of the old section of the Visitor Centre and the Lancaster Hide, giving the cafe views across the Wader Scrape. The room would be split by dividers allowing flexible use eg on weekdays the activity room could accommodate a school visit, whilst on weekends the room could provide a cafe overflow. This would also be a pre-fabricated modular building.</p> <p>The estimated cost of Phase 2 is £180,000.</p> <p>Funding for Phase 2 is more critical. If we get the maximum amounts we apply for from Biffa, LEF, LEADER and Heritage Lottery we would still have a potential shortfall of around £20,000 – and no contingency. Exactly how much the shortfall would be would depend on how much appeal money is left after Phase 1. I realise £20,000 is a large amount for CIL funding and that we would be unlikely to get this, but any contribution towards this shortfall would be most welcome.</p> <p>We will apply for funding to the LEADER tourism programme for 40% of the cost of the cafe. We will apply to landfill tax funds (LEF and Biffa Awards) for the activity room.</p> <p>We hope to start work on this project in 2018.</p>
WLBC Response	Comments noted and updated in IDS.