



WEST LANCASHIRE BOROUGH COUNCIL

CONSULTATION ON COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY

FUNDING PROGRAMME 2018/19

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

| | |
|--|--|
| Rep no. | 1. |
| Name | Peter Vernon |
| Organisation | - |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | Smaller projects, provide more impact. |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | - |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | - |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | Option Three: Allocate funds to a number of smaller projects from the shortlist up to a maximum total spend of £100,000, and save any surplus funding, but a proposed amendment/additional comment that spending of any surplus funding should be constantly reviewed. |
| Council response | Support for smaller projects and Option 3 noted. |

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Rep no. | 2. |
| Name | Geoff Roberts |
| Organisation | - |
| Comments | Of the shortlisted projects I would prefer the new allocation of allotments in Ormskirk. If possible I would rather the flooding issues in Ormskirk were addressed. |
| Council response | Support for Ormskirk allotments noted. CIL cannot be used to fund flooding alleviation because it is not an infrastructure type listed on the R123 list. |

| | |
|--------------|-------------|
| Rep no. | 3. |
| Name | Ron Webster |
| Organisation | - |

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Comments | Hi, ALL monies should be PRIORITISED for the one thing Skelmersdale desperately needs, and that is a Railway Station. Without it, Skelmersdale will always be a NOTHING Town. We can worry about the LITTLE things later. |
| Council response | Skelmersdale rail will not require CIL funds, as the money will be provided through other revenue streams. |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Rep no. | 4 |
| Name | - |
| Organisation | Highways England |
| Comments | Highways England has no comment to make regarding these CIL proposals. |
| Council response | Comments noted. |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Rep no. | 5 |
| Name | - |
| Organisation | Network Rail |
| Comments | <p>CIL funding should be considered for infrastructure projects at railway stations which may need enhancements as a consequence of increased footfall within the West Lancs council area. Below is a list of railway stations and the relevant potential enhancements that could be funded by CIL for your consideration.</p> <p>(CIS = Customer Information System, TVM = ticket vending machine).</p> <p>Bescar Lane – Seating and TVM New Lane – CCTV and TVM Burscough Bridge – Replacement waiting shelters, seating and TVM Burscough Junction – Replacement waiting shelter and TVM Hoscar - CCTV Parbold – Shelter Refurbishment, Seating and TVM Rufford – Replacement shelters, Seating, CIS, CCTV and TVM Croston - Replacement shelters, CIS, CCTV and TVM</p> |
| Council response | Further information is required from Network Rail and Northern Rail to provide further details regarding costs and justification of need as a result of new development. The Council consider that much of the proposals suggested should fall under the remit and provision of the rail agencies and therefore clarification is requested regarding why CIL monies are required. Should this information be provided, then the projects may be included on the IDS. |

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Rep no. | 6 |
| Name | Mrs C Lawrenson |
| Organisation | - |
| Comments | After reading your article in the "Champion". I suggest you spend any cash you have available on Ormskirk Bus Station. The pavements could do with a covering of tarmac as there is a great trip hazard with uneven paving stones. The shelters have no seats and are like sieves when it rains. Considering the great number of students and general public waiting for buses I think this should be given some consideration. |
| Council response | Comments noted. There are proposals to upgrade the Ormskirk Bus Station and so any improvements to the station will be dealt with through this scheme (#39 on the IDS). Ormskirk Bus Station will not require CIL funding as it will be funded through alternate sources (LTP) and so this project cannot be shortlisted and considered for CIL funding. |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Rep no. | 7 |
| Name | David Cheetham |
| Organisation | - |
| Comments | <p>These proposals are not among your shortlisted projects but will enhance the current development at the Woodlands, Whalleys , Skelmersdale.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed and partly constructed footpath/cycleway to the south of Beacon Lane at the Northern boundary of the site should be extended to Elmers Green Lane rather than lead people onto the very busy, narrow and dangerous Beacon lane. Such a route will encourage new residents to walk or cycle to Dalton rather than take the safe option of driving. 2. The pedestrian route signage provided throughout the New Town by the SDC should be reinstated. The concrete support posts largely remain. Without clear signage the new residents of Woodlands will be unable to find the tortuous pedestrian walking route from the development to the Concourse and Tawd Valley Park. As an experiment I suggest CIL officers walk from the Ashurst Centre to the Concourse. <p>Inevitably the new house holders will walk down the roads, particularly Northway and put themselves at risk. Children will be particularly at risk as they walk to school at either Dalton or the Maharishi. They may even wish to go to the swimming pool or library.</p> <p>I submitted photos of the remaining concrete support to the old</p> |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| | signs last year and can resubmit if necessary. A few remain outside Whelmar house and can be easily visited from the WLBC Concourse Office. |
| Council response | The suggestion to extend the footpath to Elmers Green Lane has now been included on the IDS (Project #132). The Whalleys development of 630 new homes would provide justification for a need resulting from new development. At present, the Council do not have sufficient information regarding costs or delivery to recommend this project for CIL funding in 2018/19, but it will be considered in future years, alongside the remainder of the IDS projects. Signage would not be an appropriate infrastructure type to receive CIL funding. We still have the photos submitted last year on our files. |

| | |
|--|---|
| Rep no. | 8 |
| Name | - |
| Organisation | Bickerstaffe Parish Council |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | Bickerstaffe Parish Council was unable to comment on this point as a council as most suggestions on the list are mostly unknown to Bickerstaffe. |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | As above |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | <p>Bickerstaffe Colliery Cycle Trail is used by over 2,500 people from West Lancs and beyond, and it would be of benefit to include this in the listings as LCC is proposing to transfer this asset and it is under threat of closure as Bickerstaffe Parish Council cannot afford to pay the insurance to keep it going. Many youngsters from the area, especially Skelmersdale, use these trails on a regular basis, plus schools, families and other community groups. See Bickerstaffe Cycle Trails Facebook page. One of the issues is the amount of litter dropped – a small group of volunteers clean it regularly but they are exhausted and weary of doing this. Regular litter picking and a small budget for annual insurance could save it and keep the Trails open.</p> <p>The benefits of the Trails are central to WLBC core strategy aims, for health and wellbeing, and when these youngsters are on the Trails they are not on the streets at a loose-end.</p> <p>Bickerstaffe Colliery Cycle Trails are of great social/community benefit to West Lancs, and if the Trails could be put under umbrella insurance (BPC's quote was under £2,000), with litter collection, a great community asset could be saved.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | <p>Number 3: Allocate funds to a number of smaller projects from the shortlist up to a maximum total spend of £100,000, and save any surplus funding.</p> <p>Bickerstaffe Parish Council considers it appropriate, as a general principle, to spread out the money to as many projects as possible rather than one project receiving all of it, so that as many areas/residents as possible across West Lancs could benefit from it.</p> |
| Council response | <p>CIL must be spent on infrastructure to support new development, and it is not clear how this scheme would support that given that there has been very limited development in Bickerstaffe. Notwithstanding this, CIL monies cannot be used to fund insurance for existing leisure areas, nor can it be used to pay for litter picking and therefore this scheme would be unsuitable to receive CIL funding.</p> |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Rep no. | 9 |
| Name | - |
| Organisation | Historic England |
| Comments | Thank you for consulting Historic England on how we think West Lancashire should spend CIL monies. We have no comments to make on this occasion. |
| Council response | Comments noted. |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Rep no. | 10 |
| Name | Sheila Thomas |
| Organisation | - |
| Comments | <p>Would it be possible to consider improving the pavements Briars Lane Burscough to Wheat Lane Burscough it is almost impossible to walk in safety from Heathfields to get onto the canal to be able to have a walk.</p> <p>A foot bridge from Heathfields onto the canal would be really helpful, I think it was originally planned that the developers should put one there.</p> |
| Council response | <p>The IDS already contains a Heathfields Connectivity Plan which aims to improve access and connectivity between the canal, Heathfields and local amenities, and provide a pedestrian bridge over the canal. IDS project #120.</p> <p>The Parish Council are seeking £10,000-£15,000 initially to fund a feasibility study into the proposals, which would provide greater detail on the costs and delivery of the project. However, Burscough Parish Council are already in receipt of over £58,000 of neighbourhood CIL monies which they could use to fund the feasibility study and enable CIL monies to be used elsewhere.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>While there has been new development on the Heathfields estate recently (Ivy Close), it is not a substantial addition, but it does highlight the need to better connect Heathfields with Burscough Town Centre. The proposal would also add to the strategic Green Infrastructure and Cycling network proposed along the canal corridor. However, at this point in time, there are more deliverable and higher priority needs on this strategic canal corridor and it would be more appropriate for the Parish Council to utilise the CIL monies from the “neighbourhood” portion on the feasibility study.</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Rep no. | 11 |
| Name | - |
| Organisation | Downholland Parish Council |
| Comments | <p>The A5147 (Haskayne) carries traffic into the borough mainly from Liverpool. The bridge adjacent to the Kings Arms situated on Delph Lane has some very decrepit railings in need of securing for safety and also a complete sand down and repaint. It would certainly enhance the visual amenity for residents, visitors and passing traffic, if this was carried out. As you will be aware Southport often holds International and National sporting events which increase the numbers substantially. Would you consider putting this on the list please.</p> |
| Council response | <p>This item is already listed on the IDS as project #103. CIL must be used to support <u>new</u> development and there has been limited new development in Downholland to justify use of CIL. Insufficient information has been provided about this scheme, in relation to CIL funding required and delivery, to be able to recommend this scheme for CIL funding in 2018/19.</p> |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Rep no. | 12 |
| Name | Councillor David O'Toole |
| Organisation | - |
| Comments | <p>I support Margaret s comments and concerns earlier this year I took Kim Webber and Heidi on a tour of the word. I actually stopped on the bridge to emphasised the poor state of the railing . This road is a major route into West Lancashire and the state of the bridge does little to improve our image. I am also sending this to LCC highways in the hope that between WLBC and LCC somebody will take responsibility and stop ignoring this eyesore.</p> |
| Council response | <p>This item is already listed on the IDS as project #103. CIL must be used to support <u>new</u> development and there has been limited new development in Downholland to justify use of CIL. Insufficient information has been provided about this scheme, in</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | relation to CIL funding required and delivery, to be able to recommend this scheme for CIL funding in 2018/19. |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| Rep no. | 13 |
| Name | - |
| Organisation | National Trans Pennine Trail Officer |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | <p>Cheshire Lines – This location is part of the Trans Pennine Trail and needs significant upgrades to maintain the standards strived for and achieved by other sections of the route. It is well used and brings many visitors to the area. Cycling and outdoor recreation have proven multiple benefits for health and wellbeing and anything done to promote them should be given priority.</p> <p>Hunters Hill- This is a beautiful site with significant local biological importance, but requires improvements to make it more visitor friendly</p> <p>Tawd Valley Park – This site running through the middle of Skelmersdale needs significant upgrades in order to make the most of its location, ecological, heritage and future potential</p> |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | - |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | - |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | There are a number of important projects on the list which would benefit from various amounts of funding- makes sense to use some of it. Cheshire lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park all deserve some funding |
| Council response | <p>Support noted for Cheshire Lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park projects.</p> <p>This is one of several "same text" responses received through the consultation.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| Rep no. | 14 |
| Name | Linda Marsh |
| Organisation | - |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do | Cheshire Lines – This location is part of the Trans Pennine Trail and needs significant upgrades to maintain the standards strived |

| | |
|---|---|
| you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | <p>for and achieved by other sections of the route. It is well used and brings many visitors to the area. Cycling and outdoor recreation have proven multiple benefits for health and wellbeing and anything done to promote them should be given priority.</p> <p>Hunters Hill- This is a beautiful site with significant local biological importance, but requires improvements to make it more visitor friendly</p> <p>Tawd Valley Park – This site running through the middle of Skelmersdale needs significant upgrades in order to make the most of its location, ecological, heritage and future potential</p> |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | - |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | - |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | <p>There are a number of important projects on the list which would benefit from various amounts of funding- makes sense to use some of it. Cheshire lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park all deserve some funding</p> <p>AS someone who visits different areas of the TPT to camp, cycle and explore these projects seem well worthwhile to me.</p> |
| Council response | <p>Support noted for Cheshire Lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park projects.</p> <p>This is one of several "same text" responses received through the consultation.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| Rep no. | 15 |
| Name | - |
| Organisation | Halton Council |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | <p>Cheshire Lines – This location is part of the Trans Pennine Trail and needs significant upgrades to maintain the standards strived for and achieved by other sections of the route. It is well used and brings many visitors to the area. Cycling and outdoor recreation have proven multiple benefits for health and wellbeing and anything done to promote them should be given priority.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>Hunters Hill- This is a beautiful site with significant local biological importance, but requires improvements to make it more visitor friendly</p> <p>Tawd Valley Park – This site running through the middle of Skelmersdale needs significant upgrades in order to make the most of its location, ecological, heritage and future potential</p> |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | - |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | - |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | <p>There are a number of important projects on the list which would benefit from various amounts of funding- makes sense to use some of it. Cheshire lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park all deserve some funding.</p> <p>As a cyclist, I feel that cycle infrastructure is extremely important, especially strategic routes such as the Trans-Pennine Trail, which link communities otherwise isolated by bike/pedestrian-unfriendly routes. The improvement of the Cheshire Lines path would bring huge benefits, not just to the local community, but to Trail users generally.</p> |
| Council response | <p>Support noted for Cheshire Lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park projects.</p> <p>This is one of several "same text" responses received through the consultation.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| Rep no. | 16 |
| Name | Quentin Blagg |
| Organisation | - |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | <p>Cheshire Lines – This location is part of the Trans Pennine Trail and needs significant upgrades to maintain the standards strived for and achieved by other sections of the route. It is well used and brings many visitors to the area. Cycling and outdoor recreation have proven multiple benefits for health and wellbeing and anything done to promote them should be given priority.</p> <p>Hunters Hill- This is a beautiful site with significant local biological importance, but requires improvements to make it more visitor friendly</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | Tawd Valley Park – This site running through the middle of Skelmersdale needs significant upgrades in order to make the most of its location, ecological, heritage and future potential |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | Happy with the 3 nominated. |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | As above. |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | There are a number of important projects on the list which would benefit from various amounts of funding- makes sense to use some of it. Cheshire lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park all deserve some funding. |
| Council response | Support noted for Cheshire Lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park projects. This is one of several "same text" responses received through the consultation. |

| | |
|--|---|
| Rep no. | 17 |
| Name | John Stephen Clarke |
| Organisation | |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | Cheshire Lines – This location is part of the Trans Pennine Trail and needs significant upgrades to maintain the standards strived for and achieved by other sections of the route. It is well used and brings many visitors to the area. Cycling and outdoor recreation have proven multiple benefits for health and wellbeing and anything done to promote them should be given priority. Hunters Hill- This is a beautiful site with significant local biological importance, but requires improvements to make it more visitor friendly Tawd Valley Park – This site running through the middle of Skelmersdale needs significant upgrades in order to make the most of its location, ecological, heritage and future potential |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | - |

| | |
|---|---|
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | - |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | There are a number of important projects on the list which would benefit from various amounts of funding- makes sense to use some of it. Cheshire lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park all deserve some funding |
| Council response | <p>Support noted for Cheshire Lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park projects.</p> <p>This is one of several "same text" responses received through the consultation.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| Rep no. | 18 |
| Name | Polly Blacker |
| Organisation | - |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | <p>Cheshire Lines – This location is part of the Trans Pennine Trail and needs significant upgrades to maintain the standards strived for and achieved by other sections of the route. It is well used and brings many visitors to the area. Cycling and outdoor recreation have proven multiple benefits for health and wellbeing and anything done to promote them should be given priority.</p> <p>Hunters Hill- This is a beautiful site with significant local biological importance, but requires improvements to make it more visitor friendly</p> <p>Tawd Valley Park – This site running through the middle of Skelmersdale needs significant upgrades in order to make the most of its location, ecological, heritage and future potential</p> |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | - |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | - |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | There are a number of important projects on the list which would benefit from various amounts of funding- makes sense to use some of it. Cheshire lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park all deserve some funding |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Council response | Support noted for Cheshire Lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park projects. This is one of several "same text" responses received through the consultation. |
|------------------|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| Rep no. | 19 |
| Name | Tony Corah |
| Organisation | - |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | Cheshire Lines – This location is part of the Trans Pennine Trail and needs significant upgrades to maintain the standards strived for and achieved by other sections of the route. It is well used and brings many visitors to the area. Cycling and outdoor recreation have proven multiple benefits for health and wellbeing and anything done to promote them should be given priority. Hunters Hill- This is a beautiful site with significant local biological importance, but requires improvements to make it more visitor friendly Tawd Valley Park – This site running through the middle of Skelmersdale needs significant upgrades in order to make the most of its location, ecological, heritage and future potential |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | - |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | - |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | There are a number of important projects on the list which would benefit from various amounts of funding- makes sense to use some of it. Cheshire lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park all deserve some funding |
| Council response | Support noted for Cheshire Lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park projects. This is one of several "same text" responses received through the consultation. |

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Rep no. | 20 |
| Name | - |
| Organisation | Downholland Parish Council |
| Do you agree with our | Council agree up to a point but wish greater use is made for |

| | |
|---|---|
| shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | smaller projects |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | The local stretch of the canal in whole or in part could benefit. It is well used by local and visitors to the area. |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | Sumner Ave, Haskayne has a triangle of land owned by WLBC, which ostensibly prevents residents accessing their properties, however cars are drive across it leaving it as an eye sore. A simple solution would be to remove it or tarmac it. The road bridge on the A5147 adjacent to the Kings Arms on Delph Lane has railings on the stone wall which are in a very bad state of repair needing strengthening and painting. As this very busy main road into the borough it is an eyesore not just for local people but for visitor and traffic passing through. To upgrade this would make a vast difference. |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | The Council very much supports option 3. To spread the money across the Borough giving it to smaller projects where a lot more can be done and shown to be fairly distributed. |
| Council response | CIL must be spent on infrastructure required to support new development. It cannot be used to tarmac areas for resident parking. Improvements to the A5147 is already listed on the IDS as project #103. CIL must be used to support <u>new</u> development and there has been limited new development in Downholland to justify use of CIL. Insufficient information has been provided about this scheme, in relation to CIL funding required and delivery, to be able to recommend this scheme for CIL funding in 2018/19. Support for option 3 noted. |

| | |
|--|---|
| Rep no. | 21 |
| Name | Peter Brocklehurst |
| Organisation | - |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | Cheshire Lines – This location is part of the Trans Pennine Trail and needs significant upgrades to maintain the standards strived for and achieved by other sections of the route. It is well used and brings many visitors to the area. Cycling and outdoor recreation have proven multiple benefits for health and wellbeing and anything done to promote them should be given priority. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>Hunters Hill- This is a beautiful site with significant local biological importance, but requires improvements to make it more visitor friendly</p> <p>Tawd Valley Park – This site running through the middle of Skelmersdale needs significant upgrades in order to make the most of its location, ecological, heritage and future potential</p> |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | - |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | - |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | There are a number of important projects on the list which would benefit from various amounts of funding- makes sense to use some of it. Cheshire lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park all deserve some funding |
| Council response | <p>Support noted for Cheshire Lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park projects.</p> <p>This is one of several "same text" responses received through the consultation.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| Rep no. | 22 |
| Name | Don Thompson |
| Organisation | - |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | <p>Cheshire Lines – This location is part of the Trans Pennine Trail and needs significant upgrades to maintain the standards strived for and achieved by other sections of the route. It is well used and brings many visitors to the area. Cycling and outdoor recreation have proven multiple benefits for health and wellbeing and anything done to promote them should be given priority.</p> <p>Hunters Hill- This is a beautiful site with significant local biological importance, but requires improvements to make it more visitor friendly</p> <p>Tawd Valley Park – This site running through the middle of Skelmersdale needs significant upgrades in order to make the most of its location, ecological, heritage and future potential</p> |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think | - |

| | |
|---|---|
| should be considered for CIL funding? | |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | - |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | <p>There are a number of important projects on the list which would benefit from various amounts of funding- makes sense to use some of it.</p> <p>Mere Sands</p> <p>Cheshire lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park all deserve some funding</p> |
| Council response | <p>Support noted for Cheshire Lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park projects.</p> <p>This is one of several "same text" responses received through the consultation.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| Rep no. | 23 |
| Name | John Cope |
| Organisation | - |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | <p>Cheshire Lines – This location is part of the Trans Pennine Trail and needs significant upgrades to maintain the standards strived for and achieved by other sections of the route. It is well used and brings many visitors to the area. Cycling and outdoor recreation have proven multiple benefits for health and wellbeing and anything done to promote them should be given priority.</p> <p>Hunters Hill- This is a beautiful site with significant local biological importance, but requires improvements to make it more visitor friendly</p> <p>Tawd Valley Park – This site running through the middle of Skelmersdale needs significant upgrades in order to make the most of its location, ecological, heritage and future potential</p> |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | - |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that | - |

| | |
|--|---|
| you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | There are a number of important projects on the list which would benefit from various amounts of funding- makes sense to use some of it. Cheshire lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park all deserve some funding |
| Council response | <p>Support noted for Cheshire Lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park projects.</p> <p>This is one of several "same text" responses received through the consultation.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| Rep no. | 24 |
| Name | - |
| Organisation | Lancashire Wildlife Trust |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | <p>Cheshire Lines – For importance of its access quality / extent and ecological importance – notably a truly “green” / “wildlife” corridor / “ecological network” through an intensive agricultural area with notable fauna and fauna records (as stored with local naturalists and environmental organisations, LeRN, B.S.B.I. recorders and L.C.C. Biological Heritage (B.H.S.) site documentation - citations).</p> <p>Multi-access use improvement (pedestrians, bicycles etc) would be a worthwhile improvement with regards health and well being considerations and opportunities - would also assist ongoing monitoring / condition assessment of the various B.H.S. designated sites within the larger site.</p> <p>Hunters Hill- A valuable site – particularly in the local context - containing habitat mosaics of grassland, heathland (rare at this altitude in North West England) and pioneer woodland. Notable invertebrate records from this site which has a good diversity / populations of insects. Access improvements would help where this is difficult and also help – indirectly - to maintain the structural diversity of the habitat mosaic with “glade” areas associated with access routes.</p> <p>Tawd Valley Park – An important component of remnant ancient woodland - a scarce resource nationally and quite rare in an urban / regional (West Lancs) context. Again, carefully considered access can actually benefit the structure of the woodland when cutting back / removal of regenerating secondary woody species (Sycamore especially) restores a more natural balance of canopy structure and light penetration expected in a lowland broadleaved woodland with plentiful oak trees.</p> |
| Are there any other projects | - |

| | |
|---|---|
| on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | - |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | <p>1. <i>Allocate funds to one large project (>£100,000) and, in addition, a number of smaller projects from the shortlist up to a maximum total spend of £100,000, and save any surplus funding.</i></p> <p>There are a number of important projects on the list which would benefit from various amounts of funding- makes sense to use some of it. Cheshire lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park all deserve some funding</p> |
| Council response | <p>Support noted for Cheshire Lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park projects.</p> <p>Support noted for option 1.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| Rep no. | 25 |
| Name | Pamela Ashton |
| Organisation | Formby U3A (University of the Third Age) Cycling Group |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | <p>Cheshire Lines – This location is part of the Trans Pennine Trail and needs significant upgrades to maintain the standards strived for and achieved by other sections of the route. It is well used and brings many visitors to the area. Cycling and outdoor recreation have proven multiple benefits for health and wellbeing and anything done to promote them should be given priority. YES</p> <p>Hunters Hill- This is a beautiful site with significant local biological importance, but requires improvements to make it more visitor friendly YES</p> <p>Tawd Valley Park – This site running through the middle of Skelmersdale needs significant upgrades in order to make the most of its location, ecological, heritage and future potential YES</p> |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | - |

| | |
|---|---|
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | - |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | <p>There are a number of important projects on the list which would benefit from various amounts of funding- makes sense to use some of it. Cheshire lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park all deserve some funding</p> <p>This is my preferred option as the Cheshire Lines is in need of an enormous amount of spending in order to bring it up to standard. The surface is poor, there is almost no signage and almost no furniture eg seats or picnic tables. The farm roads that cross it and the rights to access it by shooting groups all result in more problems.</p> <p>I represent Formby U3A (University of the Third Age) Cycling Group which has 35 members and which uses the Cheshire Lines regularly. We would dearly love to see it improved as at times it is almost unusable.</p> |
| Council response | Support noted for Cheshire Lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park projects. |

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Rep no. | 26 |
| Name | Alison Wall |
| Organisation | - |
| Comments | <p>I would like to express my view on how some of the CIL money should be spent in 18/19. Please could we have more allotments in Ormskirk. I am secretary of Tower Hill allotment society and recent new members have waited many years to be allocated their plot. Myself and my husband waited 8 years and this is typical. The council are advocating healthy lifestyles through the Active West Lancs programme and more allotments would give more people the chance to grow their own food, exercise in the open air and benefit from the well-being, physical and mental, that this promotes. All plots at Tower Hill are presently tenanted (except those being purposely kept vacant by the council) and there is a waiting list held by the council. If the allotments at Tower Hill were extended onto the field, this would still leave plenty of green space, but would make our Society more viable.</p> |
| Council response | Support for Ormskirk allotments noted |

| | |
|--------------|--------------|
| Rep no. | 27 |
| Name | Fiona Duggan |
| Organisation | - |

| | |
|--|---|
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | Mere Sands Wood; a fine educational and recreational facility beloved by youngsters. The human facilities are worn out such that a lack of resources threatens its existence and development. The required sum is small but is the seed for the larger funds required. A good investment for the community |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | Hunters; very attractive spot in need of improvement Cheshire Lines; popular |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | No |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | <p>1. <i>Allocate funds to one large project (>£100,000) and, in addition, a number of smaller projects from the shortlist up to a maximum total spend of £100,000, and save any surplus funding.</i></p> <p>There are a number of important projects on the list which would benefit from various amounts of funding- makes sense to use some of it</p> |
| Council response | <p>Support noted for Mere Sands Wood, Cheshire Lines and Hunters Hill projects.</p> <p>Support for option 1 noted.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| Rep no. | 28 |
| Name | Paul Stubbings |
| Organisation | - |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | <p>I agree with the shortlisted projects, the greatest priority being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mere Sands Wood Visitor Centre Phase II, Holmeswood / Rufford <p>Mere Sands Wood is a strategic facility close to development areas (Burscough, Rufford etc.) and attracts many visitors from across the county and further afield. It provides wildlife experience and educational facilities to all ages which is becoming more and more important as the trend for urbanisation increases and the general public continue to lose touch with the natural world.</p> <p>The amount of money is small and well justified in comparison with some other schemes and would unlock considerable matching funding to allow much needed improvement in the</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>existing facilities and hence the increased effectiveness of the centre. Equally, the percentage CIL funding requested of total spend is the lowest (10%) of the projects shortlisted and consequently offers the biggest bang for a buck.</p> <p>The allocation of the requested funds would continue the existing policy of support for this facility from CIL funds.</p> |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | None known |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | None known |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | <p>Supported option</p> <p>3. Allocate funds to a number of smaller projects from the shortlist...</p> <p>The best use of the CIL fund is to provide initial investment for community projects that would then unlock additional financial support from other sources. The availability of additional financial support (community funding, charitable grants etc) being evidence of broad based support for the project.</p> <p>The Mere Sands Wood Visitor Centre Phase II is a clear example of this justifiable use of public funding for the benefit of the community.</p> |
| Council response | <p>Support noted for Mere Sands Wood.</p> <p>Support for option 3 noted.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| Rep no. | 29 |
| Name | William Lowes |
| Organisation | - |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | <p>Cheshire Lines – This location is part of the Trans Pennine Trail and needs significant upgrades to maintain the standards strived for and achieved by other sections of the route. It is well used and brings many visitors to the area. Cycling and outdoor recreation have proven multiple benefits for health and wellbeing and anything done to promote them should be given priority.</p> <p>Hunters Hill- This is a beautiful site with significant local</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>biological importance, but requires improvements to make it more visitor friendly</p> <p>Tawd Valley Park – This site running through the middle of Skelmersdale needs significant upgrades in order to make the most of its location, ecological, heritage and future potential</p> |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | - |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | - |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | <p>1. <i>Allocate funds to one large project (>£100,000) and, in addition, a number of smaller projects from the shortlist up to a maximum total spend of £100,000, and save any surplus funding.</i></p> <p>There are a number of important projects on the list which would benefit from various amounts of funding-makes sense to use some of it. Cheshire lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park all deserve some funding</p> |
| Council response | <p>Support noted for Cheshire Lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park projects.</p> <p>This is one of several "same text" responses received through the consultation.</p> <p>Support for option 1 noted.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| Rep no. | 30 |
| Name | Kathryn Mitchell |
| Organisation | - |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | <p>Cheshire Lines – This location is part of the Trans Pennine Trail and needs significant upgrades to maintain the standards strived for and achieved by other sections of the route. It is well used and brings many visitors to the area. Cycling and outdoor recreation have proven multiple benefits for health and wellbeing and anything done to promote them should be given priority.</p> <p>Hunters Hill- This is a beautiful site with significant local biological importance, but requires improvements to make it</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>more visitor friendly</p> <p>Tawd Valley Park – This site running through the middle of Skelmersdale needs significant upgrades in order to make the most of its location, ecological, heritage and future potential</p> |
| <p>Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding?</p> | <p>I recently attended an Ormskirk residents' meeting and the CIL funding subject was discussed including an invitation for other suggestions.</p> <p>As an Ormskirk resident and owner of 2 rescue ex racing greyhounds, I have been thinking for quite some time how beneficial it would be for both owners and dogs to have an enclosed dog park to allow the dogs to run free and safely. We have enclosed parks for children and I am sure the many dog owning residents of Ormskirk would welcome such a facility. I would go further by proposing it be a 'key' park whereby a nominal annual fee be paid for the use. This would hopefully attract 'responsible' dog owners who would 'pick up' after their dog and, by paying for a key would assist in the park being self sufficient as well as keeping out any potential vandals. I would suggest the enclosure be erected in green anti vandal fencing (similar to Coronation Park's bowling green) and high enough, again, to keep out any unwelcome visitors. As for its location, I would suggest Church Fields as it is a large enough area that could easily accommodate a dog park facility. Obviously additional dog waste bins would be required together with signage requesting that dog owners clean up after their dogs. I would also make the dog owners aware that if they fail to be responsible then their key will be forfeited. I appreciate this may be difficult to enforce and may rely on complaints to the council but, as long as key owners appreciate and respect the dog park, I truly believe this project is affordable and manageable.</p> <p>May I finally remark that my suggestion was met with a positive response from the Residents' Meeting and I was encouraged by all to put forward my proposal. I do hope it is given serious consideration (and that I have completed the correct section of this form!)</p> |
| <p>Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why?</p> | <p>-</p> |
| <p>Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include?</p> | <p><i>Allocate funds to one large project (>£100,000) and, in addition, a number of smaller projects from the shortlist up to a maximum total spend of £100,000, and save any surplus funding.</i></p> |

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| | There are a number of important projects on the list which would benefit from various amounts of funding- makes sense to use some of it. Cheshire lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park all deserve some funding |
| Council response | <p>Support noted for Cheshire Lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park projects. This is one of several "same text" responses received through the consultation.</p> <p>CIL must be used to fund infrastructure required as a result of new development. To have a 'dog park' included on the IDS, which lists those projects required to support new development, further information would need to be supplied to explain why this project is needed as a direct result of new development, and the levels of demand for such a project. This information can be supplied at any time. Subject to its receipt, the scheme may then be suitable for inclusion on the IDS.</p> <p>Support for option 1 noted.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| Rep no. | 31 |
| Name | Charles Scott |
| Organisation | - |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | I am only familiar with Mere Sands Wood and fully support the efforts there to improve this wonderful local amenity. I acknowledge local expertise in forming the shortlist which all seem to have some merit. |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | None known |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | None known |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | <p>1. Allocate funds to one large project, and, in addition, a number of smaller projects from the shortlist...</p> <p>There are a number of important projects on the list which would benefit from various amounts of funding – makes sense to use some of it. Cheshire Lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park all deserve some funding as well as Mere Sands Wood.</p> |
| Council response | <p>Support for Mere Sands Wood noted.</p> <p>Support for option 1 noted.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| Rep no. | 32 |
| Name | - |
| Organisation | Natural England |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | <p>We support the following projects and consider them to be the greatest priority to deliver:</p> <p>58 – Tawd Valley, Skelmersdale 61 – Hunters Hill, Parbold</p> <p>Both these projects provide improvements to existing green infrastructure / public open space and may contribute to the reduction in recreational disturbance of land which is functionally linked to European designated sites.</p> <p>128 – Mere Sands Wood Visitors Centre Phase 2.</p> <p>This project will support the development of facilities within a SSSI which will enable the continued management of that SSSI.</p> <p>130 – Martin Mere Filtration Reed Bed</p> <p>This project will provide environmental improvements to an existing SPA and SSSI, including water quality improvements and will enhance the biodiversity of the site.</p> |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | Future priority projects should include those which address recreational disturbance on land which is functionally linked to the European designated sites; water quality and flood risk management. |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | No |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | We would support option 1 to enable the delivery of a larger project which provides environmental improvements – ie. #130 – Martin Mere, whilst enabling smaller projects and saving money for other future projects. |
| Council response | <p>Support noted for Tawd, Hunters Hill, Mere Sands Wood and Martin Mere Filtration Reed Bed.</p> <p>Support for option 1 noted.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| Rep no. | 33 |
| Name | William Atkinson |
| Organisation | - |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | <p>Cheshire Lines – This location is part of the Trans Pennine Trail and needs significant upgrades to maintain the standards strived for and achieved by other sections of the route. It is well used and brings many visitors to the area. Cycling and outdoor recreation have proven multiple benefits for health and wellbeing and anything done to promote them should be given priority.</p> <p>Hunters Hill- This is a beautiful site with significant local biological importance, but requires improvements to make it more visitor friendly</p> <p>Tawd Valley Park – This site running through the middle of Skelmersdale needs significant upgrades in order to make the most of its location, ecological, heritage and future potential</p> |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | - |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | - |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | <p>1. Allocate funds to one large project...</p> <p>There are a number of important projects on the list which would benefit from various amounts of funding- makes sense to use some of it. Cheshire lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park all deserve some funding</p> |
| Council response | <p>Support noted for Cheshire Lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park projects.</p> <p>This is one of several "same text" responses received through the consultation.</p> <p>Support for option 1 noted.</p> |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Rep no. | 34 |
| Name | Philip Birchall |
| Organisation | - |
| Comments | I wish to input my views for the CIL funding. I would like to suggest allotments would benefit from any funding available and could benefit the community. I have recently acquired a allotment on the Tower Hill site After being on the waiting list for over seven years this shows that there is a demand for new plots and the is a shortage for people would like to grow there own produce the funding would benefit the community who want a new allotment enabling them to have a healthier life style fresh air, exercises, fresh produce and benefit meeting new people on the other plots. Thank you for your time and I hope you will consider my views for the funding |
| Council response | Support for Ormskirk allotments noted. |

| | |
|--|--|
| Rep no. | 35 |
| Name | Carole Hampton |
| Organisation | - |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | <p>My husband and I have been visiting Mere Sands Wood from its inception in a Portacabin many years ago. We appreciate the quiet natural setting and the variety of wildlife (Birds, Moths, Butterflies, Bees, Bats, Fungi etc).</p> <p>I think that the proposed improvements to the visitor centre would make visits more enjoyable for everyone, a café would be an added bonus possibly attracting additional visitors and earning money for Mere Sands whilst creating local jobs/staff training.</p> <p>The dedicated staff and volunteers at Mere Sands Wood deserve this additional facility.</p> <p>I often support other businesses in the local area – very good chandlers in Burscough!</p> |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | - |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | - |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which | I support Option 3, which would allow the funding of: |

| | |
|---|---|
| projects do you think that option should include? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mere Sands Wood £25,000 • Hunters Hill £60,000 |
| Council response | Support for Mere Sands Wood noted. Support for Option 3 noted. |

| | |
|--|--|
| Rep no. | 36 |
| Name | Jeff Gorse |
| Organisation | - |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | Mere Sands Wood is an excellent and enjoyable site to visit with a range of special wildlife. Since discovering the reserve last year I have visited frequently and enjoy the tranquillity as well as the opportunity to see a variety of wildlife. I firmly believe that the reserve should be enhanced to broaden its appeal and recognise that a wider range of facilities would play a role in attracting visitors from further afield. I also recognise the role the reserve could play in the local economy with the developments opening opportunities for volunteering and employment roles. |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | - |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | - |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | I support Option 3, which would allow the funding of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mere Sands Wood £25,000 • Hunters Hill £60,000 |
| Council response | Support for Mere Sands Wood and Hunters Hill noted. Support for Option 3 noted. |

| | |
|--|--|
| Rep no. | 37 |
| Name | - |
| Organisation | Lathom Parish Council |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | Lathom Parish Council agree with the shortlist and feel community projects would be greatest priority. |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think | No |

| | |
|---|---|
| should be considered for CIL funding? | |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | No |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | Lathom Parish Council would support Option 3 – possibly include projects where additional funding has been raised from other sources. |
| Council response | Support for Option 3 noted. |

| | |
|--|--|
| Rep no. | 38 |
| Name | Peter Tipping |
| Organisation | - |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | I very much value visiting Mere Sands Wood and would like to see improvements to the visitor facilities. I think this would make visits more enjoyable for everyone and would attract more visitors from further afield. The establishment of a cafe would also create jobs. Increasing the community service facilities will benefit the local area. |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | - |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | - |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | I support Option 3, which would allow the funding of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mere Sands Wood £25,000 • Hunters Hill £60,000 |
| Council response | Support for Mere Sands Wood, and Hunters Hill noted. Support for Option 3 noted. |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Rep no. | 39 |
| Name | Janice Jowett |
| Organisation | - |
| Comments | I am writing to ask if consideration can be given to resurfacing the |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| | <p>pathway between Marians Drive, Ormskirk and the West End School on Grimshaw Lane.</p> <p>This pathway has deep potholes and indentations in the surface, so that it is extremely difficult to negotiate with a pram or buggy, not to mention the impossibility of anyone in a wheelchair using it. It is even more hazardous in wet or icy weather. People taking their children to school use the pathway on a daily basis, often with younger children in buggies with them. There is also a small children's play area next to the school, accessed by this pathway and again the path makes it difficult to get to because of the high probability of tripping on one of the many potholes.</p> <p>Please go and check this out for yourselves and you will see what I mean.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> |
| Council response | Highway surfacing is a matter for Lancashire County Council. |

| | |
|--|---|
| Rep no. | 40 |
| Name | Pauline Margaret Brooks |
| Organisation | - |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | I would like to see the Phase II development at Mere Sands Wood. This reserve offers a great space for people of all ages, it is very welcoming as well as providing education and leisure opportunities. |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | Martin Mere Filtration Reed beds. Martin Mere is a great attraction in our locality – generating income and providing employment and volunteering opportunities. The reed beds provide wildlife with a great habitat and should be maintained to a high standard. |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | Improvements to the Wiggins Road play area in Holmeswood. The equipment is outdate and does not meet the needs of children – not age and stage appropriate. A good example is the play area on Liverpool Road, Much Hoole. I am aware this is not in our area, but we take our grandchild here, knowing he is playing in a safe and stimulating environment. This is not the case in Holmeswood. Also aware of a [lower?] population of children in Holmeswood, but this should not influence their opportunity to play safely. |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | Option 3. The more projects that are supported the fairer the allocation of funds throughout West Lancs, as most people will support their own local projects. |

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Council response | <p>Support for Mere Sands Wood noted. Support for Martin Mere filtration reed beds noted. Support for Option 3 noted.</p> <p>The Wiggins play area does not accord with the Council's "bigger, better, fewer" strategy.</p> |
|------------------|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| Rep no. | 41 |
| Name | Edward Stevens |
| Organisation | - |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | <p>Mere Sands Wood visitor centre will be 30 years old next year, and is badly in need of upgrading. Activities are provided there by staff and volunteers for schools during term time and at the school holidays activities are also provided such as pond dipping and bug hunting. Also people with learning difficulties are catered for. There are 2 buggies available for the use of disabled people for which only a small donation is required to help maintain them. There are over 60,000 visitors a year to the site and at the moment only 2 toilets, so a few more would be a great help, there are at the moment limited refreshment facilities available and the establishment of a café would be great and would also create jobs.</p> |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | Hunters Hill Country Park Parbold. This site needs to attract more visitors and would definitely benefit from improvement. |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | - |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | <p>I support Option 3, which would allow the funding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mere Sands Wood £25,000 - Hunters Hill £60,000 |
| Council response | Support for Option 3 noted. Support for Mere Sands Wood and Hunters Hill noted. |

| | |
|--|---|
| Rep no. | 42 |
| Name | - |
| Organisation | Lathom South Parish Council |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | <p>We have no objection to the inclusion of the Tawd Valley scheme within the list but do not support the allocation of funds to it at this stage. The plans need to be much firmer and cost-controlled first.</p> <p>We do not agree with the inclusion of the Martin Mere Reed bed for the reasons stated in the consultation document (description</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>of short-listed projects).</p> <p>Our priority list for the remaining projects is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mere Sands Wood Visitor Centre £25,000 (least cost for greatest return). 2. Cheshire Lines Path £40,000 (contribution to recreation and road safety) 3. Chequer Lane changing facilities £60,000 (support for disability sports) 4. Whittle Drive playing fields £40,000 (maintaining reasonable standards of leisure facilities) 5. Thompson Avenue play area £60,000 (improved facilities in return for reduced area of land) 6. Ormskirk Allotment site £40,000 (lower priority because no site has been identified) 7. Hunters Hill Country Park £60,000 (parished area seeking 100% funding) <p>We have regarded unparished areas as a generally higher priority in the absence of exceptional circumstances because i) Ormskirk has generated CIL incomes and has no Parish component of CIL funding and ii) the Skelmersdale/Up Holland built up areas do not attract CIL payments for housing developments.</p> |
| <p>Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding?</p> | <p>Not at this stage.</p> |
| <p>Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why?</p> | <p>Not at this stage.</p> |
| <p>Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include?</p> | <p>We propose a modified option 3, i.e. without the suggested £100,000 total spending). There would be no point in having a shortlist of nine, with seven projects costing less than £100,000 each, if only two could possibly be funded. Option 1 provides for spending a total of at least £300,000, up to £400,000, so the proposed option 3 limit makes no sense.</p> |
| <p>Council response</p> | <p>The CIL Regulations specify that 15% of CIL receipts must be apportioned for local uses in the area in which they are collected. In parished areas, this money is given to the parish council who determine how the money should be spent. In non-parished areas, the Borough Council retain the monies and will consult with local communities to identify the most suitable projects for delivery. Subsequently, those areas which are non-parished will still receive</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>15% of the CIL monies collected in its area for use on local infrastructure schemes. Some projects may be better funded by 'local' CIL monies to enable the remainder of CIL to be used elsewhere in the Borough and get the best value from CIL.</p> <p>Objection to use of monies for Martin Mere Filtration Reed Beds and Tawd Valley noted. Support for Mere Sands Wood and Cheshire Lines Path noted. Further support for other listed projects noted.</p> <p>Support for a modified option 3 noted.</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| Rep no. | 43 |
| Name | Ron Strickland |
| Organisation | - |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | As Mere Sands Wood have only asked for 25% contribution we think it should be supported, with consideration to increase the % contribution on the basis that the site is in the stages of critical development. |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | Not at the moment as in our opinion Mere Sands needs to be recognized as a strategic wetlands development site. |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | See 2. above |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | <p>1. Allocate funds to one large project and in addition a number of small projects...</p> <p>There are a number of important projects on the list which would benefit from various amounts of funding – makes sense to use some of it. Cheshire Lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park all deserve some funding.</p> |
| Council response | <p>Support for Mere Sands Wood noted.</p> <p>Support for Option 1 noted.</p> |

| | |
|--------------|------------------|
| Rep no. | 44 |
| Name | Diane Strickland |
| Organisation | - |

| | |
|--|---|
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | As Mere Sands Wood have only asked for 25% contribution we think it should be supported, with consideration to increase the % contribution on the basis that the site is in the stages of critical development. |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | Not at the moment as in our opinion Mere Sands needs to be recognized as a strategic wetlands development site. |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | See 2. above |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | 1. Allocate funds to one large project and in addition a number of small projects... There are a number of important projects on the list which would benefit from various amounts of funding – makes sense to use some of it. Cheshire Lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park all deserve some funding. |
| Council response | Support for Mere Sands Wood noted. Support for Option 1 noted. |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Rep no. | 45 |
| Name | - |
| Organisation | Newburgh Parish Council |
| Comments | I have been asked to contact you regarding our response to the Spending CIL in 2018/19 consultation. Newburgh Parish Council prefers the Option 3 method specified – allocate funds to a number of smaller projects from the shortlist up to a maximum total spend of £100,000 and save any surplus funding. |
| Council response | Support for Option 3 noted. |

| | |
|--|--|
| Rep no. | 46 |
| Name | - |
| Organisation | Environment Agency |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | Yes, we have no issues with the shortlist of projects. In terms of priority, the two with the most potential to improve the water environment and water quality are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tawd Valley Park - Martin Mere Filtration Reed Bed We have been involved in the development of both of these |

projects – more so the Tawd Park one. We have been working in partnership to try and progress these projects due to the beneficial improvement that they would bring to the water environment.

Given only one choice, we would support the Tawd Valley Park project, as we believe it will lever in the most match funding and produce the best, most rounded project for the environment and people. We have already contributed funding to the masterplan phase of this project, and have further aspirations to contribute to the delivery phase through our Environmental Programme. There has been extensive public consultation about this project which provided evidence of need and support from the local community. From an Environment Agency perspective, the project has the potential to significantly improve the water quality and habitat of the River Tawd. Consultation has shown that currently, the community are aware of the presence of the river, but don't necessarily value it because they believe it is polluted. Overall, water quality in the Tawd is not bad, but the river does suffer from intermittent pollution incidents which are visible to the public and likely influence their opinion that it is polluted / unsafe. Part of the masterplan is for the construction of wetlands which will provide a buffer for surface water drainage into the river, as well as creating new aquatic habitat and an amenity. The project has a big focus on education, with the desire to enable the river to become an outdoor classroom for local schools. We hope that all of this activity, alongside a great improvement to the whole park, will result in the river being better valued by local people.

We note that the new Local Plan which is currently being prepared by West Lancashire marks Skelmersdale as an area for future development. The Tawd Valley Project could also assist in creating a 'sense of place' within the centre of Skelmersdale whilst creating an attraction that could benefit the visitor economy.

The Martin Mere filtration reed bed also has the potential to be a brilliant project for the water environment. The proposals would allow for the creation of a huge reed bed alongside Martin Mere. The idea is to allow water from Boat House Sluice to flow (may need to be pumped) through the reed bed to improve water quality. This would likely make a significant improvement as well as providing habitat and public amenity. The reed bed would be situated downstream of Burscough Waste water Treatment Works and hopefully the outlet from Martin Mere itself, which is a contributor of organic pollution to water courses due to the size of the bird population. There would be an increase in storage capacity, slowing the flow downstream. However, this is not expected to result in a significant reduction in flood risk, due to there being only a small number of properties. It may ease pressure on the waterway network however, e.g. less pressure on maintained embankments and pumping stations. And a reduction

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>in nutrients may help reduce growth of weed in the water course channel, which is a significant problem for the Environment Agency this year. We note the concerns the council have around the use of CIL funding in this way, given some of the highest costs are associated with the price of the land. However, we think without external investment, Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust just wouldn't be able to afford to hold onto this land, so there's a significant risk it would need to be sold to a private landowner, probably for intensive agriculture. That said, there may be other funding mechanisms with which we can support WWT. This is partly why we would prioritise the Tawd project.</p> <p>The Cheshire Lines project would also have some indirect benefits to use by encouraging use of green transport alongside a water course, the water course is likely to be better valued and better observed (i.e. more people to witness and report pollution incidents or risk to flood assets).</p> |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | From an Environment Agency perspective, the projects with most benefit to the water environment have been shortlisted. |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | Not at this time. |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | <p>It is difficult to answer this question, not knowing how much the Council have in their CIL pot (or at least we have not been able to ascertain this from the documents).</p> <p>However, our preference would be option 1 – fund one large project and a number of smaller projects.</p> <p>There could also be the opportunity to go back to applicants and offer a smaller amount of funding from CIL, if funding is short. In many cases, they may be able to use CIL funding to lever in other funds, or deliver a scaled back project.</p> |
| Council response | Support for the Tawd noted. Support for Martin Mere filtration reed beds noted. Support for Option 1 noted. |

| | |
|--------------|--------------|
| Rep no. | 47 |
| Name | Bryan Pready |
| Organisation | - |

| | |
|--|---|
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | Ormskirk Community Partnership's Committee considered the proposals at its last meeting and agreed to support all three of the projects in Ormskirk, i.e. New changing facilities at Whittle Drive, Ormskirk; new allotments Ormskirk; and improvements to play area at Thompson Ave Park, Ormskirk. These are not in order of priority, we hope that all three will be progressed as soon as possible |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | No, taking account of the explanations given |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | Not at this point. But we would like the opportunity to discuss with relevant Council officers the possibility of bringing forward specific proposals for Ormskirk. This is important because Ormskirk is an "unparished" area that does not benefit from the "neighbourhood portion" given to parish councils. |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | At this stage we would prefer Option 3. |
| Council response | <p>Support for Whittle Drive, Ormskirk allotments and Thompson Ave play area noted. Support for Option 3 noted.</p> <p>The CIL Regulations specify that 15% of CIL receipts must be apportioned for local uses in the area in which they are collected. In parished areas, this money is given to the parish council who determine how the money should be spent. In non-parished areas, the Borough Council retain the monies and will consult with local communities to identify the most suitable projects for delivery. Subsequently, whilst Ormskirk is non-parished, 15% of the CIL monies collected in its area will still be awarded to fund local infrastructure schemes. Some Ormskirk projects may be better funded by 'local' CIL monies to enable the remainder of CIL to be used elsewhere in the Borough and get the best value from CIL.</p> <p>We will collect the first CIL monies from Ormskirk this financial year, and so consultation on the use of the 15% on local projects will be undertaken next year.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| Rep no. | 48 |
| Name | Pamela Greaves |
| Organisation | - |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | I very much value visiting Mere Sands Wood and would like to see improvements to the visitor's facilities. I think that this would make visits more enjoyable for everyone and would attract visitors from further afield especially if a cafe was established. |

| | |
|---|--|
| | A cafe would also be a source of job creation for local people. |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | - |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | - |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | I support Option 3, which would allow fusing of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mere Sands Wood £25,000 • Hunters Hill £60,000 |
| Council response | Support for Mere Sands Wood noted. Support for Option 3 noted. |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Rep no. | 49 |
| Name | - |
| Organisation | WLBC Leisure Services |
| Comments | <p>I would fully support the option of the Council providing funding for one large project and some smaller schemes.</p> <p>The Tawd Valley Park scheme has had an extensive local consultation and the Council has funded the production of an extensive Masterplan from this process. Aspirations have now been raised and although the initial bid of £300,000 that has been put forward in the IDS will only complete part of this project it would be a very important impetus to the project and could be used to lever in more funds. This is a very important project for the Council and should be supported as much as possible.</p> <p>Of the smaller projects I would particularly support the 2 schemes that would provide opportunities for football clubs to provide the local community with quality facilities.</p> <p>At Whittle Drive the quality of the facilities is preventing the club from expanding and providing healthy outdoor activities for both adults and children.</p> <p>At Chequer Lane the scheme is to provide changing and community facilities for numerous junior teams, plus a home for a local disabled adults team. Both of these projects have had pledges of support from the Football Foundation, conditional upon the Council making the funds they have requested available.</p> |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| | Both schemes are also very keen to progress and can be undertaken within 2018/19 |
| Council response | Support for Tawd Valley, Whittle Drive and Chequer Lane projects noted. Support for option 1 noted. |

| | |
|--|--|
| Rep no. | 50 |
| Name | Robert Yates |
| Organisation | - |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | <p>I very much value visiting Mere Sands Wood and would like to see improvements to the visitor facilities. I think this would make visits more enjoyable for everyone and would attract more visitors from further afield.</p> <p>The establishment of a cafe would also create jobs. In the 30 years I have been visiting this site the recreational value cannot be underestimated, but the facilities to the average visitor are very old fashioned and seriously need updating.</p> |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | - |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | - |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | <p>I support Option 3, which would allow the funding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mere Sands Wood £25,000 • Hunters Hill £60,000 |
| Council response | Support for Mere Sands Wood noted. Support for option 3 noted. |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Rep no. | 51 |
| Name | - |
| Organisation | Lancashire County Council |
| Comments | <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above consultation.</p> <p>We are in broad agreement with the proposals presented in this consultation and look forward to continuing a close working relationship as the CIL funding programme progresses.</p> |

For more specific recommendations, I offer the following comments from Highways and School Planning colleagues at Lancashire County Council.

Highways Service

Lancashire County Council Highways would like to see West Lancashire Borough Council incorporate the following projects in CIL Regulation 123 list:

- Public transport subsidies for new services, cycling links and highway schemes in Burscough and Ormskirk to overcome the known congestion issues and facilitate planned development;
- Highway schemes to improve capacity on the A59 through Burscough and where required the provision of land to deliver highway improvement schemes, i.e. at the junction of the A59 and A5209, Square Lane Junction (this would be in addition to works delivered by the Yew Tree Farm development);
- Public realm improvements in Burscough would also be beneficial to improve pedestrian priority and the environment of the A59 in the town centre;
- Ormskirk accessibility – work is about to commence on an Ormskirk Movement Study, the outcome of which could identify potential changes. There is also work currently being undertaken to identify priority improvement schemes. CIL contributions would be good to help deliver the identified infrastructure.

Lancashire County Council Highways note that West Lancashire Borough Council have already shortlisted a number of projects. The schemes involving transport infrastructure (Tawd Valley and Cheshire Lines Path) are supported.

Education

Lancashire County Council Schools Planning would like to thank West Lancashire Borough Council for the opportunity to comment on this consultation. Currently education provision is not included on the Regulation 123 List and any education infrastructure projects are funded by Section 106 Legal Agreements.

Schools Planning attended a meeting with West Lancashire Borough Council Planning Officers in September 2017, which was requested as part of the Local Plan Review. The subject of education infrastructure funding was discussed. West Lancashire Borough Council advised that they are not reviewing the CIL Regulation 123 List as part of the Local Plan Review, and explained that they will wait for the outcome of the government white

| | |
|------------------|---|
| | <p>paper on CIL before taking any steps to review CIL funding. Any change to CIL would require elected member approval.</p> <p>I trust that the comments outlined in this response are useful.</p> |
| Council response | <p>Support for the Tawd Valley and Cheshire Lines projects are noted.</p> <p>Cycling links and highways schemes (various) are already included in the IDS. Further information on costs and delivery must be provided by LCC for them to be assessed and considered for CIL funding. Burscough Town Centre Public Realm Improvements is project #64 on the IDS. Ormskirk Town Centre Movement Strategy is project #4 in the IDS. The Council are awaiting the results of the Strategy before a package of measures can be identified.</p> <p>Highway improvement schemes along the A59 may be suitable for inclusion on the IDS. Further information has been requested from LCC and will be added to the IDS on receipt.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| Rep no. | 52 |
| Name | Linda Ebrey |
| Organisation | - |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | I am not aware of most of the projects but would like to support Mere Sands Wood. As this project is great for Education about wildlife and the environment and provides stimulation and activity for young and old. |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | No |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | No |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | <p><i>Allocate funds to one large project (>£100,000) and, in addition, a number of smaller projects from the shortlist up to a maximum total spend of £100,000, and save any surplus funding.</i></p> <p>There are a number of important projects on the list which would benefit from various amounts of funding- makes sense to use some of it. Cheshire lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley Park all deserve some funding</p> |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| | Mere Sands Wood would give good benefit |
| Council response | Support for Mere Sands Wood noted. Support for option 1 noted. Support for Cheshire Lines, Hunters Hill and Tawd Valley noted. |

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Rep no. | 53 |
| Name | L Hill |
| Organisation | Ormskirk Residents Group |
| Comments | New Ormskirk Residents Group (NORG), at a recent meeting considered the list of projects for which possible allocation of CIL funds could be considered. It was decided that we would support option 4 - to save CIL monies to be allocated towards a larger project in the future. |
| Council response | Support for Option 4 noted. |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Rep no. | 54 |
| Name | - |
| Organisation | Sport England |
| Comments | Sport England would like to support the Football Foundation linked investment projects at Chequer lane and Whittle Drive. With significant partner will and financial support these can be delivered quickly and will have an important impact on sport locally. |
| Council response | Support for Chequer Lane and Whittle Drive projects supported. |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Rep no. | 55 |
| Name | - |
| Organisation | Wrightington Parish Council |
| Comments | <p>Further to your email and consultation documents in relation to the draft CIL Funding Programme, the Parish Council's observations are as follows:</p> <p>1) The Parish Council feel that planned capital projects are a good idea, however, there must be some form of maintenance programme put into place going forward, to ensure that the work undertaken in creating some of the ideas is continued year on year and, that the project does not become an eyesore due to lack of ongoing maintenance funding or lack of interest once the project is complete e.g: The gateway planting project completed a few years ago at Crow Orchard Road/Motorway roundabout in Wrightington with funding obtained by the Borough Council. For the first couple of years the gateway planting was tended,</p> |

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| | <p>weeded, cut back and maintained. For the past 2-3 years there has been nothing. Ongoing maintenance has ceased and the Parish Council find themselves contacting LCC repeatedly to ask for overgrown shrubs and vegetation originally forming part of the gateway project to be cut back.</p> <p>2) Improvements at Hunters Hill Country Park describe this site as being in Parbold. The Parish Council always believed the site to be in Hilldale once the new Parish of Hilldale was formed when it split from Wrightington Parish many years ago. The Parish Council feel that this is a really good project, however, a planned maintenance programme as outlined above would need to be put in place to ensure that the area was kept up to the improved standards proposed in the draft programme. The Parish Council would also like to suggest that all the access routes, public footpaths etc. should be upgraded to ensure that the Country Park is accessible to everyone, young, old, able-bodied or disabled. There is no point in improving and enhancing Hunters Hill Country Park if the only means of accessing the facility is by car.</p> <p>3) The Parish Council would therefore support Option 3 - Allocate funds to a number of smaller projects from the shortlist up to a maximum total spend of £100,000 and save any surplus funding.</p> <p>4) The Parish Council would also like to suggest a further project which could be added to the list for funding in the future. The West Lancashire Borough Council play area and playing fields at Appley Lane South. The play equipment is in much need of updating and enhancing as this is the only play facility in the Appley Bridge Ward of Wrightington. No money has been spent on this play area for several years and, when wooden play equipment was removed for safety reasons many years ago nothing replaced it. The play area is in a great location and would be a valuable community asset if enhanced using CIL money.</p> |
| <p>Council response</p> | <p>1) CIL monies cannot be used on the maintenance of existing infrastructure unless there is a need resulting from new development. Landscape maintenance (cutting back overgrown shrubs etc) would not be an acceptable use of CIL monies.</p> <p>2) Support for Hunters Hill noted.</p> <p>3) Support for Option 3 noted</p> <p>4) This project is already listed on the IDS as no #98. At present, there has been very little development in Appley Bridge to justify a local need arising from new development. Insufficient information has been provided about funding and delivery to be able to recommend this scheme for CIL funding.</p> |

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Rep no. | 56 |
| Name | - |
| Organisation | Hilldale Parish Council |
| Comments | Following the meeting of Hilldale Parish Council last night Thursday 2nd November 2017 I have been asked to write to you to express Hilldale Parish Council's support for the improvements at Hunters Hill Country Park . It was felt this project would be of the most benefit to the widest range of residents across West Lancashire |
| Council response | Support for Hunters Hill noted. |

| | |
|--|---|
| Rep no. | 57 |
| Name | David White |
| Organisation | - |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | I very much value visiting Mere Sands Wood and would like to see improvements to the visitor facilities. I think this would make visits more enjoyable for everyone and would attract more visitors from further afield. The establishment of a café would also create jobs. |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | n/a |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | n/a |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | I support option 3 which would allow the funding of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mere Sands Wood £25,000 • Hunters Hill £60,000 |
| Council response | Support for Mere Sands Wood and Hunters Hill noted. Support for option 3 noted. |

| | |
|--------------|----------------------------------|
| Rep no. | 58 |
| Name | - |
| Organisation | Friends of Mere Sands Wood Group |

| | |
|--|---|
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | Mere Sands Wood is a beautiful and interesting Nature Reserve, providing a good venue for activities and pleasure to a wide cross section of the community. In addition to nature lovers (and dog walkers!), it accommodated activities for school visits, talks and activities for many community groups, especially for those 'of a certain age' and disabled. Many community volunteers enjoy working there and maintain the reserve generally. These, and a "Friends of MSW Group" help to arrange funding and a community appeal has realised part funding for a 2 phased project to enhance the visitor centre. There are, however, no facilities for refreshments and toilet facilities are inadequate for large group activities. This project is to include café/tearoom and toilets car park enhancement to attract more community visitors and provide a lakeside meeting place, especially for more elderly people. It will also provide more employment and more funding to help maintain the Reserve. I think that MSW project is worth priority. |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | - |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | - |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | I support option 3 which would allow the funding of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mere Sands Wood £25,000 |
| Council response | Support for Mere Sands Wood noted. Support for option 3 noted. |

| | |
|--|---|
| Rep no. | 59 |
| Name | Graeme, Carol & Jamie Williams |
| Organisation | - |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | I very much value visiting Mere Sands Wood and would like to see improvements to the visitor facilities. I think this would make visits more enjoyable for everyone and would attract more visitors from further afield. The establishment of a café would also create jobs. |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | 1.Cheshire Lines Path, Downholland/Great Altcar. Improve access to an area vital for healthy recreation for all ages. 2.Hunters Hill Country Park "Natural" areas around this part of Lancashire are few and far between – Vital we create more breathing spaces for wildlife and humans |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included | Please see above |

| | |
|--|--|
| on the IDS list? Why? | |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | <p>I support option 3 which would allow the funding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mere Sands Wood £25,000 • Hunters Hill £60,000 <p>Thank you for the chance to comment</p> |
| Council response | Support for Mere Sands Wood, Cheshire Lines and Hunters Hill noted. Support for option 3 noted. |

| | |
|--|--|
| Rep no. | 60 |
| Name | Stuart Dundas |
| Organisation | - |
| Do you agree with our shortlist of projects? Which do you think are the greatest priority to deliver? Why? | <p>We regularly visit Mere Sands Woods, recently with extended family too, and think it would be greatly improve by enhanced visitor facilities.</p> <p>They also hold regular sessions in the woods, and in the classroom, on what can be found / observed in Mere Sands Woods, which are very enjoyable too.</p> <p>A café would be well used and appreciated, and would also bring extra employment to the area</p> |
| Are there any other projects on the IDS that you think should be considered for CIL funding? | - |
| Can you suggest any other infrastructure schemes that you think could be included on the IDS list? Why? | - |
| Which of the four options do you support? Why? Which projects do you think that option should include? | <p>Option 3, to allow the funding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mere Sands Wood £25,000 • Hunters Hill £60,000 |
| Council response | Support for Mere Sands Wood and Hunters Hill noted. Support for option 3 noted. |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Rep no. | 61 |
| Name | - |
| Organisation | Canal & Rivers Trust |
| Comments | Thank you for your consultation in respect of how the authority plans to spend the CIL receipts for 2018/19. Having reviewed the options the Canal & River Trust has no comment to make. |

| | |
|------------------|----------------|
| | |
| Council response | Comments noted |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Rep no. | 62 |
| Name | Brian Farrimond |
| Organisation | - |
| Comments | <p>I am writing regarding the CIL proposals currently posted on page http://www.westlancs.gov.uk/CFP</p> <p>I support funding going towards the Ormskirk allotments. It is not clear to me from your document how you wish to spend the money. Two possibilities occur to me:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Upgrade the existing allotments, 2) Extend the existing allotments <p>In either case it is essential that good security be arranged. If the funding isn't sufficient to extend the allotments then at least installing a decent fence should be possible in order to protect the existing ones</p> |
| Council response | Support for Ormskirk allotments noted. The project is explained in more detail in the consultation supporting document, including the IDS. The project would be for the creation of a new allotment site in Ormskirk (approximately 20 new plots). Comments regarding security noted. |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Rep no. | 63 |
| Name | Cllr Bob Pendleton |
| Organisation | - |
| Comments | <p>I Support Option one</p> <p>On my bid. Improvement around Tanhouse consisting of Bowling green upgrade All weather pitch youth shelter Skate park plus Landscaping. The project can be delivered as the funding in place In submitting my Bid I had as J Malison Landscape Arcetact to cost the development and the programme of works. This is part of my bid.</p> <p>The Question about maintenance of the bowling green this can be manage with the Enterprise taking the lead on this. Remember WLBC are responsible for Maintaining the Pitch and the Skate Park and the Surrounding Area. Another point to bear in is that there are only 2bowling club left in Skelmersdale and they are under great threat of winding up. Question were do the go. Also I have been asked to submit Schemes for use of 106 money this I have done by using 106 money to support my bid only to be told the Council have not agreed to this then Why as for suggestion if they are then rejected</p> |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| | |
| Council response | No clear details have been received regarding the ongoing maintenance, including costs and responsibility, for the proposed bowling green. S106 funding has not been secured as match funding. A decision on any S106 funding is also awaiting the receipt of further details on this project. |

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Rep no. | 64 |
| Name | Mike Smith |
| Organisation | - |
| Comments | <p>I very much value visiting Mere Sands Wood and would like to see improvements to the visitor facilities. I think this would make visits more enjoyable for everyone and would attract more visitors from further afield.</p> <p>The establishment of a cafe would encourage people to spend time on site and would also create jobs.</p> |
| Council response | Support for Mere Sands Wood noted. |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Rep no. | 65 |
| Name | - |
| Organisation | Shevington Parish Council |
| Comments | <p>Thank you for inviting Shevington Parish Council to respond to WLBC's consultation over future CIL projects.</p> <p>The Council noted the options at their meeting on 2 November and, in general, have no comments on the short-listed schemes.</p> <p>However, it was noted that that an Appley Bridge 'Park & Ride' scheme is included in the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule. Are you able to supply any details about how and when this scheme will be funded?</p> |
| Council response | <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>With regard the Appley Bridge 'Park and Ride' scheme, this relates to Network Rail proposals to improve accessibility at stations across Greater Manchester. The project is therefore the responsibility of Network Rail / Transport for Greater Manchester to fund, and will be subject to their own changing priorities and assessed need.</p> |