

**LOCAL PLAN CABINET WORKING GROUP**

**HELD: 7 December 2016**

Start: 6.30PM

Finish: 8.45PM

**PRESENT:**

Councillor: J Hodson (Chairman)  
G Dowling (Vice-Chair)

Councillors: I Ashcroft J Davis  
N Furey E Pope  
D Westley A Yates

Officers: Director of Development and Regeneration (Mr. J. Harrison)  
Strategic Planning & Implementation Manager (Mr. P. Richards)  
Assistant Strategic Planning & Implementation Manager  
(Mr. S. Benge)  
Member Services/Civic Support Officer (Mrs. J.A. Ryan)

12 **APOLOGIES**

There were no apologies for absence received.

13 **URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no urgent items of business.

14 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no Declarations of Interest received.

15 **MINUTES**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on the 18 October 2016 be approved as a correct record.

16 **UPDATE ON EVIDENCE BASE STUDIES**

The Strategic Planning and Implementation Manager gave Members an update on the Evidence Base Studies, during which the following comments were noted:-

- Members asked what the differences were in the evidence document as set out on page 10 of the report and those in the 2012 Local Plan.
- Members asked whether the Liverpool City Region Strategic Housing and Employment Land Market Assessment (SHELMA) and the Thematic and Spatial Evidence Papers were live documents and whether they were available on line.

**RESOLVED:** That the comments be noted.

**17 DRAFT ISSUES AND OPTIONS PAPER**

The Strategic Planning and Implementation Manager discussed with members the draft Issues and Options Paper during which the following comments and questions were raised:-

- The duty to co-operate statement (Appendix B of the report) was noted as being to follow (paragraph 1.3.5)
- The spatial areas in the report, Members sought clarity that these were the current Local Plan areas (paragraph 2.1.1)
- To make sure that the proposed spatial areas were set out clearly from the outset
- Paragraph 1.1.5 misses out the social infrastructure/environmental issues and Members felt it was important to keep reiterating the 3 components of sustainability
- Members question why student accommodation was mentioned in paragraph 1.1.4 of the document, they would prefer this to be substituted with different wording, possibly unemployment of something else.
- Members stated it would be better to not refer to the student issue except at the student accommodation section
- Members felt that at paragraph 1.3.1 this was a good opportunity to mention the 3 tenets of sustainability
- At paragraph 1.2.3 Members felt the longer plan period would be a concern and the allocation of sites
- The wording in paragraph 1.3.2 Members didn't feel 'aspirational but realistic' was needed and the words should be deleted
- Flooding in Burscough was mentioned but Members raised the point that flooding occurred elsewhere also, it was felt that positive comments were included re issues in Ormskirk and Skelmersdale but there were no positive ones for Burscough
- It was felt that there should be something covering the environment/ economy /social for each area also
- On page 6 Members asked if the paragraph relating to Skelmersdale could be 'sparkled' up and the removal of the words socio-economic could be removed
- It was also felt that we should not put in 'deprived' when Skelmersdale mentioned at this section of the document
- At paragraph 2.1.3 in the document we refer to the need to retain graduates will this be a problem by concentrating on accommodation for the elderly
- On page 8 of the document with regard to the travelling community, Members stated where something is statutory/legally required this should be stated
- It was also felt that where anything was statutory possibly put this in bold type
- On pages 8-10 of the document Members noted that renewable energy and energy provisions is not included within the issues raised
- On page 9 – easing traffic congestion in Ormskirk, it was noted that the Ormskirk By-Pass had not been mentioned and Members asked where this was
- Members discussed whether there is any hierarchy in the objectives provided in section 3.2

**LOCAL PLAN CABINET WORKING GROUP      HELD:    Wednesday, 7 December 2016**

- On page 12 of the document Members felt that the canal network should be mentioned
- Paragraph 4.2.1 Members raised whether numbers should be in here at this stage
- Members also raised whether we needed 5 housing options in here and whether there would be any mention of actual land mass (area) developed in West Lancashire
- At paragraph 4.3.4 concern was raised re the longer term assumptions and it was explained to Members that these had to be put in the document but that reference to the need to review these assumptions after 2025 would be appropriate
- On page 23 a map showing the spatial areas was discussed, Members felt the percentages would be better omitted
- Members raised the importance of engaging young people when consulting on the Local Plan Review (paragraph 5.4)
- At paragraph 5.5. Members suggested that this section needed trimming, it was raised that not all HMO's are students and we need to think about accommodation for graduates whom we wish to retain in the Borough.
- It was felt at this section that we may be better having an HMO heading and student issues separately
- Members also raised that at the beginning of this section it should be mentioned that Edge Hill University have no plans to expand further
- The issue of the loss of employment land as mentioned in paragraph 5.7.11 this needed to be spelt out why the loss of employment land to housing was a threat/issue
- Paragraph 5.8 – Members were not convinced that Burscough had a 'centre', it was felt that Burcough had upmarket eateries that served other towns e.g. Ormskirk and Skelmersdale, it was important to mention about a 'network' of the three centres and links between them
- Members felt it was important to focus not only on town centres but also outlying assets. Town Centres were 'hubs' or 'gateways'
- It was also mentioned that Burscough Industrial Estate also had retail outlets mixed in
- Members stressed that the opening line in paragraph 5.8.1 talked about towns and villages being the traditional destinations to buy goods and obtain services it was noted that retail wasn't the sole future for town centres – they needed to evolve/reinvent themselves
- Paragraph 5.9.6 – Members felt that the ethnic make-up of the Borough may change in the future e.g. asylum seekers and that this point needed to be mentioned
- At paragraph 5.9.26 Members felt that this needed to be expanded as there were significant number of people moving onto the water e.g. elderly downsizing
- Members felt that the comment stated at paragraph 5.10.1 about there being no issues relating to flooding should be removed or clarified as members of the public would react to this

- At paragraph 5.10.1 the bullet point relating to New Lane waste water treatment, Members asked if works were to be before or after new houses were built
- A Member raised a question as to why there was no mention of the Burscough rail improvements felt reference should be made in relation to this (page 70).

Members wished Officers to be thanked for their input and work into this document.

**RESOLVED:** That the comments and points raised be noted.

(Note: Councillor Dowling left during consideration of this item and was not present for the remainder of the meeting).

18      **PROPOSALS FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON THE ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

This item was not discussed.

19      **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

**RESOLVED:** That the date of the next meeting be confirmed.

.....  
**- CHAIRMAN -**