

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED UP TO AND INCLUDING 15/8/12

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
72	57	Appendix 5	a) We support the document and are pleased to see theatres are listed in Appendix 5 Parking Standards.	a) Noted.
9	6	Appendix 7	a) Appendix 7 Nature Conservation Sites – add the current Geological Heritage Sites alongside the Biological Heritage Sites as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roach Bridge</li> <li>• Bannister Hall Weir</li> <li>• Penwortham Bridge – (part of this site is in Preston)</li> </ul>	a) <b>Minor change</b> to add Geological Heritage Sites into Appendix 7. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>“Roach Bridge</u></li> <li>• <u>Bannister Hall Weir</u></li> <li>• <u>Penwortham Bridge – (part of this site is in Preston)”</u></li> </ul>
292	149	Appendix 7	a) The HCA owns most of this site and supports its allocation as a Biological Heritage Site. The HCA welcomes continuing dialogue with the Council on exploring options to ensure that the site is effectively protected. Given the HCA’s extensive land holdings and future development activity elsewhere within the Borough it is expected that this site could be required in order to provide mitigation / enabling for the development of other sites. The formal process for determining long term management would depend on the potential impacts of other HCA development sites within the Borough balanced against the scale of benefit likely to be provided at this site. The site is 13.6ha and therefore has considerable potential benefits for both South Ribble and Preston.	a) Noted.
254	138	Chapter A - Policy A1 – Developer Contributions	a) LCC welcomes introduction of Developer Contributions Policy, inclusion of transport, community and green infrastructure. Piecemeal development, contributing to increased congestion and reduced highway capacity, without contributing towards any infrastructure improvements, should be avoided. b) Not possible for a developer to provide additional education provision themselves – LCC would require a developer contribution for this.	a) The Central Lancashire Councils, including South Ribble, are in the process of consulting on the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). LCC are included as part of the consultation and development stages of CIL for Central Lancashire. b) Priorities for the allocation of s106 and CIL monies will be informed by the Central Lancashire Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (2012) and the South Ribble Housing Viability Assessment (2010).
246	135	Chapter A – Policy A1 – Developer Contributions	a) Must be shown that the major constraints which prevent development of many of the large sites can be practically overcome before their contribution to meeting the required housing trajectory can be taken into account. Exploratory calculations on the information available indicate that quite unrealistic burdens will be placed on developers to the extent that sites will not be viable by a substantial margin. It has to be borne in mind that affordable homes are themselves a cost on the development and will be unable to contribute to the CIL and extra construction costs: that will fall as an additional burden on the market housing alone. The many constraints that must be overcome before many of the sites can contribute to meeting the housing needs of the core strategy make it most unlikely that the LPA’s assessment of time and rate of delivery of new homes is realistic.	a) The deliverability of large development sites will depend on successful masterplanning, including as set out in Policies C1, C2, C3 and C4. Although beyond the scope of the DPD, much of the masterplanning is at an advanced stage and incorporates viability assessments, indicating that the Council will deliver housing and infrastructure in collaboration with development partners. Priorities for the collection and allocation of s106 and CIL monies will be informed by the Central Lancashire Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (2012) and the South Ribble Housing Viability Assessment (2010), and by other relevant LDF policies, including Policy 7 of the Core Strategy (Affordable Housing).
280	146	Chapter A - Policy A1 - Developer Proposals	a) Please ensure all references to development of footpaths, cycle ways refer to multi-user paths which include Bridleways as is mentioned in section 6.11 – but should be referred to whenever footpaths and cycle ways are mentioned across the whole borough. b) Other sections where bridleways are overlooked include 9.18, 10.51,10.57,10.42 and others. c) Bridleway provision is an increased requirement considering road safety - this will become more of a problem given the proposed developments and associated increase in traffic – particularly Moss Side and test track area. Increasing number of horses in area as has been supplied on a separate document. Also satisfies requirements in Policies 23,24, and 25	a) <b>Minor change</b> – Policy A1(c) to read: <b>“Transport (highway, rail, bus and cycle/footpath/bridleway networks, canal and associated facilities);”</b> b) Noted. No further changes to the justification text. c) Noted.

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
91	74	Chapter A - Policy A2	<p>a) High traffic volume is running north to south or south to north depending on the time of day. This is due to the traffic heading in and out of the centre of Preston City and out to the motorway junctions. Don't understand how building a new east to west link road will ease the traffic heading north and south. Currently, all roads heading north and south (Penwortham Way, Leyland Rd, Watkin Lane, Bamber Bridge Bypass and Station Rd (Bamber Bridge)), become heavily congested at peak times. The roads that head east and west (Coote Lane and Brownedge Rd) never have more than a dozen vehicles waiting at a junction and you are soon through.</p>	<p>a) The Cross Borough Link Road is an important route, both to improve east-west travel across the urban area, but also to serve the new developments in the surrounding area. The link road will improve accessibility in an east-west direction through the Borough, increase community access to the range of services within the Borough and help traffic flow on existing roads. The Penwortham by-pass was conceived prior to the adoption of the South Ribble Local Plan in 2000. To ensure delivery and completion of the remaining sections of the road the Council (in collaboration with Lancashire County Council) will protect land from any development for the completion of the bypass and ease the north to south movement of traffic.</p>
206	111	Chapter A - Policy A2 - Transport	<p>a) Concerned about the manner of importance attached to the delivery of the link road, which is not supported by transport modelling setting out the need and impact. The DPD should be revised to take account of the required highways modelling.</p> <p>b) Need to clarify that some of the funding for the Cross Borough Link Road should come (via CIL) from the development of other sites, and this should be referenced in the DPD.</p> <p>c) Flexibility should be introduced into the DPD to allow infrastructure to be brought forward in line with demand and viability. There are enabling works relating to drainage and utilities at Pickering's Farm which will require funding in addition to the Council's CIL requirements. The DPD as currently drafted has no regard to site enabling works and costs which could bear a serious burden to a scheme's viability.</p> <p>d) Concern with the level of importance attached to the requirement for the new West Coast Mainline Bridge, because until the relevant assessments and surveys are undertaken the need for it is unclear. The Pickering's Farm development will provide the opportunity for the delivery of the bridge, however this infrastructure is not essential for the delivery of the development.</p>	<p>a) The evidence to support the construction of the CBLR and the Penwortham Bypass is contained in documents presented by the Councils to the re-convened Core Strategy examination in March 2012. (The Core Strategy has been found sound by the Planning Inspector and it was adopted by South Ribble on 18 July 2012.) The key evidence was produced by Lancashire County Council, using the new Transport Model for Central Lancashire. Additional evidence is contained in the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule. These evidence documents are being developed into a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan, led by Lancashire County Council, with input by South Ribble Borough Council.</p> <p>b) Funding proposals identified as coming through CIL and LCC.</p> <p>c) No change.</p> <p>d) The bridge upgrade is needed to improve access to the Pickering's Farm when accessed from the east. It is also required to help ensure the completion of the Cross Borough Link Road, which will improve accessibility in an east-west direction through the Borough, increase community access to the range of services within the Borough and help traffic flow on existing roads.</p>
255	138	Chapter A - Policy A2 and A3	<p>a) Whilst Policies A2 and A3 will ensure land is protected for their delivery, they cannot ensure delivery within the Plan period as that is dependent on funding. The document is clear that both will be funded through CIL/developer contributions, but with the caveat that LTP funding could be made available. Neither has funding currently allocated in either the County Council's Capital Programme through to 2014/15, or the LTP implementation Plan 2011/12 to 2013/14. Also it is not clear which is the priority, nor if sufficient CIL/developer funding can be raised to fund both. As both are seen as vital pieces of infrastructure for delivery of the plan, more clarity on funding priorities is needed.</p>	<p>a) The Council has revised Chapter A, including adding new Policy A1, which help to clarify the purpose and operation of infrastructure requirements. The deliverability of large development sites will depend on successful master planning, including as set out in Policies C1, C2, C3 and C4. Although beyond the scope of the DPD, much of the master planning is at an advanced stage, indicating that the Council will deliver housing and infrastructure in collaboration with development partners. The evidence to support the construction of key transport infrastructure has moved on, and is contained in documents presented by the Councils to the Core Strategy examination in March 2012. The Core Strategy was adopted on 18<sup>th</sup> July 2012. The key evidence was produced by Lancashire County Council, using the new Transport Model for Central Lancashire. Additional evidence is contained in the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule. These evidence documents have been developed into a Central Lancashire Transport Master plan, led by Lancashire County Council, with input by South Ribble Borough Council.</p>
243	135	Chapter B	<p>a) Land allocated under See section in attached submission is for local needs only and excludes market housing. Given the very poor prospect of 100% affordable housing coming forward on such sites, as can be seen from the non-development over many years of the current policy D9 sites, the identified need for 50 affordable housing units in New Longton and Longton will not be met through this policy.</p>	<p>a) There are several sites allocated under this policy, most of which were allocated in the Local Plan. These sites have seen over 35 affordable dwellings being built over the last 12 years. Market housing will not be permitted as it is likely this would be built at the cost of an identified need in the villages. Policy 7 of the adopted Core Strategy requires the provision of sufficient affordable and special needs housing. Delivering affordable housing is a key government objective aimed at enabling everyone to have a decent home that they can afford. Specifically, Core Strategy Policy 7b sets the level of 100% affordable housing to be provided on rural exception sites, and Policy B2 in the DPD identifies the locations where some of these sites may be suitable for development.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
229	128	Chapter B - Policies B2 and D1	<p>a) Land east of Swallow Field, Much Hoole is an appropriate location for market housing development (representation also made under Policy D1). The Council has provided no evidence to suggest that the designation of the site for housing development would significantly undermine the objectives of DPD Policy B2 being delivered.</p> <p>b) Allowing market housing can facilitate the provision of affordable housing, health care, community facilities or employment uses which would otherwise be unviable. The NPPF, at paragraph 54, also requires local planning authorities to consider whether allowing some market housing would facilitate the provision of significant additional affordable housing.</p> <p>c) Policy B2 is amended as follows :  <i>“Land on the periphery of Much Hoole, New Longton, Coupe Green and Mellor Brook is safeguarded to meet local needs as shown on the Proposals Map. It will only be released during the Plan period for development (including local affordable housing, health care, community facilities or employment) which meets the following requirements:</i>  <i>a) The proposed development cannot be accommodated within the existing built-up area of the village, or this site is preferable for the use proposed. Evidence of this will be required; and</i>  <i>b) The proposed development does not include market housing. Market housing will only be permitted when it does not significantly undermine the ability to provide appropriate levels of affordable housing, health care, community facilities, employment or other local needs within the village; or would be facilitating development which meets affordable housing, health care, community facilities, employment or other local needs.</i></p>	<p>a) The Council has engaged with representatives of the development industry to update the SHLAA in February 2012, and a total of 79 sites are shown in its latest update of the SHLAA. Further sites have been brought forward for inclusion in the DPD: 19 new sites of 0.4ha or over are allocated for housing development in Table 2 of the DPD, and summarised in Policy D1. The Council's view is that there are sufficient deliverable sites to provide an adequate and continuous supply of housing land to meet housing requirements. Development at Much Hoole is restricted by the wording of Policy B2: Village Development, which is designed to meet a specific requirement for development in the areas of Much Hoole, New Longton, Mellor Brook and Coupe Green.</p> <p>A planning application has been received in relation to this site. The proposed development site is currently allocated for Local Needs in Villages (Policy D9) in the South Ribble Local Plan. This protects land on the periphery of villages including Much Hoole and will only be released during the plan period for development which meets the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is conclusive evidence of a local, affordable housing, health care, community or employment need for the development proposed;</li> <li>• The proposed development cannot be accommodated within the existing built-up area of the village;</li> <li>• The proposed development would be in keeping with the scale and character of the village.</li> </ul> <p>Such land is reserved to meet compelling local needs which cannot be satisfied elsewhere. Otherwise it is envisaged that the land will remain in its existing use. This will only be released during the Plan period for development (including local affordable housing, health care, community facilities or employment) which meets the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development cannot be accommodated within the existing built-up area of the village, or this site is preferable for the use proposed. Evidence of this will be required;</li> <li>• The proposed development does not include market housing.</li> </ul> <p>The proposed development comprises eight dwellings – all of which are market housing. As such it does not meet the requirements of either Policy D9 of the current Local Plan, or Policy B2 of the emerging Site Allocations DPD. It is therefore recommended for refusal.</p> <p>b) Policy 7 of the adopted Core Strategy requires the provision of sufficient affordable and special needs housing. Delivering affordable housing is a key government objective aimed at enabling everyone to have a decent home that they can afford. Specifically, Core Strategy Policy 7b sets the level of 100% affordable housing to be provided on rural exception sites, and Policy B2 in the DPD identifies the locations where some of these sites may be suitable for development.</p> <p>c) For the reasons stated above, the Council does not accept this amendment.</p>
232	128	Chapter B - Policies B2 and D1	<p>a) Land south of Liverpool Road, Much Hoole is an appropriate location for market housing development (representation also made under Policy D1). The Council has provided no evidence to suggest that the designation of the site for housing development would significantly undermine the objectives of DPD Policy B2 being delivered.</p> <p>b) Allowing market housing can facilitate the provision of affordable housing, health care, community facilities or employment uses which would otherwise be unviable. The NPPF, at paragraph 54, also requires local planning authorities to consider whether allowing some market housing would facilitate the provision of significant additional affordable housing.</p> <p>c) Policy B2 is amended as follows :  <i>“Land on the periphery of Much Hoole, New Longton, Coupe Green and Mellor Brook is safeguarded to meet local needs as shown on the Proposals Map. It will only be released during the Plan period for development (including local affordable housing, health care, community facilities or employment) which meets the following requirements:</i>  <i>a) The proposed development cannot be accommodated within the existing built-up area of the village, or this site is preferable for the use proposed. Evidence of this will be required;</i></p>	<p>a) The Council has engaged with representatives of the development industry to update the SHLAA in February 2012, and a total of 79 sites are shown in its latest update of the SHLAA. Further sites have been brought forward for inclusion in the DPD: 19 new sites of 0.4ha or over are allocated for housing development in Table 2 of the DPD, and summarised in Policy D1. The Council's view is that there are sufficient deliverable sites to provide an adequate and continuous supply of housing land to meet housing requirements. Development at Much Hoole is restricted by the wording of Policy B2: Village Development, which is designed to meet a specific requirement for development in the areas of Much Hoole, New Longton, Mellor Brook and Coupe Green.</p> <p>b) Policy 7 of the adopted Core Strategy requires the provision of sufficient affordable and special needs housing. Delivering affordable housing is a key government objective aimed at enabling everyone to have a decent home that they can afford. Specifically, Core Strategy Policy 7b sets the level of 100% affordable housing to be provided on rural exception sites, and Policy B2 in the DPD identifies the locations where some of these sites may be suitable for development.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>and</p> <p>b) <i>The proposed development does not include market housing. Market housing will only be permitted when it does not significantly undermine the ability to provide appropriate levels of affordable housing, health care, community facilities, employment or other local needs within the village; or would be facilitating development which meets affordable housing, health care, community facilities, employment or other local needs.</i></p>	c) For the reasons stated above, the Council does not accept this amendment.
127	93	Chapter B - Policy B1	<p>a) Even urban sites can be important in terms of biodiversity and it is recommended that the following additional criteria are added to the policy:</p> <p>d) Protects, conserves and enhances the biodiversity of the site.</p>	a) Noted. Biodiversity aspects will be considered against other plan policies, including Core Strategy Policies 18 and 22, and DPD Policies G7 and G8.
128	93	Chapter B - Policy B2	<p>a) Recommended that the following criteria be added to Policy B2:</p> <p>c) <i>Protects, conserves and enhances the biodiversity of the site.</i></p>	a) Noted. Biodiversity aspects will be considered against other plan policies, including Core Strategy Policies 18 and 22, and DPD Policies G7 and G8.
219	122	Chapter B - Policy B3 - South Rings Business Park	<p>a) Supportive in principle of the Council's approach to allocate South Rings Business Park as a Mixed Employment and Commercial site through the introduction of draft Site Specific Policy B3 in the Publication DPD. However, objections to the detailed wording and requirements of draft Policy B3, in respect of its flexibility (precluding food retail stores) and the need for prior approval of a masterplan for the site.</p> <p>b) Proposed amendment to Policy B3 to read:  <i>Within the area defined on the Proposals Map at South Rings Business Park, Bamber Bridge, new development, redevelopment or change or use will be permitted to provide offices, retail, employment, leisure, recreation and tourism facilities, provided that:</i>  <i>a) Comprehensive development of the site is demonstrated through a Master plan submitted as part of a planning application;</i>  <i>b) A Phasing and Infrastructure Delivery Schedule is set out; and</i>  <i>c) The implementation of a high quality development in accordance with an agreed design code.</i></p>	<p>a) The wording of the policy is designed to prevent applications for out of centre development of food stores which would diminish the viability of Bamber Bridge centre. No change to the wording "non-food retail" in Policy B3.</p> <p>b) <b>Minor change</b> that a masterplan may be submitted with the application due to the site size and amount of existing development. Policy B3 to read:  <b>"Within the area defined on the Proposals Map at South Rings Business Park, Bamber Bridge, new development, redevelopment or change or use will be permitted to provide offices, non-food retail, employment, leisure, recreation and tourism facilities, provided that:</b>  <b>a) Comprehensive development of the site is demonstrated through a Master plan submitted as part of a planning application;</b>  <b>b) A Phasing and Infrastructure Delivery Schedule is set out; and</b>  <b>c) The implementation of a high quality development in accordance with an agreed design code."</b></p>
225	127	Chapter B - Policy B3 - South Rings Business Park	<p>a) Given that a significant part of the South Rings Business Park has already been developed, we consider that Policy B3, as currently drafted, is unsound as it is unnecessarily complicated and restrictive. Furthermore, the Policy, as worded, would jeopardise the future of our client's existing business at Bannastres at Bank, which currently falls within the range of uses envisaged within the South Rings allocation.</p> <p>b) The wording of the policy should be simplified, in line with Policy B4, to read as follows:  <i>Within the area defined on the Proposals Map at South Rings Business Park, Bamber Bridge, new development, re-development or change of use will be permitted to provide the following uses only:</i>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Offices, non-food retail, employment, leisure, recreation and tourist facilities.</i></li> </ul> </p>	<p>a) Disagree: do not accept that the policy is over-complicated or unsound.</p> <p>b) <b>Minor change</b> Policy B3 to read (but not accepting the wording as suggested here):  <b>"Within the area defined on the Proposals Map at South Rings Business Park, Bamber Bridge, new development, redevelopment or change or use will be permitted to provide offices, non-food retail, employment, leisure, recreation and tourism facilities, provided that:</b>  <b>a) Comprehensive development of the site is demonstrated through a Master plan submitted as part of a planning application;</b>  <b>b) A Phasing and Infrastructure Delivery Schedule is set out; and</b>  <b>c) The implementation of a high quality development in accordance with an agreed design code."</b></p>
130	93	Chapter B - Policy B4	<p>a) Recommended that the policy be subject to the proviso that the development protects, conserves and enhances the biodiversity of the site.</p>	a) Noted. Biodiversity aspects will be considered against other plan policies, including Core Strategy Policies 18 and 22, and DPD Policies G7 and G8.
131	93	Chapter B - Policy B5	<p>a) Recommended that the following proviso be added to the policy:  c) <i>harm the biodiversity of the site.</i></p>	a) Noted. Biodiversity aspects will be considered against other plan policies, including Core Strategy Policies 18 and 22, and DPD Policies G7 and G8.

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
160	94	Chapter B - Policy B5	a) We support this policy as there is a clear benefit in developing the remaining land within the area defined as the Capitol Centre in order to maximise the benefits to the local area.	a) Support noted.
132	93	Chapter B - Policy B6	a) There is no reference to the development needing to be in accordance with the policies or proposals of the local plan as a whole. There is also no reference to ecology or biodiversity (other than in a landscape context). It is recommended that the following additional criteria be added to the policy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development is in accordance with all other policies in this Local Plan.</li> <li>• The proposal protects, conserves and enhances the biodiversity of the site.</li> </ul> The latter criterion would help to ensure compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework.	a) Noted. Biodiversity aspects will be considered against other plan policies, including Core Strategy Policies 18 and 22, and DPD Policies G7 and G8.
197	108	Chapter C - Policies C2 and C3  Site W	a) Objection to choice of suitable sites for major residential development. In a borough of 11,461 hectares it is irresponsible to consider proposing two of the three major residential developments Policy C2 and C3 (a combined total of 1350 houses) within 1km of each other. Regardless of any proposed phasing, the eventual consequence is going to be an extra 1350 houses within an already heavily populated area, and all probably bringing with them an average of 2 cars per household pouring onto the already congested Flensburg Way, and associated minor roads at peak times. We feel that the distribution of major new residential development has not been fairly distributed across the borough.	a) These sites were identified for development in the previous local plan 2000 (as safeguarded for future development, or suitable employment uses). To meet the required housing land supply targets set by the government and adopted in the Core Strategy, these sites have been brought forward in preference to other sites, including land in the Green Belt.
281	146	Chapter C - Policy C1 - 6.11 section 106 monies	a) Please consider allocation of section 106 monies directly to the local area in which the development takes place – e.g. Moss Side Test Track. b) Ulmes Walton Bridleways Association has serious concerns over road safety in the area. Please consider off road routes and possible inclusion of a separate access road from the Moss Side test track development directly onto the bypass rather than using the existing road network along Dunkirk and Longmeanygate etc.	a) Noted. Where appropriate 106 monies will be used in the area local to the development (from March 2013 such monies will have to be used on the development site only). b) LCC highways will be consulted on matters of road safety and routing when any further master plan is submitted by a developer for the test track site. The planning brief drawn up in 2010 was produced in order to demonstrate the potential for the site.
204	111	Chapter C – Policy C1 – Pickering's Farm	a) HOW Planning (HOW) has been instructed by Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (TWUK) to submit representations on the DPD. The representations are made in relation to Pickering's Farm, Penwortham. b) In principle, support the partial allocation of the Pickering's Farm site for housing.	a and b)Noted.
49	37	Chapter C - Policy C1 - Pickering's Farm	a) Any proposal over Network Rail land would require agreement on appropriate bridging agreements including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asset protection measures.</li> <li>• Agreement of the appropriate commercial arrangement.</li> </ul>	a) Comment noted re bridging provision on Pickering's Farm.
68	55	Chapter C - Policy C1 - Pickering's Farm	a) Concerns about impact of the development of Pickering's Farm in respect of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scope of safeguarded land near to Chain House Lane</li> <li>• Risk of land being compulsorily purchased</li> <li>• Availability of/timetable for masterplan</li> <li>• Traffic management arrangements on A582</li> <li>• Loss of privacy and property value</li> <li>• Environmental impact</li> <li>• Loss of Whitestake identity</li> </ul> b) I would prefer these developments not to proceed and alternative sites sought.	a) Responses as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Representor's land is opposite and close to Church Lane access onto Chain House Lane, and is land designated within the Site Allocations development plan document as safeguarded for future development. The land will remain within that category for the life of the plan.</li> <li>• The option of compulsory purchase is highly unlikely given the land already identified for development in the next 15 years is north of the land owned by this representor.</li> <li>• No master plan has been published for the Pickering's Farm site, but owners and developers are currently working on a masterplan document. Full public consultation</li> </ul>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
				<p>will take place on any proposals included in a master plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The masterplan will need to address traffic management arrangements on the A582, and the environmental impact of the development..</li> <li>• Comments on property values and Whitestake identity noted.</li> <li>• Loss of privacy will be taken into account at the time when a planning application is received for the development of land close to the representor.</li> </ul> <p>b) Noted. No change.</p>
90	74	Chapter C - Policy C1 - Pickering's Farm	<p>a) We did not know about the potential development when we purchased the house. I have sold my house twice but the sale has fallen through both times when the buyer has found out about the potential development. I understand that houses need to be built to meet the housing demands for the area, but feel it is unfair that we have to suffer financially. I am happy to sell to the developer, at a fair market price, but they are not interested due to our plot not being of a significant size. We chose our property because of its location and seclusion and the fact we are surrounded by open fields. During construction (which may take up to 15 years) we will be affected by dust clouds from building sites.</p> <p>b) The road network could cope with the increased 1,300 (or so) houses. I don't think that proposed cross borough link road will help much. The current road network is already at breaking point, with the centre of Lostock Hall and the roundabout at the top of Watkin Lane being gridlocked in all directions at peak times.</p> <p>c) Unsure how building on all this land is going to affect drainage. During heavy rainfall, all the surrounding fields become water logged and on occasions, completely flood.</p>	<p>a) Comments noted however this plot was identified in the previous local plan 2000 as part of a wider area of land safeguarded for future development. To meet the required housing land targets set by the government this site has been brought forward for development during the plan period 2010-2026.</p> <p>b) The masterplan required for the development will need to address traffic management arrangements for the road network on and around the site.</p> <p>c) This site is not within a noted flood zone that would affect development.</p>
133	93	Chapter C - Policy C1 - Pickering's Farm	<p>a) It is recommended that the following criteria be added to the policy: <i>d) The Masterplan including an assessment of the ecology of the site and how its biodiversity will be protected, conserved and enhanced.</i></p>	<p>a) Due to the size and diversity of this site this would be a sensible requirement of any master plan, but no change to Policy C1. Biodiversity aspects will be considered against other plan policies, including Core Strategy Policies 18 and 22, and DPD Policies G7 and G8.</p>
203	111	Chapter C - Policy C1 - Pickering's Farm	<p>a) Representations in relation to the proposed wording of draft Policy C1 and supporting text at paragraphs 6.6 to 6.12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed masterplan for the entire Pickering's Farm site (extending to 90 hectares) will be prepared and submitted to SRBC for approval prior to the submission of an outline planning application.</li> <li>• Infrastructure will need to be phased and viability tested in the context of the release of a smaller proportion of the overall site during the period of the plan, including new primary school and medical centre. It may be possible to fund the delivery of these uses in the later phases of the project through the delivery of residential development in earlier phases.</li> <li>• Flexibility requested in Policy C1 to include provision of retail development in C1(a), and removal of employment references (B uses) because of availability of alternative sites.</li> <li>• Of particular concern is the requirement for the land allocated for residential led development to solely fund and deliver all necessary infrastructure. Need to factor in the contribution from safeguarded land to the south of the site, and other sites in the area as these schemes will all benefit from the infrastructure provision.</li> <li>• Need to ensure the deliverability and viability of the DPD in respect of paragraph 173 of the NPPF.</li> </ul>	<p>a) Noted but no change to policy. The deliverability of large development sites will depend on successful masterplanning, including as set out in Policy C1. Although beyond the scope of the DPD, much of the masterplanning is at an advanced stage, indicating that the Council will deliver housing and infrastructure in collaboration with development partners.</p>
244	135	Chapter C - Policy C1 - Pickering's Farm	<p>a) This is a multi-ownership site where prior agreement is required to a range of specific considerations. In addition, the site is dependent on the provision of a westward extension to the Cross Borough Link Road which includes the construction of a new bridge crossing the West Coast Main Line. The section of the Cross Borough Link Road intended to be</p>	<p>a) Comments noted and response incorporated in chapter D response 'Homes for All'</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>extended has neither been programmed nor funded, as discussed above. Whilst the site is likely to make a large contribution to the housing land supply in the plan period, it is unreasonable to assume that the serious constraints can be overcome and agreement between all land owners and developers achieved in time to allow the site to deliver 100 dwellings in phase 1. In addition, it is most unlikely that average completion rates as high as 100 dwellings a year can be achieved through the remaining phases of the plan. Alterations to this site are proposed in the discussion on Homes for All.</p>	
286	149	Chapter C - Policy C1 - Pickering's Farm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Support the allocation of Pickerings Farm as a residential-led Major Development Site within the DPD as its selection is based on a sound evidence base.</li> <li>b) Welcome future engagement with the Council to ensure that the Safeguarded Land to the south of the allocation is appropriately considered for development in the future.</li> <li>c) Support Policy C1, ensuring that future infrastructure requirements are considered, particularly highway and public realm improvements at Tardy Gate and the final link of the Cross Borough Link Road (Policy A2).</li> </ul>	<p>a) b) and c) Comments noted and welcomed.</p>
256	138	Chapter C - Policy C1, C2, C3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Policy C1, C2 and C3 all indicate that more highway/ transport infrastructure is to be funded through CIL. CIL will be limited and the policies should reflect this.</li> <li>b) LCC is preparing a highway and transport master plan to determine necessary and suitable forms of transport improvements and additional infrastructure and assist in the preparation of local plans, and ultimately the delivery of sustainable forms of development, across Lancashire.</li> <li>c) The progression of the Site Allocation Plan to examination should await proper consideration of the likely impact and preferred infrastructure solution, through close working between district and county officers, ensuring that the two plans are compatible. If the infrastructure requirements are not identified prior to the submission of the plan, there is a significant risk that it will be found unsound by the inspector, as the plan would be undeliverable.</li> <li>d) Primary Schools in the South Ribble area are projected to be full to capacity or very close to being full within the next 5 years.</li> <li>e) LCC is not able to support further housing development in the Pickering's Farm (South of Penwortham and North of Farington) location (allocation covered by Policy C1), Moss Side test track (Policy C2) and land between Heatherleigh and Moss Lane (Policy C3) unless such development is tied to the provision of appropriate and necessary major additional transport infrastructure and education provision, full details of which should be presented as part of the proposals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The Central Lancashire councils, including South Ribble, are in the process of consulting on the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). This is aimed for examination after submission of the DPD. Once approved, the relevant rates will be applied to secure funding for infrastructure projects identified as part of appendix 1 reference SD4 (Infrastructure Delivery Schedule) as part of the Adopted Core Strategy and LCC Local Transport Plan 2011-2021. The application of CIL in South Ribble will be in accordance with the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended).</li> <li>b) Noted. South Ribble Borough Council is a key partner with the County Council on the highways and transport masterplan.</li> <li>c) The Council does not agree with this point. The evidence to support the construction of the CBLR, the Penwortham Bypass and other key infrastructure is contained in documents presented by the Councils to the re-convened Core Strategy examination in March 2012. The key evidence was produced by Lancashire County Council, using the new Transport Model for Central Lancashire. Additional evidence is contained in the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule. These evidence documents are being developed into a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan, led by Lancashire County Council, with input by South Ribble Borough Council.</li> <li>d) Comments noted. The Council will continue to work with LCC on the issue of educational facilities to ensure adequate provision in the area.</li> <li>e) Noted. The tie between infrastructure provision and development will be secured through the development of an agreed masterplan.</li> </ul>
4	4	Chapter C - Policy C2 - Moss Side Test Track	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) We are glad to see that the Green Belt is preserved and that a green corridor has been designated around what is now the test track. What we cannot understand, however, is why a strip of the present green area, virtually all around the outside of the track, has been incorporated into the brown area set for development. Given the Council's commitment to protecting and enhancing the environment, surely there is enough area to develop without having to cut down the trees in this small belt?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) There has been no change to the boundary to this site between local plan 2000 and the publication version.</li> </ul>
43	35	Chapter C - Policy C2 - Moss Side Test Track	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) As our local roads become increasingly busy, the safety of our local riders and other road users is paramount. With the influx of new people to the area will come additional equestrians and more horses in South Ribble.</li> <li>b) Since our last horse count, which was not as detailed, numbers have risen from in the region of 250 in 2003 to over 450 in 2012. The main feedback we received was that more off road riding, eg incorporation of routes within the test track site and developments adjacent to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a and b) Comments noted .</li> <li>c) <b>Minor Change</b> – Policy A1(c) to read: <b>“Transport (highway, rail, bus and cycle/footpath/bridleway networks, canal and associated facilities)”</b>.</li> </ul>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>Schleswig Way was essential to promote this growing sport in a safe environment.</p> <p>c) Infrastructure of multi-use paths/bridleways must be included at an early planning stage to maximise the use of Section 106 monies which are set aside for purposes such as this. At a time when we are being told by Government to exercise and stay healthy, support for this project must be encouraged by our local council.</p>	
54	40	Chapter C - Policy C2 - Moss Side Test Track	<p>a) There is a school on Paradise lane and the traffic congestion there is absolutely horrendous already and parking on both sides of this narrow road already drastically reduces any swift response from emergency vehicles leading leading to the residential developments beyond.</p> <p>b) Cocker Lane is the only access road for somewhere in the region of three hundred houses. Entry and exit to Cocker Lane is already very difficult at the times mentioned above. Adding more traffic plus buses to Paradise Lane would cause extreme difficulties for those living in and off Cocker Lane.</p>	<p>a and b) A development brief has been prepared for this site as a guide to how the Council view the site for development. LCC highways have and will be fully involved in any proposed development of the site to ensure that vehicular accesses are appropriate. An agreed master plan is required as part of policy C2 before any development of this site is permitted.</p>
85	69	Chapter C - Policy C2 - Moss Side Test Track	<p>a) I am writing about the current proposals for the development to include cul-de-sacs and emergency access from the very western side of Longmeanygate (opposite house number 192) onto the Test Track site. From Waltons Barn, there are no pavements on either side of the road northwards until you reach the Midge Hall T Junction, and this is a busy, bendy – there is a bad bend immediately north of the barn on which there have been fatalities in the past (when people have crashed into the barn) – national speed limit road.</p> <p>b) The effect of the cul-de-sacs, and indeed the whole test track development will be to increase traffic on Longmeanygate and vastly increase the number of people walking along Longmeanygate eg going to and from the Midge Hall pub, which could easily become ‘the local’ for many people on the proposed site. I would be greatly concerned that very nasty accidents involving pedestrians could occur along this particular part of Longmeanygate if access is allowed. If there is any sort of pedestrian access in this particular area, the number of people walking northwards towards Midge Hall will be vastly increased, and as I say there are no pavements, and it is an especially difficult and dangerous road to navigate. Is it possible for the access to either be moved or removed entirely?</p> <p>c) At a public meeting chaired by Councillor Michael Green, it was suggested having access onto the estate from the T Junction at Midge Hall, via the construction of a new roundabout with the access road possibly taking account of an old emergency access road onto the test track. If this was the case the pedestrian access/pavements would be instantly solved, as relatively few would then turn southwards back towards Dunkirk Lane.</p>	<p>a, b and c) A development brief has been prepared for this site as a guide to how the Council view the site for development. LCC highways have and will be fully involved in any proposed development of the site to ensure that vehicular accesses are appropriate. An agreed master plan is required as part of policy C2 before any development of this site is permitted.</p>
99	81	Chapter C - Policy C2 - Moss Side Test Track	<p>a) My main concern is the proposed access to the development via two sites on Longmeanygate. It would appear that it is no coincidence that both these areas of woodland are owned by SRBC. Both of these sites are on bends, one of which has been the site of a very many accidents, three very serious and one fatality. The proposals have not considered safety.</p> <p>b) It was once a quiet country lane surrounded by farmland. This area cannot cope with more traffic and the Wymott brook cannot cope with any more discharge from this development.</p> <p>c) We realise we cannot halt progress but we must have good public service links – the re-opening of Midge Hall station is essential and should be a condition of the passing of these plans.</p> <p>d) We therefore suggest a roundabout at the junction of Longmeanygate and Midge Hall Lane with the access road by the Methodist Chapel, away from bends, and leading onto Midge Hall Lane which would take Preston traffic via the Longton bypass. As you said there is money available to improve these roads.</p> <p>e) My concerns are to keep our children, grandchildren and the many people who regularly take their life in their hands by taking a walk along Longmeanygate where there are no footpaths, safe.</p>	<p>a to e) A development brief has been prepared for this site as a guide to how the Council view the site for development. LCC highways have and will be fully involved in any proposed development of the site to ensure that vehicular accesses are appropriate. An agreed master plan is required as part of policy C2 before any development of this site is permitted.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
134	93	Chapter C - Policy C2 - Moss Side Test Track	a) Recommended that the following criteria be added to the policy: <i>d) The Masterplan including an assessment of the ecology of the site and how its biodiversity will be protected, conserved and enhanced.</i>	a) Any master plan will include assessments of the ecology and proposals in line with Core Strategy Policy 22. No change to Policy C2.
208	113	Chapter C - Policy C2 - Moss Side Test Track	a) I have had considerable experience of matters relating to Traffic Management and Road Safety. I was also a trained Health and Safety Assessor.  Please see identical representation Ref: 129, ID 230.	a and b) A development brief has been prepared for this site as a guide to how the Council view the site for development. LCC highways have and will be fully involved in any proposed development of the site to ensure that vehicular accesses are appropriate. An agreed master plan is required as part of policy C2 before any development of this site is permitted.
210	115	Chapter C - Policy C2 - Moss Side Test Track	a) I represent a group of 40 very disappointed older people who reside at Hazel House Nursing Home, and in excess of 50 members of staff. We are surprised that as the largest community of residents, housed in the building located closest to the proposed site, we have not had adequate notification of your proposals provided directly to us. b) Furthermore, we are extremely disappointed that you do not seem to have taken sufficient account of the needs of this frail, vulnerable group of senior citizens in your consultation process. The whole notion of social inclusion seems to have been turned on its head by inconsiderate planning. If these plans go ahead as proposed, the peaceful end phase of life for a large number of vulnerable older people will be instantly destroyed. Moreover, safeguarding will become even more difficult and their freedom will be severely restricted by a substantial increase in the volume of traffic, including heavy goods vehicles, and noise levels.	a) The Council made every effort to make residents aware of the proposals. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There was a quarter page item 'Your area, your choice' in the Winter 2010/11 edition of Forward (Issue 66) on page 4: <a href="http://www.southribble.gov.uk/Section.asp?sectiontype=listseparate&amp;catid=301168&amp;docid=3000">http://www.southribble.gov.uk/Section.asp?sectiontype=listseparate&amp;catid=301168&amp;docid=3000</a> This was to bring the process and document to the attention of all residents of the borough. As you'll appreciate, we pay people to deliver these newspapers to every household in the borough and would therefore appreciate knowing if any areas are not receiving them. You should have recently received copy (delivery deadline was 17 September 2012) but, if it hasn't arrived, perhaps you'd be kind enough to let Kim Lamper know on 01772 625235 or <a href="mailto:klamper@southribble.gov.uk">klamper@southribble.gov.uk</a>.</li> <li>There was a further article on page 9 of the Winter 2011 edition: <a href="http://content.yudu.com/Library/A1v2md/FORWARDWINTER2011/resources/index.htm?referrerUrl=">http://content.yudu.com/Library/A1v2md/FORWARDWINTER2011/resources/index.htm?referrerUrl=</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Posters have been displayed in shops, doctors' surgeries, dentists surgeries, church halls, community centres, schools, leisure centres, etc.</li> <li>Members of our team attended every Area Committee meeting (or put on additional events for the ones which were cancelled due to the bad weather just before Christmas 2010).</li> <li>We have spent days with a display in supermarkets – Booths (Penwortham and Longton), Sainsbury's (Bamber Bridge), Morrisons (Leyland and Bamber Bridge), Tesco and Leyland Market to raise awareness at each stage of the consultation.</li> <li>The full documents have been available in all South Ribble libraries and at the Civic Centre at every stage of the process and some post offices during the first two stages.</li> <li>Each stage of the process has been promoted via our website and press releases/press notices.</li> <li>All Council meetings which have discussed the document, Cabinet and Council, were open to the public to attend.</li> <li>Ward and parish councillors have been kept fully informed throughout the process and have provided essential liaison between planning officers and their constituents.</li> <li>We have an extensive database of people who have expressed an interest in the Site Allocations DPD (over 2,000 contacts) who have all received letters or emails about the latest stage of the process.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> b) A development brief has been prepared for this site as a guide to how the Council view the site for development. LCC highways have and will be fully involved in any proposed development of the site to ensure that vehicular accesses are appropriate. An agreed master plan is required as part of policy C2 before any development of this site is permitted.
230	129	Chapter C - Policy C2 - Moss Side	a) The infrastructure of this locality is in a fragile state. Local road systems, drainage, sewage removal, local rail links and recreational amenities and the maintenance of a green	a to e) A development brief has been prepared for this site as a guide to how the Council view the site for development. LCC highways have and will be fully involved in any proposed

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
		Test Track	<p>environment and eco-structure are poor! The lack of medical provision, dentists and schooling does not seem to have been addressed so far in the planning process.</p> <p>b) Concern about safe access to the site from and along Longmeanygate, and disagrees with the points of access identified on the Development Brief for the site.</p> <p>c) Alternative access proposed from Midge Hall Lane, forming a roundabout at its crossing with Longmeanygate.</p> <p>d) Also complete a new stretch of road, directly into the site from Schleswig Way. This road would run parallel with Dunkirk Lane, an already over-used road and take residents directly from the By-pass to the residential area of the new estate. There is a possible route along an existing stretch of existing roadway – Rhoden Road. This road is currently not a major service route.</p>	development of the site to ensure that vehicular accesses are appropriate. An agreed master plan is required as part of policy C2 before any development of this site is permitted.
616	135	Chapter C - Policy C2 - Moss Side Test Track	<p>a) For many years the LPA has included this site as a deliverable site within its housing land supply. It is now evident from Policy C2 that this was never the case and there are important access and infrastructure problems to overcome and detailed agreements to be reached on the form of development. It remains most unlikely that these will be achieved in time for the site to make any significant contribution of new housing to phase 1 of the plan. The expectation in table 2 that it will deliver 125 new homes in phase 1 is unjustified.</p>	<p>a) The quoted figure of 125 was in the Preferred Options Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD. It was reduced in the Publication version. This site has 80 dwellings identified as phase one 2010-16.</p>
580	319	Chapter C - Policy C2 - Moss Side Test Track	<p>a) The two proposed access points on Longmeanygate are extremely close to two bad bends. One of these has seen accidents, two have been serious and one fatal. Many cars have gone through hedge into the wood between 153 and the chapel, and many going through the hedge at 188. It would appear that safety has not been considered.</p> <p>b) The obvious solution to traffic flow would be to re-open Midge Hall Station, and to put a roundabout at Midge Hall Lane junction and put in a road along the emergency access road by the Methodist chapel, giving direct access to the station and to Preston, Liverpool and Southport over the moss onto the Longton bypass.</p> <p>c) When the Test Track was constructed on farm land, the many drainage ditches were stopped or rediverted, and since then the area has been liable to flooding. Apparently the drainage from the proposed development is to go into the Wymott – this cannot be allowed to happen! The Wymott cannot take the water already draining into it. There must be new proposals for drainage.</p>	<p>a, b and c) A development brief has been prepared for this site as a guide to how the Council view the site for development. LCC highways have and will be fully involved in any proposed development of the site to ensure that vehicular accesses are appropriate. An agreed master plan is required as part of policy C2 before any development of this site is permitted.</p>
581	320	Chapter C - Policy C2 - Moss Side Test Track	<p>a) Over the years the road has become extremely busy and the traffic levels are too high already for the roads to cope. After looking at the proposed development, I was shocked to see an exit road been placed on an extremely bad bend. This part of the road has seen many accidents over the years, including my wife and mother been knocked down whilst pushing our two year old in a pram. My son has been left with permanent scarring to his face and not to mention the post-traumatic stress the family are still coping with.</p> <p>b) My wife also rides and keeps her horses on Longmeanygate at Mum's and at times has had to deal with drivers taking the bend too fast not knowing what's round the corner and nearly ploughing into the horses and this is a spot you say is a place to put an entrance/exit road!!! The only safe place would be next to the Chapel and by putting a roundabout there it would also calm the speed of the traffic.</p>	<p>a and b) A development brief has been prepared for this site as a guide to how the Council view the site for development. LCC highways have and will be fully involved in any proposed development of the site to ensure that vehicular accesses are appropriate. An agreed master plan is required as part of policy C2 before any development of this site is permitted.</p>
583	321	Chapter C - Policy C2 - Moss Side Test Track	<p>a) The site has for years been hidden behind hideous reinforced concrete walls. Open it up and let local residents view it before making a decision.</p> <p>b) The site has a great deal of natural beauty, and has acquired a wildlife population since its previous industrial use has ceased. It is NOT urban in character, is bordering on the green belt, and it would be more consistent with its character to make it part of the green belt. This site is ringroaded by Longmeanygate Reiver Road/Titan Way/Paradise Lane (really</p>	<p>a) Comments noted. The Test Track is not in Council ownership, and as such, the Council cannot impose public access onto the site.</p> <p>b) The site is brownfield and has been allocated for development for some years. The Council is keen to give preference to brownfield sites for development. Any development on the site would be expected to contribute towards infrastructure improvements in the area.</p> <p>c) Given the history of the site, the fact that it is previously developed, and within the main</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>continuations of the same stretch of road) and Dunkirk Lane. These single carriageway roads are hopelessly inadequate for the huge increase in traffic which would result from a large population increase into 750 more houses. Sufficient road building to meet this could not be done without great damage to the green belt and loss of good agricultural land. Commercial builders, create only temporary jobs, and are constantly looking for excuses to allege that it would be more logical for the green belt boundary to be moved further West.</p> <p>c) The character of the site means it could be a great public amenity if developed into say, a park or nature reserve.</p>	urban area, it is not considered suitable for Green Belt allocation.
584	322	Chapter C - Policy C2 - Moss Side Test Track	<p>a) Midge Hall railway station should be a high priority in any scheme.</p> <p>b) Paradise Lane was built as a bus only route to the test track. When we sold some land for the road the New Town Corporation, with a condition that it was never made into a through road for two land traffic.</p> <p>c) No more traffic onto Dunkirk Lane as it is blocked at peak times and getting out from Paradise Lane is dreadful.</p> <p>d) Have you considered relocating the industrial units, eg Norlec, Council Yard, etc to the test track site so that the road could go through there?</p>	a to d) A development brief has been prepared for this site as a guide to how the Council view the site for development. LCC highways have and will be fully involved in any proposed development of the site to ensure that vehicular accesses are appropriate. An agreed master plan is required as part of policy C2 before any development of this site is permitted.
585	323	Chapter C - Policy C2 - Moss Side Test Track	<p>a) The extra volume of residential traffic is far in excess of the narrow country lane that is 'Longmeanygate'.</p> <p>b) The proposed access roads onto Longmeanygate are close to a very dangerous road bend which has been the scene of many RTAs over recent years. Extra junctions = more RTAs.</p> <p>c) The surface water drainage, open ditches and culverts along Longmeanygate are already inadequate during wet weather. Extra houses will only worsen the problem.</p>	<p>a to b) A development brief has been prepared for this site as a guide to how the Council view the site for development. LCC highways have and will be fully involved in any proposed development of the site to ensure that vehicular accesses are appropriate. An agreed master plan is required as part of policy C2 before any development of this site is permitted.</p> <p>c) This area is not in a recognised flood zone. Any new development will need to show that surface water will be drained satisfactorily from any new development.</p>
586	324	Chapter C - Policy C2 - Moss Side Test Track	<p>a) I am concerned about the extra volume of traffic this development will produce and especially the two access lanes into Longmeanygate. The access lanes are near to very bad corners where numerous accidents have occurred, last year on two separate occasions cars ended up in the hedge bordering our house and a greater volume of traffic will only exacerbate this problem.</p> <p>b) Our field and garden regularly flood already because the water does not drain away and the ditches back up and overflow. If surface water etc from the new development drains into the same drainage channels this will make an already bad problem, worse.</p> <p>c) This area also has a very large number of horses who use the roads. Most of us have already had near misses and again more traffic will make this worse.</p>	<p>a and b) A development brief has been prepared for this site as a guide to how the Council view the site for development. LCC highways have and will be fully involved in any proposed development of the site to ensure that vehicular accesses are appropriate. An agreed master plan is required as part of policy C2 before any development of this site is permitted.</p> <p>c) <b>Minor change.</b> Policy A1(c) to read:  <b>"Transport (highway, rail, bus and cycle/footpath/bridleway networks, canal and associated facilities);"</b></p>
587	325	Chapter C - Policy C2 - Moss Side Test Track	<p>a) Moss Side Forum – Test Track Meeting on 14/8/12 at 7.30-pm. Quite a lot of people came to this meeting and expressed their wishes for Midge Hall Station to be opened before any new housing development went ahead on the Test Track. I support this request.</p> <p>b) Hope that new infrastructure for Moss Side would be implemented if and when this project goes ahead including a bus service that would be hoped to travel to Midge Hall Station. This would not only just be good for Moss Side but would also alleviate traffic to a great extent. I am very much in favour of this plan.</p>	Comments noted.
588	326	Chapter C - Policy C2 - Moss Side Test Track	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - 17/8/12</p> <p>a) Concerns regarding traffic volume, speed and heavy goods vehicles on this road without the addition of this proposed access. The obvious entry to this site would be at the junction of Midge Hall Lane and Longmeanygate. A simple roundabout system would work very well and probably reduce the HGVs using Longmeanygate as a cut through to the industrial estate.</p> <p>b) I also have concerns regarding the wildlife living in the woodland opposite the barn. Any construction work would surely involve removing trees, not only for access but for safety to</p>	a and b) A development brief has been prepared for this site as a guide to how the Council view the site for development. LCC highways have and will be fully involved in any proposed development of the site to ensure that vehicular accesses are appropriate. An agreed master plan is required as part of policy C2 before any development of this site is permitted.

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			avoid obstruction of view to vehicles exiting and entering this site.	
597	329	Chapter C - Policy C2 - Moss Side Test Track	<p>a) Concern that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The road structure in the area is poor and would need significant improvement prior to the development being built.</li> <li>• The proposed access points were unacceptable, as the principal access points were via an industrial estate and the secondary access points were from a very busy and dangerous road, namely Longmeanygate.</li> <li>• The impact the development would have on the public open space, in particular Paradise Park, as the plan showed the development to be taking place on part of the park. This, of course, would be unacceptable and would be opposed by the local community.</li> <li>• The number of properties proposed on the site and the density of the development, which had been based previous housing numbers which had been imposed upon South Ribble Borough Council regionally.</li> <li>• The lack of detail regarding proposed improvements to public transport.</li> </ul> <p>b) Cannot support the further housing development at Moss Side Test Track unless appropriate and necessary infrastructure is provided by the development, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major additional transport infrastructure (eg dualling Schleswig Way, re-opening Midge Hall station and bus routes linking the station with the new development).</li> <li>• Educational facilities.</li> <li>• New access road directly from Schleswig Way.</li> <li>• Improved access arrangements from Longmeanygate.</li> <li>• Reduced housing numbers to 500 or 600, with fewer affordable homes.</li> <li>• More facilities for young people.</li> <li>• Multi-use tracks.</li> <li>• Protection and improvement of Paradise Park.</li> <li>• More shops and medical/community facilities.</li> </ul> <p>c) Consider alternative uses including leisure, recreation, museum or hotel uses.</p>	<p>a to c) An illustrative and indicative development brief in respect of this site is a guide to how we view the site for development. LCC highways have and will be fully involved in any proposed development of the site from an early stage to ensure that vehicular accesses are appropriate. An agreed master plan is required as part of policy C2 before any development of this site is permitted. This site is a major site for the delivery of the housing land supply, the number of affordable homes identified are in line with adopted Core Strategy guidelines contained in Policy 7.</p>
598	330	Chapter C - Policy C2 - Moss Side Test Track	<p>a) Concern of the local community about the safety of the proposed accesses to the development, from Longmeanygate, as set out in the development brief. Access should be taken from the junction of Midge Hall Lane and Longmeanygate, and from a new road north of and parallel to Dunkirk Lane, linking directly to Schleswig Way.</p> <p>b) Concern about density of development. Applying the proposed densities at the other sites to this one, it would result in approximately 600 houses on the Moss Side Test Track site, a reduction of 20%.</p> <p>c) Present drainage infrastructure cannot cope.</p> <p>d) Development will have a detrimental effect on wildlife.</p> <p>e) Object to removal of trees.</p> <p>f) Development brief incorrectly includes part of Paradise Park in the development site.</p> <p>g) Concern about shortage of school and medical services.</p> <p>h) It is the view of Moss Side Community Forum that all contributions from pots such as CIL must be spent in the Moss Side and Midge Hall area, to mitigate against the negative impacts. This should include re-opening Midge Hall railway station, coupled with safe cycling/walking routes to the station; facilities for young people; multi-use tracks for cyclists and horse-riders; protection and enhancement of Paradise Park; improved community facilities including enhancements to the community centre and additional shops.</p>	<p>a to h) A development brief has been prepared for this site as a guide to how the Council view the site for development. LCC highways have and will be fully involved in any proposed development of the site to ensure that vehicular accesses are appropriate. An agreed master plan is required as part of policy C2 before any development of this site is permitted.</p>
1	1	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) We feel that developing the site with a proposed 650 homes and any relevant amenities would be the final straw for us as we moved to Leyland 11 years ago to a lovely tranquil spot which admittedly has already been marred by the stench from the non-smelling waste plant! We feel the proposed development will potentially:</p>	<p>a) Comments noted however this site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development. At this stage, the site is an allocation. Any planning application, in keeping with the masterplan required by Policy C3 will need to include specifics on areas of open space and</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- spoil any views currently enjoyed</li> <li>- cause a lack of privacy by being overlooked</li> <li>- increase the general noise level</li> <li>- have a detrimental effect on wildlife</li> <li>- increase traffic on a very busy bypass</li> </ul> <p>b) There are many new homes available on development areas in and around Leyland which appear to be struggling to sell so why is it deemed necessary to build 650 homes in this area?</p>	<p>landscaping. Noise and air pollution assessments will be required along with any planning application on this land. Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys will also be required as part of any planning application. LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</p> <p>b) The Council is required to identify land to allow building of a minimum of 417 dwellings per annum. This cannot be done using existing development sites and brownfield land only, some greenfield land is also needed. During the last five years, the build rate has been lower than this, and so the supply of land will need to be increased beyond 417 dwellings and will need to meet the requirement and shortfall. Whilst new development has already taken place in the area, the Council is now in a position where it has to review its Plan for the next 15 years, and identify enough land to meet its housing requirements. Safeguarded sites, such as this one, are needed to meet the requirement for housing development in the Borough.</p>
7	4	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) We wonder if the whole of the area labelled W, which we believe is presently farm land, has to be built on. Is it not possible to leave a green corridor along the road to enhance people's environment when driving into South Ribble?</p> <p>b) We are also unsure what an "area of separation" means. This again is farmland. Is this also going to be built on at some stage?</p>	<p>a) The land has been development land for many years and is considered to be appropriate for building at this time. At this stage, the site is an allocation. Once a planning application is made, that it the opportunity to include specifics on areas of open space and landscaping.</p> <p>b) An area of separation is an area protected from inappropriate development other than Green Infrastructure uses, leisure and recreational uses, which would not adversely impact on the visual or spatial continuity of the Green Infrastructure and separation area.</p>
11	8	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) The plans you have will spoil our view over fields, destroy wildlife and will make the bypass worse that it is now, will also increase traffic on our road and what about our privacy?</p>	<p>a) Comments noted however this site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development. Whilst new development has already taken place in the area, the Council is now in a position where it has to review its Plan for the next 15 years, and identify enough land to meet its housing requirements. Safeguarded sites, such as this one, are needed to meet the requirement for housing development in the Borough.</p> <p>Policy C3 requires the preparation of a masterplan. Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys will be required as part of any planning application. LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</p>
103	8	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) I strongly object to the proposed 'Masterplan'. The proposal will bring about increased road traffic which will severely compromise road safety in the area.</p> <p>b) In the area there is a significant amount of wildlife. The proposal is likely to have a detrimental effect on the wildlife in the area due to the increased noise and air pollution.</p> <p>c) Currently the Croston Road area of Farington is a desirable location to reside. Many of the properties benefit from open land to the rear. The proposal will without doubt reduce the desirability of the area and the value of the homes. As a resident of this area we have already been subjected to the development of a waste disposal facility near to the area. This has already had a huge impact on the value of properties within this area and the 'Masterplan' would only double the impact and further reduce the value.</p>	<p>a) A master plan as set out in Policy C3 is designed to assist with the overall picture of the development showing the site as a whole. Traffic management forms part of that process as does layout and density of the infrastructure required to support the development. LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</p> <p>b) Noise and air pollution assessments will be required along with any planning application on this land. Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys will also be required as part of any planning application.</p> <p>c) This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development.</p>
17	12	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) There is no established need for additional housing in this area. The increased population nationally is due to uncontrolled immigration in recent years. It is unlikely that a big increase in housing will be required in the long term.</p> <p>b) As the name implies, Farington Moss is a very wet area and there have been large areas of standing water for most of the year. This problem will be exacerbated if a large area is covered in concrete.</p> <p>c) The extra houses will probably mean an extra 500 cars. Flensburg Way is already congested at peak hours.</p>	<p>a) The Council is required to identify land to allow building of a minimum of 417 dwellings per annum. This cannot be done using existing development sites and brownfield land only, some greenfield land is also needed. During the last five years, the build rate has been lower than this, and so the supply of land will need to be increased beyond 417 dwellings and will need to meet the requirement and shortfall.</p> <p>This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development.</p> <p>Whilst new development has already taken place in the area, the Council is now in a position</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>d) The site is very attractive countryside and agricultural land. It is a valuable source of food and a haven for wildlife, it is particularly useful for country walks due to its proximity to the town centre.</p> <p>e) The large number of trees and other plant material absorbs large amounts of carbon dioxide that is thought to cause climate changes.</p> <p>f) There is already significant unemployment in the area due to the loss of manufacturing capacity – Royal Ordnance Chorley, British Leyland, Leyland Paints, Leyland Rubber, etc. Additional housing would be bound to increase the number of people seeking employment in the area</p>	<p>where it has to review its Plan for the next 15 years, and identify enough land to meet its housing requirements. Safeguarded sites, such as this one, are needed to meet the requirement for housing development in the Borough. Policy C3 requires the preparation of a masterplan.</p> <p>b) This site does not fall within a recognised flood zone.</p> <p>c) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</p> <p>d) Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys will be required as part of any planning application.</p> <p>e) Noise and air pollution assessments will be required along with any planning application on this land.</p> <p>f) The plan includes land identified for future employment to meet the needs of a growing population.</p>
21	14	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) I object to the proposed extension of the Policy C3 site. Not enough consideration is being given to the use of Brownfield sites to meet the borough's housing needs, having allocated the Greenfield site adjacent (between Heatherleigh and Bannister Lane), this is a further, permanent, Greenfield site loss. The development of the full 40Ha will complete the urbanisation of a previously rural area. The Site Allocation document itself defines the use of the site as "Not a sustainable use of resources".</p> <p>b) Access to the north of proposed site is quoted as Moss Lane. This is for the most part a single track lane without pavement, and not suitable to serve a residential area of the proposed size. Road infrastructure changes would therefore be required around the entire site, not just to Moss Lane, but Croston road, Bannister Lane and any new entry/exit route onto Schleswig Way.</p> <p>c) I do not believe the Borough Council has done enough to inform the affected local residents of the allocation and of the current status of the proposal, and its amendment. It is not unreasonable to expect as a council tax payer, to be involved, or at least informed, of matters that will directly impact one's quality of life. Perhaps using the council's own Forward magazine could give at least a quarterly view of any consultations of interest.</p>	<p>a) All brownfield sites have been identified for development where possible and access allowing. For the past few years, the 70% target for new residential development on brownfield land has been exceeded.</p> <p>b) The Council agrees that Bannister Lane is not a suitable access, and would not support a proposal with access from here. Master plan for the site will identify suitable accesses for consideration.</p> <p>c) A quarter page item 'Your area, your choice' in the Winter 2010/11 edition of Forward (Issue 66). This was to bring the process and Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document to the attention of all residents of the borough. A further item appeared in the Winter 2011 edition (Issue 70). Posters in shops, doctors' surgeries, dentists surgeries, church halls, community centres, schools, leisure centres, etc. Members of our team attended every Area Committee meeting (or put on additional events for the ones which were cancelled due to the bad weather just before Christmas 2010). We have spent days in supermarkets – Booths (Penwortham and Longton), Sainsbury's (Bamber Bridge), Morrisons (Leyland and Bamber Bridge), Tesco and Leyland Market to raise awareness at each stage of the consultation. The full documents have been available in libraries and at the Civic Centre at every stage of the process and some post offices during the first two stages. Each stage of the process has been promoted via our website and press releases.</p>
36	29	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) In your recently published documents, there are one or two respondents comments in support of these proposals. These are a small number of residents who see the proposed development as an opportunity to cash in and move away from the area. They have no interest in what is left behind for the rest of us who love living on Bannister Lane because of the nature of the surroundings.</p> <p>b) You have been unable to demonstrate a need for additional housing accommodation in this area. Over recent years there has been considerable residential development in the area. This has put huge pressure on the existing infrastructure as it is. What are your proposals to upgrade highways and drainage, provide additional health care facilities and schools to deal with the increase in population and all their demands? Look around the estate agents in Leyland and see the mass of unsold property available in the area. Please advise what research has been done to calculate and ascertain the need for such a massive amount of additional residential property in the area. I would request your specific and detailed responses to these points as I and the majority of other residents of this area do not find any validity in these proposals.</p> <p>c) Increasing the population of the area will only serve to increase the number of unemployed or the number of cars on the road for people to commute out of the area to work as there is no generation of new business or industry in the area to support additional employment.</p> <p>d) This area is Moss land, densely planted with trees which assist in the reduction of</p>	<p>a) Comments noted.</p> <p>b) &amp; c) Nationally, targets are set for housing land supply and the requirements within South Ribble for the life of this plan are met by development sites identified including site W. The Council is required to identify land to allow building of a minimum of 417 dwellings per annum. This cannot be done using existing development sites and brownfield land only, some greenfield land is also needed. During the last five years, the build rate has been lower than this, and so the supply of land will need to be increased beyond 417 dwellings and will need to meet the requirement and shortfall. The site requires a master plan which will identify infrastructure requirements and the site layout in relation to green infrastructure as well. This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development. The Council is working closely with relevant bodies, such as the PCT, United Utilities, the Environment Agency and the Education Authority to ensure there is adequate provision of services in the area. LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</p> <p>d) Noise and air pollution assessments will be required along with any planning application on</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			greenhouse gases. What damage are you doing to the environment by clearing these areas of trees and adding between 600 and 1200 more cars into the area? How does this sit with the Council's environmental policies?	this land. Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys will also be required as part of any planning application.
582	29	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) All the residents are alarmed that this proposal includes the following which you have either stated in writing, or advised at meetings, would not be permitted :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Access off Bannister Lane</li> <li>- Construction of affordable housing</li> <li>- Construction of apartments</li> </ul>	<p>a) The Council does not support access to the site from Bannister Lane. Policy 7 of the adopted Core Strategy requires the provision of sufficient affordable and special needs housing. Delivering affordable housing is a key government objective aimed at enabling everyone to have a decent home that they can afford. The Council has no general or specific policy requirement for the provision of apartments on this site.</p>
44	36	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) Whilst we welcome the removal of the safeguarded land allocation from this site and its allocation for residential use in line with our previous representation, we object to the proposal for our client's land to be comprehensively developed alongside the wider residential allocation to the south and west of the site.</p> <p>b) Our client's site is capable of being developed independently and without prejudicing the development of the remaining allocation. As such the site could be delivered promptly, assisting the council in meeting its five year housing land supply requirements and delivering much needed affordable housing over the short to medium term.</p> <p>c) Request that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The requirement for a masterplan for the comprehensive development is removed from Policy C3; or</li> <li>2. The policy clarifies that the requirement for a masterplan for the comprehensive development is not relevant to our client's site.</li> </ol>	<p>a) The Council has reassessed this site and is now proposing to allocate the whole of the current safeguarded allocation for a residential development (with an element of leisure as appropriate) through the Site Allocations DPD. The Council is seeking for the site to be developed strategically with appropriate master planning for the whole site.</p> <p>b) The Council would not permit individual areas of land to be developed separately to the rest of the site – it must be a comprehensive development of the whole site.</p> <p>c) No change to the Policy.</p>
52	38	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) I object to this proposed development. The impact on traffic and wildlife has not been taken into consideration. The road infrastructure is not capable of handling the excess traffic that would be created on Moss Lane and Croston Road.</p> <p>b) The trees directly behind no 11 have had barn owls and many other species of wild birds, this development would be a disaster for these birds.</p>	<p>a) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</p> <p>b) Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys will be required as part of any planning application.</p>
55	41	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) I object to this proposed development. Not enough consideration is being given to the loss of the Green fields, and agricultural land the development of this area is completely miss use of good land.</p> <p>b) Moss Lane is a country road and is not a suitable road for more traffic, and there will be if this goes through. It made it very busy when Flensburg Way the by-pass road at the top of Moss Lane was made. I would ask you to consider the very large amount of traffic on Flensburg Way.</p> <p>c) My objections are based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of precious green space</li> <li>• Increased noise and air pollution</li> <li>• Increased traffic, posing risk to road safety.</li> </ul>	<p>a) This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development. Whilst new development has already taken place in the area, the Council is now in a position where it has to review its Plan for the next 15 years, and identify enough land to meet its housing requirements. Safeguarded sites, such as this one, are needed to meet the requirement for housing development in the Borough. Policy C3 requires the preparation of a masterplan. A master plan is required for the whole site to enable suitable development to manage traffic and other infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>b) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</p> <p>c) Noise and air pollution assessments will be required to be submitted along with any planning application.</p>
57	43	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) I object to the proposed residential development to the west of Croston Road, Farington Moss Leyland. This will have a negative impact on the surrounding area for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased traffic to Bannister lane and surrounding area.</li> <li>• Increase in pollution.</li> <li>• Increase in crime.</li> </ul>	<p>a) Comments noted however this site has been identified as suitable for development since the last local plan in 2000. The requirement for a master plan for the site as a whole will look to take account of the items listed. The necessary habitat and wildlife surveys will be included as part of this process. LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network. Noise and air pollution assessments will be required to be submitted along with any planning</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current property values will be negatively impacted.</li> <li>• The development will overshadow the gardens of multiple properties preventing the use and enjoyment of this amenity space.</li> <li>• The development process presents potential hazards in the form of building dust, noise pollution and movement of heavy machinery in a small residential street, where there are a number of children resident.</li> <li>• Impact of growing wildlife environment</li> </ul> <p>On this basis, I would not consider this proposal to be in keeping with proper development of the area and would ask that the application be refused.</p>	application.
58	44	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) The character of the area would be ruined with the proposed 650 houses in area W. Croston Road is already subject to traffic calming measures. The local shops have limited parking, and the traffic light junction at Golden Hill, is already inadequate. This area really has a local feel to it, please build elsewhere.</p> <p>b) Wildlife in the area has already been badly affected by the new smelly waste plant.</p>	<p>a) Comment noted but as this site has been previously identified for development and all steps will be taken through master planning to ensure the site is sensitively developed to meet local needs.</p> <p>b) Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys will be required as part of any planning application.</p>
59	45	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) Object to this proposed development. This will have a negative impact to the surrounding area for the following reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Loss of wildlife</li> <li>- Increased traffic to Bannister lane, Croston road and surrounding area.</li> <li>- Increase in pollution</li> <li>- Increase in crime</li> <li>- Current properties will be de-valued</li> <li>- The development will overshadow the gardens of multiple properties preventing the use and enjoyment of this amenity space.</li> <li>- the development process presents potential hazards in the form of building dust, noise pollution and movement of heavy machinery in a small residential streets, where there are a number of children resident.</li> </ul>	<p>a) Comments noted however this site has been identified as suitable for development since the last local plan in 2000. The requirement for a master plan for the site as a whole will look to take account of the items listed. The necessary habitat and wildlife surveys will be included as part of this process.</p> <p>LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</p> <p>If considered appropriate, noise and air pollution assessments would be required should a planning application be received.</p>
60	46	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) Why do we have to have another housing estate on Croston Road? We would rather keep the fields, there is land off Wheelton Lane near Morrisons which was a factory and land off Golden Hill Lane which was also a factory, these are brown field sites and not built on.</p> <p>b) If you insist on building on fields once they have gone they have gone forever. We do not want to live in a city, if we did we would go and live in Preston.</p>	<p>a) Comments noted however this site has been identified as suitable for development since the last local plan in 2000. The Council is required to identify land to allow building of a minimum of 417 dwellings per annum. This cannot be done using existing development sites and brownfield land only, some greenfield land is also needed. During the last five years, the build rate has been lower than this, and so the supply of land will need to be increased beyond 417 dwellings and will need to meet the requirement and shortfall. The land off Wheelton Lane (site B) has been identified in the plan as residential with permission.</p> <p>b) Noted.</p>
61	47	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) How can you even think of building on the land in this area, have the people in this area not had enough already with the building of the recycle plant with its constant stench and ugly form spoiling the views.</p> <p>The area will lose its beauty, house prices will go down because it is classed as a semi-rural area and insurances will go up. I moved to this area nine years ago because of the natural beauty and the fact it is classed as semi-rural.</p> <p>b) More traffic more pollution.</p> <p>c) The wildlife will suffer terribly and insurances will rise.</p>	<p>a) Nationally, targets are set for housing land supply and the requirements within South Ribble for the life of this plan are met by development sites identified including site W. The Council is required to identify land to allow building of a minimum of 417 dwellings per annum. This cannot be done using existing development sites and brownfield land only, some greenfield land is also needed. During the last five years, the build rate has been lower than this, and so the supply of land will need to be increased beyond 417 dwellings and will need to meet the requirement and shortfall. This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development. The site requires a master plan which will identify infrastructure requirements and the site layout in relation to green infrastructure as well.</p> <p>b) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
				<p>individual developments will have on the infrastructure network. Noise and air pollution assessments will be required along with any planning application on this land.</p> <p>c) Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys will also be required as part of any planning application.</p>
62	48	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) The proposal of 650 houses will destroy all forms of wildlife.</p> <p>b) The site will bring with it CO emissions and other forms of pollution.</p> <p>c) Leyland already has very little green space but South Ribble seem bent on joining us to Preston with all the houses going up along the by-pass.</p>	<p>a) Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys will also be required as part of any planning application. Site capacity is 600 dwellings.</p> <p>b) Noise and air pollution assessments will be required to be submitted along with any planning application.</p> <p>c) Nationally, targets are set for housing land and the requirements within South Ribble for the life of this plan are met by development sites identified including site W. This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development. The site requires a master plan which will identify infrastructure requirements and the site layout in relation to green infrastructure as well. At this stage, the site is an allocation. Once a planning application is made, that it the opportunity to include specifics on areas of open space and landscaping.</p>
63	49	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) The proposed 650 home master plan development will cause a massive impact on the roads. The current capacity of the bypass B5253 Flensburg Way leading onto the A582 Penwortham Bypass and leading to Farington Road and the motorway junctions is quite stretched and has daily traffic delays causing congestion and pollution so the development will only bring further complications, congestion, delays &amp; pollution.</p> <p>b) The change to the character of the area will be immense, Farington Moss has the feel of a village we do not want this changed into an extension of the urban sprawl.</p> <p>c) Despite living close to the B5253 Flensburg Way the fields act as a haven of wildlife and provide a measure of landscape and allow the noise of the traffic to be dissipated.</p> <p>d) Bannister Lane is a safe road where children can play outside and enjoy the fresh air this will be lost with an massive development.</p> <p>e) The site is too dense with very little safe road access which will cause problems and pollution.</p> <p>f) The loss of value to my property from having the open fields replaced with a 650 home development would be catastrophic. The resale price would be severely reduced.</p> <p>g) The fact that you as a council didn't notify the residents affected directly when amending the original site due to cost is disgraceful. Should I as a householder not inform you of certain information I am fined.</p>	<p>a) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network. Noise and air pollution assessments will be required along with any planning application on this land. Site capacity is for 600 dwellings.</p> <p>b and d) The master plan required for this site will address the matters relating to traffic management, site layout and design, in association with LCC to ensure that suitable infrastructure is in place for the development.</p> <p>c) Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys will also be required as part of any planning application.</p> <p>e) Consultation responses to the Preferred Options Site Allocations Development Plan Document highlighted that the densities on this site should be lower to reflect the surrounding area and ensure the site is comprehensively developed. As a result of this, the site area was extended to accommodate the required number of dwellings.</p> <p>f) This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development.</p> <p>g) The council used several recognised, suitable and varied methods to communicate the plan to the residents of the borough. Individuals local to any site are contacted for their comments specifically when a formal application is received.</p>
572	50	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) We object to the development.</p> <p>b) The proposed development would compromise road safety, due to increased road and pedestrian traffic.</p> <p>c) It would provide an unwelcome change to the area in the form of loss of wildlife and landscape, increased noise and air pollution.</p> <p>d) We are concerned about the loss of value to the properties in the area which have the unique factor of open land to the rear, which is currently an extremely strong selling feature to be considered in future plans.</p>	<p>a) Objections noted but the response will be the same as previously made to same objections noted above.</p> <p>b) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</p> <p>c) Noise and air pollution assessments will be required along with any planning application on this land. Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys will also be required as part of any planning application.</p> <p>d) This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development.</p>
64	51	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) I object to the proposed development. I object to the fact that the local government offices of South Ribble have underhandedly proposed this development without notifying affected residents in the area of its intentions.</p> <p>b) Infrastructure:- the roads surrounding this development are already at full capacity and with</p>	<p>a) The Council used several recognised, suitable and varied methods to communicate the plan to the residents of the borough. Individuals local to any site are contacted for their comments specifically when a formal application is received. In an effort to let all residents of the borough know about consultation opportunities throughout the process:</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>a potential for 2000 additional vehicles from this development alone I seriously question its viability. If the traffic from the other proposed development, at the old Leyland Motors test track, is added in then this will impact the already overloaded roads. Croston Road is already a rat run with traffic choosing to forsake the queues on Flensburg Way, add to this the traffic generated by the Global Renewables site plus the traffic from the Barn Hey Drive development and it is quite obvious that the roads were not designed for this volume of traffic. (it might be argued that the increase in traffic is less than 1% but this is against a traffic census undertaken within the last couple of years not against the census that brought about the creation of Flensburg Way and Farington Road).</p> <p>c) Amenities:- Are the current Doctors, dentists , schools etc. expected to cope with the increased demand or will this require further planning proposals</p> <p>d) Environment :- The proposed development will seriously reduce the amount of green belt land available with its impact being felt on the wildlife within the area, added to this is the potential for increased air, light and noise pollution together with an already present problem of littering along Croston Road.</p> <p>e) Asset Values:- The owners of properties within the proposed development have already seen the value of their assets dramatically affected by the development of the Global Renewables site and this proposal will only compound this negative effect.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was a quarter page item 'Your area, your choice' in the Winter 2010/11 edition of Forward (Issue 66) on page 4. This was to bring the process and document to the attention of all residents of the borough.</li> <li>- There was a further article on page 9 of the Winter 2011 edition.</li> <li>- Posters have been displayed in shops, doctors' surgeries, dentists surgeries, church halls, community centres, schools, leisure centres, etc.</li> <li>- Members of our team attended every Area Committee meeting (or put on additional events for the ones which were cancelled due to the bad weather just before Christmas 2010).</li> <li>- We have spent days with a display in supermarkets – Booths (Penwortham and Longton), Sainsbury's (Bamber Bridge), Morrisons (Leyland and Bamber Bridge), Tesco and Leyland Market to raise awareness at each stage of the consultation.</li> <li>- The full documents have been available in all South Ribble libraries and at the Civic Centre at every stage of the process and some post offices during the first two stages.</li> <li>- Each stage of the process has been promoted via our website and press releases/press notices.</li> <li>- All council meetings which have discussed the document, Cabinet and Council, were open to the public to attend.</li> <li>- Ward and parish councillors have been kept fully informed throughout the process and have provided essential liaison between planning officers and their constituents.</li> <li>- We have an extensive database of people who have expressed an interest in the Site Allocations DPD (over 2,000 contacts) who have all received letters or emails about the latest stage of the process.</li> <li>b) The master plan required for this site will address the matters relating to traffic management in association with LCC to ensure that suitable infrastructure is in place for the development.</li> <li>c) The Council is working closely with relevant bodies, such as the PCT, United Utilities, the Environment Agency and the Education Authority to ensure there is adequate provision of services in the area.</li> <li>d) No Green Belt boundary has been changed in this area.</li> <li>e) This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development.</li> </ul>
66	53	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) Lack of appropriate consultation with local residents and ill publicised amendments to the original planned development.</p> <p>b) Adverse effects on the surrounding properties e.g. noise and air pollution; loss of privacy; loss of open aspects to rear and reduction in value of properties. The area is already suffering from frequent presence of obnoxious odours which invade our homes from Global Renewals.</p> <p>c) Increased traffic on Croston Road – present traffic calming measures having had little impact, the volume and speed of traffic already a serious hazard.</p> <p>d) It is productive agricultural land due to the excellent quality of soil in the area which spans both sides of the by-pass.</p> <p>e) Recent building projects in the area have already increased crime rate and drug related incidents in the locality.</p> <p>f) Irrevocable damage to wildlife i.e. pond and copse at the rear of our property is the habitat for several species wildlife (frogs, toads, nesting herons, water birds, insects, squirrels, foxes, rabbits and a wide variety of birds which inhabit the area.</p> <p>g) The proposed large residential site would completely change the character of the area which historically has always been a close knit rural community</p>	<p>a) The Council used several recognised, suitable and varied methods to communicate the plan to the residents of the borough. Individuals local to any site are contacted for their comments specifically when a formal application is received. In an effort to let all residents of the borough know about consultation opportunities throughout the process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was a quarter page item 'Your area, your choice' in the Winter 2010/11 edition of Forward (Issue 66) on page 4. This was to bring the process and document to the attention of all residents of the borough.</li> <li>- There was a further article on page 9 of the Winter 2011 edition.</li> <li>- Posters have been displayed in shops, doctors' surgeries, dentists surgeries, church halls, community centres, schools, leisure centres, etc.</li> <li>- Members of our team attended every Area Committee meeting (or put on additional events for the ones which were cancelled due to the bad weather just before Christmas 2010).</li> <li>- We have spent days with a display in supermarkets – Booths (Penwortham and Longton), Sainsbury's (Bamber Bridge), Morrisons (Leyland and Bamber Bridge), Tesco and Leyland Market to raise awareness at each stage of the consultation.</li> <li>- The full documents have been available in all South Ribble libraries and at the Civic Centre at every stage of the process and some post offices during the first two stages.</li> <li>- Each stage of the process has been promoted via our website and press releases/press notices.</li> <li>- All council meetings which have discussed the document, Cabinet and Council, were open to the public to attend.</li> <li>- Ward and parish councillors have been kept fully informed throughout the process and have provided essential liaison between planning officers and their constituents.</li> </ul>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We have an extensive database of people who have expressed an interest in the Site Allocations DPD (over 2,000 contacts) who have all received letters or emails about the latest stage of the process. The site area was extended as a result of consultation responses to the Preferred Options Site Allocations Development Plan Document.</li> <li>b) If considered appropriate, noise and air pollution assessments would be required should a planning application be received.</li> <li>c) The master plan required for this site will address the matters relating to traffic management in association with LCC to ensure that suitable infrastructure is in place for the development.</li> <li>d) This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development.</li> <li>e) Noted.</li> <li>f) In addition, appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys would be required as part of any planning application.</li> <li>g) The master plan required for this site will address the matters relating to site layout and design, in association with LCC to ensure that suitable infrastructure is in place for the development.</li> </ul>
67	54	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	Please see identical representation Ref No 53, ID 66.	Please see identical representation Ref No 53, ID 66.
69	56	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) TRAFFIC how will a building development of this magnitude deal with the extra volume of traffic? Croston Road is a very busy road even with the By-Pass.</li> <li>b) POLICING/CRIME. The Police are stretched to the limit without any further impact with this proposed development.</li> <li>c) HEALTH AND WELFARE. Where are all these extra people going to go? How are the surgeries going to cope and the hospitals?</li> <li>d) FARINGTON MOSS is on a FLOOD PLAIN, there are ditches and bankings in the area to prevent flooding including Bannister Lane where we live.. If a development like this is allowed to go ahead, where is this excess water going to go?</li> <li>e) Farington Moss is a beautiful semi-rural area which will be permanently destroyed if this housing development is allowed and Leyland as a town in its own right is now becoming one massive building development and we feel this will have a detrimental effect in the years to come.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The master plan required for this site will address the matters relating to traffic management in association with LCC to ensure that suitable infrastructure is in place for the development.</li> <li>b) Noted. The Police Service is involved and informed about the proposals contained in the DPD.</li> <li>c) The Council is working closely with relevant bodies, such as the PCT, United Utilities, the Environment Agency and the Education Authority to ensure there is adequate provision of services in the area.</li> <li>d) Not a recognised flood plain</li> <li>e) This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development.</li> </ul>
74	59	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Loss of my job, I work for the farmer that farms that land, no land no job for me.</li> <li>b) Increase of traffic on Croston Road, compromising road safety which is already very noisy due to humps in the road, and busy due to wagons that are not supposed to come down, South Ribble bin wagons going to the recycling depot which they are not supposed to come down Croston Road except on collection days, cars speeding down the middle of the road trying to avoid the humps. Vans with trailers speeding over the humps and losing their loads.</li> <li>c) Change to the character of the area, loss of wildlife and landscape, increased noise and air pollution.</li> <li>d) Loss of value to my property, which has already lost its value due to the recycling depot, with wagons coming up and down Croston Road, the stench and pollution it chucks in to the air.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The aim of the DPD is to identify housing and employment land to meet the needs of the borough to 2026. This site was identified in the local plan 2000 as land for future development to meet those needs.</li> <li>b) The council requires a master plan for the whole site to ensure that the infrastructure and design of the site meet the local needs and does not adversely contribute to traffic congestion. LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network. Comments noted about council vehicles and passed on to the relevant service.</li> <li>c) Noise and air pollution assessments will be required along with any planning application on this land. Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys will also be required as part of any planning application.</li> <li>d) This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development.</li> </ul>
76	61	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	a) I would like to strongly object to the proposed development of the above land. This will have a detrimental effect on this neighbourhood. Our quality of life will also be affected as our house is currently facing onto open fields and we assume any development will mean that our	a) This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development. The Council cannot get involved in any financial agreements between residents and the developers/landowners. The land has been

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>outlook will be greatly affected and that houses will be built right up to the boundary. This will have a significant effect on the value of our property and I assume no compensation will be paid for this.</p> <p>b) The land is currently home to numerous species of wildlife which will be greatly affected by this development.</p> <p>c) The roads in this area are already significantly overloaded and I do not understand how they will cope with a further 650 cars trying to use them.</p>	<p>development land for many years and as such is considered to be appropriate for building at this time. Whilst new development has already taken place in the area, the Council is now in a position where it has to review its Plan for the next 15 years, and identify enough land to meet its housing requirements. Safeguarded sites, such as this one, are needed to meet the requirement for housing development in the Borough. Policy C3 requires the preparation of a masterplan. At this stage, the site is an allocation. Once a planning application is made, that it the opportunity to include specifics on areas of open space and landscaping.</p> <p>b) As part of the master planning for this site a full habitat assessment will be included.</p> <p>c) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</p>
78	63	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) I object to the proposed residential development, on land at the end of Murray Avenue.</p> <p>b) I object to any vehicular access to any proposed residential development at the end of Murray Avenue. If granted, it would mean the width of Murray Avenue being extended, this would bring traffic very close to my property. Also, Moss Lane would have to be made much wider, to accommodate the increase in traffic, and a much better drainage system installed. Moss Lane is already used by traffic going to, and coming from the bypass and waste disposal centre, and if the above proposals go ahead, the increase in traffic will be tremendous.</p>	<p>a) This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development. Whilst new development has already taken place in the area, the Council is now in a position where it has to review its Plan for the next 15 years, and identify enough land to meet its housing requirements. Safeguarded sites, such as this one, are needed to meet the requirement for housing development in the Borough. Policy C3 requires the preparation of a masterplan.</p> <p>b) At this stage, the site is an allocation. Once a planning application is made, that it the opportunity to include specifics on areas of open space and landscaping. Traffic management solutions will be included as part of the master plan required for this site. LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</p>
79	64	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) We object to the proposed planning proposal between Heatherleigh and Moss Lane. There is obviously little demand for property. We have already had to put up with bad smells coming from the waste site. What compensation you are proposing to give the local residents for the drop in valuation of our properties.</p> <p>b) The development will have a very negative effect on the surrounding area both in terms of destroying wildlife and quality of living.</p> <p>c) The area is already congested with traffic and the local roads will not be able to cope with the traffic increase from the building of 650 houses in this location. Can you provide the data that shows us how you propose to rectify this problem or are you going to leave us all to try and sort it out ourselves.</p> <p>(Also see representation Ref 061)</p>	<p>a) The Council cannot get involved in any financial agreements between residents and the developers/landowners. The land has been development land for many years and as such is considered to be appropriate for building at this time. The Council is required to identify land to allow building of a minimum of 417 dwellings per year. This cannot be done using existing development sites and brownfield land only, some greenfield land is also needed. During the last five years, the build rate has been much lower than this, meaning the borough is now in a situation of under provision. Whilst new development has already taken place in the area, the Council is now in a position where it has to review its Plan for the next 15 years, and identify enough land to meet its housing requirements. Safeguarded sites, such as this one, are needed to meet the requirement for housing development in the Borough. Policy C3 requires the preparation of a masterplan. At this stage, the site is an allocation. Once a planning application is made, that it the opportunity to include specifics on areas of open space and landscaping.</p> <p>b) As part of the master planning for this site a full habitat assessment will be included.</p> <p>c) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network. Traffic management solutions will be included as part of the master plan required for this site.</p>
82	66	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) I object to the proposed development. As if it wasn't bad enough allowing the waste plant to be built – spoiling the views to the front of the property, not to mention the smell it produces. My property already has decreased in value because of the waste plant, but if 650 houses are built behind then this will decrease the value further. I bought this house believing that the moss was a very important arable area for farming and that it would not change from green belt banding.</p> <p>b) Have we not got enough housing already.</p> <p>c) The roads round this area are already a disgrace. The increased traffic to the area is also a concern. The traffic lights on Croston Road/Golden Hill Lane/Longmeaneygate struggle to cope on a good day. But it is only a matter of time before someone is killed. More houses – more traffic. Our children are going to be put in danger with the increased number of vehicles new housing would bring.</p>	<p>a) This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development. It is not in the Green Belt. At this stage, the site is an allocation. Once a planning application is made, that it the opportunity to include specifics on areas of open space and landscaping.</p> <p>b) Whilst new development has already taken place in the area, the Council is now in a position where it has to review its Plan for the next 15 years, and identify enough land to meet its housing requirements. Safeguarded sites, such as this one, are needed to meet the requirement for housing development in the Borough. Policy C3 requires the preparation of a masterplan.</p> <p>c) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network. Traffic management</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
				solutions will be included as part of the master plan required for this site.
83	67	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) I object strongly to the proposed development of 650 houses. Has anyone given any thought to the plight of several homeowners on Croston Road who have been trying to sell their homes for 2 or 3 years without success because of the uncertainty about the impact of the new waste plant being built – this new proposal is certainly not going to help matters. Building these new houses will mean that all our homes currently on Croston Road, Bannister Lane, Five Acres, Moss Lane and Heatherleigh will lose value.</p> <p>b) Speed humps were installed on Croston Road a few years back to try to relieve traffic flow on Croston Road but this will surely increase if these houses are built as I understand access will be from Croston Road.</p>	<p>a) The Council is required to identify land to allow building of a minimum of 417 dwellings per year. This cannot be done using existing development sites and brownfield land only, some greenfield land is also needed. During the last five years, the build rate has been much lower than this, meaning the borough is now in a situation of under provision.</p> <p>b) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</p>
84	68	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) I object to the proposed extension of, site map ref W for the purpose of residential dwellings. At present, this is one of the few remaining areas in the locality of outstanding natural beauty marred only by the hideous, but sadly necessary Leyland by-pass. The said land until recently, was designated “Not a sustainable use of resources” fit only for agricultural purposes or “Yellow Land”. Now, it has rather conveniently been re-designated as prime building land without the knowledge of the local residents whose lives it directly impacts. More consideration given to alternative “brownfield sites” to facilitate the borough’s needs to meet the required level for residential dwellings.</p> <p>b) Moss Lane is suitable only for its intended purpose of providing access to the properties currently on Moss Lane including Murray and Marks Avenue, and could not be developed to provide a road plus pavement wide enough to suit the increased level of traffic this proposal would bring, at the same time satisfying all the health and safety pre-requisites. I fear it is only a matter of time before a serious or even fatal accident will occur and this proposal only serves to further heighten my concerns.</p> <p>c) I must also point out that this proposal will have a serious impact on both noise and air pollution, including completely obliterating the local wildlife as well as many beautiful trees, some of which date back to the nineteenth century.</p> <p>d) In particular, as a council tax payer, I am appalled at the total lack of direct communication by the borough council, to the residents of the area concerning this proposal and strongly recommend it be scrapped indefinitely.</p>	<p>a) This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development. Whilst new development has already taken place in the area, the Council is now in a position where it has to review its Plan for the next 15 years, and identify enough land to meet its housing requirements. Safeguarded sites, such as this one, are needed to meet the requirement for housing development in the Borough. Policy C3 requires the preparation of a masterplan.</p> <p>b) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network. Traffic management solutions will be included as part of the master plan required for this site.</p> <p>c) Noise and air pollution assessments will be required to be submitted along with any planning application. Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys will also be required as part of any planning application.</p> <p>d) The council have used several appropriate and suitable methods to communicate the details of the proposals during the last two years. In an effort to let all residents of the borough know about consultation opportunities throughout the process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was a quarter page item ‘Your area, your choice’ in the Winter 2010/11 edition of Forward (Issue 66) on page 4. This was to bring the process to the attention of all residents.</li> <li>- There was a further article on page 9 of the Winter 2011 edition.</li> <li>- Posters have been displayed in shops, doctors’ surgeries, dentists surgeries, church halls, community centres, schools, leisure centres, etc.</li> <li>- Members of our team attended every Area Committee meeting (or put on additional events for the ones which were cancelled due to the bad weather just before Christmas 2010).</li> <li>- We have spent days with a display in supermarkets – Booths (Penwortham and Longton), Sainsbury’s (Bamber Bridge), Morrisons (Leyland and Bamber Bridge), Tesco and Leyland Market to raise awareness at each stage of the consultation.</li> <li>- The full documents have been available in all South Ribble libraries and at the Civic Centre at every stage of the process and some post offices during the first two stages.</li> <li>- Each stage of the process has been promoted via our website and press releases/press notices.</li> <li>- All council meetings which have discussed the document, Cabinet and Council, were open to the public to attend.</li> <li>- Ward and parish councillors have been kept fully informed throughout the process and have provided essential liaison between planning officers and their constituents.</li> <li>- We have an extensive database of people who have expressed an interest in the Site Allocations DPD (over 2,000 contacts) who have all received letters or emails about the latest stage of the process.</li> </ul>
86	70	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) Moss Lane is totally unsuitable to be used for access to this proposed development site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Compromised Road Safety</li> <li>- Small amount of Pavement Area.</li> </ul>	<p>a) Traffic management will for part of the Master Plan required for this site.</p> <p>b) All suitable and appropriate methods of communication were used to inform residents for the borough that the plan was being consulted on. In an effort to let all residents of the Borough</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Single track Road</li> <li>- Road Weight Limit</li> <li>- Risk to the safety of current residents.</li> </ul> <p>b) The amended proposals are likely to cause as many problems as they solve and there have been inadequate attempts to consult with residents about the land usage changes affecting houses in Moss Lane and Murray Avenue.</p> <p>c) We note that under the original plans for this site the proposed development was for the Heatherleigh south side only. Following objections from Heatherleigh residents to the development, the proposal has now been amended to include all land between Bannister Lane and Moss Lane. The reason for this amendment was stated as “due to objections from the residents of Heatherleigh that the development was too dense for the area”. This amendment has shifted the problem from residents at Heatherleigh to the residents in Moss Lane, Murray Avenue, Marks Avenue, Five Acres, Croston Road and we would claim that the development is also too intense for this area which is also considerably more rural than that of Heatherleigh a purpose built housing estate next to the bypass. The scale of the proposed development should be substantially reduced to a development of less than one hundred houses cited in the space of the original plan but in a less dense arrangement therefore making less houses and satisfying the objections of the Heatherleigh and surrounding residents.</p> <p>d) We are pleased to see that Bannister Lane is not cited as a point of access for the proposed development, yet in comparison with Moss Lane, Bannister Lane has far better and safer pedestrian pavement access on the north and south side of the road. Measures should be taken to ensure that there is no access to the development from Moss Lane (particularly by vehicles), which could be achieved by making Moss Lane into a no through road and access to the development being exclusively via Heatherleigh at the original location.</p> <p>e) Previous plans for residential development to the land south of Moss have been rejected over the last thirty years, due to road access being unsuitable, cost of running services (sewers, drainage, power), road safety compromises and united objections from residents on Moss Lane and Murray Avenue. Have these previous applications been considered when considering changing this land from category D8 “Safeguarded land – not designated for any specific purpose” to developing this site for housing? We believe pressure on South Ribble Council to produce a number of new large housing sites to reach government targets of building new houses is creating poor judgements within the planning of new homes creating dramatic and irrevocable landscape changes. Until July 2012 this land was noted by the council as “Yellow land” “Safeguarded land – not designated for any specific purpose” and not for residential development. In this class it is noted that “maintenance of the land may be permitted provided that any landscape and wildlife features and access for recreation are protected”. The council has failed to protect this land and a large amount of trees were felled in May 2012. The council were notified of the felling on 22nd May 2012 but I believe nobody from the council has carried out any assessment to the damage done or visited the site. The damage is still visible now, and it is possible to do this assessment now. Why has this land use now changed? Changes have occurred without adequate attempts to notify residents in Moss Lane about the land usage proposed changes. The impact of the development will be extremely harmful to the interests and safety of residents of Moss Lane, causing considerable loss of amenity and changing the whole landscape and environment. This will substantially affect the living experience of residents and is likely to result in loss in the value of houses in Moss Lane. We recommend that the proposed development is abandoned for all the reasons identified above. In particular we would add that the countryside in this beautiful area should not be irrevocably damaged and should be properly protected for future generations to use and enjoy. The Council should take account of the fact that its decision on land usage is likely to be ultra vires owing to the inadequate consultation with neighbouring residents and needs to run a new full consultation on the proposal to redesignate the land south of Moss Lane.</p>	<p>know about consultation opportunities throughout the process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was a quarter page item ‘Your area, your choice’ in the Winter 2010/11 edition of Forward (Issue 66) on page 4. This was to bring the process to the attention of all residents.</li> <li>- There was a further article on page 9 of the Winter 2011 edition.</li> <li>- Posters have been displayed in shops, doctors’ surgeries, dentists surgeries, church halls, community centres, schools, leisure centres, etc.</li> <li>- Members of our team attended every Area Committee meeting (or put on additional events for the ones which were cancelled due to the bad weather just before Christmas 2010).</li> <li>- We have spent days with a display in supermarkets – Booths (Penwortham and Longton), Sainsbury’s (Bamber Bridge), Morrisons (Leyland and Bamber Bridge), Tesco and Leyland Market to raise awareness at each stage of the consultation.</li> <li>- The full documents have been available in all South Ribble libraries and at the Civic Centre at every stage of the process and some post offices during the first two stages.</li> <li>- Each stage of the process has been promoted via our website and press releases/press notices.</li> <li>- All council meetings which have discussed the document, Cabinet and Council, were open to the public to attend.</li> <li>- Ward and parish councillors have been kept fully informed throughout the process and have provided essential liaison between planning officers and their constituents.</li> <li>- We have an extensive database of people who have expressed an interest in the Site Allocations DPD (over 2,000 contacts) who have all received letters or emails about the latest stage of the process.</li> </ul> <p>c) The site was extended to allow lower densities of dwelling to reflect the surrounding areas.</p> <p>d) The Council does not consider Bannister Lane to be a suitable access, and would not support a proposal with access from here. Master plan for the site will identify suitable accesses for consideration.</p> <p>e) This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development. There is no designation of “Yellow Land”. Land shown in yellow on the Local Plan is designated as “Safeguarded Land”, which falls within Policy D8 in the Local Plan. This land was not designated for any specific purpose in the Local Plan. It was identified to ensure that Green Belt boundaries would not need to be altered at the end of a the plan period, it safeguards land between the urban areas and the Green Belt to meet longer term development needs. Whilst new development has already taken place in the area, the Council is now in a position where it has to review its Plan for the next 15 years, and identify enough land to meet its housing requirements. Safeguarded sites, such as this one, are needed to meet the requirement for housing development in the Borough. Policy C3 requires the preparation of a masterplan.</p> <p>f) This site has been subject to a sustainability appraisal as part of the consideration for its development.</p> <p>g) This site is not within a recognised flood risk area.</p> <p>h) Noise and air pollution assessments will be required along with any planning application on this land. Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys will also be required as part of any planning application.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>f) We would question whether this development can possibly meet any “sustainability” test given the issues raised here.</p> <p>g) The proposed development threatens existing water drainage provision in Moss Lane. There is a crucially important drainage ditch on the north side and some parts north and south side of the road which would be compromised by any changes to the road layout. These drainage ditches are essential for the movement of water to disperse efficiently and reduce potential flood risk. For many months of the year the front gardens of the houses on Moss Lane are full of water.</p> <p>h) As well as causing road safety hazards, more vehicles and pedestrians using Moss Lane will cause significant increased noise and disturbance for residents of Moss Lane and completely change the character of a peaceful residential road.</p>	
88	72	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) Your highlight plan appears to cover house already on Croston road, is this a mistake? Therefore, is there a need to build on this site, when there are other unused site is a concern, and feels like you are just land grabbing.</p> <p>b) The description of type of houses and use is very limited, and needs to be more expansive, or do you not know, or hiding the reason. It's indicated to be complete in 15 years, is the build to be done in zones, you must have program.</p> <p>c) How do you stop hindrance to houses already built.</p>	<p>a) The boundary of the site at Croston Road has been drawn incorrectly. <b>Minor Change:</b> a revised boundary will be drawn and submitted to the Inspector, excluding residential properties on Croston Road. This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development. Whilst new development has already taken place in the area, the Council is now in a position where it has to review its Plan for the next 15 years, and identify enough land to meet its housing requirements. Safeguarded sites, such as this one, are needed to meet the requirement for housing development in the Borough. Policy C3 requires the preparation of a masterplan.</p> <p>b) A required master plan will show any design and style of buildings to be developed on the site and these will be brought forward in phases as detailed in Chapter D table 2.</p> <p>c) This matter will be addressed through the masterplan.</p>
89	73	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) This proposal would increase traffic on the Croston Road. On the accepted calculation of 1.5 cars per household we will see an increase of at least 975 vehicles. At the present time there is speed reducing devices on Croston Road. However, there is still too many vehicles using this road and a large number of cars are parked on the road from Moss lane to the traffic lines south. The road safety will be compromised and it would be unsafe for the children living in and around Croston road.</p> <p>b) This increases the noise pollution as well as the increased general pollution due to the fumes.</p> <p>c) There are inadequate resident amenities, such as play areas and parks etc. There is no Post Office or any shops in this area. The available sub post office at SPAR shop will be over-subscribed.</p> <p>d) A large number of houses being built behind the Croston road area will lead to overshadowing and our house being over looked by the new houses.</p> <p>e) At the present time the road gets flooded after a heavy rain. In addition, the grounds are quite wet during the rainy season. With further development of new houses the ground water level will rise leading to flooding and subsidence, which may damage the properties. The existing character of the old houses and the presence of farm land which is a great attraction of Farington Moss will be completely destroyed.</p> <p>f) The new houses will be completely out of character and will not fit in with the character and appearance of the surrounding area.</p> <p>g) The density of housing will be too dense, definitely higher than that found in this area.</p> <p>h) There will be an increase in the number of vermin in the area with more houses being built. The rats and other animals who live in the land will be displaced and will increasingly enter the housing units spreading disease.</p>	<p>a) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</p> <p>b) Noise and air pollution assessments will be required along with any planning application on this land.</p> <p>c) This site is residential led and a master plan will identify the additional requirements for infrastructure such as shops etc.</p> <p>d) This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development. Whilst new development has already taken place in the area, the Council is now in a position where it has to review its Plan for the next 15 years, and identify enough land to meet its housing requirements. Safeguarded sites, such as this one, are needed to meet the requirement for housing development in the Borough.</p> <p>e) The proposed site is not in a recognised flood plain.</p> <p>f) Once a planning application is made, that it the opportunity to comment on specific issues of the development.</p> <p>g) The allocation was extended in response to concerns raised about density in the Preferred Options round of consultation.</p> <p>h) South Ribble Borough Council provides a free service to all South Ribble residents, for the treatment of rats and mice and should be contacted in the event of any problems of this nature.</p>
95	78	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) I wish to register my objection to the development of lands from Heatherleigh to Moss Lane.</p>	<p>a) Noted.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
97	80	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) I object to the above-mentioned as it adds substantial additional noise and air pollution on top of that already created by local industrial units and A roads.</p> <p>b) The character of the area is destroyed – changing from semi-rural to urban. There is an abundance of wildlife – foxes, badgers, herons, swans, etc – which will be hugely impacted and the landscape will be detrimentally altered.</p> <p>c) The increased traffic generated along this overused road, will create additional problems in respect of road safety.</p> <p>d) I also believe there will be a huge impact on the value and saleability of houses on Croston Road as the unique open land to the rear will have been taken away. This is clearly unreasonable and unfair.</p>	<p>a) Noted. Noise and air pollution assessments will be required along with any planning application on this land.</p> <p>b) Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys will also be required as part of any planning application.</p> <p>c) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</p> <p>d) This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development. Whilst new development has already taken place in the area, the Council is now in a position where it has to review its Plan for the next 15 years, and identify enough land to meet its housing requirements. Safeguarded sites, such as this one, are needed to meet the requirement for housing development in the Borough. Policy C3 requires the preparation of a masterplan.</p>
98	80	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) I would like to register my concerns regarding the above-mentioned development proposal.</p> <p>b) I believe the development will have a material impact on the value of houses on Croston Road. The area will have its character changed entirely from semi-rural to out and out urban. I think an increased visual and odour pollution to the front of the property caused by the waste plant, followed by an increase in the tip size have already started to impinge on and cause substantial detriment to local residents.</p> <p>c) I believe there are already reasons to be concerned about road safety in this area. Speed bumps have been put in over the last few years but the volume and nature of the traffic means the road is a safety hazard and the increased levels created by the development will further compromise road safety.</p> <p>d) Noise and air pollution will be unfairly and substantially increased and affect houses that have already had to bear significant odour pollution from previous planning disasters in the area.</p> <p>e) The landscape will be hugely impacted as will the wildlife and both will create a completely different feel to the area.</p>	<p>a) Noted.</p> <p>b) This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development. Whilst new development has already taken place in the area, the Council is now in a position where it has to review its Plan for the next 15 years, and identify enough land to meet its housing requirements. Safeguarded sites, such as this one, are needed to meet the requirement for housing development in the Borough. Policy C3 requires the preparation of a masterplan.</p> <p>c) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</p> <p>d) Noise and air pollution assessments will be required along with any planning application on this land. Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys will also be required as part of any planning application.</p> <p>e) Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys will also be required as part of any planning application.</p>
102	83	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) I am strongly objecting to the plans for building on the land directly next to my property at the end of Murray Avenue Farrington Moss.</p>	<p>a) Noted</p>
108	85	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) This proposal would have a significant and detrimental impact on the local residents. When purchasing the properties along Bannister Lane, the residents (some of 20+years) purchased the houses for the quiet, semi-rural and no-through road position. There will undoubtedly be a negative impact on the value of our properties; putting a further squeeze onto everyone's already stretched financial situation, as a result of the current recession. I object to the proposed housing on site 'W' but instead favour, if there needed to be a major residential development within the Farrington moss general area, the proposals at site 'FF' (Test Track) as defined in Policy C2.</p> <p>b) It is also proposing to have an impact and loss on local businesses, namely loss of farmed agricultural land at Model Farm, Croston Road, Farrington Moss and loss of glass houses and associated buildings necessary to a horticultural nursery supply business.</p> <p>c) It is also difficult to see how the proposals would be able to retain the green corridors already in situ, providing valuable wildlife habitat and foraging routes for birds and bats. Which is a further recommendation within the document (Policy G10, 12 and 13) and in doing so contradicts itself.</p> <p>d) The statement that 'there is to be no access to the site from Bannister Lane' is all well and good but needs to be upheld.</p>	<p>a) This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development. Whilst new development has already taken place in the area, the Council is now in a position where it has to review its Plan for the next 15 years, and identify enough land to meet its housing requirements. Safeguarded sites, such as this one, are needed to meet the requirement for housing development in the Borough. Policy C3 requires the preparation of a masterplan. Site FF (Moss Site Test Track) is also proposed for allocation.</p> <p>b) The emerging plan includes land identified for future employment to meet the needs of a growing population.</p> <p>c) Noise and air pollution assessments will be required along with any planning application on this land. Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys will also be required as part of any planning application.</p> <p>d) Noted.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
120	90	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) We support the inclusion of the wider site within the emerging DPD. Policy D1 states that the site could accommodate 600 dwellings within the plan period. Our client's land would provide some 150 dwellings of this capacity.</p> <p>b) We consider that there should be flexibility and that the number of dwellings should be specifically referred to as a minimum.</p> <p>c) The annual delivery of housing on this site, shown in table 2, should indicate the minimum level of housing which could be exceeded.</p> <p>d) We agree that a masterplan is prepared for the key land interests across the site. This support is based on that exercise being undertaken as soon as possible so that the site can deliver early in the plan period.</p> <p>e) We contest the requirement that there be no access to the site from Banister Lane. We consider that there is no justification for such a restriction, and the submissions (copy enclosed) by our client's highway consultants demonstrate why this is not necessary. Its conclusions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it would provide greater integration with the existing urban area;</li> <li>• technically the proposed development can be easily accessed off Bannister Lane, with some localised widening;</li> <li>• the layout of Bannister Lane with the proposed widening would fully accord with the latest highway design standards/guides;</li> <li>• in terms of capacity, the existing Bannister Lane/Croston Road junction can easily accommodate the additional development traffic;</li> <li>• the proposal for the limited 150 houses will be suitably integrated with the wider allocation site by facilitating through pedestrian and cycle movement along a 'green lane' type route from north to south. There will be no physical vehicular route via the site through to Flensburg Way/Penwortham Way;</li> <li>• the proposals will not prejudice the overall masterplan approach to the development of the wider allocation site;</li> <li>• given the large size of the wider site and its location, it would be preferable to have multiple access points to increase permeability and integration of the overall site by all modes of transport; and,</li> <li>• the proposed access off Bannister Lane will also assist in integrating the existing dwellings on Bannister Lane to the wider proposals in this area.</li> </ul> <p>f) In addition, a public exhibition is to be held on southern part of the wider site on Tuesday, 14th August 2012. As part of this public exhibition, a master plan has been produced which shows an area of development accessed directly off Bannister Lane. We understand this has been agreed in discussions between the landowner in that case and the council. This clearly demonstrates that Bannister Lane is appropriate for a level of development. Our submitted highway report confirms that circa 150 dwellings could be accessed from north of Bannister Lane.</p>	<p>a) Noted.</p> <p>b) No change in the policy wording. The number of dwellings has been calculated to allow for other opportunities for development on the site, as set out in Policy C3(a).</p> <p>c) The annual building rates contained in table 2 are the Council's best estimate, based on a variety of factors including liaison with landowners and housebuilders.</p> <p>d) Noted and welcomed.</p> <p>e) Bannister Lane is not a suitable access, and the Council will not support a proposal with access from Bannister Lane.</p> <p>f) It is not true to say that any agreement has been reached between a landowner and the Council concerning the development of this site. The Council considers the number of dwellings suitable for development on this site to be appropriate, given the location/area of the site, and the requirement contained in Policy C3 for the Masterplan to incorporate community and leisure facilities.</p>
125	91	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) This proposal would greatly increase traffic on all local roads eg Croston Road and Bannister Lane, compromising road safety which is already a problem on these roads. Bannister Lane in particular has dangerous access onto Croston Road. I have just returned from the Public Consultation session held by Leigh Hough who are submitting a planning application for 350 houses on part of the site. Their plan includes 18 new houses with access onto Bannister Lane along with footpath and cycle path access even though the South Ribble Master Plan states in paragraph 6.25 "Access to the site must be from Croston Road, Heatherleigh and Moss Lane. There is to be no access to the site from Bannister Lane."</p> <p>b) The proposed plans will totally ruin the character of this semi-rural area by loss of landscape and wildlife, and increase noise and air pollution.</p> <p>c) It will also mean a loss of value of properties in the area as the houses are currently surrounded by large areas of open land which is a great selling feature and was the reason that most of the current residents invested their hard earned money and life's in this area.</p>	<p>a) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network. Policy C3 requires a master plan for the whole site and this remains the council's position. This will enable comprehensive development of the site to meet the overall requirements.</p> <p>b) Noise and air pollution assessments will be required along with any planning application on this land. Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys will also be required as part of any planning application.</p> <p>c) This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development. Whilst new development has already taken place in the area, the Council is now in a position where it has to review its Plan for the next 15 years, and identify enough land to meet its housing requirements. Safeguarded sites, such as this one, are needed to meet the requirement for housing development in the Borough.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
135	93	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	a) Add the following criteria be added to the policy: d) <i>The Masterplan including an assessment of the ecology of the site and how its biodiversity will be protected, conserved and enhanced.</i>	a) Noted. Biodiversity aspects will be considered against other plan policies, including Core Strategy Policies 18 and 22, and DPD Policies G7 and G8.
164	97	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	a) I object very strongly to the proposed development of 650 dwellings on land off Croston Road. We moved to Farington Moss because of the green fields and country feel of the area. This development will turn out to be another Buckshaw Village where there are still many houses left to sell. Croston Road residents already have to put up with the smells from the Global Renewables Site which Lancashire County Council said would not smell and cause us problems. b) Croston Road already has traffic calming measures on it because of the speed of traffic and this proposed development would increase the traffic flow by at least 1000 cars in the morning and the same in the evening. c) Is Leyland suddenly to become a boomtown for employment, I think not. d) Living in a bungalow next to the proposed entrance to the estate would result in unnecessary noise extra traffic and pollution. I have heard that land has already been purchased by a major house builder who has already been measuring Moss Lane for access to his estate.	a) This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development. Whilst new development has already taken place in the area, the Council is now in a position where it has to review its Plan for the next 15 years, and identify enough land to meet its housing requirements. Safeguarded sites, such as this one, are needed to meet the requirement for housing development in the Borough. b) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network. c) The emerging plan includes land identified for future employment to meet the needs of a growing population. d) Noise and air pollution assessments will be required to be submitted along with any planning application.
187	101	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	a) Leyland is already overcrowded and over populated with motor vehicles, many of which frequently use Croston Road as a rat run to avoid frequent severe congestion on the by-pass. In recent times property values throughout the country have been dramatically reduced. The proposals will further diminish the values. Consideration must be given to the impact on individuals like me and not purely the wider gains to the town which will probably create many more problems than they solve. b) There are insufficient school places to accommodate the potential influx of children the proposed developments could bring. There is currently nothing for families to do at week-ends; no places to go, no entertainment facilities. And no proposals to create any! Leyland already has too many homes and not enough of everything else that the people who live in those homes, need. c) My own property includes three stables and two paddocks. The outlined properties around my own come far too close to the paddocks and in doing so propose a serious risk to the safety of riders in the paddocks if and when noise, etc., spook a horse.	a) This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development. The Council is required to identify land to allow building of a minimum of 417 dwellings per annum. This cannot be done using existing development sites and brownfield land only, some greenfield land is also needed. During the last five years, the build rate has been lower than this, and so the supply of land will need to be increased beyond 417 dwellings and will need to meet the requirement and shortfall. b) Community infrastructure including schools will be considered as part of a required master plan for the site. The Council is working closely with relevant bodies, such as the PCT, United Utilities, the Environment Agency and the Education Authority to ensure there is adequate provision of services in the area. c) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.
188	102	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	a) Increase road traffic and pedestrians, compromising road safety. b) Change to the character of the area, loss of wildlife and landscape. c) Increased noise and air pollution. d) Loss of value to the properties as our houses are unique with open land to the rear which is a great selling feature and which would be lost. Negative effect on the character of the neighbourhood which is currently semi-rural.	a) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network. b) Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys will also be required as part of any planning application. c) Noise and air pollution assessments will be required to be submitted along with any planning application. d) This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development. The Council is required to identify land to allow building of a minimum of 417 dwellings per annum. This cannot be done using existing development sites and brownfield land only, some greenfield land is also needed. During the last five years, the build rate has been lower than this, and so the supply of land will need to be increased beyond 417 dwellings and will need to meet the requirement and shortfall.
189	103	Chapter C - Policy	Please see identical representation Ref 102, ID 188.	Please see identical representation Ref 102, ID 188.

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
		C3 - Site W		
190	104	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	Please see identical representation Ref 102, ID 188.	Please see identical representation Ref 102, ID 188.
191	105	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) Destruction of semi-rural aspect to rear of our property (which we have enjoyed for over 13 years), being one of the key reasons why we purchased the property. Likely depreciation of our property value due to destruction of semi-rural location with open outlook to rear of property.</p> <p>b) Destruction of wildlife habitat and associated wildlife corridors – especially the large hawthorn hedgerow along the rear garden boundary of properties along southern side of Bannister Lane. The proposed development will remove moss habitat, wildlife and increase air and noise pollution. Has a detailed environmental impact assessment been performed and, if so where is this for inspection and comment by residents?</p> <p>c) The suggested addition of 18 houses to Bannister Lane (and likely through traffic from planned development via an easily removed plastic emergency barrier?) will increase vehicular traffic along what is a narrow lane hence increasing risk of traffic accidents, air and noise pollution. This will effectively destroy the existing quiet semi-rural cul-de-sac character of Bannister Lane.</p> <p>d) Any attempt to widen Bannister Lane as part of any ‘improvement’ would destroy the existing character of the land.</p> <p>e) The suggested social housing, eg ‘new village street’ – incorporating mews/apartment type properties appears to be immediately to the rear of our property and is completely out of character with the traditional 1930s ribbon development, with loss of privacy where overlooked. The inclusion of social housing is incompatible with the area and will have a negative impact on the socio-economic structure of the neighbourhood and may give rise to increased local crime.</p>	<p>a) This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development.</p> <p>b) Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys will also be required as part of any planning application. Noise and air pollution assessments will be required along with any planning application on this land.</p> <p>c) The Council maintains that Bannister Lane is not a suitable access, and would not support a proposal with access from here.</p> <p>d) No comments can be made on the plan seen by the respondent as no planning application has been submitted.</p> <p>e) Inclusion of affordable housing in a development of this size is a requirement of the NPPF and adopted Core Strategy. Policy 7 of the adopted Core Strategy requires the provision of sufficient affordable and special needs housing. Delivering affordable housing is a key government objective aimed at enabling everyone to have a decent home that they can afford.</p>
192	106	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	Please see identical representation Ref No: 105, ID191	Please see identical representation Ref No: 105, ID191
194	107	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	Please see identical representation Ref No: 105, ID191	Please see identical representation Ref No: 105, ID191
198	108	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) This proposal would have a significant and detrimental impact on the local residents. When purchasing the properties along Bannister Lane, the residents (some of 20+years) purchased the houses for the quiet, semi-rural and no-through road position. There will undoubtedly be a negative impact on the value of our properties; putting a further squeeze onto everyone’s already stretched financial situation, as a result of the current recession. I object to the proposed housing on site ‘W’ but instead favour, if there needed to be a major residential development within the Farington moss general area, the proposals at site ‘FF’ (Test Track) as defined in Policy C2.</p> <p>b) It is also proposing to have an impact and loss on local businesses, namely loss of farmed agricultural land at Model Farm, Croston Road, Farington Moss and loss of glass houses and associated buildings necessary to a horticultural nursery supply business.</p> <p>c) It is also difficult to see how the proposals would be able to retain the green corridors already in situ, providing valuable wildlife habitat and foraging routes for birds and bats. Which is a further recommendation within the document (Policy G10, 12 and 13) and in doing so contradicts itself.</p> <p>d) The statement that ‘there is to be no access to the site from Bannister Lane’ is all well and good but needs to be upheld.</p>	<p>a) This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development. Whilst new development has already taken place in the area, the Council is now in a position where it has to review its Plan for the next 15 years, and identify enough land to meet its housing requirements. Safeguarded sites, such as this one, are needed to meet the requirement for housing development in the Borough. Policy C3 requires the preparation of a masterplan. Site FF (Moss Site Test Track) is also proposed for allocation.</p> <p>b) The emerging plan includes land identified for future employment to meet the needs of a growing population.</p> <p>c) Noise and air pollution assessments will be required along with any planning application on this land. Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys will also be required as part of any planning application.</p> <p>d) Noted.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
199	109	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) My main concern living on Bannister Lane is extra traffic on the Lane – which can only just cope with the amount there is already. In addition, Croston Road cannot, in my opinion, take any more traffic.</p> <p>b) I am concerned at the devaluation of my property which currently is classed as semi-rural – we will all lose out financially.</p> <p>c) Lea Hough state that some of the building will be for ‘affordable housing’ – I take this to mean ‘council tenants’ – which if I am honest, I do not want living in the direct vicinity of my property.</p> <p>d) Local schools, doctors and dentists do not have capacity to take on this level of new patients as they are currently full – with 300 properties minimum, the number of extra patients/schoolchildren will increase considerably.</p> <p>e) I am also appalled that the consultation event was held yesterday following a leaflet through my door last week – and the closing date for yourselves is today. This does not give anyone time to digest or respond in a reasonable timeframe.</p>	<p>a) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</p> <p>b) This site has been safeguarded for development for many years, and has therefore always been considered to be suitable for development.</p> <p>c) Inclusion of affordable housing in a development of this size is a requirement of the NPPF and adopted Core Strategy. Policy 7 of the adopted Core Strategy requires the provision of sufficient affordable and special needs housing. Delivering affordable housing is a key government objective aimed at enabling everyone to have a decent home that they can afford. A master plan for comprehensive development of the whole site is a requirement of policy C3.</p> <p>d) The Council is working closely with relevant bodies, such as the PCT, United Utilities, the Environment Agency and the Education Authority to ensure there is adequate provision of services in the area. Community infrastructure will form part of the overall master plan for the site and the reason the whole site is covered by policy C3.</p> <p>e) This event was not involving the council and we had no input into the proposals demonstrated. In an effort to let all residents of the borough know about consultation opportunities throughout the site allocation process over the last couple of years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was a quarter page item ‘Your area, your choice’ in the Winter 2010/11 edition of Forward (Issue 66) on page 4. This was to bring the process to the attention of all residents.</li> <li>- There was a further article on page 9 of the Winter 2011 edition.</li> <li>- Posters have been displayed in shops, doctors’ surgeries, dentists surgeries, church halls, community centres, schools, leisure centres, etc.</li> <li>- Members of our team attended every Area Committee meeting (or put on additional events for the ones which were cancelled due to the bad weather just before Christmas 2010).</li> <li>- We have spent days with a display in supermarkets – Booths (Penwortham and Longton), Sainsbury’s (Bamber Bridge), Morrisons (Leyland and Bamber Bridge), Tesco and Leyland Market to raise awareness at each stage of the consultation.</li> <li>- The full documents have been available in all South Ribble libraries and at the Civic Centre at every stage of the process and some post offices during the first two stages.</li> <li>- Each stage of the process has been promoted via our website and press releases/press notices.</li> <li>- All council meetings which have discussed the document, Cabinet and Council, were open to the public to attend.</li> <li>- Ward and parish councillors have been kept fully informed throughout the process and have provided essential liaison between planning officers and their constituents.</li> <li>- We have an extensive database of people who have expressed an interest in the Site Allocations DPD (over 2,000 contacts) who have all received letters or emails about the latest stage of the process.</li> </ul>
200	110	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) The proposal in relation to this area cannot be supported in its current form due to the stipulation that access to the site must be via Croston Road. For the size of this development 1000+ properties Croston Road is simply not a suitable main access point even if access is spread across three locations along Croston Road. Even with the S106 and CIL contributions it is not practical to expect any infrastructure improvements to alter the character of Croston Road sufficiently to support such an increase in the volume of traffic that such a development would inevitable generate.</p>	<p>a) The number of properties proposed for this site is 600 over the plan period (to 2026). Access to this site will be determined by the required master plan and has to date not been decided, other than Bannister Lane not being deemed a suitable access point.</p>
207	112	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) The proposal states that the proposed development of +1,000 homes will be accessed via Croston Road. This is not a suitable main access point. Croston Road is not capable of supporting the volume of traffic that a development of this size would attract, even if the</p>	<p>a) The number of properties proposed for this site is 600 over the plan period (to 2026). Access to this site will be determined by the required master plan and has to date not been</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			access was split across three locations. Neither could any infrastructure improvements be sufficient to alter the character of Croston Road sufficiently enough to support such an inevitable increase traffic volume.	decided. Other than Bannister lane not being deemed a suitable access point
211	116	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) Represent the interests of the Farington Moss Residents Action Group; a large group of residents whose concern is to ensure that the safety, character and amenity of their own homes are not compromised by inappropriate development of the surrounding area.</p> <p>b) Objection to the proposed allocation of land for development between Heatherleigh and Moss Lane as defined in the published LDF Policy C3, Map Ref W, but support the original (SR110) proposals attempting to include amenity space within any proposed development.</p> <p>c) Site allocation should be abandoned because of compromised road safety, increased traffic, reduced green space, destruction of established wildlife, loss of amenity, loss of value, increased noise and air pollution, increased flood risk and water drainage problems.</p> <p>d) No detail is provided of any planned infrastructure developments or recommendations such as increasing local road network capacity, enlisting the help of Sustrans in the development of appropriate access routes, and engaging Fishwick and Sons bus company to increase the usability of their Croston road bus route.</p> <p>e) Concern about use of Moss Lane as an access point because of its single track status.</p> <p>f) Inadequate direct consultation with neighbouring residents. Council needs to run a new full consultation on the proposal to redesignate the land south of Moss Lane to avoid lengthy legal processes. Until that point the land use should be returned to protected yellow land.</p> <p>g) HCA and the Landowner consortium should engage with the Farington Moss Residents Action Group.</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) Noted.</p> <p>c) This land has been identified as safeguarded development land for development since the last local plan in 2000. The site does not form part of a wildlife protection areas or a flood zone, and a master plan will identify appropriate access to the site and necessary road improvements to meet those needs. Noise and air pollution assessments will be required along with any planning application on this land. Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys will also be required as part of any planning application.</p> <p>d) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will inform the masterplanning of this site, and will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</p> <p>e) The access at Moss Lane will be taken from a spur to the Flensberg Way roundabout, not from the Croston Road end. <b>Minor Change</b> to the first sentence of para 6.25 to read: “.....from Croston Road, Heatherleigh and Moss Lane (via the roundabout at Flensberg Way).”</p> <p>f) The Council is satisfied that it has undertaken its duties of consultation correctly. In an effort to let all residents of the borough know about consultation opportunities throughout the process over the last couple of years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was a quarter page item ‘Your area, your choice’ in the Winter 2010/11 edition of Forward (Issue 66) on page 4. This was to bring the process to the attention of all residents.</li> <li>• There was a further article on page 9 of the Winter 2011 edition.</li> <li>• Posters have been displayed in shops, doctors’ surgeries, dentists surgeries, church halls, community centres, schools, leisure centres, etc.</li> <li>• Members of our team attended every Area Committee meeting (or put on additional events for the ones which were cancelled due to the bad weather just before Christmas 2010).</li> <li>• We have spent days with a display in supermarkets – Booths (Penwortham and Longton), Sainsbury’s (Bamber Bridge), Morrisons (Leyland and Bamber Bridge), Tesco and Leyland Market to raise awareness at each stage of the consultation.</li> <li>• The full documents have been available in all South Ribble libraries and at the Civic Centre at every stage of the process and some post offices during the first two stages.</li> <li>• Each stage of the process has been promoted via our website and press releases/press notices.</li> <li>• All council meetings which have discussed the document, Cabinet and Council, were open to the public to attend.</li> <li>• Ward and parish councillors have been kept fully informed throughout the process and have provided essential liaison between planning officers and their constituents.</li> <li>• We have an extensive database of people who have expressed an interest in the Site Allocations DPD (over 2,000 contacts) who have all received letters or emails about the latest stage of the process.</li> </ul> <p>g) Noted. Members of the Group have already met with senior staff in the Planning Department.</p>
220	124	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) According to this plan the majority of access to the proposed area will be via Croston Road. This road is already extremely over stretched with long delays specially during the rush traffic hours. To add the traffic of another 1000 or more houses would be totally inappropriate and unsustainable. In addition the heavy traffic on this road is already presenting a dangerous prospect when it comes to not only car drivers but children and</p>	<p>a) The site is allocated to provide 600 houses and the master plan required will identify appropriate accesses to the site other than Bannister Lane. LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>families having to cross the road in order to reach their school or the shops. It cannot be possible to improve the road safety to such a standard so that it would be acceptable in order to ensure health and safety, as well as a reasonable flow of traffic.</p>	
267	141	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) Strong objection to the proposed development site, it is not appropriate for the area and would create a completely different atmosphere to the one enjoyed by current residents. Change of character to a lovely area. Loss of house value as these houses in this area are attractive due to their rural location. It seems this is an unnecessary building project and has little support and lots of opposition. There are lots of houses for sale in Leyland and Buckshaw village which would fulfil this type of housing need.</p> <p>b) Increase traffic and cause risk to road safety (especially on moss lane)</p> <p>c) Loss of wildlife ecosystem</p> <p>d) Loss of land drainage on the field</p> <p>e) It is important to consult with people properly on any future developments and I found out about this proposal via word of mouth which is not very good.</p>	<p>a) This land has been identified as safeguarded development land since the last local plan in 2000. The requirement to provide housing land is set nationally and site W is identified to meet those targets. The Council is required to identify land to allow building of a minimum of 417 dwellings per year. This cannot be done using existing development sites and brownfield land only, some greenfield land is also needed. During the last five years, the build rate has been much lower than this, meaning the borough is now in a situation of under provision.</p> <p>b) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</p> <p>c) Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys will be required as part of any planning application.</p> <p>d) The site does not form part of a flood zone and a master plan will identify appropriate access to the site and necessary road improvements to meet those.</p> <p>e) In an effort to let all residents of the borough know about consultation opportunities throughout the process over the last couple of years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was a quarter page item 'Your area, your choice' in the Winter 2010/11 edition of Forward (Issue 66) on page 4. This was to bring the process to the attention of all residents.</li> <li>- There was a further article on page 9 of the Winter 2011 edition.</li> <li>- Posters have been displayed in shops, doctors' surgeries, dentists surgeries, church halls, community centres, schools, leisure centres, etc.</li> <li>- Members of our team attended every Area Committee meeting (or put on additional events for the ones which were cancelled due to the bad weather just before Christmas 2010).</li> <li>- We have spent days with a display in supermarkets – Booths (Penwortham and Longton), Sainsbury's (Bamber Bridge), Morrisons (Leyland and Bamber Bridge), Tesco and Leyland Market to raise awareness at each stage of the consultation.</li> <li>- The full documents have been available in all South Ribble libraries and at the Civic Centre at every stage of the process and some post offices during the first two stages.</li> <li>- Each stage of the process has been promoted via our website and press releases/press notices.</li> <li>- All council meetings which have discussed the document, Cabinet and Council, were open to the public to attend.</li> <li>- Ward and parish councillors have been kept fully informed throughout the process and have provided essential liaison between planning officers and their constituents.</li> <li>- We have an extensive database of people who have expressed an interest in the Site Allocations DPD (over 2,000 contacts) who have all received letters or emails about the latest stage of the process.</li> </ul>
268	142	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) The land is wholly controlled by two entities, the Homes and Communities Agency and a Consortium of landowners. It is an excellent opportunity to appropriately and suitably infill what is already an area of relatively comprehensive residential development.</p> <p>b) The land has long since been identified as potentially suitable for the delivery of residential development and it the landowners view that it is now an appropriate time for the site to be brought forward to that end.</p> <p>c) The Croston Road site is in accordance with the Core Strategy and the key principles of the NPPF. It is deliverable in the short term and as such the proposed phasing of development is supported. The allocation of the site for residential use is suitable, available and achievable and is strongly supported.</p> <p>d) Masterplanning is well advanced: the land can deliver approximately 300-350 units. There</p>	<p>a to c)Noted.</p> <p>d) Noted, however Bannister Lane is not a suitable access, and the Council will not support a proposal with access from Bannister Lane.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			are several opportunities to access the site from Heatherleigh, Croston Road and Bannister Lane.	
270	144	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) Most of the residents in this area do not know about this plan.</p> <p>b) The main reason for my objections are increase in traffic</p> <p>c) Possibility of devaluation of property which has already occurred due to the waste plant so you are making it an impossible task to sell. It will also ruin the landscape and I am sure there are other areas in Leyland where this can go I think we have had our fair share with the waste plant being built.</p> <p>d) I am concerned about the risk of more surface water run off due to the fact my house already flooded this year. I feel the river Lostock will also not be able to cope with any more water which will cause a very big risk to all the residents on Bispham Ave and put them in danger.</p> <p>e) I am worried about the school situation I have to young children and I do not want to have difficulty getting them in to local school because new houses means people with children which could potentially lead to over-crowding in schools.</p>	<p>a) In an effort to let all residents of the Borough know about consultation opportunities throughout the process over the last couple of years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was a quarter page item 'Your area, your choice' in the Winter 2010/11 edition of Forward (Issue 66) on page 4. This was to bring the process to the attention of all residents.</li> <li>- There was a further article on page 9 of the Winter 2011 edition.</li> <li>- Posters have been displayed in shops, doctors' surgeries, dentists surgeries, church halls, community centres, schools, leisure centres, etc.</li> <li>- Members of our team attended every Area Committee meeting (or put on additional events for the ones which were cancelled due to the bad weather just before Christmas 2010).</li> <li>- We have spent days with a display in supermarkets – Booths (Penwortham and Longton), Sainsbury's (Bamber Bridge), Morrisons (Leyland and Bamber Bridge), Tesco and Leyland Market to raise awareness at each stage of the consultation.</li> <li>- The full documents have been available in all South Ribble libraries and at the Civic Centre at every stage of the process and some post offices during the first two stages.</li> <li>- Each stage of the process has been promoted via our website and press releases/press notices.</li> <li>- All council meetings which have discussed the document, Cabinet and Council, were open to the public to attend.</li> <li>- Ward and parish councillors have been kept fully informed throughout the process and have provided essential liaison between planning officers and their constituents.</li> <li>- We have an extensive database of people who have expressed an interest in the Site Allocations DPD (over 2,000 contacts) who have all received letters or emails about the latest stage of the process.</li> </ul> <p>b) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</p> <p>c) This land has been identified as development land since the last local plan in 2000. The requirement to provide housing land is set nationally and site W is identified to meet those targets, which are now incorporated into the Adopted Core Strategy for Central Lancashire.</p> <p>d) The site is does not form part of a flood zone and a master plan will identify appropriate access to the site and necessary road improvements to meet those.</p> <p>e) The Council is working closely with relevant bodies, such as the PCT, United Utilities, the Environment Agency and the Education Authority to ensure there is adequate provision of services in the area.</p>
288	149	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) Supports the allocation of this site within the DPD as a major site for residential development (Policy C3), recognising the need to secure comprehensive development of the site, including community uses and infrastructure. Welcomes the Council's decision to allocate the larger area of land, previously safeguarded.</p> <p>b) Considers that the allocation is deliverable and justified, and provides a robust evidence base to support the policy. Development Statements have been prepared and submitted to the Council and are available.</p> <p>c) Masterplanning work completed as part of the Development Statements respects the Council's desire to restrict access from the site onto Bannister Lane and proposes only new on-street frontage development, effectively retaining Bannister Lane as a cul-de-sac.</p> <p>d) Detailed technical and environmental baseline work, masterplanning and public consultation is currently being undertaken to support the submission of an outline planning application. The application is likely to be submitted in September 2012.</p> <p>e) The allocation's status as a Major Development Site should be reflected and listed on page 7 of the DPD.</p>	<p>a to d) Support noted.</p> <p>e) <b>Minor Change.</b> Paragraph 3.4 to read, under the heading "Major Sites for Development":</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Pickering's Farm</li> <li>• Moss Side Test Track, <u>Leyland</u></li> <li>• <u>Land between Heatherleigh and Moss Lane, Farington Moss</u></li> <li>• <u>Cuerden Strategic Site</u></li> <li>• BAE Systems, Samlesbury"</li> </ul>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
573	312	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) No local councillor was present at the Lea Hough meeting, or any member of your newly formed Neighbourhood Forum which was disappointing as there were a large number of members of the public present. As a resident of Heatherleigh I am against the development and would like that to be recorded.</p> <p>b) They propose that one of the main entrances to this new development will be on Heatherleigh. The new estate will have 350 houses. It was raised at the consultation that Croston Road cannot be the only access exit point onto the new estate. I do not see why as it seems to manage perfectly well on the opposite side to accommodate Morley Croft/Barn Hey Drive estate. My next point is that of the "landmark building" on the proposed entrance at Heatherleigh. I have been told by the development team that they propose this to be residential and I would ask that this be the case. I do not wish a shop, community centre, etc, to be put on this point as I feel that this will I increase anti-social behaviour in the area. The area which is currently empty but earmarked for recreation on Heatherleigh gives me great concern.</p> <p>c) I have great concerns regarding Schleswig Way being able to cope with the added traffic that this estate will bring. The congestion at peak times is horrific and the speeding is terrible. Although I accept that attempts have been made to address this by reducing the speed limit to 50 this has had little effect. Could some of the money (106) from the new estate be used to improve this issue?</p>	<p>a) The public meeting was arranged by a private company with an interest in the site for development. The council was not consulted or invited to attend.</p> <p>b) No comments can be made on the proposed site plan as no planning application has been received by the Council. The council remains firm that a master plan of the whole site is required before any development can take place. This is why access to the site is considered as a whole to ensure that all traffic management issues are resolved satisfactorily.</p> <p>c) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</p>
574	313	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) I would like to express my objections to the development of the land behind my house on Croston Road for several reasons that I have listed below. My last outlook over the countryside at the back will be lost forever and my views turned into a modern estate. The proposal has also made me re-think about developing my own property any further. I had hoped to have the attic converted to take advantage of the views behind my house, but this won't be going ahead if I'm to be staring out over some modern housing estate, I mean who wants to look at an area covered in houses as tightly packed as financially viable. The building of any houses on this land is without doubt going to have a detrimental effect on the future value in any sale of my house, if it was to go ahead.</p> <p>b) This will also have a detrimental effect on the wildlife that inhabits the moss as I like to call it. At present, the wildlife is in abundance and thriving well, frogs, toads, newts, countless birds etc will all be lost for nothing more than profit once again.</p> <p>c) The transport infrastructure is not capable to taking the extra volume of traffic that would increase due to the development. The roads are already overburdened and at certain times of the day come to a near standstill during the rush hours.</p> <p>d) Take Buckshaw Village as an example, absolutely horrible and let's be honest, struggling to sell due to the financial market and design of the estate. Nobody wants this kind of housing, especially behind Croston Road, not now and not ever. This area should have its land use description changed to Green Belt, to protect it for the future and to preserve all the wildlife that lives within it.</p>	<p>a) Comments noted however this site has been identified as development land for several years and is required to meet the housing land supply for this area.</p> <p>b) Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys would be required as part of any planning application.</p> <p>c) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</p> <p>d) No comments can be made on the proposed site plan as no planning application has been received by the Council.</p>
575	314	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) Over time traffic has increased to a great degree and traffic calming procedures haven't worked.</p> <p>b) You are now proposing to build 1,000 more homes on all the green fields to the west of Croston Road from Heatherleigh to Moss Lane, with all the extra traffic coming into Croston Road.</p>	<p>a) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</p> <p>b) The site is allocated to provide 600 houses and the master plan required will identify appropriate accesses to the site.</p>
576	315	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>a) Why is the council allowing planning application on green sites when there are existing brownfield sites still to be developed out eg BTR site, land to rear of Morrisons, land off old railway sidings in Lostock Hall, former Test Track on Moss Side industrial estate.</p>	<p>a) For the past few years, the 70% target for new residential development on brownfield land has been exceeded. The Site Allocations DPD includes brownfield sites as well as greenfield. The sites mentioned are identified for development in the DPD along with site W.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b) The impact on the volume of traffic on Croston Road and the road junction of Golden Hill and Longmeanygate, in addition to the roads at the double roundabout on Croston Road towards Lostock Hall. Why is no consideration of putting a roundabout access off Flensburg Way.</li> <li>c) There are limited or no local amenities in this area to sustain a development of this size, eg junior schools, doctor surgery, chemist.</li> <li>d) The proposal of the surveyors highlights a landmark building for the site on Heatherleigh. This would be out of character for the area. There are no buildings between the AFL store and Church Road over two storey, any property over two storey would be out of character for the area and an eyesore/blot on the landscape.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</li> <li>c) The Council is working closely with relevant bodies, such as the PCT, United Utilities, the Environment Agency and the Education Authority to ensure there is adequate provision of services in the area.</li> <li>d) Comments noted about the landmark building. No comments can be made on the site plan referred to as no planning application has been received. The master plan requirement for the site will identify the infrastructure to meet the community facilities required.</li> </ul>
577	316	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) I object to the proposed development strongly. It would decimate the area as no green areas would remain, resulting in one large built-up area. A vast recycling plant has already been introduced in the area, devaluing our houses. From day one, news of the development has drastically reduced the value and saleability of our home. Due to a drastic loss in value a re-assessment of council tax banding of each home is essential. Consult local estate agents if you have doubts.</li> <li>b) The country average is 2 cars per home. An extra 350 new houses would result in an extra 700 vehicles, polluting and using a cramped and unsuitable road system.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) This land has been identified as development land since the last local plan in 2000. The requirement to provide housing land is set nationally and site W is identified to meet those targets, which are now incorporated into the Adopted Core Strategy for Central Lancashire.</li> <li>b) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</li> </ul>
578	317	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>Responses to Lea Hough questionnaire.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The masterplan can be improved by leaving the country as it is, just stop upsetting residents who already live on Croston Road. Have you taken notice of the number of houses up for sale! And the local council need to look after what we already have got.</li> <li>b) We had affordable housing once, but what do the council do? Sell them off, when they are ready for a re-vamp!</li> <li>c) The existing roads on Croston Road are not going to grow bigger, to take another 300 cars. How are people going to get out of the place to get to work on time! Would support Multiple Access points from the development to distribute traffic more evenly. Croston Road cannot take any more traffic.</li> <li>d) Must put back the jobs first.</li> <li>e) Are you going to build more schools instead of keep closing them down? Where are all those children going to go? Farington St Paul's primary school is already full!"</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The Council is required to identify land to allow building of a minimum of 417 dwellings per annum. This cannot be done using existing development sites and brownfield land only, some greenfield land is also needed. During the last five years, the build rate has been lower than this, and so the supply of land will need to be increased beyond 417 dwellings and will need to meet the requirement and shortfall.</li> <li>b) Policy 7 of the adopted Core Strategy requires the provision of sufficient affordable and special needs housing. Delivering affordable housing is a key government objective aimed at enabling everyone to have a decent home that they can afford.</li> <li>c) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</li> <li>d) Noted.</li> <li>e) The Council is working closely with relevant bodies, such as the PCT, United Utilities, the Environment Agency and the Education Authority to ensure there is adequate provision of services in the area.</li> </ul>
579	318	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>Responses to Lea Hough questionnaire.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The existing highways and footpaths cannot take any more traffic.</li> <li>b) Definitely not affordable housing. Who wants to buy a house next to or back to back with someone who is on housing benefits and out of work?</li> <li>c) If all the residential properties/living accommodation that exists in Leyland, Farington, Lostock Hall, and Euxton and so on was sold there would not be a need of further development in the area. The new housing estate on Croston Road (opposite to your new proposed site) has houses for sale and yet when it was at this stage new growth for the economy and all the reasons you gave today were given then – but where is the new economic growth that those houses were supposed to generate – why are half of them up for sale? We are Great Britain, not America or Canada with . . . (missing from photocopy received). Shortage of housing – I am not convinced – locally and nationally.</li> <li>d) No local schools. No health centre/clinic. Dentist? Not enough NHS appointments, in Leyland now. Local supermarkets are too far way to walk with a family's shopping – their car parks are full now at peak times and quiet times, their shelves are poorly stocked.</li> <li>e) The junction at Earnshaw Bridge cannot take any more traffic. This also affects Leyland Lane, Golden Hill Lane and Longmeanygate. Support Multiple Access points from the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</li> <li>b) Policy 7 of the adopted Core Strategy requires the provision of sufficient affordable and special needs housing. Delivering affordable housing is a key government objective aimed at enabling everyone to have a decent home that they can afford.</li> <li>c) The Council is required to identify land to allow building of a minimum of 417 dwellings per annum. This cannot be done using existing development sites and brownfield land only, some greenfield land is also needed. During the last five years, the build rate has been lower than this, and so the supply of land will need to be increased beyond 417 dwellings and will need to meet the requirement and shortfall.</li> <li>d) The Council is working closely with relevant bodies, such as the PCT, United Utilities, the Environment Agency and the Education Authority to ensure there is adequate provision of services in the area.</li> <li>e) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network.</li> <li>f) The document also identifies allocations for employment use.</li> <li>g) For the past few years, the 70% target for new residential development on brownfield land</li> </ul>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>development to distribute traffic more evenly. Speed restrictions now cause damage to cars, noise to people living there and just cause queues on an already congested Croston Road. If council can't keep on top of looking after existing roads on estates, how are they going to manage a new development? Earnshaw Bridge is lethal – you cannot cross any of the roads without a lorry driver gives way and holds up the traffic for you. Public transport is slow (because of the traffic congestion in Leyland and is limited along Croston Road.</p> <p>f) Where are the long terms jobs for the new residents to pay their mortgages?</p> <p>g) You cannot keep on developing new housing developments on green fields (which produce the O2 that we need to breathe) when there are huge expanses of land left derelict by previous landowners whose buildings are now crumbling and which create a hazard for all concerned. One such site is at the side of the M6 motorway in Bamber Bridge. A massive weaving/cotton spinning factory has been left derelict for years – you could develop that area for a thousand new homes and add businesses in the local authority and current landowners could agree. That would improve the area and solve your housing problem three times over.</p>	<p>has been exceeded. The Site Allocations DPD includes brownfield sites as well as greenfield. The mill referred to in Bamber Bridge is included as a site for development.</p>
136	93	Chapter C - Policy C4 - Cuerden Strategic Site	<p>a) Recommended that the following criteria be added to the policy:  <i>d) The Masterplan including an assessment of the ecology of the site and how its biodiversity will be protected, conserved and enhanced.</i></p>	<p>a) Noted. Biodiversity aspects will be considered against other plan policies, including Core Strategy Policies 18 and 22, and DPD Policies G7 and G8.</p>
161	95	Chapter C - Policy C4 - Cuerden Strategic Site	<p>a) Sainsbury's supports the allocation of Cuerden Strategic Site as an employment-led site where a range of high quality employment uses will be promoted. This allocation is considered to be sound as it reflects the existing uses within the site and is consistent with national planning policy contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p>	<p>a) Noted.</p>
216	119	Chapter C - Policy C4 - Cuerden Strategic Site	<p>a) This representation is on behalf of the freehold owners of the three largest private landholdings within the Cuerden Strategic Site. Between them, these clients own and control in excess of 26% of the Cuerden Strategic Site.</p> <p>b) Endorse the flexibility set out in Policy C4 to allow a wide range of uses in order to achieve the best comprehensive development of this strategic gateway site.</p> <p>c) Concerned that comprehensive development may take years to bring about and so endorse the emphasis, at paragraph 6.29 of the Justification, that the comprehensive development of the Cuerden Strategic Site should be accelerated to avoid planning blight.</p> <p>d) Significant weight should be given to development that can be brought forward at the earliest practicable opportunity. We therefore recommend that the wording of Policy C4 should be amended to incorporate the emphasis on accelerated development which is contained in paragraph 6.29 of the Justification.</p>	<p>a) Noted  b) Noted and welcomed.</p> <p>c and d) Accelerated development of this site is an aim of the Council, and the marketing efforts undertaken by Lancashire County Council (the majority landowner) are designed to secure the tenants or owners to develop and occupy the site. There will be no additional benefit gained by adding the word "accelerated" into Policy C4.</p>
614	137	Chapter C - Policy C4 - Cuerden Strategic Site	<p>a) In relation to Policy C4 (Cuerden Strategic Site) RPS considers this site is suitable for a wide range of uses as suggested by the policy and by paragraph 6.27 of the supporting text.</p> <p>b) In respect of paragraph 6.31 we consider that it would be more consistent to adopt the phrase 'appropriate retail, leisure and housing'. Whilst we recognise the importance of the need for proper planning of the site, we do not consider that a masterplan is the only means of achieving this. Individual sites could be brought forward without prejudicing the development of the wider site.</p>	<p>a) Noted.  b) Master plan is required to enable a structure to the development so that it will fit with the strategic nature of the site creating local and regional employment opportunities. If no master plan exists the strategic aim for this site will be lost. [A Master plan is a generic name for a document that sets out the vision and objectives for the detailed and comprehensive development of a site. Other such documents include Development Briefs or other forms of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs).]</p>
251	138	Chapter C - Policy C4 - Cuerden Strategic Site	<p>a) The County Council supports the recognition of the importance of the Cuerden Strategic Site as a site capable of stimulating economic growth in Central Lancashire and the wider Lancashire sub region.</p> <p>b) The County also supports the wording in Policy C4 that "Alternative uses may be appropriate where it can be demonstrated that they may help deliver the strategic employment</p>	<p>a – c) Noted. Policy wording is considered appropriate to identify alternate uses to enable development for this site.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>aspirations for this site", however, the wording of the justification should be changed to refer to alternative uses acting as "enabling development" as it is considered that this would improve the prospects of delivering the strategic employment aspirations for this key site.</p> <p>c) Request that the term comprehensive development which is used at part a) of Policy C4 deleted and replaced with the term integrated development. This better reflects the planning ambition that whatever is brought forward and delivered by potential different parties is done so in a manner which seeks to integrate one with the other. The word comprehensive should also be removed from paragraphs 6.29 and 6.31 of the justification for the same reason.</p>	
269	143	Chapter C - Policy C4 - Cuerden Strategic Site	<p>a) LCC acquired approximately 44 hectares of the Site from the Homes and Communities Agency in January 2012.</p> <p>b) Overall, support the allocation of the Cuerden Strategic Site as a major site for employment led development within the DPD.</p> <p>c) Keen to ensure that the delivery of the site is not unduly constrained by the need for a masterplan for the comprehensive development of the whole site which could place additional financial burdens on development. Specifically, request that the DPD provides sufficient flexibility for phased development of parts of the land on a stand-alone basis, but as an integrated part of the development of the wider site.</p> <p>d) Request that the term "<i>comprehensive</i>" is removed and replaced with the term "<i>integrated</i>" as this better describes an appropriate phased approach for Cuerden. The word "<i>comprehensive</i>" should also be removed from paragraphs 6.29 and 6.31 of the justification for the same reason.</p> <p>e) Policy C4 is not clear on what form an agreed masterplan, phasing and infrastructure delivery schedule will need to take, who this will be prepared by and how it will need to be agreed. The need for a SPD would, for example, be particularly onerous if requested at a later stage. Request that the Council takes a flexible approach given different ownerships and interests across the Cuerden site.</p> <p>f) The wording in Policy C4 that "<i>Alternative uses may be appropriate where it can be demonstrated that they may help deliver the strategic employment aspirations for this site</i>" is supported. However, the wording of the justification in paragraph 6.27 and 6.31 should be changed to refer to alternative uses acting as "<i>enabling development</i>" as it is considered that this would improve the prospects of delivering the strategic employment aspirations for this key site.</p>	<p>a and b) Noted and welcomed.</p> <p>c) Disagree. Masterplanning for such a significant site is important to ensure that all public benefits can be secured alongside the creation of jobs for the area. It is a reasonable request for a site of such importance.</p> <p>d) No change, but <b>glossary</b> to include a definition of the meaning of "comprehensive". For the purpose of this document, it is extensive as the development of the site will incorporate employment, commercial and industrial uses. It is a strategic site and the development will need to be extensive to deliver all of its uses.</p> <p>e) A Master plan is a document that sets out the vision and objectives for the comprehensive development of a site. Master plan is required for Cuerden to enable a structure to the development so that it will fit with the strategic nature of the site creating local and regional employment opportunities. If no master plan exists the strategic aim for this site will be lost. No change to Policy C4.</p> <p>f) No change to the supporting text.</p>
285	148	Chapter C - Policy C4 - Cuerden Strategic Site	<p>a) Represent Brookhouse, who have land interests on Cuerden Strategic Site.</p> <p>b) Site is stalled because of the high cost of providing new highway connection to the strategic highway network. There are very few land-uses that would generate sufficient value to justify delivery of such infrastructure: B-Class uses alone would not support this cost.</p> <p>c) Policy needs amending to recognise how the up-front infrastructure costs to be met. Request that the following text is added to paragraph 6.27: <i>'The council recognises that in order to deliver employment generating uses to the site, significant investment would be required to deliver the necessary infrastructure, and a pragmatic approach will be taken to ensure the wider benefits would be delivered.'</i></p> <p>d) Suggest that the policy is amended to allow for alternatives to a Masterplan. Such an amendment would include the following wording at C4 part (a): <i>'agreed Masterplan, Development Brief or other document that supports the comprehensive development of the site'</i>.</p> <p>e) Suggest that additional words are used at paragraph 6.31: <i>'It is acknowledged that the alternative uses set out may have to come forwards as enabling development becoming ancillary across a range of uses in the Masterplan Development Brief or other document over the passage of time.'</i> Ancillary development in this sense could also be described as complementary and so perhaps the definition would be widened in 6.31 to reflect this.</p>	<p>a and b) Noted.</p> <p>c) No change</p> <p>d) Master plan is required to enable a structure to the development so that it will fit with the strategic nature of the site creating local and regional employment opportunities. If no master plan exists the strategic aim for this sit will be lost.</p> <p>e) No change.</p> <p>f) Para 8.28 indicates the sensitivity of not having a retail site to the detriment of the local and district centres and for that reason should remain unchanged. The NPPF will be applied to any planning application along with all other relevant material considerations.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>f) Suggest that the following additional amendment set out in [bold] is made to relevant text elsewhere in the DPD as follows.</p> <p><i>a. Paragraph 8.28</i>  <i>The retail hierarchy directs retail development and town centre uses to Leyland Town Centre. Retail growth elsewhere will need to be of levels which are appropriate to the location, [but also in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, it is important that needs for retail and other main town centre uses are met in full and are not compromised by limited site availability.] With regards to District and Local Centres there is a reasonable degree of flexibility to be applied to ensure they can perform their important local community role and serve a different purpose to the town centre. Care will also be needed to avoid, for example, a single excessively large retail outlet which risks competing with the town centre or undermining the healthy mix of functions within the Local Centre.</i></p>	
111	86	Chapter C - Policy C5 – BAE Systems, Samlesbury	<p>a) As stated in my objection to the so-called 'rollback' of the Green Belt, the DCLG does not sanction this (letter received from DCLG with copy to Lorraine Fullbrook, MP) despite the fact that the Treasury approved that the Enterprise Zone for Salmsbury. Therefore, I reiterate that this is an inappropriate use of the Green Belt according to the DCLG. It also contravenes proposed Policy G1 (page 56). There is no justification of the Enterprise Zone in the finalised NPPF.</p>	<p>a) Whilst there is no requirement from CLG to alter Green Belt boundaries, in order to make the Enterprise Zone as viable as possible, some alteration is necessary. Given the importance of the Enterprise Zone to the economy, especially at this time, an exceptional circumstance has been demonstrated. Economic growth is essential to support an area. It is important to note that the proposed rollback actually covers an area that is Previously Developed Land, being the former runways and associated infrastructure. This area is not considered to be Greenfield. The land in question is entirely within the ownership of BAE and until recently, was utilised as part of the activities on the site.</p>
137	93	Chapter C - Policy C5 – BAE Systems, Samlesbury	<p>a) The revised Samlesbury Aerodrome BHS boundary was agreed between the Biological Heritage Site Partnership (Lancashire County Council, Natural England and The Wildlife Trust) and BAE systems at the start of 2011. Although this site was approved during the 2010 Biological Heritage Site (BHS) annual review, it is understood that the review currently remains to be signed off by Lancashire County Council. We would suggest that the Local Wildlife Site boundary be added to the 'Map 1' associated with the proposed LDF Policy C4 to improve certainty.</p>	<p>a) No records found for this site when searching LCC website, Mapzone and Lancashire RIGS See Also Ref 93, ID 143 and ID 138</p>
167	98	Chapter C - Policy C5 – BAE Systems, Samlesbury	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 111	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 111
174	99	Chapter C - Policy C5 – BAE Systems, Samlesbury	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 111	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 111
182	100	Chapter C - Policy C5 – BAE Systems, Samlesbury	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID111	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID111
218	121	Chapter C - Policy C5 – BAE Systems, Samlesbury	<p>a) The Enterprise Zone at Samlesbury Aerodrome will cover the area shown in green on the enclosed plan (Parcels A, B and C), with BAES continuing to operate on the area shaded yellow (Parcel D).</p> <p>b) Support for the Development of an Enterprise Zone and Advanced Engineering and Manufacturing (AEM) activities. Policy C5 seeks to continue to support BAES' advanced aerospace manufacturing activities at Samlesbury in line with the Company's objectives and</p>	<p>a and b) Noted and welcomed.</p> <p>c) No change</p> <p>d) No change</p> <p>e) Noted and welcomed.</p> <p>f) <b>Minor change</b>, but insert after para 6.37, not in Policy C5(b):  <u>"In order to fully realise the economic benefits of the Enterprise Zone at Samlesbury, a new</u></p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>supports the development of an Enterprise Zone at the site. It is therefore considered that Policy C5 is sound and justified in this respect.</p> <p>c) Policy C5 should specifically refer to, and promote the development of AEM uses and their supply chains at the Enterprise Zone as this would be the most appropriate option for growing the manufacturing sector in the North West. Specifically referring to the development of AEM uses at the Enterprise Zone would make Policy C5 more in conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and in particular the Government's "pro-growth" agenda set out in the NPPF. Requested that the following text is added to Part (b) of Policy C5: <i>"Land has been allocated at Samlesbury Aerodrome to allow for the development of an Enterprise Zone. This Enterprise Zone will consist of a cluster of advanced engineering and manufacturing businesses and associated industries."</i></p> <p>d) This addition was requested in BAES' representations to the Preferred Options Version of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD. South Ribble Borough Council's response was that the types of uses that will be acceptable at the site would be set out in the Local Development Order (LDO) and there was no need to repeat these in Policy C5. BAES does not agree with this statement however. It is considered that reference to the uses which will be permitted at the Enterprise Zone in Policy C5 would ensure that any future LDO for the Enterprise Zone would reflect local planning policy in the LDF. However, if the Council and Secretary of State, or the Inspector appointed on his behalf, consider that it is not necessary to repeat the detail of Appropriate uses on the site in Policy C5, it is requested that Policy C5 instead makes reference to the site being developed for the uses stated in the LDO. This would continue to ensure that Policy C5 and the existing LDO for the site and any further LDO are in accordance. The following wording is suggested to achieve this: <i>"The Council supports the delivery of the Enterprise Zone and has produced a Local Development Order – Part 1, to aid the delivery process. Subsequent Local development Orders will be produced when necessary. A masterplan must also be produced as a key part of the overall delivery of the Enterprise Zone. The site will be developed in accordance with the uses permitted in the Local Development Orders and the site masterplan."</i></p> <p>e) The substantial economic benefits that would arise as a result of the designation of the Samlesbury site as an Enterprise Zone, including the creation of many direct and indirect jobs and a significant increase in inward investment, are exceptional circumstances that warrant the removal of Parcel B from the Green Belt. Identifying an area of the site will be removed from the Green Belt(parcel B) in Policy C5 makes the policy effective and therefore sound in this respect.</p> <p>f) Policy C5 should reference the requirement for dedicated access to fully realise the build out opportunities of the Samlesbury Enterprise Zone following initial feedback from master planning activities. This includes a revision to the East Gate configuration to access "Parcel A" penetrating off the A59 and an additional entrance being opened up off the A677 to facilitate full build out of "Parcel B". Without this reference the policy is unsound as it is not deliverable and therefore not effective. . It is therefore requested that the following text is added at the end of Part B of Policy C5: <i>"In order to fully realise the full build out and economic benefits of the Enterprise Zone at Samlesbury, dedicated access is required through the revision to the East Gate access configuration to access 'Parcel A' penetrating off the A59 and an additional entrance being opened up off the A677 to facilitate full build out of 'Parcel B'."</i></p> <p>g) Support the extent of the Strategic Site allocation on the Proposals Map and consider it to be sound as it is in conformity with the LDO for the Enterprise Zone. However, the map at Appendix 3 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD identified Parcel B as an area of land to be removed from the Green Belt, but does not show it to form part of the Strategic Site. Supports the removal of Parcel B of the site from the Green Belt, but Parcel B should also be shaded purple to show it is part of the Enterprise Zone and Strategic Site on the map at Appendix 3. This would provide clarity to the full extent of the</p>	<p><u>dedicated access will be designated and constructed into the Strategic Site from the A677."</u> <i>nb. Modified A59 access will be in Ribble Valley and so not covered by this DPD.</i></p> <p>g) The designation and area of the Strategic Site is shown in Appendix B of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy. This is the DPD which shows the Strategic site boundaries.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			Strategic Site and ensure that the extent of the Strategic site on this map is the same as that shown on the Proposals Map.	
591	327	Chapter C - Policy C5 – BAE Systems, Samlesbury	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 111	<p>a) Whilst there is no requirement from CLG to alter Green Belt boundaries, in order to make the Enterprise Zone as viable as possible, some alteration is necessary. Given the importance of the Enterprise Zone to the economy, especially at this time, an exceptional circumstance has been demonstrated. Economic growth is essential to support an area.</p> <p>b) It is important to note that the proposed rollback actually covers an area that is Previously Developed Land, being the former runways and associated infrastructure. This area is not considered to be Greenfield. The land in question is entirely within the ownership of BAE and until recently, was utilised as part of the activities on the site.</p>
138	93	Chapter C - Policy C5 - Paragraph 6.39	<p>a) Account needs to be taken of the presence of the BHS, Lowland Meadows (a Habitat of Principal Importance in England as defined by the NERC Act 2006) and populations of breeding birds, in particular the Lapwing (<i>Vanellus vanellus</i>). Other notable species include Reed Bunting, Skylark, Oystercatcher and Brown Hare. A pond within the site supports Great Crested Newts, which are a European Protected Species.</p>	<p>a) No records found for this site when searching LCC website, Mapzone and Lancashire RIGS. Any development would require an assessment of the biodiversity of the site.</p> <p>See also Ref 93, ID 143 and ID 137</p>
252	138	Chapter C - Policy C5 BAE Enterprise Zone	<p>a) The County Council supports the recognition of the importance of the capability of the Enterprise Zone at Samlesbury to stimulate economic growth in Central Lancashire, the wider Lancashire sub region and nationally, with the potential of attracting significant inward investment of an international scale. Support is also given to the amendment to the green belt boundary shown in Appendix 3 to the Publication version document as this will facilitate delivery of the employment aspirations of this site.</p>	<p>a) Comments noted.</p>
107	85	Chapter C - Residential Led Sites	<p>a) I object to the choice of suitable sites for major residential development. In a borough of 11,461 hectares it is irresponsible to consider proposing two of the three major residential developments Policy C2 and C3 (a combined total of 1350 houses) within 1km of each other. Regardless of any proposed phasing, the eventual consequence is going to be an extra 1350 houses within an already heavily populated area, and all probably bringing with them an average of 2 cars per household pouring onto the already congested Flensburg Way, and associated minor roads at peak times. The distribution of significant new development has not been fairly distributed across the borough.</p>	<p>a) Government led Housing supply targets require the Council to identify land for development during the life of this DPD. Sites covered by policies C2 and C3 were identified as safeguarded for future development in the local plan adopted in 2000. These sites have been brought forward as suitable for development in the life of this plan to meet the required targets for housing.</p>
245	135	Chapter D	<p>a) Policy D1 It is of immediate concern that at §7.3 there is no reference to the core strategy having been found by the inspector to be unsound in its housing policies.</p> <p>b) Draft NPPF proposes a 20% margin for this purpose and that may be enshrined in national planning policy within the next 3 months. The fact that, for the period 2010 -2026 the housing requirement in the DPD of 6,984 dwellings is matched by a supply of 6,964 (6962??) dwellings is a wholly inadequate basis on which to plan to provide 'Homes for All'.</p> <p>c) Reliance on sites such as the Wesley Street Mill to deliver housing in significant numbers, let alone development at 92 dph, indicates that the authority has failed to comprehend the fundamental change in the housing market on which it is reliant on to provide 'Homes for All', including a high proportion of affordable houses as well as major infrastructure projects identified as necessary for many of the sites proposed for allocation.</p> <p>d) Need of a diversity of developing sites exploiting all aspects of the housing market, rather than the concentration of development in a few large sites.</p> <p>e) Group One, off Central Avenue, Buckshaw Village, Leyland: 260 dwellings in the remaining 4 years of the Plan 1st phase is 65 dwellings a year and this is a serious overestimate of potential contribution for the first phase of the consultation DPD. It may deliver this number of dwellings over the full plan period.</p>	<p>a) The Core Strategy was found sound by the Planning Inspector and it was adopted by South Ribble on 18 July 2012.</p> <p>b) The discrepancy in this representation derives from paragraph 7.3 of the DPD. The Council's figures relate to a 15 year timespan, and para 7.3 needs a <b>Minor Change</b> to read (beginning in the middle of the first sentence):  “.....417 dwellings per year from <u>2011</u> – 2026, this is a total of 6,255 dwellings for the 15 year plan period. Since <u>2011</u> there have been.....”  A related <b>Minor Change</b> is required to the relevant column in Table 2 will also need to change from 2010-2016 to <u>2011-2016</u>.  By clarifying this change, the overall requirement for the 15 years (2011-2026) is 6,815, and the supply identified is 6,962, a surplus of 147 dwellings. The Council does not rely on the windfall estimate in paragraph 7.13 to demonstrate a surplus of housing supply over requirements.  The Council is aware of the requirement in paragraph 47 (second bullet point) of the NPPF, requiring a buffer of 20% above the five year supply of specific deliverable housing sites. The NPPF guidance requires the Council to move sites forward from later in the plan period,</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>f) Former Farington Business Park, Farington: in the light of the post-recession housing market here is little prospect of the site delivering 471 dwellings when it is developed. There is no prospect of the site delivering the required 36 dwellings a year contribution to the first phase of the plan.</p> <p>g) Former Prestolite Factory, Cleveland Road, Leyland: there has been no movement towards bringing this site into development since the 2010 SHLAA. Even if the development were to commence in the near future, there is very little prospect of it achieving 25 dwellings a year.</p> <p>h) Former Arla Foods Premises, School Lane, Bamber Bridge: there is no prospect of the site delivering 150 dwellings by 2016: even if development commenced in 2012 this requires completion of 38 dwellings a year, which is around double the likely rate of sales.</p> <p>i) Vernon Carus and Land, Factory Lane, Penwortham: this site has major thresholds to overcome before development can commence. It is dependent on the construction of the Cross Borough Link Road (Policy A1). It must remain very uncertain when or if this highway scheme will be constructed, and the housing developments that are dependent upon it (including that of the Lostock Hall Gas Works site) is equally uncertain. There is no reason at all to expect delivery within the first phase of development in the plan. The expectation in the plan that the site will deliver 75 dwellings in that period cannot be accepted.</p> <p>j) Lostock Hall Gasworks, Lostock Hall: there is no reason at all to expect delivery within the first phase of development in the plan. The expectation in the plan that the site will deliver 110 dwellings in that period cannot be accepted.</p> <p>k) Land West of Grasmere Avenue, Farington: given that outline planning permission is not yet available, that reserved matters will also need to be subsequently approved and the site is in a poor market area development in the first phase is more likely to be 40 dwellings than the 150 expected in the DPD. This assumes a willing developer bearing in mind the site is located in a very secondary location. Sites of this nature are not attractive in poor market conditions.</p> <p>l) Land between Altcar Lane/Shaw Brook Road, Leyland: development is unlikely to commence at the earliest for 2 years as it depends on the adoption of the DPD as well as subsequently achieving the necessary planning consents; 50 dwellings is a more realistic prospect.</p> <p>m) Land off Wesley Street, Bamber Bridge: this site is severely constrained by the existing mill building and its location in a poor market area with poor access. The Council have for a number of years been looking for a development partner to assist in bringing this site forward. We are not aware of any developer interest to date.</p> <p>n) Land off Brownedge Road, Bamber Bridge: the expectation that this site will be redeveloped for housing in the first phase of the plan is wholly unsubstantiated. The 2010 SHLAA assessed the site as delivering 60 dwellings by 2014 but there is still no application for housing development. The site may come forward in the later phases of the plan.</p> <p>o) South of Bannister Lane/North of Heatherleigh, Farington Moss: the prospect of all of the constraints and other planning requirements being met in time for it to deliver housing early in the plan period is remote and the delivery of 200 dwellings is unrealistic. Development is unlikely to commence at the earliest for 2 years. Access from Bannister Lane for part of the development will facilitate achieving maximum completions.</p> <p>p) Gas Holders Site, Lostock Hall: the 25 prospective dwellings indicated in Table 2 are not followed through in the plan phases. If the gasholders have been decommissioned the HSE hazard zones will be removed and this will facilitate other residential development in the immediate locality. This is a site where development can reasonably be considered to contribute additional dwellings to the plan's first phase.</p> <p>q) Site Q Rear of Chapel Meadow, Longton: confirm that this can be brought forward for housing development in the short term and the site will contribute to meeting the deliverable 5 year supply of homes.</p> <p>r) Site BB Land adjacent to Barn Flatt Close, Higher Walton: this site can be quickly brought forward for development and will contribute to the 5 year housing land supply.</p> <p>s) Site W Land North of Bannister Lane, Farington.: the allocation of this site is supported. The expected development contribution of 200 homes to the requirements for Phase 1 of the DPD will not be realised because of the restricted time available to bring the site forward following</p>	<p>not to allocate a further 20% of housing land sites in the DPD. (Policies D1/D2) The adoption of the Site Allocations DPD will secure the allocation of sufficient housing land to meet a six-year housing requirement.</p> <p>c) Wesley Street Mill has a site area of 6.9 hectares, and is expected to deliver 175 dwellings, at an average density of 25.4dw/ha.</p> <p>d) Noted.</p> <p>e) Noted. No change.</p> <p>f) Noted. No change.</p> <p>g) Full planning permission was granted in September 2012 for 82 dwellings on the former Prestolite Factory (site D).</p> <p>h) The former Arla Food Premises site (site E) has recently been acquired by a major housebuilder, in advance of the submission of a reserved matters planning application.</p> <p>i) Noted. No change.</p> <p>j) Noted. No change.</p> <p>k) Full planning permission was granted in May 2012 (subject to a s106 agreement) for the development of 160 dwellings on the Grasmere Avenue site (site L).</p> <p>l) Noted. No change.</p> <p>m) Noted. No change.</p> <p>n) Noted. No change.</p> <p>o) Noted. The Council do not want to see any vehicular access to new development from Banister Lane. No change.</p> <p>p) Table 2 shows that the Gas Holders' site will deliver 25 houses between 2016 and 2021.</p> <p>q) Noted.</p> <p>r) Noted. No change.</p> <p>s) There is no reference to the Heatherliegh/Moss Lane site in Policy G3. Croston Road runs along the whole of the eastern boundary of the Heatherleigh/Moss Lane site, not just the southern section, as stated in this representation. <b>Minor Change</b> to Policy G3 and the Proposals Map:  <b>"...at the following locations:</b>  <u>v</u> <b>South of Factory Lane and east of the West Coast Main Line</b>  <u>w</u> <b>Southern area of the Major Development Site at Pickering's Farm, Penwortham</b>  <u>x</u> <b>South of Coote Lane, Chain House Lane, Farington</b>  <u>y</u> <b>Land off Church Lane, Farington</b>  <u>z</u> <b>Land off Emnie Lane, Leyland"</b></p> <p>t) Noted. No change.</p> <p>u) Noted. The remaining site on Long Moss Lane (The Fields) was reviewed as part of the preparation of the DPD. The Council's view is that it is a less sustainable location for development, being adjacent to the Green Belt, and that there exists a better site for village development in a more central location adjacent to the church. A recent planning application for the development of this site has been refused by the Council and is the subject of a planning appeal. No change.</p> <p>v) Noted. No change.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>allocation and the market restraint on completion rates that can be expected. The land north of Bannister Lane can be brought forward as an independent development accessed from Bannister Lane, which has capacity and a good quality access to Croston Road. In Policy G3 that the land is referred to in error as safeguarded land.</p> <p>t) Site EE Pickering's Farm, Penwortham: this site suffers from major infrastructure thresholds to development, the costs of which are to be met from developer contributions. The allocation takes an arbitrary line to the southern boundary when, In order to start development in the locality, extending the site southwards to Chain House Lane is logical and will allow some development to commence from a southern access.</p> <p>u) Current D9 Sites, Long Moss Lane, New Longton. These two sites have been removed from the allocations for development in the existing local plan and included as G4 Protected Open Land in the DPD. There has been no change in circumstances since the local plan was adopted that would justify any change in this assessment.</p> <p>v) The LPA has identified a need of 50 affordable homes in the villages of Longton and New Longton. Other sites allocated to meet local needs are specifically not to accommodate market housing. Given the history in the village that developments of 100% affordable housing development do not come forward, the only way of meeting this need is as part of market housing led development. Around 20% of this unmet need for affordable housing can be met in the short term by market housing development on these two sites, which should be allocated for development.</p>	
50	37	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site AA	<p>a) This is considered appropriate for residential development. The proximity to Bannister Brook constrains the site and flood risks would need to be resolved with the Environment Agency to facilitate redevelopment.</p> <p>b) Where developments will result in an increase in footfall at Leyland Railway Station and / or where permission for a development would be subject to usage of Leyland Railway Station – Network Rail would seek S106 developer contributions / CIL contributions to enhance facilities at the station. As Network Rail is a publicly funded organisation with a regulated remit it would not be reasonable to require Network Rail to fund rail improvements necessitated by commercial development.</p>	<p>a) The comments have been noted and will be considered at the appropriate time.</p> <p>b) Any CIL contributions collected from the development of this site will be used to help fund schemes listed in the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Schedule.</p>
122	90	Chapter D – Policy D1 – Site BB – Land Adjacent to Barn Flatt Close, Higher Walton	<p>a) Site BB can now be allocated for residential development following further assessment on noise pollution.</p>	<p>a) No change.</p>
234	131	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site CC	<p>a) Draft policy B1 is sound because it is accordance with paragraph 152 of the NPPF. It will provide for the delivery of non-allocated sites over the plan period as they become available. The policy is therefore both effective and consistent with national planning policy.</p> <p>b) Policy B6 – Design of New Development. The majority of draft design Policy B6 can be supported, it is unsound on the grounds that the heritage criterion is inconsistent with national planning policy. This policy currently includes a criterion which states permission will be granted where, "The proposal would not adversely affect the character or setting of a listed building and / or any heritage asset." The NPPF states that in determining applications where heritage assets are affected, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be (paragraph 132). Where a development will lead to substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, permission should be refused, unless it is demonstrated the harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits, or a number of other criteria as listed apply (paragraph 133). Where less than substantial harm would be caused, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal,</p>	<p>a) Noted and welcomed.</p> <p>b) Agree that clause (d) in Policy B6 does not properly reflect the wording of NPPF paragraphs 132 – 141, but disagree with the representors's proposed new wording. The proposed wording would result in a serious reduction in the protection of heritage assets and, despite the claim to the contrary, is not consistent with the NPPF. As the representor has quoted from paragraph 134 of the NPPF, weighing harm against public benefit only applies where less than substantial harm is caused. The proposed re-write omits this vital qualification.</p> <p>c) Support for site CC noted.</p> <p>d) The adoption of the Site Allocations DPD will secure the allocation of sufficient housing land to meet a six-year housing requirement. The Council has engaged with representatives of the development industry to update the SHLAA in February 2012. The phasing figures have been calculated following discussions with developers to ensure they are as accurate as possible. The allocations/phasing are realistic, particularly in the light of the current economic climate. The Council's view is that there are sufficient deliverable sites to provide an adequate and continuous supply of housing land to meet housing requirements.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>including securing its optimum viable use (paragraph 134). In seeking to resist all adverse impacts, whatever magnitude, the policy conflicts with advice in the NPPF, rendering it unsound. To make the policy sound, the criterion should be amended to read: <i>“The proposal would not lead the loss of, or result in harm to, the significance of a listed building or heritage asset, unless the identified degree of harm is considered to be outweighed by the public benefit of the proposed development.”</i></p> <p>c) The allocation of site CC for housing is sound. Support this allocation and the phasing of the 15 units on this site in the first phase of the plan period</p> <p>d) Policies D1 and D2 are unsound on a number of grounds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policies fail to allocate sufficient land to meet the objectively assessed development needs over the first 5 years of the plan when a 20% buffer of additional sites is factored in. Whilst the document suggests a windfall allowance may be included in the 5 year supply, compelling evidence to support this has not been provided. The Council have not identified sufficient land to cover the entire plan period. The policies have built in no flexibility in the event of failure to deliver allocated sites. The policy as currently drafted provides no certainty that the scale of housing that will be required will be delivered and it is neither consistent with the pro-active stance of the NPPF, nor would it be effective.</li> <li>• Strategic sites, such as Pickering’s Farm, which require major infrastructure, planning and time for practical implementation will not achieve the levels of development suggested in the phasing strategy.</li> <li>• Persistent under-delivery of housing appears set to continue (the under-supply has increased since 2011 to 560 dwellings) and so additional sites will need to be allocated and the phasing reconsidered to bring more sites into Phase 1.</li> </ul> <p>e) Overall housing land requirement and supply. The housing allocations in the Publication Site Allocations DPD support and interpret the policies of the Core Strategy. The document currently allocates land to accommodate 4,108 dwellings over the plan period (2010 – 2026) which, when added to sites with planning permission, sites with current applications, and ‘other sites’ provides a total supply for the entire plan period of 6,962 units.</p> <p>Table 2 of the document identifies 3 phases for the housing delivery. The first phase is six years and runs from 2010 to 2016. For this first period, 2,712 dwellings are phased for delivery that is equivalent to 452 dwellings per annum. The housing requirement for South Ribble is 417 dwellings per annum and the SHLAA Update confirms that at March 2011, there was a shortfall against this target of 313 dwellings. Paragraph 7.14 confirms this shortfall will be made up over the first phase; this is supported by Redrow. The effect of this would be to increase the 5 year requirement to 480 dwellings per annum <math>([417 \times 5] + 313)</math> resulting in a 5-year requirement of 2,398 dwellings.</p> <p>Paragraph 47 of the NPPF confirms the adopted housing requirement should include a 5% buffer or a 20% buffer of additional sites, depending on whether there has been ‘persistent under delivery’. South Ribble has not met the RSS annual housing requirement since the period 2005 – 2006 and it can be rationally concluded that a 20% buffer is therefore the most reasonable target for the Authority. Indeed this is acknowledged in Policy D2, which states: “...Annual Monitoring of the delivery of housing will be undertaken. It will include a review of Sites and Phasing within Table 2 and aim to ensure that a 5 year supply (including a 20% buffer if appropriate, and if performance approves, the Council will look at reducing the buffer to 5% as part of the monitoring process)...” With a base date of March 2011, the effect of the 20% additional buffer is to increase the 5-year housing requirement to 2815 dwellings <math>([417 + 20\%] \times 5) + 313</math>, which is equivalent to 563 dwellings per annum. Therefore, the overall effect is that the supply of 2,712 dwellings identified in the Publication document would only provide 4.8 years’ supply against the 5 year requirement (which is 2,815 dwellings). If compared to the 2011 SHLAA Update (the common base date for assessment, as information to March 2012 is not available), a supply</p>	<p>e and f) The discrepancy in this representation derives from paragraph 7.3 of the DPD. The Council’s figures relate to a 15 year timespan, and para 7.3 needs a <b>Minor Change</b> to read (beginning in the middle of the first sentence): “....417 dwellings per year from <u>2011</u> – 2026, this is a total of 6,255 dwellings for the 15 year plan period. Since <u>2011</u> there have been.....” A related <b>Minor Change</b> is required to the relevant column in Table 2 will also need to change from 2010-2016 to <u>2011-2016</u>. By clarifying this change, the overall requirement for the 15 years (2011-2026) is 6,815, and the supply identified is 6,962, a surplus of 147 dwellings. The Council does not rely on the windfall estimate in paragraph 7.13 to demonstrate a surplus of housing supply over requirements.</p> <p>g) Noted. No change.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>of just 2,538 dwellings, is identified which is equivalent to just 4.5 years.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.13 of the consultation document states some flexibility of supply may be available by virtue of accounting for 45 windfall dwellings per annum. However, this is only suggested as an “indicative total”, whereas paragraph 48 of the NPPF is clear that such an allowance should only be made if there is compelling evidence that sites have consistently become available and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. The Council has not provided the ‘compelling evidence’ required to support a windfall allowance in the first 5 years of the plan.</p> <p>The sites allocated and phased by Policies D1 and D2 are therefore insufficient to meet the remaining requirements of the first phase of the plan. Policies D1 and D2 are therefore unsound, as they are not effective in the delivery of the basic (minimum) Core Strategy requirement. The policies are also unsound on the basis that they do not take the positive opportunities to meet the development needs of the area and are not consistent with national policy. They do not provide for the full, objectively assessed requirement of the Core Strategy (paragraph 47) or the additional NPPF buffer of 20%. The appropriate course of action would be to identify further sites in accordance with the evidence of housing supply. In order to make Policies D1 and D2 sound, it will be necessary to identify additional deliverable land in the remaining 5 years of Phase 1 (i.e. April 2011 – March 2016), sufficient to provide for 2,815 units (417 annual requirement + NPPF 20% x 5 years + 313 undersupply).</p> <p>It is notable that paragraph 7.14 of document states that the shortfall at April 2012 has increased further to 560 dwellings. This demonstrates the situation of undersupply is continuing. This further emphasises the need to bring forward sites now.</p> <p>f) Policy D1: The Requirement over the Core Strategy Entire Plan Period. Policy D1 should allocate sufficient housing to meet the Core Strategy housing requirement, NPPF delivery buffer and the shortfall of 313 units. Over the remaining 15 year period of the plan, the total basic requirement is 6,568 dwellings (417 x 15 + 313), which is just less than the 6,962 dwellings identified. This does not include any delivery buffer and there is very little flexibility to react to rapidly changing circumstances over the 15 year period. Given that the strategic housing requirement is set as a minimum that may be exceeded the relatively limited number of allocations is considered to be unsound and unlikely to deliver the scale of housing that will be required.</p> <p>Whilst the allocation of additional sites is required to meet the annual requirement, accurate phasing of those sites already identified is required to ensure that the above situation of potential under-supply is not exacerbated.</p> <p>g) Pickering’s Farm (Site EE), is a site on which the Council anticipate 300 dwellings to be delivered by 2016. This is not realistic because of the requirement to construct a section of the Cross Borough Link Road. Given lead in times and development rates the site is unlikely to deliver more than c.50 dwellings in the first phase of the plan.</p>	
233	131	Chapter D – Policy D1 – Site DD – Gas Holders Site	<p>a) Site DD is adjacent to Redrow’s existing site at Claytongate Drive and the allocation of this site for housing is supported.</p> <p>b) Land to the south of draft allocation DD should be allocated for residential development to ensure that soundness of the strategy for housing delivery is achieved. In earlier representations, Redrow recommended that draft housing allocation DD (Gas Holders Site, Lostock Hall) should be extended to include land to the south, which would be released from a Health and Safety Executive Consultation Zone by virtue of development of site DD. This area is shown on the enclosed plan (a resubmission of the plan provided previously), which highlights the area which is now available for development, which could be accessed via the existing Claytongate site for delivery in the first phase of the plan period. The site is available for development now, achievable and suitable and, in light of the shortfall of allocated sites</p>	<p>a) Support for site DD noted (Redrow have a separate representation for Policy B1).</p> <p>b) With the withdrawal of the safety zone, the Council accepts that the land south of allocation DD should be allocated for residential development. <b>Minor Change</b> required to Proposals Map, and to Table 2 if this change is accepted by the Inspector (in negotiation with the developers).</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			highlighted in this representation, it is considered this site should be allocated to meet development needs.	
51	37	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site H	a) Network Rail would request that the council ensure that any development on Factory Lane does not use the route under the restricted height bridge. The comment states that the bridge is, "not suitable to serve the development as a whole." Any access under the bridge would require the council and the future developer to fund bridge strike mitigation measures as a result of any development.	a) Noted.
45	37	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site I – Hospital Inn Railway Crossing, Brindle Road	a) Brindle Road proposals (housing site I) may bring about an increase in traffic on the local road network, which may affect the adjacent Hospital level crossing. Network Rail would be interested to know whether the council / developers have given any consideration to the additional traffic that the new housing estate will generate, and what impact that will have on Hospital level crossing and the road junction with Bank Head Lane. There is already a significant flow of traffic up and down Brindle Road – this proposed development will no doubt add to it.	a) Development of this site was granted outline planning permission on 6/2/12 subject to a number of conditions. The reserved matters application has not yet been received, and most of the observations on this matter relate to the determination of the reserved matters. transport appraisal has been done as part of the planning application. This can be viewed as part of application 07/2011/0340/OUT. This development is also subject to a S106 agreement which includes provision for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- £20,000 to upgrade of the two bus stops outside the Hospital Inn pubic house Brindle Road . . . plus a further £2,000 for the continued maintenance of such bus stops;</li> <li>- £3,000 shall be applied to provide yellow box marking at the new access of the development with Brindle Road plus a further £500 for the continued maintenance of such markings;</li> <li>- £10,000 shall be applied towards the improvement of the cycle link between Brindle Road and Bank Head Lane.</li> </ul>
289	149	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site I – Hospital Inn Railway Crossing, Brindle Road	a) The HCA supports the identification of this site as a 'Site with Planning Permission' within Table 2 of the DPD. The HCA owns the site and has secured planning permission for 42 units (September 2011), in accordance with the emerging DPD. The site was previously identified as an allocated housing site within the South Ribble Local Plan (February 2000). The HCA are currently marketing the site for disposal, and subject to market uptake it is anticipated that development could commence on-site in early 2013. The HCA undertook extensive local engagement prior to the submission of the application, and continues to work with the Council to ensure the efficient delivery of the site.	a) Support noted.
80	65	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site L and Chapter E policy E1 site g	a) As landowners of the Farington Hall Estate we make representations on the following sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Site E1(g) – Farington Hall Estate, West of LeylandBusiness Park, Farington</li> <li>- Site D1 (L) – Land off Grasmere Avenue, Leyland</li> </ul> b) We support the identification of both sites for development. The sites are highly sustainable being within walking distance of a range of shops, schools and services and have access to a range of means of transport. The sites also lie within the urban area, are available for development and have been the subject of detailed appraisal. There are no technical factors such as flood risk or ecological constraints that would impede their development. c) Request that the uses permitted are widened to include mixed development opportunities. This should include additional residential provision and other supporting employment generating uses should be allowed, for example a nursery, healthcare facilities and a hotel. This could, for example, extend to include the area of land to the west of planning application 07/2011/0711/ORM to the boundary of the River Lostock and south of Mill Lane.	a) Noted b) Noted and welcomed. c) The site originally suggested was made up of E1g and D1L. They have been split to enable separate parts of the site to be allocated for employment and housing. The area identified for housing, D1L has now been approved on 30/5/12 (check date) subject to imposition of conditions and completion of a S106 Agreement. Other employment generating uses, such as a nursery, healthcare facilities and a hotel will be considered on their merits, but the Council does not support a change in the overall designation of the site.
599	96	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site N	a) Objection to the previous draft document. There is a significant flaw in the Council's reliance on the wording "unless there are exceptional reasons for larger scale redevelopment"	a) The reference is relating to Policy 1 of the Core Strategy which was adopted on 18 July 2012. It is important to note that the Core Strategy also states that larger scale development

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>schemes” in Policy 1 of the Core Strategy document. The Core Strategy informs the Site Allocations. Any exceptional circumstances should have been identified in the preparation of the later document. The wording in para 3.6 of the Site Allocations does not include any reference to exceptional circumstances in smaller villages, so clearly the process had already taken that into account. Policy D1-N does not provide any justification of any exceptional circumstances. It merely says that some limited new development is needed. An open market development would not address any local need and would not be sustainable in that it would add to the numbers of people already commuting by car. Policy D1-N is in conflict with the vision of the document set out in 3.6 and should be removed. It should be noted that para 3.6 accords with the Hutton Village Plan. Policy D1-N is in conflict with the Village Plan.</p> <p>b) I accept that matters of detail need to be looked at if and when development is applied for. However, I consider that due regard has not been given to identifying site constraints. As an example, para 3.7 identifies drainage and flooding issues in Longton and requires developer contribution. There are similar problems in Hutton associated with this site. Local people take no comfort in the fact that LCC as Highway Authority will need to agree highway detail, particularly since LCC are also the landowners.</p>	<p>would be acceptable in exceptional circumstances. In this case, the site is currently safeguarded for future development, and could also provide an opportunity to improve parking issues at Hutton Grammar School. These are considered to be exceptional circumstances which mean the site is suitable for the proposed use. The Council has to balance the need and requirement for new housing in the Borough with the wishes of the community. Allocating no land for housing in the Borough is not an option. The Village Plan does not take precedence over the DPD.</p> <p>b) The parking provision would be investigated along with LCC, and the School itself. Other land is protected and therefore not allocated in the DPD. Until a planning application is made, there are no indications of where the access would be. Any access points would be subject to approval from LCC, as the Highways Authority. The Environment Agency will be consulted at the time of a planning application on the specific proposals and the impact on flooding and drainage issues. This allocation allows for essential development without the need to use Green Belt.</p>
73	58	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	<p>a) On two occasions in the last 18 months since we have lived on Leyland Lane, our garden to the rear has suffered severe flooding when we have had sustained downpours. On both occasions the depth was about 4 inches and I have had to raise a manhole cover to mitigate the flooding and if this development goes ahead I can only see it being more serious and more frequent, as there will be very little open ground to absorb the rainfall. There is a definite increased risk of flooding.</p> <p>b) A massive development as proposed will mean a massive increase in traffic along Leyland Lane.</p> <p>c) Increase in air pollution and an increase in the already high noise pollution. Although there is a 40mph speed limit on this road it is rarely adhered to and I can only see this problem increasing.</p> <p>d) Although there are several rights of way that run across this land and they are to be protected, they are frequently used by people who want to enjoy the countryside not walk through a housing estate.</p> <p>e) There are a great many mature trees and hedgerows. These need protecting and if the housing goes ahead it is more than likely these will be cut down and reduced in number. Trees are also an important part of the control of water and with the reduction in numbers and the tarmacing of this area can only make the problems of potential flooding worse.</p> <p>f) On a personal basis we are very concerned about being overlooked. The housing on our section of Leyland lane mostly are Bungalows and therefore are easily overlooked.</p> <p>g) If this area is deemed to be good agricultural land why build houses on it.</p>	<p>a) Flooding – A small area of this site falls included within a flood zone. However, this does not mean that it is not suitable for development, but that appropriate mitigation measures must be put into place to protect the development from flood risk. The Council will require developers to work closely with both itself, and the Environment Agency, to ensure that this can be achieved.</p> <p>b) Traffic - LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network. LCC has not raised an objection to this site.</p> <p>c) Air/noise pollution – If considered appropriate, noise and air pollution assessments would be required should a planning application be received.</p> <p>d) Noted.</p> <p>e) Trees and hedgerows/ecology/wildlife - Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys would be required as part of any planning application.</p> <p>f) Overlooking of properties - The development will be expected to be planned in such a way that it did not adversely affect the amenities of neighbouring residents. The development is likely to be range of house types.</p> <p>g) Agricultural land/farming – although the land is currently used for agricultural purposes, it is not designated as “Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land”.</p>
104	84	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	<p>a) This land is a vital part of the ecology surrounding Worden Park. It is home to an abundance of breeding wildlife including bats, kestrels, pheasants, woodpeckers, nuthatches and owls as well as foxes, squirrels, field mice and probably numerous other hidden species. Building on this local land would restrict this enjoyment to just the park itself, when what attracts a lot of people is the local area, not confined to park boundaries. We feel this would massively reduce the attractiveness of this area of Leyland as a place to visit.</p> <p>b) The fields behind Altcar Lane are actively used by local farmers, for sheep, cattle and horses co-existing with local wildlife. Any building on this land would take away land from the local farms which would have a major impact on their businesses. Losing such good local business would not be good for Leyland, at a time when local produce is more important than ever.</p> <p>c) Our neighbouring houses consist of old character properties and working farms with open aspects to countryside. Any development would significantly reduce the values of our</p>	<p>a) Trees and hedgerows/ecology/wildlife - Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys will be required as part of any planning application.</p> <p>b) Agricultural land/farming – although the land is currently used for agricultural purposes, it is not designated as “Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land”.</p> <p>c) Character of area/value of properties – this land has been identified for many years as safeguarded for future development.</p> <p>d) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network. LCC has not raised an objection to this site.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>property and in excess of 30 other surrounding properties in the areas around these fields, in turn reducing the desirability of Leyland as being a prosperous and attractive area to move to. Building houses directly in the fields behind Altcar Lane will have an undesirable impact on the local character of this area.</p> <p>d) The increased amount of residential properties would also increase traffic immensely around such attractive quiet countryside.</p>	
386	84	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
287	149	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	<p>a) Supports the allocation of site P for residential development.</p> <p>b) Development Statement and high-level masterplanning shows that the site can accommodate 430 dwellings.</p> <p>c) Strongly supports the reference in paragraph 7.43 and Policy G9 – ‘Worden Park’ for the site to assist in the delivery of an extension to the park. The HCA welcomes ongoing dialogue to explore options to deliver Policy G9.</p>	a to c) Support for the allocation of Site P is noted.
294	150	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	<p>a) I object to the proposed planning application for residential development to the fields on Leyland Lane between Altcar Lane and Shaw Brook Road. This area has always been regarded by the residents as green belt, irrespective of councils changing their minds and re-designating as the whim takes them.</p> <p>b) Extensive planning permission has been given to areas off Wigan Road and the massive derelict site of the old ROF already has the infrastructure required and has far more capacity for new housing than will be needed in the next 20 years.</p>	<p>a) The site has been allocated for development for many years as safeguarded land, which is shown in the South Ribble Local Plan 1995. It is now required for residential development in order to meet the borough’s housing requirement. The land is greenfield – not within the Green Belt. There are no plans to change Green Belt boundaries in the Site Allocations DPD, except at Samlesbury Aerodrome.</p> <p>b) The Council is required to identify land to allow building of a minimum of 417 dwellings per year. This cannot be done using existing development sites and brownfield land only, some greenfield land is also needed. During the last five years, the build rate has been much lower than this, meaning the borough is now in a situation of under provision.</p>
296	152	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	<p>a) There is no immediate access for the ingress and egress of traffic into the site. The proposed egress from the site onto the roundabout at Schleswig Way and Leyland Lane suggests a twice-daily traffic problem. This would affect the quality of life of site residents and those of the immediate local area. The traffic movement onto Leyland Lane, which is a ‘B’ road, for the 2.4 cars per household which 430 houses would generate, would be greatly affected and probably could not cope. The morning journeys to work, then followed by the school run would overload Leyland Lane by an additional 1200 cars each morning. The evening would then be the same. This would mean 2400 additional cars on Leyland Lane per day!!!! Seven Stars would be gridlocked, it can hardly cope now at peak travel times.</p> <p>b) The pollution caused by these journeys would be noise pollution and air pollution causing health problems.</p> <p>c) There is no plan of the potential street scene and if it would be in keeping with the housing on Leyland Lane, Altcar Lane and Worden Lane.</p> <p>d) At this time the area allocated for housing is countryside that is currently farmed. This supports an ecosystem that has been the same for hundreds of years and plant life, trees and wildlife would be massively affected to their detriment. In some cases to extension!</p> <p>e) There is no provision for additional doctors, dentists, schools, police and emergency services to support this housing.</p>	<p>a) Lancashire County Council is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network. LCC has not raised an objection to this site. The infrastructure requirements are contained within the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule, and any developer of the site will be required to contribute towards the agreed infrastructure provision.</p> <p>b) If considered appropriate, noise and air pollution assessments would be required should a planning application be received.</p> <p>c) Street scene in keeping with area – this would be considered should a planning application be received.</p> <p>d) Although the land is currently used for agricultural purposes, it is not designated as “Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land”. Trees and hedgerows/ecology/wildlife - Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys would be required as part of any planning application.</p> <p>e) Access to doctors, dentists, schools, police and emergency services - The Council is working closely with relevant bodies, such as the PCT, United Utilities, the Environment Agency and the Education Authority to ensure there is adequate provision of services in the area.</p>
297	153	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
298	154	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
299	155	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
300	156	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
301	157	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
302	158	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
303	159	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
304	160	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
305	161	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
306	162	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
307	163	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
308	164	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
309	165	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
310	166	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
311	167	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
312	168	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
313	169	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
314	170	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
315	171	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
316	172	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
317	173	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
318	174	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
319	175	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
320	176	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
321	177	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
322	178	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
324	180	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
325	181	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
326	182	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
327	183	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
328	184	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
329	185	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
331	187	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
332	188	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
333	189	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
334	190	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
335	191	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
336	192	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
337	193	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
338	194	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
339	195	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
340	196	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
341	197	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
342	198	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
343	199	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
344	200	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
346	201	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
347	202	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
348	203	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
349	205	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
350	206	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
351	208	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	<p>a) I find it difficult to understand how and why it was left to chance readership of a local newspaper that such an important should be so poorly circulated. As the residents of Butlers Farm Court are likely to be the people most affected by this plan, I would have thought that a document 'signposting' this could have been posted or hand-delivered? As the article in the Leyland Guardian gives no indication of where our 'views' are to be sent I can only assume that handing this in at SRBC offices might lead to some response?</p> <p>b) We are opposed to any such proposal to build houses on the land between Altcar Lane and Shaw Brook Road. We were assured by the builder that this land was 'Green Belt' and as such would remain so.</p> <p>c) Any increase in traffic would be of great concern, especially to those residents with young children.</p>	<p>a) Lack of consultation – Consultation has been taking place over the last two years and the council has made every effort to let all residents of the borough know about consultation opportunities throughout the process using:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A quarter page item 'Your area, your choice' in the Winter 2010/11 edition of Forward (Issue 66). This was to bring the process and Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document to the attention of all residents of the borough. A further item appeared in the Winter 2011 edition (Issue 70).</li> <li>- Posters in shops, doctors' surgeries, dentists surgeries, church halls, community centres, schools, leisure centres, etc</li> <li>- Members of our team attended every Area Committee meeting (or put on additional events for the ones which were cancelled due to the bad weather just before Christmas 2010).</li> <li>- We have spent days in supermarkets – Booths (Penwortham and Longton), Sainsbury's (Bamber Bridge), Morrisons (Leyland and Bamber Bridge), Tesco and Leyland Market to raise awareness at each stage of the consultation.</li> <li>- The full documents have been available in libraries and at the Civic Centre at every stage of the process and some post offices during the first two stages.</li> <li>- Each stage of the process has been promoted via our website and press releases.</li> <li>- All council meetings which have discussed the document, Cabinet and Council, can be attended by members of the public.</li> <li>- Ward and parish councillors have been kept fully informed throughout the process and have provided essential liaison between planning officers and their constituents.</li> <li>- We have an extensive database of people who have expressed an interest in the Site Allocations DPD (over 2,000 contacts) who have all received letters or emails about the latest stage of the process.</li> <li>- There are no plans in place at present to develop site P, but all affected properties will be notified once an application is received.</li> </ul> <p>b) Designation of land - The site has been allocated for development for many years as safeguarded land, which is shown in the South Ribble Local Plan 1995. It is now needed for residential development in order to meet the borough's housing requirement. The land is greenfield – not within the Green Belt. There are no plans to change Green Belt boundaries in the Site Allocations DPD, except at Samlesbury Aerodrome.</p> <p>c) Traffic - LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network. LCC has not raised an objection to this site.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
352	209	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
353	210	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
354	211	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
355	212	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
356	213	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
357	214	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
358	215	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
359	216	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
360	217	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
361	218	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
362	219	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
363	220	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
364	221	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
365	222	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
366	223	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
367	224	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
368	225	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	a) Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296 b) In addition: I think that nice large houses should be left in an area, free from crowding of other lesser houses, my reason is, that nice larger houses should be appealing for business people who work hard and aspire to build larger businesses that create employment which in turn helps the economy. Why bother building a business if you can't find a nice place to spend your money on?	a) Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296 b) Affordable housing – Policy 7 of the adopted Core Strategy requires the provision of sufficient affordable and special needs housing. Delivering affordable housing is a key government objective aimed at enabling everyone to have a decent home that they can afford.
369	226	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
370	227	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	a) Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296 b) In addition: I really fail to understand why you are not prioritising the existing unused "brownfield sites" eg the old Leyland Motors site behind Morrisons (to the side) instead of destroying green belt agricultural which has an abundance of wildlife including sitings of barn owls and a wider variety of domestic birds, local indigenous tree specials - this land cannot ever be replaced as diversity green fields.	a) Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296 b) Use of brownfield sites - For the past few years, the 70% target for new residential development on brownfield land has been well exceeded. The Site Allocations DPD includes brownfield sites as well as greenfield. The site referred to is also identified for development within the life of this plan. Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys will be required as part of any planning application.
371	228	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
372	229	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
374	230	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
375	231	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
376	232	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
377	233	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
378	234	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
379	235	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
380	236	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
381	237	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
382	238	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
383	239	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
384	240	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
385	241	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
483	249	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	<p>a) There is no immediate access for the ingress and egress of traffic into the site. The proposed egress from the site onto the roundabout at Schleswig Way and Leyland Lane suggests a twice-daily traffic problem. This would affect the quality of life of site residents and those of the immediate local area. The traffic movement onto Leyland Lane, which is a 'B' road, for the 2.4 cars which the 430 houses would generate, would be greatly affected and probably would not cope. The morning journeys to work, then followed by the school run would overload Leyland Lane by an additional 1200 cars each morning. The evening would then be the same. This would mean 2400 additional cars on Leyland Lane per day. Seven Stars would be grid locked. It cannot cope now at peak times.</p> <p>b) The noise and air pollution caused by these journeys would cause health problems.</p> <p>c) There is no plan of the potential street scene and if it would be in keeping with the housing on Leyland Lane, Altcar Lane and Worden Lane.</p> <p>d) At this time the area allocated for housing is countryside that is currently farmed. This supports an ecosystem that has existed for hundreds of years.</p> <p>e) Plant, trees and wildlife could be massively affected to its detriment and in some cases possible extinction.</p> <p>f) Also, there is no provision for additional doctors, dentists, schools, police and emergency services to support this housing.</p>	<p>a) Traffic – Lancashire County Council is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network. LCC has not raised an objection to this site.</p> <p>b) Air/noise pollution – If considered appropriate, noise and air pollution assessments would be required should a planning application be received.</p> <p>c) Street scene in keeping with area – this would be considered should a planning application be received.</p> <p>d) Agricultural land/farming – although the land is currently used for agricultural purposes, it is not designated as “Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land”.</p> <p>e) Trees and hedgerows/ecology/wildlife - Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys would be required as part of any planning application.</p> <p>f) Access to doctors, dentists, schools, police and emergency services - The Council is working closely with relevant bodies, such as the PCT, United Utilities, the Environment Agency and the Education Authority to ensure there is adequate provision of services in the area.</p>
484	250	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483
485	251	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483
486	252	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
487	253	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483
488	254	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483
489	255	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483
490	256	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483
491	257	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483
492	258	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483
493	259	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483
494	260	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483
495	261	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483
496	262	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483
497	263	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483
498	264	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483
499	265	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483
500	266	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483
501	267	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
502	268	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483
503	269	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483
504	270	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483
505	271	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483
506	272	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483
507	273	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483	Please see identical representation Ref No: 249, ID 483
236	131	Chapter D – Policy D1 – Site P	a) Support this allocation in principle. Paragraph 7.43 confirms the development would be expected to provide land for an extension to Worden Park. However, the extent of this extension is not identified on the Proposals Map, which does not provide the certainty that developers require. Until the extent of the Worden Park extension is known, the effectiveness of the Policy is thrown in to question and therefore, it is considered <b>unsound</b> .	a) The boundary of the park extension has been removed from the Proposals Map to allow the masterplan process to consider the best way of accommodating an extension.
116	86	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site Q	a) This small Greenfield site would be appropriate for 10 proposed dwellings in the last resort in the absence of available Brownfield land, without having an adverse effect on the local environment, as long as necessary mitigating measures are implemented to protect wildlife species.	a) Use of brownfield sites - For the past few years, the 70% target for new residential development on brownfield land has been well exceeded. The Site Allocations DPD includes brownfield sites as well as greenfield. Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys would be required as part of any planning application.
121	90	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site Q	a) Support the allocation of this site within the emerging DPD. We can confirm that the site is available, suitable and achievable for development in the next 5 years as confirmed in the 2010 SHLAA (Ref LHU1).	a) Support for this proposal is noted.
171	98	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site Q	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 116	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 116
178	99	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site Q	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 116	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 116
186	100	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site Q	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID116	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID116
595	327	Chapter D - Policy	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 116	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 116

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
		D1 - Site Q		
600	331	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site Q	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Concern about communication of latest DPD plans.</li> <li>b) Disagrees with the designation of Longton as a Rural Local Service Centre.</li> <li>c) Concern that Protected Open Land adjacent to Site Q at Longton will be developed and not remain as countryside.</li> <li>d) Unclear whether social infrastructure (schools, doctors, health centres) and drainage infrastructure will be in place to service the new development.</li> <li>e) Concern about traffic implications arising from development of Site Q, especially in using Chapel Lane, Longton.</li> <li>f) Concern about loss of natural open countryside and wildlife.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Communication of proposals – Consultation has been taking place over the last two years and the council has made every effort to let all residents of the borough know about consultation opportunities throughout the process using: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A quarter page item 'Your area, your choice' in the Winter 2010/11 edition of Forward (Issue 66). This was to bring the process and Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document to the attention of all residents of the borough. A further item appeared in the Winter 2011 edition (Issue 70).</li> <li>- Posters in shops, doctors' surgeries, dentists surgeries, church halls, community centres, schools, leisure centres, etc</li> <li>- Members of our team attended every Area Committee meeting (or put on additional events for the ones which were cancelled due to the bad weather just before Christmas 2010).</li> <li>- We have spent days in supermarkets – Booths (Penwortham and Longton), Sainsbury's (Bamber Bridge), Morrisons (Leyland and Bamber Bridge), Tesco and Leyland Market to raise awareness at each stage of the consultation.</li> <li>- The full documents have been available in libraries and at the Civic Centre at every stage of the process and some post offices during the first two stages.</li> <li>- Each stage of the process has been promoted via our website and press releases.</li> <li>- All council meetings which have discussed the document, Cabinet and Council, can be attended by members of the public.</li> <li>- Ward and parish councillors have been kept fully informed throughout the process and have provided essential liaison between planning officers and their constituents.</li> <li>- We have an extensive database of people who have expressed an interest in the Site Allocations DPD (over 2,000 contacts) who have all received letters or emails about the latest stage of the process.</li> </ul> </li> <li>b) The designation of Longton as a Rural Local Service Centre is accepted within Policy 1 of the Adopted Core Strategy.</li> <li>c) This site is currently covered by Policy D1 of the Local Plan 2000 which protects it from development other than that required for the purposes of agriculture or uses appropriate to a rural area or for the re-use and rehabilitation of existing buildings. However, some development is essential in areas in order to keep services viable. In addition, the Council has to identify enough land across the borough in order to meet its housing requirement. In some cases, land not previously identified for development will have to be allocated for new development to maintain the viability and support and maintain the services in the area.</li> <li>d) Access to doctors, dentists, schools, police and emergency services - The Council is working closely with relevant bodies, such as the PCT, United Utilities, the Environment Agency and the Education Authority to ensure there is adequate provision of services in the area. The infrastructure requirements are contained within the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule, and any developer of the site will be required to contribute towards the agreed infrastructure provision. The Environment Agency will be consulted at the time of a planning application on the specific proposals and the impact on flooding and drainage issues.</li> <li>e) Lancashire County Council is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network. LCC has not raised an objection to this site.</li> <li>f) Appropriate wildlife surveys will be required as part of any planning application (no planning application has been received for this site).</li> </ul>
282	147	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site R	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Object to the demolition and redevelopment of the Wesley Street Mill site (site R). Proposed alternative to refurbish the mill.</li> <li>a) Our historic buildings are very important to our towns and cities - not just for the people who live there but for us all. I can confidently conclude that when this mill is gone it will be greatly missed. Nostalgia for our past has a most important role, and to rid ourselves of the tangible connections to it is one of the reasons why society has failed in England. Work to find a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The significance of the mill to local residents is noted. Wesley Street Mill is not a listed building and is not in a conservation area. It therefore has no formal protection as a heritage asset. It is derelict and in a poor physical condition, and for these reasons the Council has identified the site for redevelopment.</li> </ul>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			use! Look at similar buildings that have been converted- some are magnificent! The grounds are big enough for a Park and Lake and the front for Parking for all the apartments.	
139	93	Chapter D - Policy D1 – Site R – Wesley Street Mill	a) The allocation of site 'R' (Land off Wesley Street) includes the former mill lodge, grassland and woodland areas, which should be excluded from the development site. The area should be mapped as part of the ecological network of South Ribble and a site management plan should be produced and implemented as part of a section 106 or CIL agreement for the development of the derelict mill buildings. A part of site 'Z' at Lostock Hall Primary School includes an area of woodland, which should be excluded from the development site.	a) The Council will require the protection and enhancement of the Green Infrastructure on this site to be incorporated into its comprehensive development. <b>Minor Change to para 7.46, to read:</b> "The comprehensive development of <u>this site would help to address these issues. Any such development will including the demolition of the mill and the pub, and will require the protection and enhancement of the Green Infrastructure on the site.</u> "
266	140	Chapter D - Policy D1 – Site R – Wesley Street Mill	a) Submission on behalf of majority landowner of the Wesley Street Mill site (site R). b) Supports the allocation of the land off Wesley Street in Bamber Bridge for housing. The site is achievable with a realistic prospect that more than 50 housing units will be delivered on the site within five years. c) Redevelopment of the site is viable providing the mill is demolished.	a to c) Support for the development of this site is noted.
6	3	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	a) Concern about the effect of at least another 250 vehicles a day using The Hospital Inn level Crossing/junction if Site S is developed (other sites in the vicinity will add even more traffic). b) Requests that a study is done to assess the crossings capacity to take yet more traffic BEFORE any further developments either housing or industrial are under taken.	a and b) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network. Residential development on the site could contributed to improve the existing traffic issues on the local highway network.
87	71	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	a) Brindle Road is still operating on the original sewerage system (unchanged since the 1950's). Since then Moorhey Close, Stephendale Avenue, Greystock Close and more recently, Bluebell Way have all been developed. I wonder just how many more houses can the sewerage system support? b) You mention that local medical facilities will be able to cope with increased numbers due to housing development, I beg to differ; Ryan Medical Centre is at the point of closing patient lists, and I understand that Roselea Medical Centre is also under pressure. c) Recent developments have had to have original plans altered to allow easy access to emergency vehicles - I hope that access roads will enable such large vehicles to enter the area safely. Brindle Road is already an extremely busy road. Accidents do happen along its length; the exit from Withy Trees Avenue onto Brindle Road is dangerous with very limited views of approaching traffic and the roundabout at Bluebell Way is ambiguous when entering the access to Shuttling Fields Lane and drivers often become angry when we cross the roundabout and turn right behind them. The railway crossing is a cause of serious concern. Many, many cars cross there every day - will the crossing infrastructure be able to cope with so many extra vehicles? d) I had understood that Public Rights of Way were safe from development. Why then is it mentioned that the recognised footpath will be altered. Is it when it suits a developer? e) What is "amenity" land and how would this affect the planned development? On Bluebell Way a children's play area was included in the planning application - where is this now? It never appeared - once the houses were finished, the builders just upped and left and the proposed play area is neglected.	a) Sewage facilities – this site is not within a flood zone. The Environment Agency/United Utilities would be consulted should a planning application be received. b) Access to doctors, dentists, schools, police and emergency services - The Council is working closely with relevant bodies, such as the PCT, United Utilities, the Environment Agency and the Education Authority to ensure there is adequate provision of services in the area. c) The infrastructure requirements are contained within the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule, and any developer of the site will be required to contribute towards the agreed infrastructure provision. LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network. Residential development on the site could contribute to improve the existing traffic issues on the local highway network. d) Public Rights of Way - Public Rights of Way will still exist even if a site is developed. e) Define amenity land in the glossary.
119	89	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	a) Persimmon Homes control approx 9.6ha of Site S which would be available for immediate delivery. We continue to support the allocation of Site S for housing. b) New masterplanning undertaken in August 2012, including noise mitigation buffers, shows a net developable area of 15.7ha which at 30 units to the hectare would equate to 470	a) Support for this allocation is noted. b and c) Proposal to increase the number of dwellings proposed is not agreed. The reduction has been based on responses regarding high levels of noise from the motorway, which would significantly affect the site. Noise due to the elevated sections of the motorway would

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>dwelling. From the masterplans the Persimmon site alone could accommodate 286 units.</p> <p>c) Request that Policy D1 be reviewed and amended to accommodate a more realistic (or less pessimistic) quantum of units on Site S to c. 400 units and given Persimmon Homes' interest acknowledge that 150 units would be immediately available in the first phase of the plan period (2010 to 2016).</p>	<p>reduce the amount of housing to be delivered and would require large buffer zones.</p>
126	92	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	<p>a) Years ago we were told that the sewers would not manage with much more housing. Since then Bluebell Way has gone up, Cottage garden centre, and there are plans to develop land the other side of the railway crossing past the hospital inn. To my mind the sewers have not been extended ?</p> <p>b) The privacy would be lost and the value of my property would be compromised that's for sure.</p> <p>c) At present the traffic and noise on Brindle Road has been increased so much so that I have difficulty most days to get out of my drive !</p> <p>d) What about education? Are there plans for more schools?</p> <p>e) I feel that there are so many other places housing could be more appropriate.. Why spoil the green areas is this down to VAT for the builders? Isn't less for green areas than brown ones?</p>	<p>a) Sewage facilities – this site is not within a flood zone. The Environment Agency/United Utilities would be consulted should a planning application be received.</p> <p>b) The development will be expected to be planned in such a way that it did not adversely affect the amenities of neighbouring residents. The development is likely to be range of house types.</p> <p>c) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network. Residential development on the site could contribute to improve the existing traffic issues on the local highway network. The infrastructure requirements are contained within the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule, and any developer of the site will be required to contribute towards the agreed infrastructure provision</p> <p>d) The Council is working closely with relevant bodies, such as the PCT, United Utilities, the Environment Agency and the Education Authority to ensure there is adequate provision of services in the area.</p> <p>e) For the past few years, the 70% target for new residential development on brownfield land has been well exceeded. The Site Allocations DPD includes brownfield sites as well as greenfield.</p>
222	126	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	<p>a) Dorbcrest Homes Limited control part of the land at Site S, Brindle Road.</p> <p>b) Site does not rely on the surrounding land; is deliverable in the short-term without the need for any major infrastructure improvements; and its development would not conflict with the delivery of the wider site.</p> <p>c) Site can deliver housing within the period 2010-2016 without the need for major infrastructure provision as there is already an access from Cottage Gardens which our client has control over and can serve the development site.</p> <p>d) Requests review to allow development of the site in isolation for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It has an existing access point;</li> <li>• The site is owned by a major house builder;</li> <li>• Major infrastructure provision is not necessary;</li> <li>• The site is deliverable in the short-term;</li> <li>• Its development will not prejudice the development of the wider site;</li> <li>• It would not represent 'ad hoc' or piecemeal development.</li> </ul>	<p>a) Noted.</p> <p>b to d) Whilst Cottage Gardens may be one of the agreed access points for the development of this site, the Council is firmly of the view that the site requires comprehensive treatment to ensure that the layouts and interests of different developers are integrated. The site will require significant infrastructure provision, including site roads and services, landscaping and buffering adjoining the motorways, transport improvements, and (subject to further consideration) contributions to social services such as education and healthcare.</p>
602	334	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	<p>a) Why have people not been informed on Brindle Road. I only found out through a third party (it's like the secret service with you lot).</p> <p>b) Where is the extra health care coming from, I struggle to see a doctor now (please tell me straight instead of your usual fudging around). Extra school places will be needed all costing the taxpayer more money.</p> <p>c) The motorway bridge is not designed for this amount of traffic. There are weight restrictions on it now although nobody takes any notice. The road is used as a short cut for vehicles of all types, including heavy wagons taking a short cut to the motorway. It is going to place a huge traffic problem especially on the level crossings where you have already allowed the building of 48 houses in the vicinity, it is already a bottle neck. Kellet Lane is far too narrow for all this traffic and yet again all this will be ignored in the quest for more council tax money.</p> <p>d) Once again green land will be taken up for more houses.</p>	<p>a) Communication of proposals – Consultation has been taking place over the last two years and the council has made every effort to let all residents of the borough know about consultation opportunities throughout the process using:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A quarter page item 'Your area, your choice' in the Winter 2010/11 edition of Forward (Issue 66). This was to bring the process and Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document to the attention of all residents of the borough. A further item appeared in the Winter 2011 edition (Issue 70).</li> <li>- Posters in shops, doctors' surgeries, dentists surgeries, church halls, community centres, schools, leisure centres, etc</li> <li>- Members of our team attended every Area Committee meeting (or put on additional events for the ones which were cancelled due to the bad weather just before Christmas 2010).</li> <li>- We have spent days in supermarkets – Booths (Penwortham and Longton), Sainsbury's (Bamber Bridge), Morrisons (Leyland and Bamber Bridge), Tesco and Leyland Market to</li> </ul>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
				<p>raise awareness at each stage of the consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The full documents have been available in libraries and at the Civic Centre at every stage of the process and some post offices during the first two stages.</li> <li>- Each stage of the process has been promoted via our website and press releases.</li> <li>- All council meetings which have discussed the document, Cabinet and Council, can be attended by members of the public.</li> <li>- Ward and parish councillors have been kept fully informed throughout the process and have provided essential liaison between planning officers and their constituents.</li> <li>- We have an extensive database of people who have expressed an interest in the Site Allocations DPD (over 2,000 contacts) who have all received letters or emails about the latest stage of the process.</li> <li>- No planning application has been received for this site. All affected properties would be notified should an application be received.</li> </ul> <p>b) The Council is working closely with relevant bodies, such as the PCT, United Utilities, the Environment Agency and the Education Authority to ensure there is adequate provision of services in the area.</p> <p>c) The infrastructure requirements are contained within the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule, and any developer of the site will be required to contribute towards the agreed infrastructure provision. LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network. Residential development on the site could contribute to improve the existing traffic issues on the local highway network.</p> <p>d) The site has been allocated for development for many years as safeguarded land, which is shown in the South Ribble Local Plan 1995. It is now needed for residential development in order to meet the borough's housing requirement. The land is greenfield – not within the Green Belt. There are no plans to change Green Belt boundaries in the Site Allocations DPD, except at Samlesbury Aerodrome. For the past few years, the 70% target for new residential development on brownfield land has been well exceeded. The Site Allocations DPD includes brownfield sites as well as greenfield</p>
603	335	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) This proposal will take away our privacy and will devalue our property.</li> <li>b) Brindle Road has now become a very busy road, at times it's not easy getting out of our driveway for traffic. We hate to think what it will be like with another 218 – 240 houses here.</li> <li>c) Bluebell Way is another recent development on Brindle Road, when is taking all our green fields going to stop. How much more of our local countryside is going to become just more urban sprawl. We believe the land over the Hospital Inn crossing near Kellet Lane is also going for building houses. We aren't going to have any green belts left and certainly no wildlife. Why can't all the brownfield sites be developed before taking more countryside?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The development will be expected to be planned in such a way that it does not adversely affect the amenities of neighbouring residents. The development is likely to be range of house types.</li> <li>b) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network. Residential development on the site could contribute to improve the existing traffic issues on the local highway network.</li> <li>c) The site has been allocated for development for many years as safeguarded land, which is shown in the South Ribble Local Plan 1995. It is now needed for residential development in order to meet the borough's housing requirement. The land is greenfield – not within the Green Belt. There are no plans to change Green Belt boundaries in the Site Allocations DPD, except at Samlesbury Aerodrome. For the past few years, the 70% target for new residential development on brownfield land has been well exceeded. The Site Allocations DPD includes brownfield sites as well as greenfield.</li> </ul>
47	37	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site T	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) For the foreseeable future this land will be continuing its existing use as an operational railway site. The council should be aware that Network Rail has made contact with them to discuss the site's continued use as operational railway land to facilitate a rail freight operation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Noted. No change</li> </ul>
12	9	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site Y	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The Walmer Bridge Village Plan supports residential use of the above site. We refer to our letter of 12 January 2009, responding to the Central Lancashire Local Development Core Strategy – September 2008. This letter clearly states a preference for mixed use – including</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Comments noted. Full planning consent was granted for the development of 69 dwellings on this site in August 2012, subject to a s106 agreement.!</li> </ul>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			SOME housing. The Village Plan has never stated the desire for this site to be used solely for residential use. Please can you ensure that any reference to this is deleted from future documents?	
115	86	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Sites M, V & X	<p>a) Longton already is viable as a thriving village and needs no further development to support &amp; maintain the services that it provides. It certainly does not have the capacity to support the increase of volume in traffic that any further development would entail. These Greenfield sites ought to be used for agricultural purposes so that people can grow produce for local consumption.</p> <p>b) Brownfield sites must be used for housing development first.</p>	<p>a) LCC is working on a Central Lancashire Transport Masterplan which will address issues that individual developments will have on the infrastructure network. The Council is working closely with LCC to ensure that suitable sites are brought forward for development. LCC has not raised an objection to these sites.</p> <p>b) Use of brownfield sites - For the past few years, the 70% target for new residential development on brownfield land has been well exceeded. The Site Allocations DPD includes brownfield sites as well as greenfield.</p>
170	98	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Sites M, V & X	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 115	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 115
177	99	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Sites M, V & X	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 115	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 115
185	100	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Sites M, V & X	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 115	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 115
235	131	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Sites M, V & X	<p>a) Redrow supports Policy B1 and the allocation of sites M, V and X for housing at Longton are sound. Allocation of these sites will support the delivery of the Core Strategy and their allocation is in accordance with national planning policy, which seeks to increase the delivery of housing. The sites are within the Rural Local Service Centre, which is prioritised for development in Core Strategy Policy 1.</p> <p>b) Support the delivery of Site X wholly within the first phase of the plan period.</p>	a and b) Support of sites V, M and X is noted. (Redrow have a separate representation relating to Policy B1).
265	139	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Sites M, V & X	<p>a) Support allocation and phasing of sites M, V and X, on behalf of landowners.</p> <p>b) Bringing the sites forward within the context of a strategic master plan would facilitate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An integrated movement strategy;</li> <li>• A structural landscape framework (incorporating existing and new tree and hedgerow planting) to enhance the relationship of the development with the greenbelt and the listed Longton Hall;</li> <li>• A comprehensive approach towards the delivery of utilities infrastructure;</li> <li>• An efficient use of land through a development layout responsive to the physical context of the site; and</li> <li>• A high quality of urban design through consistency in the use of materials and architectural detailing on both properties and the public realm.</li> </ul> <p>In addition to supporting the services and facilities within Longton, development of the site has the potential to deliver wider benefits such as the diversification of housing stock, the provision of affordable housing and contributions to local infrastructure schemes.</p> <p>c) There are no physical constraints that would preclude the sites from coming forward for development.</p> <p>d) The sites allocated and phased by Policies D1 and D2 are insufficient to meet the remaining requirements of the first phase (2010 – 2016) of housing development. In order to make Policies D1 and D2 sound, it will be necessary to identify additional deliverable land in the</p>	<p>a to c) Support for the allocation of this site is noted, including the proposal by the agents to prepare a masterplan to guide the development of these sites.</p> <p>d) Noted. No change.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			remaining 5 years of Phase 1 (i.e. April 2011 – March 2016), sufficient to provide for 2,815 units (417 annual requirement + NPPF 20% x 5 years + 313 undersupply). As a result of these shortcomings, the landowners propose that all three sites are phased for development within the period 2010-2016.	
594	327	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Sites M, V & X	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 115	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 115
140	93	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Table 2 - with permission	<p>a) The 'Residential with Permission' area 'A' overlaps with Worden Wood BHS (Ancient Woodland Wd1). Has there been appropriate mitigation and compensation?</p> <p>b) The 'Residential with Permission' area 'GG' is adjacent to Preston Junction BHS and LNR. Is there an appropriate buffer zone adjacent to it?</p>	<p>a) Area A – Group One, off Central Avenue, Buckshaw Village was granted planning permission in 2008.</p> <p>b) Area GG – Wateringpool Lane, Lostock Hall, was granted planning permission in June 2012 following an appeal.</p>
238	123	Chapter D - Policy D3	<p>a) Agree with Policy D3c(i) concerning the removal of agricultural occupancy conditions where it can be demonstrated that “the essential need which originally required the dwelling to be permitted no longer applies in relation to the farm unit and that the dwelling will not be required similarly in the longer term.”</p> <p>b) Disagrees with Policy D3c(ii) concerning whether “reasonable attempts have been made to dispose of the dwelling for occupation in compliance with the original condition” because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should the marketing result in a level of interest in the property, or indeed an offer to purchase, all that normally demonstrates is an ability (on the part of the prospective purchaser) to comply with the Agricultural Occupancy Condition. Without an interrogation of the circumstances of the interested parties, the mere ability to comply cannot be said to be evidence of 'need'.</li> <li>• Interest is often expressed by persons who are unable to comply with the occupancy condition, but who are prepared to make a speculative purchase given the extent of the 'discount' to unconditional Market Value which the Asking Price normally reflects.</li> <li>• The marketing of an Agricultural Workers Dwelling solely for planning purposes, without any genuine intention on the part of the owner to sell, is disingenuous at the very least, and equivalent to property misdescription.</li> <li>• Furthermore, the wide misuse of marketing for planning purposes only can often generate a negative response from the market; potential prospective purchasers assuming that the marketing exercise is in fact a sham and thus not bothering to make enquiries about the property.</li> <li>• Finally, the ability to obtain mortgage finance for dwellings subject to Agricultural Occupancy Conditions has always been problematic. In the current adverse residential market conditions, with mortgage finance difficult to secure for most properties, the chances of a purchaser obtaining loan finance in respect of a property with an agricultural occupancy condition is considered to be remote.</li> </ul> <p>c) Alternative Method for establishing whether there is an essential need in the locality for the agricultural workers dwelling is by firstly addressing what is meant by both need and locality, and then analysing the full approved planning permissions for agricultural workers dwellings in the locality identified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need: distinguish evidence of continuing need for Agricultural Workers' Dwellings from evidence of continuing demand. In this context, at least, the words are not synonymous. Many factors may contribute towards the market demand for a particular property, but, it is the need for a dwelling that is relevant in the case of farm or forestry workers dwellings” (our emphasis). The number of planning applications received (for agricultural workers' dwellings) as a yardstick for gauging need is misguided. The number of such applications received is only indicative of demand. It is the number of such applications which are subsequently approved which may provide evidence of need.</li> </ul>	<p>a and b) Noted.</p> <p>c) The alternative method defines terms (need and locality) that are not used in policy D3c(ii). This proposal is unduly complex: no change.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locality: in more rural parts of the Country the locality, for the purposes of an assessment, of a particular agricultural unit may be appropriately defined by reference to travelling distance or travelling time. However such a simple and straightforward measure is inappropriate in the more densely populated parts of the North West of England, where travelling distances between settlements are short. The locality, at its widest, varies according to the location of the subject property. A 1/100,000 Scale Plan can be used to define these boundaries, but they often include major roads, waterways and towns/cities. Any need for residential accommodation for a key agricultural worker on an agricultural unit located beyond identified settlements would not require an Agricultural Workers' Dwelling within the locality defined. Those settlements would provide a wide range of available house types and tenure capable of satisfying such accommodation need.</li> <li>• Identifying need within the locality: evidence obtained from research of the Planning Registers of the relevant LPA's (who cover the identified locality) regarding planning applications for permanent agricultural workers' dwellings should be reviewed. Research of all applicable local planning authority's planning registers to identify the number, frequency and outcome of planning applications submitted for permanent Agricultural Workers' Dwellings over the past 10 years should be carried out. Analysis of the approved planning applications within the identified locality will provide evidence of need. This is the only one yardstick required for identifying need within the local agricultural sector.</li> </ul>	
201	111	Chapter D Policy D1 – Site H	a) The Council has identified 475 houses to be delivered at Vernon Carus and Land at Factory Lane, Penwortham (Proposals Map ref: H). However the Consultation Paper at paragraph 7.26 indicates the site is the subject of a current planning application for a mixed use development of 368 dwellings and 4,500 sq m of Class B1 commercial floor space. The housing land description for the site is therefore not consistent with table 2 and it appears as though 475 units will not be achieved at the site especially as it only extends to 4.14 hectares.	a) The area of Site H, as shown in Table 2 and para. 7.26 is incorrect. A <b>Minor Change</b> is required to show the correct site area of <b>12.8 hectares</b> . The two site capacity figures are not inconsistent: 475 is the overall capacity of the site, whilst 368 is the figure referred to by the applicants, when submitting an application to develop part of the site for housing.
38	31	Chapter E - Policy E1 – Site c – Kellet Lane	a) The revised plan to unallocate the land on Kellett Lane as employment status is good news in light of traffic problems in area and also the fact that many units are empty or up for let on Walton Summit and sceptre nearby. Would not make sense in current climate to develop.	a) Support is noted.
141	93	Chapter E - Policy E1 – Site d	a) Site 'd' (North of Lancashire Business Park) includes Habitats of Principal Importance in England (Lowland Meadows, Rivers, Hedgerows and Ponds), which will have to be mitigated and compensated for such that there is a net gain in biodiversity in accordance with requirements paragraphs 9, 17, 109, 117 & 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework.	a) Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys would be required as part of any planning application.
142	93	Chapter E - Policy E2	a) Our records show Site 16 (Carr Lane, Farington) to overlap with a Biological Heritage Site (reference 52SW07). If this is correct the boundary of the Employment Site should be amended to exclude the BHS. b) The policy should be subject to the proviso that any development must protect, conserve and enhance the biodiversity of the protected employment areas and sites.	a) <b>Minor Change:</b> agree that Site 16 should exclude the area marked as a BHS – this area is currently shown as covered by two policies on the Proposals Map. b) Noted. Biodiversity aspects will be considered against other plan policies, including Core Strategy Policies 18 and 22, and DPD Policies G7 and G8.
249	137	Chapter E - Policy E2	a) The emerging DPD is too restrictive and is not fully consistent with the NPPF, which highlights the need for flexibility within policy frameworks to ensure local authorities can respond to changing market circumstances and demand from individual occupiers. b) The document should acknowledge the substantial employment benefits of 'non-traditional B	a) The Council has included and protected a wide range of development land for employment use which meets the NPPF requirements. b and c) The evidence to support the text in paragraph 8.28 is derived from the Central

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>Class uses' such as specialist retail operators and sui generis uses. The policy framework should enable individual schemes to be considered on their own merits in accordance with the relevant tests and criteria outlined within National Planning Policy guidance. RPS consider Policy E2 'Protection of Employment Areas and Sites' and paragraph 8.28 too restrictive and do not provide sufficient flexibility to support sustainable economic growth.</p> <p>c) Do not consider that the final sentence of supporting paragraph 8.28 relating to large scale retail development is appropriate. Policy should not seek to preclude forms of retail development which may have wide ranging benefits for local economy including local employment opportunities. Indeed, such proposals should duly be considered upon their merits and are capable of being considered against the NPPF which prescribes the key retail policy tests of the sequential approach to site selection and retail impact.</p>	Lancashire Retail & Leisure Study. No change.
239	133	Chapter E - Policy E3 - Leyland Town Centre	<p>a) Strongly recommend that Leyland's Town Centre's boundary be extended to include the existing Morrisons store (together with the Argos Extra and the Homebase store) at Olympian Way, as defined in Appendix 4 of the DPD.</p> <p>b) Note that the Local Plan Town Centre boundary from 2000 has been retained, which includes the Tesco Extra store. We would suggest that this boundary is now dated and does not reflect the recent developments in the town centre. Furthermore, given that the Morrisons and Tesco store clearly have a similar role within the Town Centre and a similar physical relationship to the PSA, we suggest that the Town Centre boundary of Leyland should be extended to include our client's store.</p>	a and b)The Town Centre boundaries are informed by the Retail and Leisure Study. No change.
162	95	Chapter E - Policy E4	<p>a) Supports the retention of Liverpool Road, Penwortham as a District Centre. However, the District Centre boundary and Primary Retail Frontages as currently proposed in the Site Allocations DPD excludes the site of the proposed Sainsbury's foodstore. This approach is inconsistent with national guidance and, therefore, unsound. Recommended that the District Centre boundary and Primary Retail Frontage is extended to include the frontage of the proposed Sainsbury's store on Liverpool Road.</p> <p>b) Sainsbury's legal advisors are currently in discussions with the Council to finalise the S106 Agreement which will allow the formal decision notice to be issued. The Sainsbury's store will strengthen the role and function of the District Centre.</p> <p>c) Suggested Change: <i>Extend the District Centre boundary and Primary Retail Frontage of Penwortham to include the frontage of the proposed Sainsbury's store on Liverpool Road.</i></p>	a to c)The Council's approach is to wait until the Sainsbury's store is built and trading before considering a modification to the retail boundaries at Penwortham. At present, the store does not have a valid planning permission (awaiting a s106 agreement) so modifying the boundary would be premature.
112	86	Chapter E - Policy E5	a) My comment is the use of the term 'local centres'. These are in fact villages. It is important to make the distinction between the rural (villages of varying sizes) and urban environments (towns).	a) The NPPF (paragraph 23) states that local planning authorities should "define a network and hierarchy of centres...." The Core Strategy defines city, town and district centres in chapter 9 (figure 13) and refers to local centres in Policy 11e. Policy E5 is simply identifying and defining the local centres (as the next level down from district centres) in South Ribble. None of the hierarchy definitions deny the more general definition of villages, but for the purposes of the DPD, "Local centres" is the correct and appropriate terminology.
168	98	Chapter E - Policy E5	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 112	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 112
175	99	Chapter E - Policy E5	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 112	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 112
183	100	Chapter E - Policy E5	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID112.	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID112.

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
592	327	Chapter E - Policy E5	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 112	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 112
53	39	Chapter F - Rail Facilities	a) Please reinstate the Preston to Southport railway line.	a) Support for this is noted.
46	37	Chapter F - Rail Facilities - Paragraph 9.10	a) Any future station at Midge Hall could result in an increase in the volume of traffic over the level crossing, with the potential for issues of blocking back across the crossing as vehicles park at any proposed station. As a first principle, Network Rail would seek to close level crossings where possible, and in this case, Network Rail would seek developer contributions for closure of the level crossing and the installation of a road bridge as well as developer funding for the proposed railway station. Any development would be subject to Network Rail's full approval.	a) The Core Strategy has been found sound by the Planning Inspector and it was adopted by South Ribble on 18 July 2012. Network Rail will be consulted when this identified need becomes viable.
48	37	Chapter F - Tram - paragraph 9.16	a) The applicant must seek all necessary consents from Network Rail before any works on site commence with regard to the connection at Preston Railway Station.	a) Network Rail will be consulted prior to this project being undertaken.
16	11	Chapter G	a) The Council is pleased to note that Chapter G, paragraph 10.20, refers to the fact that all sites with international, national and local environmental designations are recognised by the Central Lancashire Core Strategy and are given a level of protection from any adverse impacts of development through Core Strategy Policy 22.	a) Noted.
231	130	Chapter G	<p>a) It would appear that a substantial amount of green areas will be sacrificed to housing.</p> <p>b) I am pleased with the creation of the central park and the green corridor along London Way.</p> <p>c) Years ago I wrote to the local councillors suggesting the park to the East of Watkin Lane should be extended West by using the field between South View, Lostock Hall &amp; Farington Road to link up with the land to the West of Sherdley Road. Paths through would be an added advantage to save pedestrians walking along a road with no footpath. This field is an important wildlife corridor which is appreciated by the councillors on the planning committee if not by South Ribble planners and should certainly be added to the green corridor.</p>	<p>a) The amount of land required for housing has been set by the Core Strategy, much of which was previously designated safeguarded for future development, and the amount of previously undeveloped land for housing has been tested against the sustainability appraisal which has been prepared alongside the DPD. In accordance with the Core Strategy, the Council has sought to allocate previously developed (brownfield) land before considering greenfield sites. The Core Strategy has been found sound by the Planning Inspector and it was adopted by South Ribble on 18 July 2012. For the past few years, the 70% target for new residential development on brownfield land has been well exceeded. The Site Allocations DPD includes brownfield sites as well as greenfield.</p> <p>b) Noted.</p> <p>c) The area of land identified lies within the Green Belt (Policy G1) and Area of Separation (Policy G5) and so has a high degree of protection against built development in the DPD. The Council has, however, no plans to extend the park as described. Appropriate environmental and wildlife surveys would be required as part of any planning application</p>
260	138	Chapter G	<p>a) The County Council support all the Policies in Chapter G; however a few issues should be raised.</p> <p>b) NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by... recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services (the benefits people obtain from ecosystems such as, food, water, flood and disease control and recreation). DPD document makes no reference to ecosystem services. SRBC may wish to examine how the DPD achieves this objective of the NPPF and incorporate appropriate amendments.</p> <p>c) NPPF states that LPAs should set criteria based policies against which proposals for any development on or affecting protected wildlife or geodiversity sites or landscape areas will be judged. Distinctions should be made between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites, so that protection is commensurate with their status and gives appropriate weight to their importance and the contribution that they make to wider</p>	<p>a) Noted.</p> <p>b) Ecosystem services is a new expression. It is alluded to in the adopted Core Strategy (eg Strategic Objective 17 and Policy 22), and paragraphs 10.1 and 10.2 in the DPD. No further change.</p> <p>c) The Core Strategy contains policies designed to protect wildlife, geodiversity and landscape areas (Policies 18, 21 and 22), although these are not framed as criteria policies. The detailed identification of the Green Belt, Protected Open Land, Areas of Separation, Central Park, Green Infrastructure, Green Corridors, Conservation Areas, Historic Parks and Gardens, Biological Heritage Sites, Geological Heritage Sites, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Local Nature Reserves, Sites of Special Scientific Interest and Wildlife Corridors are all depicted on the Proposals Map for the DPD (but most of the designations are not related to any policy in the DPD). The depiction is intended to simply plot these features as known designations, and it is not necessary for there to be policies associated</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>ecological networks. Crucially, Local Plans should identify land where development would be inappropriate, for instance because of its environmental or historic significance.</p> <p>d) Central Lancs Core Strategy Policy 22 relates to Biodiversity and Geodiversity but is not criteria-based nor does it identify or distinguish between the hierarchy of protected sites. The DPD does not contain any development management policies which relate specifically to protected wildlife or geodiversity sites, as identified on the proposals maps. It would seem, therefore, that the local plan does not address the requirements established in the NPPF. Wildlife Corridors are identified on the Proposals Map. The NPPF requires local planning authorities to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure;</li> <li>• plan for biodiversity at a landscape-scale across local authority boundaries;</li> <li>• identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation;</li> <li>• promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations, linked to national and local targets, and identify suitable indicators for monitoring biodiversity in the plan;</li> <li>• contain a clear strategy for enhancing the natural, built and historic environment.</li> </ul> <p>The County Council does not believe that the sites and wildlife corridors identified are adequate to address these requirements and establish a "coherent ecological network" nor is a clear strategy for enhancement of the natural environment identified. Further consideration needs to be given to these aspects and appropriate measures developed, included and monitored. The conservation and enhancement of the natural environment is a strategic priority and the NPPF requires county and district authorities to work collaboratively to enable the delivery of sustainable development.</p>	<p>with these features.</p> <p>Distinctions are made to the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites in paragraphs 10.21 – 10.23 in the Core Strategy. Paragraph 10.21 says: "A wide range of sites important to wildlife habitats and species exist in Central Lancashire, and whilst some areas/sites are afforded greater protection through legislation, the Core Strategy recognises the ecological value of all levels." Paragraph 10.23 says: "The Core Strategy will help ensure that areas/sites with international, national and local designations will not be adversely affected by new development."</p> <p>d) Noted. The strategic approach to biodiversity and geodiversity is contained in the adopted Core Strategy. The key components of the local ecological networks are shown on the DPD Proposals Map.</p>
601	333	Chapter G	<p>a) You have not consulted or communicated with us as landowners and this has a direct effect on ourselves and our property.</p> <p>b) The garden and surrounding our property was classified on the 2000 plan as parks and other public open spaces.</p> <p>b) You have classified our property as Green Corridor, again without consultation or communication.</p> <p>c) The road (Rhoden Road) is privately owned by ourselves, it is a road and footpath combined. It is maintained by us, and is used by everyone in the area. It appears that this green corridor maintenance is funded by ourselves for the benefit of others.</p> <p>d) The open space owned by SRBC drains onto our land, this caused us problems as the ground and our septic tank becomes water logged.</p>	<p>a) The Council considers that it has taken all reasonable steps to engage with people affected by the policies and proposals in the DPD, including holding a meeting with the owners of this land during the representations period to hear their concerns.</p> <p>b) The land referred to is identified in the DPD as being within a Green Corridor (Policy G12). None of the land is covered by the Green Infrastructure designation (Policy G7).</p> <p>c) The Council's view is that the Green Corridor designation of the land and property is appropriate, because Rhoden House lies within an area of generally open land between two built-up areas. The Green Corridor designation does not completely rule out development at Rhoden House; the merits of any development in exceptional circumstances would need careful consideration by the Council.</p> <p>d) Rhoden Road crosses the Green Corridor. It is a public footpath, but has been surfaced in order to provide vehicular access to Rhoden House and several neighbouring properties. It is unadopted. The upkeep of the road surface is a private matter between the owners of the road and the neighbouring residents who take vehicle access over the road to their properties.</p> <p>e) Drainage problems related to the neighbouring land are not matters relevant to the soundness of the DPD.</p>
143	93	Chapter G - Designated Environmental Sites	<p>a) The designated environmental sites referred to in paragraphs 10.12 - 10.17 and listed in Appendix 7, don't include Samlesbury Aerodrome which would bring the current total to 67.</p>	<p>a) No information found on LCC website, Mapzone and Lancashire RIGS for Samlesbury Aerodrome.</p> <p>See Also Ref 93, ID 137 and ID 138</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
144	93	Chapter G - Designated Environmental Sites	a) Paragraph 10.20 states that “All sites with international, national and local environmental designations are recognised by the Core Strategy and are given a level of protection from any adverse impacts of development through Core Strategy Policy 22.” However, this is not backed up in a policy in this DPD. The Trust believes that there should be a presumption set out in this document against development which would adversely affect such designated sites. There should also be some clarification of the circumstances where such adverse effects may be outweighed by other consideration and the mitigation measures that would be expected. Furthermore, none of the policies refer to European Protected Species and other species with legal protection or that are a material planning consideration (see NERC Act 2006).	a) The detailed identification of the Green Belt, Protected Open Land, Areas of Separation, Central Park, Green Infrastructure, Green Corridors, Conservation Areas, Historic Parks and Gardens, Biological Heritage Sites, Geological Heritage Sites, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Local Nature Reserves, Sites of Special Scientific Interest and Wildlife Corridors are all depicted on the Proposals Map for the DPD ( <i>but most of the designations are not related to any policy in the DPD</i> ).
145	93	Chapter G - Green Infrastructure - Introduction	a) Paragraph 10.46 states: “The Council is committed to protecting and enhancing the Green Infrastructure network across South Ribble, as it ... protects natural habitats and species...”. However, Green Infrastructure is defined in 10.45 as a list of 11 features (shown on the Proposals Map). Hence those natural habitats and species that occur in one or more of the 11 features may be protected, if shown on the Proposals Map, but those natural habitats and species that occur outside of the 11 features and/or aren't shown on the Proposals Map are NOT protected. It is recommended that a more appropriate definition of Green Infrastructure is used in the DPD.	a) The Green Infrastructure policies (Core Strategy Policies 18 and 22, DPD Policies G7 and G8) set out to protect habitats and species as set out in paragraph 10.46. The areas covered by Green Infrastructure are shown on the Proposals Map, and the Proposals Map makes no distinction between the various features as set out in paragraph 10.45. The clear intention of the policies is to protect all natural habitats and features within the areas depicted on the Proposals Map, regardless of which component feature the land is attributed to. No change proposed.
291	149	Chapter G - Policies G5 & G6 - Lime Kiln Farm	<p>a) The site is currently a housing allocation within the South Ribble Local Plan (February 2000) and identified in the Central Lancashire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (September 2010) as site SA3 which is suitable, available and achievable to deliver approximately 190 dwellings (90 in the period between 2010/11 and 2014/15 and a further 100 in the period between 2015/16 and 2019/20).</p> <p>b) The DPD allocation for the site is for an Area of Separation (Policy G5), within a wider Central Park (Policy G6). Policy G6 requires that the park be delivered to enhance and protect green infrastructure, as well as creating new parkland and open spaces.</p> <p>c) In supporting the aspirations of the Council the issue which requires further consideration is how the policies for the Central Park are to be delivered. Given the site's existing allocation for housing the HCA believe that the sensitive inclusion of housing within the park will enable and support the successful delivery of the Policy G6 and create a new attractive environment. Have produced a masterplan based on the provision of low density, predominantly detached dwellings within a parkland setting, retaining the principle of the area of separation and avoiding coalescence of adjacent areas. A significant area of the Central Park is included within the masterplan, extending well beyond the proposed residential areas.</p> <p>d) The masterplanning work indicates the ability to accommodate up to 150 dwellings alongside formal and informal open space.</p> <p>e) Suggested change of a new residential allocation or revised wording of the final paragraph of Policy G6, with appropriate policy criterion which requires the provision of a Central Park and Areas of Separation around any residential development.</p>	a to e) The Council proposes that this land be retained as part of the proposed area of Central Park. It forms a key parcel of land in the built up area suitable for leisure and recreational purposes. No change.
65	52	Chapter G - Policy G1	a) Paragraph (e) of Policy G1 should be amended to exclude wind turbines, as these would impact on the openness of the land within the green belt.	a) Policy 1e is consistent with NPPF references to the Green Belt and renewable energy (especially paragraphs 91 and 97). Paragraph 91 says that “when located in the Green Belt, elements of many renewable energy projects will comprise inappropriate development. In such cases developers will need to demonstrate very special circumstances if projects are to proceed.” Paragraph 97 says: “...local planning authorities should recognise the responsibility on all communities to contribute to energy generation from renewable or low carbon sources.” Policy 1e is positively worded and qualified. The Council believes it is consistent with the NPPF and with Policy 28 of the Core Strategy, and it is intended to apply

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
				to the full range of renewable energy schemes (including micro generation) not just wind turbines. It neither rules in or out a wind turbine proposal, but when taken together with the other policies, does indicate that a wind turbine proposal will need to demonstrate very special circumstances for consent to be granted. Whilst the Green Belt does exist to keep land permanently open, paragraph 91 in the NPPF continues by saying: "Such very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources." Any restriction in the policy as suggested is unnecessary and would not be consistent with national policy or Core Strategy Policy 28. SRBC has begun to prepare a Supplementary Planning Document on Renewable and Low Carbon Energy, which will be published for consultation later in 2012.
221	125	Chapter G - Policy G1	<p>a) Land north of Goose Green Farm, Much Hoole was submitted to the Council at the earlier Call for Sites exercise but was 'filtered out' due to the fact that it is in the Green Belt and there had been a decision made by the Council not to take forward Green Belt sites. Suggested that additional land which has also become available has significantly improved the site's potential for development as it adjoins the established urban area and its development would now be far more logical than previously considered.</p> <p>b) Given the proposed allocation to the north of the site it would make sense for the site subject to these representations to be also allocated for 'Village Development' under Policy B2. This would create a site which can provide for the future local needs of Much Hoole without forming an illogical extension to the established urban area.</p>	a and b) This site is within the Green Belt. The Council has resolved not to make any amendments to the Green Belt boundary, except for the accommodation of development within the Enterprise Zone at BAE Systems, Samlesbury. The sites identified in the DPD have been done so to achieve the required housing land supply for the duration of the plan without the need to take green belt land.
596	328	Chapter G - Policy G1	<p>a) Land within the Green Belt Off Wham Lane, New Longton proposed for development for the benefit of the New Longton community.</p> <p>b) If it is the case that our proposal was too ambitious in its scale, we have since considered a small scale option (approximately 5 acres compared to the previous 20 acres) at the northern, Royalty Lane end of the plot. This has the merit of having existing buildings on three sides and could embody some of the original features addressing local needs (Policy D9), such as affordable housing and doctor's surgery.</p>	a and b) This site is within the Green Belt. The Council has resolved not to make any amendments to the Green Belt boundary, except for the accommodation of development within the Enterprise Zone at BAE Systems, Samlesbury.
209	114	Chapter G - Policy G1 - Collingwood Farm	<p>a) Collingwood Farm is a former chicken farm in the Green Belt near Hutton, which is now almost entirely used for storage and distribution purposes under class B8.</p> <p>b) When viewed from the open countryside area, the buildings and use of the site presents an unattractive view which visually conflicts with the more attractive and softer edge to this part of Hutton.</p> <p>c) Site is suitable for development because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it is immediately adjacent to the existing urban area of Hutton and visually relates to the built up area rather than the open countryside beyond. Indeed it appears as part of the settlement rather than open land and its development would only serve to consolidate this existing relationship.</li> <li>• the site is wholly brownfield/previously developed land. It does not serve any of the purposes of the Green Belt in its current use and its removal would not impact adversely on the maintenance of the Green Belt.</li> <li>• residential use would improve the amenity enjoyed by the residents of the surrounding properties in terms of visual appearance, noise and general non-residential activity.</li> <li>• it is located in an extremely sustainable location within walking distance of a post office and convenience store. It is also within 400m of a bus stop which provides regular services into Preston and the surrounding area.</li> <li>• It would provide the opportunity to widen and straighten Ratten Lane, thus improving highway conditions. There may also be an opportunity to link the pedestrian footpath through to the existing residential area on Ratten Lane.</li> </ul> <p>d) The development of residential development in this location would support the Government' objective to support sustainable development and conforms with NPPF para 89, bullet 6.</p>	a to e) This site is within the Green Belt. The Council has resolved not to make any amendments to the Green Belt boundary, except for the accommodation of development within the Enterprise Zone at BAE Systems, Samlesbury. Any application will be treated on its merits. The onus will be on the applicant to show exceptional circumstances why the site should be developed.

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			e) The form of development proposed would be a residential development of say 14no. units of a scale that reflects the existing development on site.	
153	93	Chapter G - Policy G10	a) The definition of Green Infrastructure doesn't include natural and semi natural greenspace for which a space standard has been allocated. b) The Trust would prefer to see the use of the Government's Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards (ANGSt).	a) <b>Minor Change</b> to para 10.45 to add a bullet point reading: "Natural and semi-natural greenspace" b) The provision standards contained in Policy G10 are derived/evidenced from the Council's Open Space survey (2012).
213	117	Chapter G - Policy G10	a) Welcome the commitment in Policy G10 to providing GI in all residential developments of more than five dwellings. We would like to see specific reference in the policy to the important role which trees and woods can play as a part of a well-integrated network of green infrastructure in new development. b) Welcome the Council's decision to adopt access standards for various types of green infrastructure, including one on natural greenspace. Because of the particularly wide range of social, economic and environmental benefits provided by woodland, we would like to see a separate accessibility standard for woodland. c) Promote Woodland Access Standard: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That no person should live more than 500m from at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 2 ha in size</li> <li>• That there should also be at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 20 ha within 4km (8km round trip) of people.</li> </ul> d) We would like to see reference in this chapter to the important role which trees and woods can play both in mitigation of climate change (by sequestering carbon from the atmosphere) and in adaptation, for example by helping reduce urban temperatures in summer, alleviating flood risk and improving air quality.	a) Paragraph 10.45 refers to woodland being part of the defined Green Infrastructure, and paragraph 10.68 refers to the need for new trees, woodlands and hedgerow to be provided as part of any new development. For these reasons the Council does not propose any changes to the DPD. b and c) Provision standards contained in Policy G10 are derived/evidenced from the Council's Open Space survey (2012). Woodland provision is included within several of the categories of Green Infrastructure provision set out in Policy G10, and the Council do not consider it necessary to make a separate woodland category. d) Climate change is already identified in paragraph 10.68 as one of the key features of woodlands, and the Council does not propose to repeat this point in Chapter J.
117	87	Chapter G - Policy G12	a) Representation is made on behalf of Thomas Mawdsley Builders in relation to Policy G 12 in relation to land north of Mayfields, Rhoden Road, Moss Side, Leyland. b) From both a sustainable use of urban land and a land use planning perspective that in reality, the inclusion of this site and that on the opposite side of the road are either simply because they link the Green Corridor alongside Schleswig Way with that around the Test track centre and/or it provides a noise buffer around Rhoden Road industrial estate and the noise issues that have emanated from there in the past. c) The area alongside Schleswig Way as a Green corridor is understandable. The area around the test track is understandable, both are predominantly parkland. The area between including this site less so, and it does appear that it has been included for noise attenuation measures rather than because it contributes to the `Green Corridor`. d) This is a sustainable site for development within an urban framework, and meets the tests of sustainability contained in the NPPF.	a) Noted. b and c)The Council's view is that the Green Corridor designation of the land north of Mayfields is appropriate, because it lies within an area of generally open land between two built-up areas. The Green Corridor designation does not completely rule out development; the merits of any development in exceptional circumstances would need careful consideration by the Council. e) The site was the subject of a planning condition relating to two properties constructed on Rhoden Road , one of which is Mayfields. The decision notice for 07/04/0051 was issued on 19 January 2004 and condition no.5 reads: "That full details of a landscaping scheme including details of the timing for its implementation and a management plan for its future maintenance, for the area of land edged blue on the submitted plans, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This area shall be retained thereafter as a landscaped area and shall not be included within the curtilage of the adjoining property." The reason given on the decision notice for this condition was "To enhance and maintain the character of the designated 'Green Wedge'." The land is still subject to this condition and therefore not suitable to be considered as a development site.
154	93	Chapter G - Policy G12	a) The Trust believes that the wording of this Policy could be stronger/more specific in terms of the benefits of green corridors to wildlife and biodiversity. On the Proposals Map Green Corridors are shown with a different notation to wildlife corridors. There don't seem to be any policies specific to wildlife corridors, their protection or enhancement. Is this an omission? The Lawton Review (2010) was commissioned by the government and identified the need for 'Landscape Corridors', 'Linear Corridors' and 'Stepping Stone Corridors'. The Trust recommends that Policy G12 is amended so that it includes 'Landscape Corridors', 'Linear Corridors' and 'Stepping Stone Corridors' in accordance with the Lawton Review and the	a) The detailed identification of Green Infrastructure, Green Corridors and Wildlife Corridors are all depicted on the Proposals Map for the DPD. No change.

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			requirements of the NPPF.	
215	118	Chapter G - Policy G12 - Green Corridors	<p>a) Suggest that the isolated River Lostock Country Park, Sherdley Road should be linked to the green corridor to the East of Watkin Lane adjacent to Resolution Bridge by assigning green corridor status to the two fields between the parks and adjacent the River Lostock which are currently shown as green belt &amp; area of separation. Importance of preserving the two fields for the wildlife of the area and increasing the protection from development would help achieve this.</p> <p>b) By using this area (in sites d, 10 &amp; g) a path from Leyland to Bamber Bridge could be made, the majority of which would be adjacent the river, by linking exist rights of way together. Starting from Mill Lane footbridge (Noth of Earnshaw Bridge) a new path could be made along the bank to link to the existing path / footbridge adjacent Farington Road. From this point the existing path would be used to Fowler Lane and the railway crossed by Fowler Lane bridge. Having crossed the bridge footpath No.FP6 would be followed to Farington Road. From here a new path could be made along the Western boundary of field No.2 (referred to in my first paragraph) then along the river bank to Watkin Lane. From this point existing paths link to Bamber Bridge.</p>	a and b) The area of land east of Watkin Lane lies within the Green Belt (Policy G1) and Area of Separation (Policy G5) and so has a high degree of protection against built development in the DPD. The Council has, however, no plans to extend the Green Corridor or create new rights of way along the River Lostock.
155	93	Chapter G - Policy G13	<p>a) The Trust believes that this policy would be better aimed at ecology / biodiversity / habitats generally, instead of just trees and woodlands. If not then a separate policy is recommended. An ecological survey should be sought, not just a tree survey, together with the management methods to protect all retained / newly created / enhanced habitats.</p> <p>b) Should the wording of (a)(iii) be "In a Conservation Area; or" (as opposed to "and")?</p>	<p>a) Biodiversity matters are already well served by Core Strategy Policies 18 and 22 and DPD Policies G7 and G8. Policy G13 has been included in the DPD to deal with some of the specific planning considerations for trees, woodland sand hedgerows. The need for ecological surveys is implied by the wording of Policy G7. No change.</p> <p>b) <b>Minor Change</b> to Policy 13(a) to read (in part):  <b>"iii In a Conservation Area; <u>or</u></b>  <b>iv Within a recognised Nature Conservation Site."</b></p>
212	117	Chapter G - Policy G13	<p>a) Welcome the strong protection which the policy gives to ancient woodland defined in Natural England's inventory of ancient woodland. When the inventory was compiled in the 1980s, it was decided to only record ancient woods of more than 2 hectares in size so many smaller ancient woods were not recorded. Policy should specify that all ancient woodland should be protected and measures put in place to identify and record those smaller woods which are not on the inventory.</p> <p>b) We would also like to see protection of ancient and veteran trees specified in para (a) of the policy:  "planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland....."</p> <p>c) Welcome the commitment in para c of the policy to replacing trees which are unavoidably lost to development. Many local authorities have adopted a policy of a two for one (or even three for one in some cases) replacement ratio, recognising the reduced amenity benefits of a young tree compared to an older one and the fact that many newly planted trees (particularly in busy urban environments) may not survive. We would urge you to consider more than one for one replacement for these reasons.</p> <p>d) Para b does talk about enhancement of tree cover but we would like to see a stronger wording here which commits the Council to significant tree planting and woodland creation. We would like to see the Council adopt targets for tree planting and expanding woodland cover.</p>	<p>a and b) <b>Minor change</b> to Policy G13(a)ii to read:  <b>"Ancient Woodlands including individual ancient and veteran trees and those defined in Natural England's inventory of ancient woodlands;"</b></p> <p>c) <b>Minor change</b> to Policy G13(c) to read:  <b>" Where there is an unavoidable loss of trees on site, replacement trees will be required to be planted on site where appropriate (at a rate of two new trees for each tree lost);"</b></p> <p>d) Policy G13(b) speaks about the retention and enhancement of tree cover, and Policy G10 supports the creation of new tree, woodland and hedgerow planting as part of residential development. The representation on paragraph (b) from Policy G13 goes further and is concerned with the Council initiating planting on its own or on other landowners land. This goes beyond the scope of the DPD and so is not supported.</p>
156	93	Chapter G - Policy G14	a) The Trust does not feel that the wording in (c) is sufficient to ensure that regard is had to the ecological value of an unstable or contaminated site.	a) Noted. The Council's priority for this policy is to tackle unstable and contaminated land. Any ecological matters on unstable or contaminated land will be considered against other plan policies, including Core Strategy Policies 18 and 22, and DPD Policies G7 and G8.

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
157	93	Chapter G - Policy G15	<p>a) The policy should recognise that a derelict site could be valuable ecologically. An additional criteria is recommended as follows:  c) <i>protect, conserve and enhance the biodiversity of the area.</i></p>	<p>a) Noted. The Council's priority is to reclaim derelict land, and clause (b) contains a broad environmental criteria. Any ecological matters on unstable or contaminated land will be considered against other plan policies, including Core Strategy Policy 22 and DPD Policy G7.</p>
31	24	Chapter G - Policy G1e	<p>a) We have no objection to forms of renewable energy in Green Belt in the form of solar panels or hydroelectricity but object to commercial enterprises involving engineering structures such as wind turbines or waste energy plants. It should be made clear to developers that applications for commercial wind turbines in the Green Belt are not acceptable and this would save a considerable waste of time and money on applications that are contrary to national, county and local policy.</p> <p>b) Apart from failing to meet the request Planning Policies, three recent planning applications for wind turbines in SLDC have the following in common.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They all pretend to possess green credentials, whilst they are noisy, obtrusive engineering developments.</li> <li>• They are commercial enterprises that only require 25% to 30% of their output for their own use. The remainder being a source of income from sales to the grid.</li> <li>• They have been strongly opposed by the local community.</li> <li>• They are sited far too close to residential property, as accepted by responsible authorities.</li> </ul> <p>c) Contend that Policy G1(e) contradicts the essence of National Policy PPG2 and SLDC reply stated that PPG2 has now been replaced. We have examined the new National Planning Policy Framework section related to the Green Belt and have found that this is not different to PPG2, in that "engineering operations" are considered in appropriate. Planning Inspectors have defined in numerous appeals, that commercial wind turbines are "engineering operations" and unacceptable in Green Belt.</p> <p>d) Believe that the Local Plan should reflect the wishes of the people in preserving what they wish to preserve and developing a common vision for the future. The inclusion of item (e) in G1 does not do this, and our submission is for its removal or at least a rewording that does not encourage inappropriate and unwanted development.</p>	<p>a and b) Policy G1e is consistent with NPPF references to the Green Belt and renewable energy (especially paragraphs 91 and 97). Paragraph 91 says that "when located in the Green Belt, elements of many renewable energy projects will comprise inappropriate development. In such cases developers will need to demonstrate very special circumstances if projects are to proceed." Paragraph 97 says: "...local planning authorities should recognise the responsibility on all communities to contribute to energy generation from renewable or low carbon sources."</p> <p>c and d) Policy 1e is positively worded and qualified. The Council believes it is consistent with the NPPF and with Policy 28 of the Core Strategy, and it is intended to apply to the full range of renewable energy schemes (including micro generation) not just wind turbines. It neither rules in or out a wind turbine proposal, but when taken together with the other policies, does indicate that a wind turbine proposal will need to demonstrate very special circumstances for consent to be granted. Whilst the Green Belt does exist to keep land permanently open, paragraph 91 in the NPPF continues by saying: "Such very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources." Any restriction in the policy as suggested is unnecessary and would not be consistent with national policy or Core Strategy Policy 28. SRBC has begun to prepare a Supplementary Planning Document on Renewable and Low Carbon Energy, which will be published for consultation later in 2012.</p>
42	24	Chapter G - Policy G1e	<p>a) Concern about the wording of Policy G1(e) and its relationship/consistency with NPPF paragraph 91 and Core Strategy Policies 21 and 28, especially concerning the Green Belt landscape around Longton and Walmer Bridge.</p> <p>b) In order to bring clarity to Policy G1(e) and prevent unwanted and unnecessary planning applications for commercial wind turbines in the Green Belt, that a Supplementary Policy is produced.</p>	<p>a) Policy 1e is consistent with NPPF references to the Green Belt and renewable energy (especially paragraphs 91 and 97). Paragraph 91 says that "when located in the Green Belt, elements of many renewable energy projects will comprise inappropriate development. In such cases developers will need to demonstrate very special circumstances if projects are to proceed." Paragraph 97 says: "...local planning authorities should recognise the responsibility on all communities to contribute to energy generation from renewable or low carbon sources."</p> <p>b) Policy 1e is positively worded and qualified. The Council believes it is consistent with the NPPF and with Policy 28 of the Core Strategy, and it is intended to apply to the full range of renewable energy schemes (including micro generation) not just wind turbines. It neither rules in or out a wind turbine proposal, but when taken together with the other policies, does indicate that a wind turbine proposal will need to demonstrate very special circumstances for consent to be granted. Whilst the Green Belt does exist to keep land permanently open, paragraph 91 in the NPPF continues by saying: "Such very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources." Any restriction in the policy as suggested is unnecessary and would not be consistent with national policy or Core Strategy Policy 28. SRBC has begun to prepare a Supplementary Planning Document on Renewable and Low Carbon Energy, which will be published for consultation later in 2012.</p>
613	24	Chapter G -	LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 29/8/12	a to d) Please see response to representation Ref No: 24, ID 31

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
		Policy G1e	<p>a) Concern about wording of Policy G1(e) in the context of potential wind turbine development in the Western Parishes.</p> <p>b) Need to be consistent with NPPF and Core Strategy, including Policy 21.</p> <p>c) Even though the production of renewable energy may be permissible in Green Belt, such as solar panels and hydroelectric schemes, the policy makes it clear that forms of renewable energy that would conflict with concepts of the Green Belt would not be acceptable. Wind turbines with their high engineering structures and noisy whirling blades “will compromise inappropriate development”.</p> <p>d) In its current form G1(e) has already been the cause of 4 inappropriate applications for wind turbines and the need for either its removal or the addition of a Supplementary Planning Document is essential.</p>	
146	93	Chapter G - Policy G2	<p>a) The policy needs to ensure that biodiversity is protected, conserved and enhanced in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, with particular reference to habitats listed in the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and defined in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan.</p>	<p>a) Noted. Biodiversity aspects will be considered against other plan policies, including Core Strategy Policies 18 and 22, and DPD Policies G7 and G8.</p>
100	82	Chapter G - Policy G3	<p>a) This presents suitable areas (subject to land “fitness for purpose” assessment by an accredited organisation) for the provision of an outdoor sports facility (cricket). Leyland CC in conjunction with Leyland Fox Lane Sports Club (LFLSC Community Hub), offer the capability to provision, manage and maintain a cricket ground additional to that ground existing at their Fox Lane base. An adjacent linked hockey facility can be likewise administered as required.</p>	<p>a) Noted. The land at Emnie Lane is safeguarded for future development as set out in Policy G3. This could include the provision of new cricket and hockey playing pitches, subject to negotiation with the land owners and planning consent.</p>
387	84	Chapter G - Policy G3	<p>a) Support the Council's decision to safeguard the area of land at Emnie Lane from development as an employment area. I am extremely pleased that the Council has taken this decision.</p>	<p>a) Noted. However, DPD Policy G3 clearly states that the land is safeguarded <b>for</b> future development (but not designated for any specific purpose within the Plan period).</p>
147	93	Chapter G - Policy G3	<p>a) The area South of Coote Lane overlaps with Farington Lodges BHS and therefore the safeguarded land allocation should be amended to exclude the BHS, together with an appropriate buffer zone adjacent to it.</p> <p>b) The Land off Emnie Lane overlaps with an area of Green Infrastructure. It is recommended that the safeguarded land allocation should be amended to exclude the Green Infrastructure and an appropriate buffer zone adjacent to it.</p>	<p>a and b) Noted. All BHS and Green Infrastructure designations will be respected in considering planning applications, including the need for appropriate buffers and/or mitigation measures. The Green Infrastructure designation on the Emnie Lane site will assist in dealing with a planning application in clarifying the need for open space provision as part of any future development. There is no BHS showing on MapZone in this site area.</p>
248	136	Chapter G - Policy G3	<p>a) We act for the owners of the land off The Cawsey, Penwortham. The DPD allocates the site as Safeguarded Land under policy G3; the site forms part of the land South of Factory Lane and east of the West Coast Main Line. We propose that the site be allocated for residential development under policy D1 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site represents a sustainable option for residential development, when considered against sustainability appraisal criteria including proximity and access to services, public transport. Several surveys of the site (flood risk assessment, ecological survey, preliminary risk assessment, transport statement and tree survey) identified no significant constraints.</li> <li>• The site is suitable for development; it is also available now and achievable, given there is a reasonable prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years. The site is therefore deliverable.</li> <li>• Development of the site could provide an alternative access into site H (Vernon Carus).</li> <li>• The site is a more sustainable option than a number of the sites allocated. The site represents an opportunity for the Council to allocate non-best and most versatile (BMV) land;</li> </ul>	<p>a) The Council has engaged with representatives of the development industry to update the SHLAA in February 2012, and a total of 79 sites are shown in its latest update of the SHLAA. Further sites have been brought forward for inclusion in the DPD: 32 sites of 0.4ha or over are allocated for housing development in Table 2 of the DPD. The Council's view is that there are sufficient deliverable sites to provide an adequate and continuous supply of housing land to meet housing requirements. The Council therefore proposes to retain the land at Factory Lane, Penwortham as safeguarded land.</p> <p>b – e) Noted. No change.</p> <p>a) Full planning permission was granted in September 2012 (subject to a s106 agreement) for 82 dwellings on the former Prestolite Factory (site D).</p> <p>b) A reserved matters planning application was made in October 2012 for 209 dwellings on this site, including 42 affordable dwellings.</p> <p>c) Noted. No change.</p> <p>d) Noted. No change.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>the BMV land at site P and south of Bannister Lane in site W being a sequentially less preferable option.;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site's allocation as safeguarded land does not accord with PPG2 . It cannot be stated that the land is between the urban area and Green Belt in the PPG2 sense;</li> <li>• The Council requires additional residential allocations. The DPD allocates insufficient land to meet a) the 5 year requirement for deliverable sites and b) longer term requirements of developable land. In some cases this is because of infrastructure constraints. It is also in part because of over-optimistic assumptions on the achievable development rates of many of the larger sites and in part from the reliance on sites not attractive to developers or the housing market. This is long standing weakness of the borough's housing land availability assessments as shown in the evidence base of past developments this practice has been involved in.</li> </ul> <p>Specific concerns set out on the following sites:</p> <p>b) Site EE Pickering's Farm, Penwortham: this site suffers from major infrastructure thresholds to development, the costs of which are to be met from developer contributions. The allocation takes an arbitrary line to the southern boundary when, In order to start development in the locality, extending the site southwards to Chain House Lane is logical and will allow some development to commence from a southern access.</p> <p>c) Moss Side Test Track: it is most unlikely that access and infrastructure constraints will be overcome in time for the site to make any significant contribution of new housing to phase 1 of the plan. The expectation in table 2 that it will deliver 125 new homes in phase 1 is unjustified.</p> <p>d) Group One, off Central Avenue, Buckshaw Village, Leyland: 260 dwellings in the remaining 4 years of the Plan 1st phase is 65 dwellings a year and this is a serious overestimate of potential contribution for the first phase of the consultation DPD. It may deliver this number of dwellings over the full plan period.</p> <p>e) Former Farington Business Park, Farington: in the light of the post-recession housing market here is little prospect of the site delivering 471 dwellings when it is developed. There is no prospect of the site delivering the required 36 dwellings a year contribution to the first phase of the plan.</p> <p>f) Former Prestolite Factory, Cleveland Road, Leyland: there has been no movement towards bringing this site into development since the 2010 SHLAA. Even if the development were to commence in the near future, there is very little prospect of it achieving 25 dwellings a year.</p> <p>g) Former Arla Foods Premises, School Lane, Bamber Bridge: there is no prospect of the site delivering 150 dwellings by 2016: even if development commenced in 2012 this requires completion of 38 dwellings a year.</p> <p>h) Vernon Carus and Land, Factory Lane, Penwortham: this site has major thresholds to overcome before development can commence. It is dependent on the construction of the Cross Borough Link Road (Policy A1). It must remain very uncertain when or if this highway scheme will be constructed, and the housing developments that are dependent upon it (including that of the Lostock Hall Gas Works site) is equally uncertain. There is no reason at all to expect delivery within the first phase of development in the plan. The expectation in the plan that the site will deliver 75 dwellings in that period cannot be accepted.</p> <p>i) Lostock Hall Gasworks, Lostock Hall: there is no reason at all to expect delivery within the first phase of development in the plan. The expectation in the plan that the site will deliver 110 dwellings in that period cannot be accepted.</p> <p>j) Land West of Grasmere Avenue, Farington: given that outline planning permission is not yet available, that reserved matters will also need to be subsequently approved and the site is in a poor market area development in the first phase is more likely to be 40 dwellings than the 150 expected in the DPD</p> <p>k) Land between Altcar Lane/Shaw Brook Road, Leyland: development is unlikely to commence at the earliest for 2 years as it depends on the adoption of the DPD as well as subsequently achieving the necessary planning consents; 50 dwellings is a more realistic prospect.</p> <p>l) Land off Wesley Street, Bamber Bridge: this site is severely constrained by the existing mill</p>	<p>e) Full planning permission was granted in May 2012 (subject to a s106 agreement) for the development of 160 dwellings on the Grasmere Avenue site (site L).</p> <p>f) Noted. No change.</p> <p>g) Noted. No change.</p> <p>h) Noted. No change.</p> <p>i) Noted. The Council do not want to see any vehicular access to new development from Banister Lane. No change.</p> <p>j) The overall requirement for 15 years (2011-2026) is 6,815, and the supply identified is 6,962, a surplus of 147 dwellings.</p> <p>k) The Council does not rely on the windfall estimate in paragraph 7.13 to demonstrate a surplus of housing supply over requirements.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>building and its location in a poor market area with poor access. Dwelling density of 92 per ha is unrealistic. The Council have for a number of years been looking for a development partner to assist in bringing this site forward.</p> <p>m) Land off Browndge Road, Bamber Bridge: the expectation that this site will be redeveloped for housing in the first phase of the plan is wholly unsubstantiated. The 2010 SHLAA assessed the site as delivering 60 dwellings by 2014 but there is still no application for housing development. The site may come forward in the later phases of the plan.</p> <p>n) South of Bannister Lane/North of Heatherleigh, Farington Moss: the prospect of all of the constraints and other planning requirements being met in time for it to deliver housing early in the plan period is remote and the delivery of 200 dwellings is unrealistic. Development is unlikely to commence at the earliest for 2 years. Access from Bannister Lane for part of the development will facilitate achieving maximum completions.</p> <p>o) For the period 2010 -2026 the housing requirement of 6,984 dwellings is matched by a supply of 6,964 dwellings is a wholly inadequate basis on which to plan to provide 'homes for all'. The immediate assumption underpinning this policy is that all of the sites identified will deliver completely at the planned capacity during the 16 year plan period. That this is a flawed assumption.</p> <p>p) At para. 7.13 of the DPD it is stated that:  <i>The Council would also expect to see some windfall development which would provide some flexibility. Based on previous windfall trends and on an assumption that each small site that receives planning permission will be built, an indicative total of 45 windfall dwellings may be built annually over the Plan period which will offer some flexibility to the housing supply.</i> It is not appropriate to rely on windfall developments to provide flexibility, especially when the figure is based on an assumption that each small site that receives permission will be built. This is highly unlikely.</p>	
290	149	Chapter G - Policy G3	<p>a) The HCA has previously promoted this site which was previously been identified as an employment site but which has now been deleted and is proposed to revert back to being Safeguarded Land.</p> <p>b) The HCA owns this site and has undertaken technical and environmental work to analyse site constraints, infrastructure requirements, masterplanning, commercial viability and market demand. This work has been produced on behalf of the HCA and assembled into a Development Statement.</p> <p>c) The work undertaken demonstrates that the site is available, viable, and deliverable and demonstrates that there is local market demand. This statement has been submitted to the Council and is therefore a public document.</p> <p>d) The HCA respect the Council's decision to revert to Safeguarded Land, and note the reasoning on the grounds of oversupply of employment land (in relation to the amount specified within the Central Lancashire Core Strategy) and local objections.</p> <p>e) The Development Statement included an option for the site to accommodate some residential development, and therefore consideration should be given when the plan is reviewed to the site's suitability for future residential and / or mixed use.</p>	a) Noted.
388	152	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
389	153	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
390	154	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
391	155	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
392	156	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
401	157	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
393	158	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
394	159	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
395	160	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
396	161	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
397	162	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
399	166	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
400	167	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
402	168	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
403	169	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
404	170	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
405	171	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
406	172	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
407	173	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
408	174	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
409	175	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
410	176	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
411	177	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
412	178	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
414	180	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
415	181	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
416	182	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
417	183	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
418	184	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
419	185	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
421	187	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
422	188	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
423	189	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
424	190	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
425	191	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
426	192	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
427	193	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
428	194	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
429	195	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
430	196	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
431	197	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
432	198	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
433	199	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
434	200	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
435	201	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
436	202	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
437	203	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
438	204	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
439	205	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
440	206	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
441	209	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
442	210	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
443	211	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
444	212	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
445	213	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
446	214	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
447	215	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
448	216	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
449	217	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
450	218	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
451	219	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
452	220	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
453	221	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
454	222	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
455	223	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
456	224	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
457	225	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
458	226	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
459	227	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
460	228	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
461	229	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
462	230	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
463	232	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
464	233	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
465	234	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
466	235	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
467	236	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
468	237	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
469	238	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
470	239	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
471	240	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
472	241	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
473	242	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
474	243	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
475	244	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
508	249	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
509	250	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
510	251	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
511	252	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
512	253	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
513	254	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
514	255	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
515	256	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
516	257	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
517	258	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
518	259	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
519	260	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
520	261	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
521	262	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
522	263	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
523	264	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
524	265	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
525	266	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
526	267	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
527	268	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
528	269	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
529	270	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
530	271	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
531	272	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
532	273	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
533	274	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
534	275	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
535	277	Chapter G - Policy G3	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
293	149	Chapter G - Policy G3 - South of Coote Lane	a) The HCA owns a significant proportion of this Safeguarded Land allocation and supports its inclusion with the DPD. The HCA agree with the Council that the site is not currently required for development within the plan period, but it is likely to be required in the future to meet the Borough's longer term development needs. The HCA has commissioned a range of environmental and technical reports which demonstrate that development of the site is achievable and deliverable. This technical work shows that the site could accommodate up to 230 dwellings in the future.	a) Noted.
22	15	Chapter G - Policy G4	a) I agree to the G4 policy relating to Protected Open Land contained in the 15 year development plan.	a) Noted.
23	16	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
24	17	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
25	18	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
615	18	Chapter G - Policy G4	a) I agree the G4 policy relating to Protected Open Land contained in the 15 year development plan.	a) Noted.
26	19	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
27	20	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
28	21	Chapter G - Policy G4	a) G4 Policy	a) Noted.
29	22	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
32	25	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
33	26	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
34	27	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
39	32	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
40	33	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
41	34	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
56	42	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
92	75	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
93	76	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
94	77	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
96	79	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
148	93	Chapter G - Policy G4	a) It is recommended that the following criteria be added to the policy: <i>d) It does not affect an important wildlife site / habitat / species.</i>	a) Noted. Biodiversity aspects will be considered against other plan policies, including Core Strategy Policies 18 and 22, and DPD Policies G7 and G8.
240	134	Chapter G - Policy G4	l) The Publication Version of the DPD allocates the site as Protected Open Land under policy G4. We propose that the site be allocated for residential development under policy D1. m) No studies have been undertaken to demonstrate that the site is a valuable area of open	a to d) The remaining site on Long Moss Lane (The Fields) was reviewed as part of the preparation of the DPD. The Council's view is that it is a less sustainable location for development, being adjacent to the Green Belt, and that there exists a better site for village

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>land or that it provides a natural break in the built-up area of New Longton. The majority of the front part of the site is dominated by the existing dwelling and its associated outbuildings.</p> <p>n) The identified housing land supply set out in the DPD is not sufficient and as a result, additional deliverable land must be allocated for housing. The land edged red on the attached plan is deliverable, is in a sustainable location and can make a valuable contribution to the shortfall of market housing.</p> <p>o) The appeal decision on the land off Long Moss Lane, New Longton (ref: 2168530) must be taken into account when considering the allocation of the land at The Fields. The Inspector considered the development of the other D9 site to be sustainable development, applying the presumption in favour. The Council needs further sites that the presumption in favour of sustainable development can be applied to and the land edged red provides such a site. it should therefore be allocated for residential development.</p>	<p>development in a more central location adjacent to the church. A recent planning application for the development of this site has been refused by the Council and is the subject of a planning appeal.</p>
536	276	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
537	278	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
538	279	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
539	280	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
540	281	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
541	282	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
542	283	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
543	284	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
545	285	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
546	286	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
547	287	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
548	288	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
549	289	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
550	290	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
551	291	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
552	292	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
553	293	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
554	294	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
555	295	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
556	296	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
557	297	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
558	298	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
559	299	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
560	300	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
561	301	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
562	302	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
563	303	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
564	304	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22
565	305	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 15, ID 22 a) Furthermore, I think it would be a good idea to utilise the land for community benefits such as allotment schemes.	a) Noted.
566	306	Chapter G - Policy G4	a) I agree with the G4 policy of 15 year development plan.	a) Noted.
567	307	Chapter G - Policy G4	a) I agree to the 15 year plan. I agree to the G4 policy relating to Protected Open Lane contained in the 15 year development plan.	a) Noted.
568	308	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 307, ID 567	Please see identical representation Ref No: 307, ID 567
569	309	Chapter G - Policy G4	a) I agree to the fifteen year plan. G4	a) Noted.
570	310	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 309, ID 569	Please see identical representation Ref No: 309, ID 569
571	311	Chapter G - Policy G4	Please see identical representation Ref No: 309, ID 569	Please see identical representation Ref No: 309, ID 569
13	10	Chapter G - Policy G4 - adjoining Site Q	a) At present, this land is classed as 'dark green' for planning purposes. I feel this is an appropriate site for residential development purposes and request that this request is considered and the land should be allocated for residential purposes as the adjacent land is currently being considered subject to planning approval (access via Chapel Meadow). I suggest it would be suitable for a quota above current legislative requirements for affordable housing. I feel strongly that many families and young people have to move out of the area as they cannot afford to purchase/rent property locally.	a) Noted. The Council has carefully assessed housing needs in Longton and the whole Borough, and does not consider it appropriate to release this land for development in the DPD. The land is appropriately identified as Protected Open Land in the DPD.
19	13	Chapter G - Policy G4 - between sites X/M & Q	a) With reference to land to the south of Chapel Lane, Longton – to the rear of Whitehall Farm and Laburnum and land to the south of Chapel Lane, Longton – between Whitehall Farm and Laburnum. This land is presently allocated as G4 "Protected Open Land". Suggest land should be re-allocated D1 "New Residential Allocation" as indicated V, X, M and Q on plan using former railway line as natural development boundary. Application for 2 no detached dwellings similar to previously approved and developed site for 2 no dwellings to west on Chapel Lane.	a) Noted. The Council has carefully assessed housing needs in Longton and the whole Borough, and does not consider it appropriate to release this land for development in the DPD. The land is appropriately identified as Protected Open Land in the DPD.
149	93	Chapter G -	a) Whilst the Trust supports this policy for this Park there is a need to:	a) Noted. Biodiversity aspects will be considered against other plan policies, including Core

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
		Policy G6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>acknowledge the Local Nature Reserve, important habitats and species;</li> <li>conserve and enhance biodiversity;</li> <li>highlight opportunities to buffer and expand the features and create corridors / links to other sites.</li> </ul>	Strategy Policies 18 and 22, and DPD Policies G7 and G8.
262	138	Chapter G - Policy G6	a) The County Council supports Policy G6. This allocation is located in the area of the former Lower Ribble Countryside Management Area, which the County has been involved in managing and enhancing.	a) Noted.
8	6	Chapter G - Policy G7	a) Suggest that Policy G8 be changed to read “ . . . <i>natural resources, bio- and geodiversity.</i> ”	a) <b>Minor change</b> to Policy G8(b) to read: “... <b>natural resources, biodiversity and geodiversity.</b> ”
118	88	Chapter G - Policy G7	<p>a) Places for People object to the designation of the Maltings on Hill Road South, Penwortham, as Existing Green Infrastructure (Policy G7) on the DPD Proposals Map.</p> <p>b) Paragraph 10.45 of the DPD defines Green infrastructure but does not explain how the private residential green space at the Maltings came to be defined as Green Infrastructure. The existing open green space on the site is part of the residential use of the site which does not include any public right of way or access.</p> <p>c) A draft development brief for the redevelopment of this site has been prepared and submitted for comment to the Council. It is anticipated that the brief will be finalised in late summer 2012.</p> <p>d) The designation of Green Infrastructure should be deleted from the site and the site shown as a housing allocation or white land on the Local Plan proposals map.</p>	a) The Council plans to meet with the owners and agents to discuss this matter, and resolve the best way of accommodating this representation.
150	93	Chapter G - Policy G7	a) It is good to see Green Infrastructure shown on the Proposals Map but the Trust is disappointed that the definition doesn't include biodiversity/nature conservation, which should be an important element of Green Infrastructure. There is no mention of an Ecological Network, although wildlife corridors are shown on the Proposals Map. The Trust believes there should be some clarification in this respect. It also notes that there is no wildlife / biodiversity policy anywhere in this document. It is assumed that the Council is relying on the Core Strategy policies (which are very broad and generic). The Trust believes that there should be more detail included in this document.	a) The detailed identification of the Green Belt, Protected Open Land, Areas of Separation, Central Park, Green Infrastructure, Green Corridors, Conservation Areas, Historic Parks and Gardens, Biological Heritage Sites, Geological Heritage Sites, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Local Nature Reserves, Sites of Special Scientific Interest and Wildlife Corridors are all depicted on the Proposals Map for the DPD. Biodiversity aspects will be considered against other plan policies, including Core Strategy Policies 18 and 22, and DPD Policies G7 and G8.
263	138	Chapter G - Policy G7	a) The County Council supports Policy G7 and the allocation/protection of County's Environment & Community Projects sites - Paradise Park and Linstock Hall Engine Sheds.	a) Noted.
151	93	Chapter G - Policy G8	<p>a) This policy should be more positive about nature conservation and biodiversity. The Council's definition of Green Infrastructure does not include biodiversity.</p> <p>b) There is no reference to enhancement of biodiversity (a requirement of the NPPF) or the need for ecological networks / links to areas outside the site. Whilst Policy G12 does protect existing 'Green Corridors' and require new development to provide new Green Corridors this is not set in the context of biodiversity or ecological networks. The Trust recommends that the following criteria be added to the policy: <i>e) protection, conservation and enhancement of the biodiversity of the site and its surroundings and contribute to the ecological network (or network of green corridors) in the area, and provide links to important habitats outside the site.</i></p> <p>c) The Trust has serious concerns that this DPD has no wildlife / biodiversity specific policies, relying presumably on the Core Strategy policies, which the Trust does not consider to be sufficient.</p>	a to c) The detailed identification of the Green Belt, Protected Open Land, Areas of Separation, Central Park, Green Infrastructure, Green Corridors, Conservation Areas, Historic Parks and Gardens, Biological Heritage Sites, Geological Heritage Sites, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Local Nature Reserves, Sites of Special Scientific Interest and Wildlife Corridors are all depicted on the Proposals Map for the DPD. Biodiversity aspects will be considered against other plan policies, including Core Strategy Policies 18 and 22, and DPD Policies G7 and G8. No change.

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
71	57	Chapter G - Policy G9	a) Although the policy and accompanying text doesn't mention The Derby wing's art centre and theatre, under our remit The Theatres Trust request to be consulted over any improvements or alterations to the theatre.	a) Noted.
152	93	Chapter G - Policy G9	a) Whilst the Trust supports this policy it considers that wording should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• acknowledge the BHS, important habitats and species;</li> <li>• acknowledge the need to conserve and enhance biodiversity; and</li> <li>• highlight opportunities to buffer and expand the features and create corridors / links to other sites.</li> </ul>	a) Noted. Biodiversity aspects will be considered against other plan policies, including Core Strategy Policies 18 and 22, and DPD Policies G7 and G8.
101	82	Chapter H	a) Leyland CC/LFLSC offer to work in close collaboration with the Council to achieve their three Core Strategy Objectives, which will be helped by an investment in the provision and maintenance of a new (additional) outdoor sport resource for cricket (and possibly hockey). b) Further enhancement of health, community services and facilities would be achieved by the development, adjacent to the new sports ground, of a walk and cycle way which could be located to form an integrated system from within and outside the Borough.	a and b) Noted.
70	57	Chapter H - Policy H1	a) We support the document because this policy will protect your cultural facilities. We suggest however for clarity that a description of the term 'cultural facilities' and 'community facilities' is included in the text and suggest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Cultural Facilities: cultural facilities and services include provision for festivals, theatre, cinema, libraries, museums, art galleries, public art, music and dance venues, spiritual centres, landscapes, heritage and tourism.</i></li> <li>• <i>Community Facilities: community facilities provide for the health, educational, sport, recreation and leisure needs of the community.</i></li> </ul>	a) Noted. Culture aspects are well covered by Core Strategy Policy 12, and by the reasoned justification in paragraph 9.29. Health, education, sport and community facilities are covered by Core Strategy Policies 23, 14, 24 and 25 respectively. The Core Strategy has been found sound by the Planning Inspector and it was adopted by South Ribble on 18 July 2012. No further change to the DPD.
158	93	Chapter H - Policy H1	a) The Introduction to Chapter H mentions the environmental as well as health benefits of allotments but the above policy doesn't mention them. Perhaps allotments should be included in those examples referred to in brackets?	a) No change.
75	60	Chapters D and G - Policies D1 and G3	a) BE Group are agents for two adjoining landowners, who together own 8 ha of land in Farington. Our clients' land comprises a self-contained area as it is bounded by Coote Lane; the Preston to Ormskirk railway: Church Lane and the Preston to East Lancashire railway. b) Although Policy G3 does not provide specific identification on the Proposals Map for the five areas of Safeguarded Land for Future Development included in Policy G3, the site forms part of the area referred to as 'South of Coote Lane, Chain House Lane, Farington.' c) This representation seeks to see our clients' land allocated for housing development, rather than as its continuance as 'Safeguarded Land.' The basis for this is as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Ribble does not have a 5 years supply of available housing land.</li> <li>• The Council has acknowledged that in accordance with the NPPF, the trigger of an additional buffer of 20% applies because there has been persistent under delivery against housing targets.</li> <li>• Our clients' landholdings can deliver sustainable development. It is available, suitable and achievable and thus can be delivered promptly. Development is not contingent on the provision of offsite infrastructure that might impose delay on the land being brought into use or that might challenge its viability.</li> </ul> d) In support of our argument that the location is sustainable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non Car Accessibility: the site is well located to ensure that movements by car mode are reduced as much as possible. It lies close to the bus network and Tardy Gate district centre.</li> </ul>	a) Noted. b) <b>Minor Change</b> to Policy G3 and the Proposals Map: <b>"....at the following locations:</b> <u>v</u> <b>South of Factory Lane and east of the West Coast Main Line</b> <u>w</u> <b>Southern area of the Major Development Site at Pickering's Farm, Penwortham</b> <u>x</u> <b>South of Coote Lane, Chain House Lane, Farington</b> <u>y</u> <b>Land off Church Lane, Farington</b> <u>z</u> <b>Land off Emnie Lane, Leyland"</b> c to f) The Council has engaged with representatives of the development industry to update the SHLAA in February 2012, and a total of 79 sites are shown in its latest update of the SHLAA. Further sites have been brought forward for inclusion in the DPD: 32 sites of 0.4ha or over are allocated for housing development in Table 2 of the DPD. The Council's view is that there are sufficient deliverable sites to provide an adequate and continuous supply of housing land to meet housing requirements. The Council therefore proposes to retain the land at Coote Lane as safeguarded land.

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walking: the site is within a 4/5 minute walk of a primary school and the bus network connecting it, via a linked trip to the north west. A 10 minute walk connects to Tardy Gate district centre and local employment zones. There are larger employment opportunities within the 2km walking distance.</li> <li>• Cycling: a number of adjacent urban areas are within the 5km cycling distance of the site and would involve a journey of around 25 minutes using a leisurely cycle speed of 12 kilometres per hour.</li> <li>• Bus: the site is located close to the local bus network as illustrated in the following plan. These bus routes connect the area to the semi urban hinterland and Preston city centre.</li> <li>• The site is referenced as 'FW8 Safeguarded Land f (eastern part), Church Lane' in the Central Lancashire SHLAA 2011 Update published in February 2012. It identifies housing completions on the site beginning 2016-17.</li> <li>• The Green Corridor shown on the Proposals Map along one boundary of the site could easily be incorporated into the open space structure of the site development.</li> </ul> <p>e) Should the Council not allocate the land for housing then we would seek that amendments are made to the wording of Policy G3 and its explanatory justification paragraphs so that land identified as safeguarded under this policy will be considered for development at any time within the Plan period in order to fulfil the Borough Council's requirement to demonstrate at all times there is a six years supply of available, developable housing land.</p> <p>f) The land is clearly self-contained. To include it as part of a wider area (which might then invoke an argument about comprehensive development in conjunction with other landholdings) is wholly inappropriate. With a live railway and road providing distinct separation from the remainder of what comprises the 'South of Coote Lane, Chain House Lane, Farington' safeguarded land designation, the land is a developable area in its own right. Nor would such separation prejudice the viability of the infrastructure that might be required for the development of those other areas. Consequently we consider the 'South of Coote Lane, Chain House Lane, Farington' designation should be split and identified as three distinct locations, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South of Chain House Lane, west of Church Lane</li> <li>• East of Church Lane, north west of the Preston – Ormskirk railway</li> <li>• South of Coote Lane, east of Church Lane, south and east of the Preston – Ormskirk railway.</li> </ul>	
106	85	Consistency	<p>a) Section 3.4 sets out the 'Major Sites for Development' which excludes Land Between Heatherleigh and Moss Lane, Farington (which in itself is also an error as part of Heatherleigh and all of Moss Lane fall within the parish of Farington Moss' not 'Farington', which is a separate parish) which is later referred to as one of the three major residential sites for development.</p>	<p>a) <b>Minor change</b> to paragraph 3.4, under the heading "Major Sites for Development"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pickering's Farm</li> <li>• Moss Side Test Track, <u>Leyland</u></li> <li>• <u>Land between Heatherleigh and Moss Lane, Farington Moss</u></li> <li>• Cuerden <u>Strategic Site</u></li> <li>• BAE Systems, Samlesbury</li> </ul>
105	85	Consultation Process	<p>a) The public consultation has been poorly communicated to residents who its proposals will have a direct and significant impact. As a resident of Bannister Lane who will be directly impacted upon, as an adjoining landowner, from one of the three proposed major development areas, I have not received any direct communication from the council of these proposals. The first I and other neighbours became aware of the proposals (which are now in the final stages of production according to Figure 1 'Development Plan Document Stages') was from local residents carrying out leaflet drops to try and raise awareness.</p>	<p>a) The Council considers that it has taken all reasonable steps to engage with people affected by the policies and proposals in the DPD, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A quarter page item 'Your area, your choice' in the Winter 2010/11 edition of Forward (Issue 66), designed to bring the process and Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document to the attention of all residents of the borough. Posters in shops, doctors' surgeries, dentists surgeries, church halls, community centres, schools, leisure centres, etc</li> <li>• Members of the Council's Forward Planning team attended every Area Committee meeting</li> <li>• Members of the Council's Forward Planning team have spent days in supermarkets at Booths (Penwortham and Longton), Sainsbury's (Bamber Bridge), Morrisons (Leyland and Bamber Bridge), Tesco and Leyland Market to raise awareness at each stage of the</li> </ul>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
				<p>consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The full documents have been available in libraries and at the Civic Centre at every stage of the process and some post offices during the first two stages.</li> <li>Each stage of the process has been promoted via our website and press releases and through formal notices in the local press.</li> <li>All council meetings which have discussed the document, Cabinet and Council, can be attended by members of the public.</li> <li>Ward and parish councillors have been kept fully informed throughout the process and have provided essential liaison between planning officers and their constituents.</li> <li>We have an extensive database of people who have expressed an interest in the Site Allocations DPD (over 2,000 contacts) who have all received letters or emails about the latest stage of the process.</li> </ul>
169	98	Energy Efficiency of New Developments	Please see identical representation Ref No: 593, ID 327	Please see identical representation Ref No: 593, ID 327
176	99	Energy Efficiency of New Developments	Please see identical representation Ref No: 593, ID 327	Please see identical representation Ref No: 593, ID 327
184	100	Energy Efficiency of New Developments	Please see identical representation Ref No: 593, ID 327	Please see identical representation Ref No: 593, ID 327
593	327	Energy Efficiency of New Developments - Page 84	a) Lancashire County Council may have a statutory right to install street lighting in new developments, but there is no legal requirement (statutory obligation) for street lighting, therefore planning permission must be sought by property developers to install street lighting if the road in the development reaches adoptable standards. Unnecessary lighting contributes to global warming and causes light pollution. The requirements of the Wildlife & Countryside Act must be considered in relation to protected species & street lighting. Street lighting for new developments should not be provided out of council tax funding.	a) Noted. This section in the DPD does not make any reference to street lighting.
113	86	Energy Efficiency of New Developments – page 84	Please see identical representation Ref No: 593, ID 327	Please see identical representation Ref No: 593, ID 327
10	7	General	a) On this occasion I can advise you that the Trust has no specific comments that it wishes to submit.	a) Noted.
35	28	General	a) Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make at this stage.	a) Noted.
37	30	General	a) Having considered the SRBC responses to our representations, along with the changes to the wording of the SADPD with regard to the Trampower proposals and Gypsy sites, West Lancashire Borough Council considers that its concerns have been satisfactorily addressed in the Publication Version of the site Allocations DPD, and that it has no further issues with	a) Noted.

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			the emerging DPD.	
159	93	General	<p>a) There is no reference to cooperation with adjoining authorities on any environmental issues, as required by the NPPF. There is clearly a need for the ecological network in South Ribble to join up with those of adjoining authorities.</p> <p>b) There is no reference to the UK Marine Policy Statement and marine plans and the requirement in Policy 105 of the NPPF to apply Integrated Coastal Zone Management across local authority and land/sea boundaries. Policy 106 of the NPPF also requires Coastal Change Management Area to be identified for any area likely to be affected by physical changes to the coast. Furthermore, there is no reference to Shoreline Management Plans as required by Policy 168 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>a) Co-operation with neighbouring authorities is considered as part of the Duty to Co-operate. The Council has complied with this through its joint working on the Core Strategy, not only with Chorley and Preston Councils, but also the working relationship with the ecological service at Lancashire County Council. The Council has a duty to co-operate agreement with its neighbours and statutory consultees.</p> <p>b) The Council has no coastline and therefore no coastal policies.</p>
226	95	General	<p>a) Publication version of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD is sound, subject to minor changes being incorporated within the document.</p>	<p>a) Noted. No change.</p>
217	120	General	<p>a) Progress Housing Group supports the vision of the DPD.</p> <p>b) Welcome the focus on housing provision in the borough and will fully support the development process with respect to the provision of affordable housing, including the use of S106 agreements.</p> <p>c) Ask SRBC to consider using income from the Community Infrastructure Levy to support the provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>d) Support the policy which recognizes and seeks to rectify the shortfall in new housing in recent years.</p>	<p>a to d) Noted. Affordable housing funding is expressly exempt from the CIL regulations.</p>
241	135	General	<p>a) Wainhomes consider that the DPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• allocates insufficient land to meet (a) the 5 year requirement for deliverable sites and (b) longer term requirements of developable land. In part this is because of overoptimistic assumptions on the achievable development rates of many of the larger sites and in part from the reliance on sites not attractive to developers or the housing market.</li> <li>• relies too much on very large sites which are significantly constrained by inadequate infrastructure. Importantly, there is no sound mechanism set out in the plan for overcoming the infrastructure constraints.</li> <li>• relies on on sites which fail the tests of deliverability to meet the 5 year supply of the first phase in the plan.</li> <li>• does not have flexibility in the plan to bring forward additional sites through phasing policies should development rates fall below the required trajectory required in the core strategy. In the absence of the capacity to release land, references to phasing can only mean to reducing supply.</li> <li>• needs to bring forward more sites and a more diverse range of sites in order to deliver the development required by the Core Strategy policy 4. In particular it needs to show more sites that are immediately developable in order to maximise housing completions in the early years of the plan, and to take into account the probable requirement of National Planning Policy Framework for a margin of 20% over the core strategy requirement for flexibility and choice.</li> </ul>	<p>a) The Council has carefully reviewed the amount of housing development required to meet the requirements for the period until 2026, and the related infrastructure needs. These are all set out clearly in the Publication version of the DPD. In some cases they will be guided by further Masterplanning, especially for the Major Sites for Development.</p>
482	149	General	<p>a) The HCA regards the DPD as a key document to support a sustainable policy framework for future growth within the Borough. This response is provided following extensive dialogue between our respective officers on the emerging DPD policies.</p> <p>b) Given the number and size of sites within its ownership and / or influence in South Ribble,</p>	<p>a to c) Noted.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>the HCA is a critical delivery partner to the Council in the realisation of the housing growth targets on the following sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pickering's Farm, Penwortham (EE) – Residential Allocation</li> <li>• Altcar Lane / Shaw Brook Road, Leyland (P) – Residential Allocation</li> <li>• South of Bannister Lane / North of Heatherleigh (W) – Residential Allocation</li> <li>• Hospital Inn Railway Crossing, Brindle Road, Bamber Bridge (I) – Site with a Current Planning Application</li> <li>• Leyland Lane / Emnie Lane, Leyland – Safeguarded Land</li> <li>• Limekiln Farm/Todd Lane – Central Park (G6) &amp; Area of Separation (G5)</li> <li>• Howick Hall – Biological Heritage Site</li> <li>• South of Coote Lane, Chain House Lane, Farington – Safeguarded Land</li> </ul> <p>c) The HCA remains supportive of the DPD and looks forward to working with the Council to deliver and enable local priorities.</p>	
261	138	Green Infrastructure	<p>a) The County Council supports the aims of the GI provision as stated in paragraphs 10.3, 10.4 and 10.5.</p> <p>b) With regard to the Ribble Coast and Wetlands, paragraph 10.5 of the DPD refers to the protection and enhancement of the Ribble Coast and Wetlands Area (RCWA). The RCWA is not referred to elsewhere in the DPD document or any DPD policy. A policy for the RCWA would be welcomed alongside an indicative boundary for the area. The County's Environment &amp; Community Projects team are currently reviewing the County wide RCWA area and will work alongside SRBC and other organisations to aid its enhancement as a green infrastructure and green tourism asset.</p>	<p>a) Noted.</p> <p>b) The RCWA is identified as an important area for countryside management and access (and a potential National Nature Reserve) in Core Strategy Policy 20. The RCWA's own website does not contain a clear boundary for the area.</p>
15	11	Habitats Regulations Assessment	<p>a) The Council is pleased to note that, under reference to the Habitats Regulations Assessment in paragraph 2.26, the document refers to the fact that it is important to ensure that sites and policies identified in the DPD do not detrimentally affect designated areas such as the Ribble and Alt Estuary Special Protection Area and Ramsar site which crosses our adjoining boundaries.</p>	<p>a) Noted.</p>
163	95	Housing and Employment Allocations	<p>a) Sainsbury's supports the Council's approach to allocate a number of sites and locations which will help to meet the Borough's identified future requirements for housing and employment land throughout the plan period (viz. B3, B4, C1, C2, C3, C5, D1, E1, E2)</p> <p>b) Considers that these policies should be expanded to make allowance for the development of ancillary uses (including small-scale retail) on these sites, which could contribute towards creating sustainable development, as advocated in para 17 of NPPF. All policies should incorporate an element of flexibility to ensure that the required development can be brought forward in a timely manner. This approach would make the policies more compliant with the NPPF which makes clear that "local plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change" (para 14).</p> <p>c) Suggested Change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand relevant policies to include wording that makes clear that it may be appropriate for alternative uses to be provided in sustainable locations that are well placed to serve the community's everyday needs.</li> <li>• Include an element of flexibility within the wording of the policies listed above to allow alternative uses to be brought forward within strategic locations, if considered necessary to enable development and achieve wider objectives.</li> </ul>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b and c) The Council is bound by the wording of the NPPF as well as by its intended wording in the DPD. It also acknowledges the need for some flexibility in the implementation of its policies, and this is a matter that is built into the monitoring and review processes. Some of the policies referred to are clearly designed to be explicitly for mixed uses (eg Policy B3, B4, C1, C2 and C4, albeit that the sites in chapter C are expected to be housing led). In contrast, some others are intended to relate to specific uses (eg C5 and E2) and the Council would be less likely to adopt a flexible approach where the intention is to develop or retain particular uses. The remaining policies (D1 and E1) identify land for housing or employment uses to meet accepted requirements and, except for the larger housing sites, are unlikely to accommodate mixed or alternative uses without compromising the requirements. In view of this, the Council proposes no change to the DPD.</p>
247	134	Land off The Cawsey, Penwortham	<p>a) We act for the owners of the land edged red on the attached plan (plan ref: C69-6-SRM) at the Cawsey, Penwortham, which the Council propose to retain the site as safeguarded land.</p> <p>b) Contest that the identified supply is not sufficient to meet (a) the 5 year requirement for</p>	<p>a) Noted.</p> <p>b, c and g) The Council has engaged with representatives of the development industry to update the SHLAA in February 2012, and a total of 79 sites are shown in its latest update of the</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p>deliverable sites and (b) longer term requirements of developable land. The DPD must take this into account and re-examine its deliverable supply; if it does not, it immediately risks being found unsound by an Inspector.</p> <p>c) Following consultation on the Preferred Options DPD the LPA increased the amount of land allocated for residential development but again retained the land edged red on the attached plan as safeguarded land. The land that was allocated is not as sustainable. The Officer's Report on application no. 07/2012/0127/OUT did acknowledge that the site is in a sustainable location.</p> <p>d) Upon closer inspection of the Sustainability Appraisal of Preferred Options Site Allocations and Development Management DPD, it is evident that the site was incorrectly assessed and this may be a reason why it has been ignored as a housing site. The Site Appraisal is attached and the following errors have been identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Appraisal acknowledges that a railway station lies within 1.61 to 2.4km but then states that there is no station when rail service frequency is considered and gives a Band E performance. The frequency at Lostock Hall station is 2 – 3 trains/hour/direction which comes under a Band B performance.</li> <li>• The Appraisal states that the site is within Flood Zone 2 and 3. The site edged red on the attached plan is within Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3a but Zones 2 and 3a form only a very small portion of the site and it has been demonstrated via application no. 07/2012/0127/OUT that the site can be developed without encroaching into zones 2 and 3a.</li> <li>• The Appraisal states the site is a Band E performer with regard access to a sewer system. However, the proposals under application no. 07/2012/0127/OUT have again demonstrated that this is not an issue.</li> <li>• The Appraisal states the site is at risk from a hazardous installation and therefore a Band E performer with regard this indicator. This is incorrect and again, was not an issue for concern with regard application no. 07/2012/0127/OUT.</li> </ul> <p>e) The LPA has also repeatedly pointed to highways concerns relating to the development of the site. Application no. 07/2012/0127/OUT was refused on highway grounds. However, Lancashire County Council has recently confirmed that the development of the site for up to 75No. dwellings would cause no highway safety concerns. LCC are close to agreeing the removal of the highways reason for refusal of application no. 07/2012/0127/OUT so that highways matters are not contested at appeal.</p> <p>f) The Sustainability Appraisal must be reassessed to give an accurate appraisal of the site which does perform better than a number of the allocated sites. In light of the reassessment, the lack of any highways concerns and the need for additional deliverable land, the site should be allocated for residential development.</p> <p>g) The land edged red on the attached plan is deliverable and can make a valuable contribution to the shortfall.</p>	<p>SHLAA. Further sites have been brought forward for inclusion in the DPD: 32 sites of 0.4ha or over are allocated for housing development in Table 2 of the DPD. The Council's view is that there are sufficient deliverable sites to provide an adequate and continuous supply of housing land to meet housing requirements. The Council therefore proposes to retain the land at Factory Lane (The Cawsey), Penwortham as safeguarded land.</p> <p>d and f) Sustainability Appraisal. <b>Minor Changes</b> to three categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rail Service Frequency: <u>Band B</u></li> <li>• Access to Sewer System: <u>Band A</u></li> <li>• At Risk from hazardous installations: <u>Band A</u></li> </ul> <p>No change to one category</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zone Area: remains in Band D because part of the site is in flood zone 3.</li> </ul> <p>p) There are no highways concerns arising from this site remaining as safeguarded land. No change.</p>
109	86	NPPF	<p>a) The finalised NPPF is significantly different than the 'draft' NPPF.</p> <p>b) It is important to ensure that the distinction between the draft &amp; the current finalised NPPF is maintained as SRBC's record on Brownfield development is very poor and that 37% of housing was built in recent years as a result of so-called 'garden grabbing' in villages, so creating inappropriate urban sprawl in a village environment.</p> <p>c) There must be no misinterpretation or any selective interpretation of the finalised NPPF.</p>	<p>a to c) Noted. The Council is aware of all the requirements contained in the NPPF, which seeks to achieve sustainable development. The Core Strategy incorporates the RS target of 70% of new housing being provided on previously developed land. For the past few years, the 70% target for new residential development on brownfield land has been well exceeded. The Site Allocations DPD includes brownfield sites as well as greenfield.</p>
165	98	NPPF	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID109	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID109
172	99	NPPF	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 109	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 109

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
180	100	NPPF	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID109	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID109
589	327	NPPF	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 109	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 109
202	111	Overview	<p>a) SRBC has increased the extent of the draft Residential Led Allocation at Pickerings Farm in the Publication DPD from 65 hectares to around 79 hectares with an estimated yield of 1,350 houses.</p> <p>b) In principle, TWUK welcome and support the proposed Housing Allocation. The draft Development Statement submitted to the Council in March 2011 demonstrates the suitability of the site for large scale residential led development. Pickerings Farm is the most appropriate and deliverable option for housing in the South of Penwortham and North of Farington Strategic Location.</p> <p>c) TWUK do have some detailed objections to the draft Policies and supporting text contained in the Publication Version Consultation Paper. TWUK would like to continue to work closely with Officers and statutory consultees to promote the site through the emerging LDF and the following sections set out TWUK's concerns.</p>	a to c) Noted.
3	2	Proposals Map	<p>a) Bell Ingram acts on behalf of Essar Oil (UK) with regard to monitoring the progress of Development Plans along the route of the NW Ethylene Pipeline, which extends from Grangemouth in Falkirk to Stanlow in Cheshire and passes through the South Ribble Borough Council area.</p> <p>b) Note that no reference has been made to the North West Ethylene pipeline as a land use planning constraint. We recommend that careful consideration is given to the including the North West Ethylene Pipeline as a constraint on the Proposals Map to usefully inform any future land allocations.</p> <p>c) For clarification, I have enclosed a copy of the up-to-date map of the pipeline route (Nos 16) for the South Ribble Borough Council area.</p>	<p>a and c)Noted.</p> <p>b) The route and implications arising from the oil pipeline will be recorded on the Council's database and maps for the purposes of considering planning applications (visual record), but will not be shown on the DPD Proposals Map. No sites proposed are affected by the pipeline and it is not necessary to be included as a land use planning constraint within the document itself.</p>
264	138	Proposals Map	a) The Proposals Map identifies SSSI, BHS, GHS (LGS) and LNR but not the internationally important Natura 2000 site: Ribble & Alt Estuaries.	a) The Natura 2000 Site (Ribble & Alt Estuaries) has the same boundary as the SSSI. <b>Minor change</b> to the legend of the Proposals Map to include reference to the Natura 2000 Site.
253	138	Relationship to Other Planning Guidance	<p>a) It may be worth noting the MWLDF Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD and stating that the DPD is at an advanced stage of preparation. The Examination in Public is currently suspended pending a further submission in September 2012.</p> <p>b) Some of the housing and employment site allocations are located partially on land allocated as Mineral Safeguarding Areas. Officers at the County should meet with you prior to your submission stage to consider how the sites go forward and to ensure that developers are aware of the requirement to be mindful of the implications of the significance of the Minerals Safeguarding Area. The County Council would subsequently require consultation on any planning applications for these sites.</p>	a and b) Not required for minerals safeguarded areas to be shown on the DPD Proposals Map. No change.
166	98	Rural Local Service Centre	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 110	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 110
173	99	Rural Local Service Centre	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 110	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 110
181	100	Rural Local	a) Longton is described as a rural local service centre; however it is in fact a village. I note that the adjective rural is used.	a and b) The designation of Longton as a Rural Local Service Centre is contained in Policy 1(e) of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy, which says that limited growth and investment will

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
		Service Centre	<p>b) The document states that Longton is well placed for future employment and housing needs, but Longton has already been over-developed by housing stock and does not have the capacity at present nor in the future to cope with the increase in traffic volume that this would entail.</p> <p>The pressure to build new housing stock in Longton and other rural/semi-rural areas is attempting to make some kind of housing shortfall for the lack of development on Brownfield sites in the Borough.</p>	<p>be encouraged to help meet local housing and employment needs and to support the provision of services to the wider area. The allocations for housing development in Longton are consistent with the Core Strategy. No change to the DPD.</p>
195	108	Stages of Production	<p>a) This has been poorly communicated to residents, who its proposals will have a direct and significant impact. The first we, and other neighbours, became aware of the proposals (which are now in the final stages of production according to Figure 1 'Development Plan Document Stages') was from local residents carrying out leaflet drops to try and raise awareness, who by chance had noticed it on the councils website when searching for something unrelated. And the response from the council representative (Zoe Harding) at Booths supermarket in Longton on Tuesday 10th July regarding this issue is considered unacceptable, whereby Zoe stated that it would be "...too expensive to write and consult with neighbouring residents".</p>	<p>a) The Council considers that it has taken all reasonable steps to engage with people affected by the policies and proposals in the DPD, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A quarter page item 'Your area, your choice' in the Winter 2010/11 edition of Forward (Issue 66), designed to bring the process and Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document to the attention of all residents of the borough. Posters in shops, doctors' surgeries, dentists surgeries, church halls, community centres, schools, leisure centres, etc</li> <li>• Members of the Council's Forward Planning team attended every Area Committee meeting</li> <li>• Members of the Council's Forward Planning team have spent days in supermarkets at Booths (Penwortham and Longton), Sainsbury's (Bamber Bridge), Morrisons (Leyland and Bamber Bridge), Tesco and Leyland Market to raise awareness at each stage of the consultation.</li> <li>• The full documents have been available in libraries and at the Civic Centre at every stage of the process and some post offices during the first two stages.</li> <li>• Each stage of the process has been promoted via our website and press releases and through formal notices in the local press.</li> <li>• All council meetings which have discussed the document, Cabinet and Council, can be attended by members of the public.</li> <li>• Ward and parish councillors have been kept fully informed throughout the process and have provided essential liaison between planning officers and their constituents.</li> <li>• We have an extensive database of people who have expressed an interest in the Site Allocations DPD (over 2,000 contacts) who have all received letters or emails about the latest stage of the process.</li> </ul> <p>No change to the DPD.</p>
237	132	Telecommunications Policy	<p>a) Comment on behalf of Mobile Operators Association.</p> <p>b) Important that there remains in place a telecommunications policy within the emerging LDF in keeping with paras 42 and 43 of the NPPF, and the Code of Best Practice for Mobile Phone Network Development (2002). Policy should read:  <i>Proposals for telecommunications development will be permitted provided that the following criteria are met: -</i></p> <p>(i) <i>the siting and appearance of the proposed apparatus and associated structures should seek to minimise impact on the visual amenity, character or appearance of the surrounding area;</i></p> <p>(ii) <i>if on a building, apparatus and associated structures should be sited and designed in order to seek to minimise impact to the external appearance of the host building;</i></p> <p>(iii) <i>if proposing a new mast, it should be demonstrated that the applicant has explored the possibility of erecting apparatus on existing buildings, masts or other structures. Such evidence should accompany any application made to the (local) planning authority.</i></p> <p>(iv) <i>if proposing development in a sensitive area, the development should not have an unacceptable effect on areas of ecological interest, areas of landscape importance, archaeological sites, conservation areas or buildings of architectural or historic interest.</i></p> <p><i>When considering applications for telecommunications development, the (local) planning authority will have regard to the operational requirements of telecommunications networks</i></p>	<p>a to e) No change. The Council will rely on the policies contained in the NPPF.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
			<p><i>and the technical limitations of the technology.</i></p> <p>c) The supporting text should read: <i>Modern telecommunications systems have grown rapidly in recent years with more than two thirds of the population now owning a mobile phone. Mobile communications are now considered an integral part of the success of most business operations and individual lifestyles. With new services such as the advanced third generation (3G) services, demand for new telecommunications infrastructure is continuing to grow. The authority is keen to facilitate this expansion whilst at the same time minimising any environmental impacts. It is our policy to reduce the proliferation of new masts by encouraging mast sharing and siting equipment on existing tall structures and buildings.</i></p> <p>d) Suggest that this policy be a stand-alone policy within one of the main LDDs, with any background information, such as electromagnetic fields (EMFs) and public health, being contained within a separate Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>e) In keeping with the aims and objectives of the legislation any background information should be contained within a separate non-statutory LDD which would not need to go through the same consultation process.</p>	
196	108	Vision - Locating Growth - Section 3.4	<p>a) In section 3.4 it sets out the 'Major Sites for Development' which excludes Land Between Heatherleigh and Moss Lane, Farington (which in itself is also an error as part of Heatherleigh and all of Moss Lane fall within the parish of 'Farington Moss' not 'Farington', which is a separate parish) which is later referred to as one of the three major residential sites for development</p>	<p>a) <b>Minor change</b> to paragraph 3.4, under the heading "Major Sites for Development"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Pickering's Farm</li> <li>• Moss Side Test Track, <u>Leyland</u></li> <li>• <u>Land between Heatherleigh and Moss Lane, Farington Moss</u></li> <li>• Cuerden <u>Strategic Site</u></li> <li>• BAE Systems, Samlesbury"</li> </ul>
110	86	Vision - Rural Local Service Centre - page 8	<p>a) Longton is described as a rural local service centre, however it is in fact a village.</p> <p>b) DPD states that Longton is well placed for future employment and housing needs, but Longton has already been over-developed by housing stock and does not have the capacity at present nor in the future to cope with the increase in traffic volume that this would entail.</p> <p>c) The pressure to build new housing stock in Longton and other rural/semi-rural areas is attempting to make some kind of housing shortfall for the lack of development on Brownfield sites in the Borough.</p>	<p>a to c) The designation of Longton as a Rural Local Service Centre is contained in Policy 1(e) of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy, which says that limited growth and investment will be encouraged to help meet local housing and employment needs and to support the provision of services to the wider area. The allocations for housing development in Longton are consistent with the Core Strategy. No change to the DPD. For the past few years, the 70% target for new residential development on brownfield land has been well exceeded. The Site Allocations DPD includes brownfield sites as well as greenfield.</p>
590	327	Vision - Rural Local Service Centre - page 8	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 110.	Please see identical representation Ref No: 86, ID 110

INCOMPLETE RESPONSES OR RETURNED MAIL

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/ Chapter/ Paragraph	Summary of Representation	Response
30	23		No comments entered on form	
295	151	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	No comments entered on form.	
323	179	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	<b>Representation Acknowledgement returned by Royal Mail - No such address</b> Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
413	179	Chapter G - Policy G3	<b>Representation Acknowledgement returned by Royal Mail - No such address</b> Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
330	186	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	<b>Representation Acknowledgement returned by Royal Mail - Addressee unknown</b> Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296	Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
420	186	Chapter G - Policy G3	<b>Representation Acknowledgement returned by Royal Mail - Addressee unknown</b> Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387	Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387

RESPONSES RECEIVED AFTER 15 AUGUST 2012

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/ Chapter/ Paragraph	Representation
275	145	Chapter A - Policy A1	<p>LATE SUBMISSION</p> <p>Objection to Policy A1. Any contributions must meet the statutory tests in Article 122 of the Regulations.</p> <p>An additional paragraph is required to state:</p> <p>In negotiating any agreement or obligation the Council will ensure that it meets the requirements of Article 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as may be amended).</p> <p>Amend final paragraph of the policy amended by including the following caveat at the start:</p> <p>Until the adoption of the CIL Charging Schedule.....</p> <p>Need for policy to clarify how key items of infrastructure will be delivered where they fall across two or more sites.</p> <p>If the Developer is to provide the necessary infrastructure on-site then this should be clearly specified in the relevant policies for the allocations which have been identified in the DPD. The suggested amendment is:</p> <p>Infrastructure which may be provided by developers has been identified as part of the relevant site-specific policies contained in this Development Plan Document.</p>
276	145	Chapter C - Policy C1 - Pickering's Farm	<p>LATE SUBMISSION</p> <p>Do not object to the principle of the proposed Pickering Farm allocation but do object to the policies lack of clarity.</p> <p>There should be explicit reference to the Cross Borough Link Road being delivered by the developer forming part of the site-specific policy.</p>
279	145	Chapter D - Policy D1 – Site H	<p>LATE SUBMISSION</p> <p>Objection is made to the suggested phasing of the Vernon Carus which does not reflect either the longstanding allocation of the land for housing development or the outstanding residential planning application has been submitted to the Borough Council that has remained undetermined for a period of approximately 4 years. More than the suggested 50 dwellings could be delivered on this site before 2016 if the outstanding application is determined. See also the representation to Policy D2. Table 2 should be amended to include at least 100 dwellings being delivered during the period 2010 to 2016.</p>
272	145	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site H - Vernon Carus	<p>LATE SUBMISSION</p> <p>Bovis Homes support the reaffirmation that the Vernon Carus and associated land at Factory Lane, Penwortham (Site H) forms part of the housing land supply for South Ribble Borough.</p>
277	145	Chapter D - Policy D2 – Site H – Vernon Carus	<p>LATE SUBMISSION</p> <p>Objection to the phasing of development on Site H, Vernon Carus at Factory Lane, Penwortham, which has been revised down from 75 to 50 dwellings between the Preferred Option and the Publication versions of the DPD.</p> <p>Table 2 should be amended to include at least 100 dwellings being delivered during the period 2010 to 2016.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/ Chapter/ Paragraph	Representation
			Disagrees with Council's position that access to the site be taken solely from the Cross Borough Link Road.
273	145	Chapter D - Policy Policy D1 - Paras 7.26 to 7.27	<p>LATE SUBMISSION</p> <p>The matters raised in paragraphs 7.26 and 7.27, concerning the Vernon Carus site (Site H) create problems rather than providing solutions.</p> <p>The restricted height of the railway bridge referred to in paragraph 7.27 would not preclude traffic associated with the development of the site for residential purposes. The bridge is restrictive of heavy goods vehicles, but not of residential traffic. Bovis considers the Factory Road access to be suitable for the development of the Vernon Carus site.</p> <p>Do not accept that the alternative access 'will be from the Cross Borough Link Road, subject of Policy A1', because a robust mechanism does not exist for the delivery of the Cross Borough Link Road (CBLR) which does not result in an inappropriate 3rd party 'ransom' situation arising. Although cost is not the issue because Bovis Homes has offered to provide funding for the CBLR, the parallel here is the intended policy burden associated with the access requirement which is unnecessary.</p> <p>If access is not taken via the CBLR then any financial contributions being sought would currently not meet the statutory tests identified at Article 122 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (see also the objection to Policy A1). The contributions would not be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development nor fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.</p> <p>The reference in paragraph 7.27 to the access being from the CBLR should be deleted and replaced by 'Access shall be provided in a manner which does not cause has severe residual cumulative impacts on the local highway network'.</p> <p>Although support the aspiration to secure the long term future of the former Vernon Carus Sports Club, it is inappropriate for the emerging development plan document to explicitly refer to the development of this longstanding allocation to 'include measures to secure the future of the existing sports club north of Factory Lane' (paragraph 7.27) This paragraph should be amended by deleting the last sentence and replacing it by 'The development will include the provision of open space to the north of Factory Lane'.</p>
274	145	Chapter D - Policy Policy D1 – Site H – Vernon Carus	<p>LATE SUBMISSION</p> <p>Support the reaffirmation that the Vernon Carus and associated land at Factory Lane, Penwortham (Site H) forms part of the housing land supply for South Ribble Borough.</p>
278	145	Sustainability Appraisal	<p>LATE SUBMISSION</p> <p>Although it is noted that a similar approach to the Central Lancashire Core Strategy has been adopted, the Sustainability Appraisal of the Publication document is flawed. The Appraisal has no regard to extant national planning policies and requirements as contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and accompanying Technical Guidance. Reference is made to document which, as indicated in Appendix 2 to the Framework, have been replaced. The Appraisal therefore needs to be amended and updated to reflect current national policies and requirements rather than rely on documents which no longer have any status.</p>
476	245	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	<p>LATE SUBMISSION</p> <p>Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296</p>
477	245	Chapter G - Policy G3	<p>LATE SUBMISSION</p> <p>Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387</p>
478	246	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	<p>LATE SUBMISSION</p> <p>Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296</p>
479	246	Chapter G - Policy G3	<p>LATE SUBMISSION</p> <p>Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387</p>
480	247	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P	LATE SUBMISSION

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/ Chapter/ Paragraph	Representation
			Please see identical representation Ref No: 152, ID 296
481	247	Chapter G - Policy G3	LATE SUBMISSION Please see identical representation Ref No: 84, ID 387
604	338	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	LATE SUBMISSION  The area currently has natural features due to its semirural location where roads and footpaths are designed for low traffic use. Any further building will cause these natural features and wildlife to become extinct.  Due to the location and its desirability, any proposed housing should be in keeping with the standard expected in a semi-rural location where most residents have worked hard to be able to live in such an area. Affordable housing should be left in less desirable areas where house prices and use of the local area will not be affected.  Bannister Lane should not be used to serve any properties due to its inadequate drainage and road width. The emergency access provision does not seem appropriate and if required should be kept to a cyclepath (single track) and not bollarded (full width) road which would be used as a rat run for residents on the proposed development to access Schleswig Way. Main access should be off Heatherleigh as provision for this was included when the road was installed and if a further junction is added off Croston Road then surely this is not required. The current traffic calming measures on Croston Road are already damaging residents' vehicles and causing unsafe driving practices. The emergency access point off Bannister Lane will be used as an illegal cut through and is not necessary due to the number of access roads and cycleways being proposed.  Open public space in a residential estate will attract the wrong type of usage as can be seen already on the neighbouring estates such as teenage gang meeting place and litter dumping ground.
605	339	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 25/8/12  We should of been informed of the proposed plans and was only informed via a newspaper report / fellow residents today. I am disappointed that there has been no information sent to ourselves at all until I received a letter from local residents today.  Our house would lose considerable value due to your development. Over the past year the residents of this area have been subjected to a reprocessing plant that devalued our properties and we also have to live with the consequences of this.  Destroying our area, quality of life and natural habitat.
609	341	Chapter A - Delivering Infrastructure - Energy	LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 28/8/12  Energy not mentioned seriously. How will developers work towards zero carbon energy use in South Ribble?  DECC have asked that District energy systems be installed in the UK . Where is this taken into account in the LDF?  Industry reports state that the UK runs out of natural gas in around 2 years' time – a short timescale. However there is no mention of what should be used in its place in either new or existing buildings.
612	341	Chapter C - major sites for development	LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 28/8/12  These include edge of town greenfield which should be retained as greenfield for as long as possible. Developments should centre on areas which have been built upon and become derelict such as the old Leyland Vehicles sites. All developments should be mixed use and follow sustainable guidelines aiming for targets such as excellent.  The Wesley Street Mill and surrounding site should be a major redevelopment based on mixed use developments and should be an exemplar zero energy, zero carbon site to show what South Ribble aims to become across the borough eventually. It should achieve either excellent or outstanding target for sustainability.

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/ Chapter/ Paragraph	Representation
610	341	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 28/8/12</p> <p>A large scale housing development on edge of town green land is not a sustainable development. It will lead to dysfunctional communities and delinquency. This was tried in the 1970s in areas such as East Manchester and has been seen to fail badly. We need sustainable communities. The LDF policy should follow BREEAM Communities guidance, LEED Neighbourhood or similar.</p>
611	341	Chapter G - Policy G7, para 10.45	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 28/8/12</p> <p>This focuses on plants and the green belt. It should also cover green energy and its role in the borough into next century. Our green land will not stay green unless we control CO2 emissions and use more 'green' energy.</p>
607	341	General	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 28/8/12</p> <p>I would ask you to look at what is being done elsewhere regarding sustainable developments. Places like Brighton and Eastleigh are seeing benefit in using agencies such as the BRE and their BREEAM Communities scheme to aid developers toward truly sustainable planning schemes. Using such an approach reduces time and expense on the local authority and also guarantees a sustainable outcome which is based on technical and scientific facts - not just opinions. They also include future proofing thinking to allow schemes to look as far ahead as possible. Every new development we approve is set for 100 years or so, we need to try to look ahead. Although sustainability is quoted as a common and main stream thread through the LDF there is no mention of what it actually means or how it is assessed and targeted. At some places it seems to suggest that the SRBC Officers will decide what is and what is not sustainable. This is not an acceptable method for making serious planning decisions. We need an accepted method which is familiar to developers such as BREEAM Communities which rely on professional and scientific guidance at every stage. We should set levels such as BREEAM Communities excellent, or very good, and require developers to achieve such standards as part of the planning agreement.</p> <p>I think the major sites are completely wrong. The LDF seems to focus on new green field sites and ignores the obvious regeneration sites. This could make us guilty of moving from one mess to the next so to speak.</p>
608	341	Introduction - para 2.23 Sustainability Appraisal	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 28/8/12</p> <p>The information quoted is not available on the website. There is a response saying 'service unavailable'.</p>
342	617	Process	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 10/9/12</p> <p>I enclose my completed response form concerning the proposed building surrounding our properties. I feel very strongly about the fact that we were not directly consulted and we have now missed the deadline for the responses. I understand that you have carried out consultations in Sainsbury's but I have never seen anyone and I shop there every week. We wouldn't have known about the proposed building now if it wasn't for a concerned neighbour on Brindle Road.</p> <p>Cottage Gardens is a very small close and I feel that we could have been informed directly.</p>
342	618	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - 10/9/12</p> <p>I object to building on the green belt land which will destroy the landscape and the wildlife. There are also ancient oak trees on the land which the council pledged to preserve and prevented my neighbours from pruning them.</p> <p>I am concerned that we were not informed directly of the proposed building on the site hence we could not meet the deadline of 15 August. We only found out from a neighbour on Brindle Road this week.</p>
343	619	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	<p>LATE SUBMISSION</p> <p>I am writing with objections to the proposal of building new developments around Brindle Road/Cottage Gardens. I have lived on this cul-de-sac since the small, quiet and friendly estate was completed. I am appalled that this will be compromised by the development of 290 houses in and around this area.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/ Chapter/ Paragraph	Representation
			<p>Please forward all information that has previously been sent and please ensure a copy of all current information is made readily available so that I can make judgements as to how I will object.</p> <p>Through other members of the community I believe that correspondence/meetings/signs have been placed to inform all residents. I can assure you that I have received no information that supports this.</p> <p>When other meetings are arranged I would be grateful to hear of the dates so that I can attend.</p> <p>Any plans that are drawn please forward to my address/email therefore when needing advice I have all relevant information to refer to.</p>
344	620	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 6/9/12</p> <p>I am a resident of Cottage Gardens, PR5 6AG and I must express how disgusted I am that a neighbour has informed me and other residents about this proposed planning application for houses. Not one person on the estate or that I know along Brindle Road has been informed of this by the council. I think something of this importance/magnitude should be told by letter or in person by the relevant council so that all objections are heard from everyone involved.</p> <p>I think housing so close to the motorway is a joke and there are enough empty estates without adding more.</p> <p>This is not something we are prepared to take lightly and I'm sure if something of this importance was "withheld" from you then you would feel the same way.</p> <p>I will be doing everything in my power to find out where we stand on this issue and if any rules were broken by us not been given the relevant information. It was mentioned in a phone call to a neighbour that someone was in the supermarkets in Longton and Leyland asking peoples opinions on this.....what good is that when they wont be affected. You should have arranged a meeting involving all persons affected and cards should have been laid on the table so that a fair debate could have taken place.</p> <p>Is this why no-one has responded to my email about the vacant/empty disgusting property 257 Brindle Road?</p>
345	621	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	<p>LATE SUBMISSION</p> <p>Where shall I start? How about 'Deception'!?</p> <p>On Monday 3rd September I discovered that there were plans in progress to build on the beautiful fields surrounding our home; once the grazing pastures for sheep and cows now the home to wildlife, such as pheasants, deer, foxes, eagles and other wildlife.</p> <p>Our family have lived on this development for 10 years. One of the reasons for our purchase was the beautiful surrounding fields which we were informed were Green Belt.</p> <p>I have to ask the question as a law abiding, tax paying, honest member of the South Ribble community, why if this 'planning' has been in progress for 2 years; did I not know about it until now?! Why did you not knock on my door (1 of only approx. 50 homes to be directly affected) and say 'Mrs Preston, thank you for paying your taxes, just to let you know...' A letter or an invite to a meeting would have been a respectable and honest way of proceeding.</p> <p>A neighbour on Brindle Road made us aware by putting up notices on lamp posts, and she only found out by accident. I talked with our local planning contact at South Ribble, Zoe Harding, who has been most helpful, she confirmed that submissions of objections should be made by 15th August. Joy...</p> <p>2 years this has been going on apparently. I asked why we were not notified individually considering this proposed new development would be directly in view and presence of our homes and she said that letters were posted out in our vicinity (nobody on Cottage Gardens or Brindle Road here receive said documentation) and that notices were posted in local papers, and even she personally spent days in supermarkets – Booths (Penwortham and Longton), Sainsbury's (Bamber Bridge), Morrisons (Leyland and Bamber Bridge), Tesco and Leyland Market to raise awareness at each stage of the consultation. Not sure why Longton and Penwortham need to know about it! And I/we didn't see them in Sainsbury's and I shop there nearly every day!! ☹</p> <p>South Ribble Council are a deceptive dishonest disgrace!</p> <p>Now that I have that off my chest; it is most probable that we have no choice in this development now, as you have taken our freedom of speech away from us. But I tell you this, we (and I mean all the surrounding residents) will most certainly be reciprocating the 'dust and dirt' that you will be pushing our way, via our entitled freedom of speech.</p> <p>So far we have been in touch with our local MP, newspapers and environmental agencies. It has been interesting, however, to discover that of all the local councils South Ribble is the easiest to sway when it comes to Planning Permission... I shall have to dig deeper I think.</p> <p>We have many questions still i.e. access, state of the decades old sewerage and draining systems etc. I request that you forward me contact details of an individual who I can liaise with as regards to this matter.</p>
346	622	Vision - Locating Growth in South Ribble	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 6/9/12</p> <p>Page 8 ref 3.6 makes reference to development in 'other places' indicating that in such places (which includes Hutton) development will be confined to small scale infill, conversion and local needs.</p> <p>Page 37 ref 7.38 states that a Greenfield site north of Liverpool Rd allocated for 45 dwellings is in line with policy 1 (f) as defined in the Core Strategy</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/ Chapter/ Paragraph	Representation
			<p>This council feel that there is a significant level of inconsistency between the two references and would suggest therefore that the potential development is removed from the 'Allocation of Housing Sites' so as to meet the generic policy statement as set out on Page 8 ref 3.6</p>
346	623	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site N	<p>LATE REPRESENTATION - SUBMISSION 6/9/12</p> <p>This Council objects to the site allocation as above for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is the view of Hutton Parish Council that housing development should be located near to employment in order to reduce carbon emissions emanating from increased travel to work. Since Hutton itself provides little employment it is our opinion that housing in the proposed location would be wholly inappropriate</li> <li>• It is the view of HPC that this proposed development also flies in the face of Hutton Village Plan 2007 whereby it was identified on Page 12 that there was a 'widespread resistance to further new development in the village especially on Greenfield sites. It was clear from various consultations that villagers are keen to retain the existing character and heritage of Hutton'. It was also stated that development should be 'limited to conversions or very small infill type plots' which supports the statement in the LDF regarding 'Locating Growth In South Ribble' as detailed above (Page 8 ref 3.6)</li> <li>• It remains the view of HPC that development of this site would create additional congestion on Liverpool Road in what is already an over congested area during the Grammar School starting and finishing times and when school events are held and that this would be detrimental to road safety. In late 1990 at a public enquiry relating to the SRBC Local Plan an Inspectors Report stated that 'of greater concern is the serious congestion and hazards to road users which are daily occurrences during school terms due to buses and cars stopping on the highway to load and off load pupils attending the Grammar School, provision of these facilities is a pre-requisite of development of the allocation land if an unacceptable increase in congestion is to be avoided but no acceptable proposal for these facilities has been achieved' It is fair to say that the position since 1990 has worsened with the expansion of Hutton Grammar School and that this Council can only see a marked further deterioration should this site ever be developed. The Council would suggest that the site is withdrawn.</li> <li>• This Council also considers that any alternative access via Anchor Drive would be equally unacceptable due to congestion in that area and the location of an existing housing development where residents would be adversely affected by any significant increase in vehicular movements.</li> <li>• It is also noted that a small wood exists in the vicinity which would if removed have an adverse effect on the local visual amenity</li> <li>• It is also of concern that there are existing drainage issues in the immediate vicinity, regular flooding occurs during heavy rainfall and the site itself is believed to have a high level of water saturation. Development would therefore transfer substantial amounts of surface water into what is believed to be a drainage system which appears to be over loaded and unable to cope with existing peak rainfall situations</li> </ul>
347	624	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 10/9/12</p> <p>Shuttlingsfields Development</p> <p>With regard to the above development, we are expressing our objection to the proposed development. Firstly we think it is disgusting that we have not been notified by the council of this proposed development. Why is this land being developed when we already have traffic problems in the area and we don't see how the local amenities can cope with further development, mainly schools and doctors surgeries. We already suffer from lack of light and sunlight at the front of the house due to the height of the trees which the council have refused to cut back. What effect will this development have on light at the back of the house. When are we going to be officially informed of this development and when are the council going to hold a meeting for the residents to voice their concerns?</p>
348	625	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 10/9/12</p> <p>I would like to object to the deveopment of green land behind Brindle Road, Bamber Bridge near to tha Hospital Inn Pub.</p> <p>Have you thought about the impact, once this is added to the approved planning this past year for Bamber Bridge.</p> <p>We as a family enjoy walking and seeing the wildlife, the conservation of wildlife in this area will be lost. There will be added pollution, extra wear and tear on the local land and roads. Increased traffic and the level crossing is aready very congested at peak times. Are there going to be extra services like Leisure Centre, Doctors and dentists? Why are current brown site not being developed first? The old mill in the centre of Bamber Bridge? All of the now empty and redundant pubs???</p> <p>Please do not ruin the future of our land for our generations to come, for such short term gains!!!!</p>
349	626	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 10/9/12</p> <p>I wish to make an appeal. Make the land involved in this planning proposal unsuitable and unfit for future building. This is an area of green, tree filled land I enjoy walking within and so do my children, We currently enjoy bird spotting with binoculars, weekly frog and toad hunting expeditions. Happiness and fun are some of the most enjoyable free and educational activities. Imagine the Christmas walk if you can? Vegetable's peeled ready to heat up. Turkey in the oven, two hours till carving. The children excited to be going for a country walk no</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/ Chapter/ Paragraph	Representation
			<p>driving needed, just hats, scarves, gloves and thick socks to tuck into boots. We all go into the cold, the whole family, off in the hope of seeing a pleasurable sight of deer running free in the fields. My family have had the pleasure of sighting deer on three occasions. Imagine 2015 Christmas day we can walk along the tarmac and look into the windows of the new family homes ear marked for the green and pleasant land. "Calm down deer"! your only going to be homeless?</p> <p>I like design, but I love good design. If you consent for building to be granted! Will you be able to make sure that the houses are of quality. Will the homes be self sufficient? No need for external services, solar and heating provided purely by own means/ Will each house have its own rain water harvesting systems? Will they have a swimming pool? leisure centre? Doctors? Dentist? Hows is the local school for space? If you the planning inspector have considered the good design of the planned area and land, I will assume you have a eye and ear for good design. Will the houses be build using off the shelf architectural styling of a mock Tudor style? if so you will have failed this green and pleasant walking area.</p> <p>I can think of three areas you could build/develop in within a three mile area which are brown field sites. You can drive round the local area for about an hour and find them. but you can't find as many areas to enjoy away from houses and cars. Green fields and trees don not seen to scare me as a parent when walking and caring for my three young children as walking on pavements next to the road.</p> <p>Simply leave the grass to grow!</p> <p>or as Rudyard Kipling makes a valid point if you care to read... Rudyard Kipling - The White Man's Burden</p>
350	627	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 22/9/12</p> <p>Could you please pass on to the Planning Inspector the concern I have that this large development will cause significant problems with traffic at the Hospital Inn railway crossing. Over the years each additional development has increased the problems at this point and an additional development of this size will make the situation intolerable.</p>
351	628	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 11/9/12</p> <p>I have just heard that plans are afoot to build 290 new houses on the above site.</p> <p>I strongly object to this proposal on the grounds that you have already swamped this area with new properties in the last few years. The area was once attractive and the residents law abiding citizens.</p> <p>Over the last few years we have had all the industrial units built on Walton Summit right up to the railway line, this causes obnoxious smells and excessive noise at times. We also have had hundreds of houses built right up to our boundaries of Greystock Close - Bluebell Way. This estate extends from the M6 motorway right up to the level crossing at the Hospital Inn. We have also had Cottage Gardens, Craigflower Court, Hudson Court and also plans are ongoing opposite Hudson Court for more houses. What are you trying to do to us.</p> <p>Why not either demolish Wesley Street Mill or re-furbish it to make more homes rather than taking up more land to build, on what is an attractive area. There must be hundreds of properties for sale in the immediate area without the need to build more. People are not in a financial position in this day and age to be buying new properties.</p> <p>I hope common sense will prevail on this issue. You should be working together with the local residents instead of causing un-necessary conflict.</p>
352	629	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 12/9/12</p> <p>I write with regards to an applicvation to build 290 private dwellings on fields off Brindle Road and Cottage Gardens, Bamber Bridge. I wish to express my strong opposition to this proposal. The taking away of such a small but beautiful green space is frankly a scandal. However my main opposition is with regards to the road infrastructure. The roads around the level crossing at Kellet Lane are unable to cope with the volume of traffic at peak times as it is now. It is not unusual for it to take up to 30 minutes at peak times to travel from walton Summit to the Hopsital Inn due to the crossing. The addition of more local traffic to this nightmare is quite simply madness. Please see sense and decline this application.</p>
353	630	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 12/9/12</p> <p>I would like you to note our objections to the proposed grant of planning permission to build 290 houses on fields to the rear of Brindle Road, Cottage Gardens and Stephendale Avenue being submitted under the Local Planning Framework</p> <p>The basis of our objections are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) As our property borders this land we will be significantly affected by any development undertaken</li> <li>2) To date, we received no written notification of the proposals</li> </ol>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/ Chapter/ Paragraph	Representation
			<p>3) Prior to purchasing the property in May 2011, the proposed planning application was not revealed on the local searches - clearly if we had been aware of this we could have made a more informed decision before completing purchase - as the main reason for purchase was the rural outlook to the rear of the property</p> <p>4) The impact on local wildlife will be significant - at present we see large numbers of birdlife, dragon flies, butterflies, frogs etc.. all living in and around the trees, hedgerows and watercourses on this land close to the brook at the rear of our property.</p> <p>5) If the development was to be completed, this would de-value our properties having lost the rear rural outlook</p> <p>6) There are potential flooding issues to properties on Stephenendale Avenue - we are already aware that the rainwater drains in the street struggle to cope with heavy rainflow - these drains all flow into the streams on the land proposed to be developed.</p> <p>7) Building houses close to the motorway - who's to say these will actually sell ? This creates further concern of crime as empty properties would attract potential of burglary, criminal damage etc. and this could lead to our properties being targeted as well.</p> <p>8) The existing trees and hedgerows all provide a natural screen and sound barrier from the the motorway - removing these will clearly impact on the noise levels around the area.</p> <p>9) The loss of privacy to the rear of our properties - one of the main reasons for purchase of property was that we where not overlooked.</p> <p>10) Traffic issues around the area - we are already aware that planning has just been passed for new housing on land that boundaries Brindle Road / Kellet Lane -this will increase the traffic around the immediate roads, particulary with the railway line crossing these roads - a further proposed 290 property development will clearly create further traffic and safety issues on the surrounding road network.</p> <p>I look forward to receiving your comments to the above points and objections raised.</p>
354	631	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 13/9/12</p> <p>SR015 - Brindle Road, Bamber Bridge (Ref from Issues and Options Document)</p> <p>I would like to complain about the underhand way in which this change to the Local Development Plan has been publicised (or NOT!). It was by chance that I found the document. I have advised neighbours who all confirm that they knew nothing about this. The land owner states that they knew nothing about this either.</p> <p>Brindle Road, Bamber Bridge is already an extremely busy road; the crossing at the Hospital Inn causes delays and danger to traffic when cars pass stationary vehicles.</p> <p>Doctors have no or limited places on surgery lists, schools are practically full. You state that land bordering the M61 will not be available to build on due to traffic noise and amenity land will create a buffer between the motorway and houses. How will this be managed? What does this actually mean? What consideration will be made to the Public Footpath that crosses the land?</p> <p>It is stated that the land is not liable to flooding, but when so many houses are planned what effect will this have on sewerage and surface water? How will this be managed?</p> <p>Our home (a bungalow) backs on to the land affected by this plan and we will lose our privacy if and when houses (they are unlikely to be bungalows aren't they?) are built, our garden will be completely overlooked.</p> <p>I realise that the potential development will go ahead when the Public Inquiry is held, but would request South Ribble Borough Council to keep local householders FULLY aware of progress – and not expect us to simply fall on information ourselves.</p>
355	632	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 13/9/12</p> <p>Dear Sir's. I was rather horrified yesterday when I was notified by a neighbour that, there is an intention to build 290 houses on the farmland behind my home.</p> <p>Despite advised legislation; we have received no prior notification from SRBC and the proposed planning as just become aware to the local inhabitants, one month after objections and concerns should have been made to SRBC and closing the 15th of August. My first concern must be; why were we not notified of this planning application?</p> <p>My second and most important concern is that the sewerage system on Brindle Road is already overloaded and to the extent that in heavy rainstorms Brindle Road is flooded to a depth of 2 feet (700mm) with raw sewerage. This situation is already going to be made worse by the fact that planning permission as been granted to 40 new houses by the railway level crossing and being added to that system.</p> <p>When you consider the concerns expressed over Legionnaires disease, then even greater concerns should be shown over raw sewerage being sprayed over cars, (plus pedestrians</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/ Chapter/ Paragraph	Representation
			<p>and homes) when they pass each other, driving through the flooding.</p> <p>I have complained several times over the last 7 years regarding the problem and due to the near flooding of my home with raw sewerage on several occasions. The last flooding was 2 weeks ago and I have shown and given photographs and video film of that occurrence to the various concerned authorities and including SRBC. The photos and video show the manhole cover on the pavement, blown off by the water pressure. The extent of flooding along Brindle road, About 100 yards (100Meters). Cars driving through the flooding and spraying each other. (Completely covering the cars). The following day with the manhole cover on the pavement and human body waste still apparent.</p> <p>Also traffic concerns must be expressed when you consider the amount of extra traffic that will be generated trying to access the motorways that are on the other side of the level crossing on Brindle Road.</p> <p>I await your reply with interest.</p>
356	633	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 11/9/12</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why develop green fields when there is a large site waiting for housing on the old Milk Marketing Board which has not been eagerly snapped up by developers!</li> <li>2. Our privacy to the rear of our house will be non-existent if the development takes place.</li> <li>3. Although you "don't buy the view" houses near to ourselves would shatter the outlook.</li> <li>4. At a time when the housing market is stagnant, what is the sense of a large development like this!</li> <li>5. Surely keeping green fields and ponds and all the wildlife we see must be something that has a big impact on this development.</li> <li>6. What about sewerage! The main drain down Brindle Road is very old and only just copes with sewerage from our housing site. Never mind a new large development.</li> <li>7. Traffic is bad at most times especially breakfast, dinner and tea. All these extra cars when the crossings are down will have a big impact on the flow to Walton Summit and the motorway.</li> </ol>
357	634	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 13/9/12</p> <p>I have just found out you intended to build houses in Stephendale Avenue without talking to the residents, who have been here over 50 years and of course we object. There will be no green belt of lovely trees to see, plus you have never discussed the plans. Why were we not informed by you? A neighbour to inform us from Cottage Garden Centre and Stephendale Avenue. I think it is really bad of you. I hope you reject the proposal.</p>
358	635	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 10/9/12</p> <p>As a resident in Cottage Gardens. Firstly. Not one resident of this road has been informed of this future development, why? This development completely encircles Cottage Gardens, destroying habitat, and the environment. Completely ruining the open aspect that all the residents enjoy. This project has been handled extremely badly by SRBC and has been in my opinion kept secret from the residents in the vicinity of Brindle Road areas.</p> <p>It is no use saying that notices were placed in local supermarkets (we go to supermarkets to buy food, not read noticeboards). Also, placing in local papers is no use as not everyone buys local papers. Another key area is drainage. The drains in this area are old and cannot take the amount that this proposed development will produce. As for the date below, this should be amended to allow everyone to raise their objections.</p>
359	636	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 14/9/12</p> <p>It has been brought to my attention that planning permission is being sought for land behind Grey Gables Farm.</p> <p>Living at 279 Brindle Road I am surprised that I have not been informed by letter of this possible development.</p> <p>Leaving and returning to my property is already difficult because of the amount of traffic on Brindle Road. This is compounded by the proximity of the railway crossing. At peak periods traffic backs up when the crossing is closed.</p> <p>The area being considered for development is also crossed by public footpaths which would have to be retained.</p> <p>Brindle Road was never intended to be a main access road and I therefore request that this application be refused.</p>
360	637	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - Received 16/9/12</p> <p>This is the only form I can find to return to you regarding the building of approx. 290 houses situated at the back of Cottage Gardens.</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/ Chapter/ Paragraph	Representation
			<p>I am so disappointed that I have not been informed . I have been informed by a neighbour that there will be a road at the side of my house. A house that I have paid a premium price for. because off its location. If I wanted to be part of a huge housing estate I would have bought else where. I have a child and I would question the safety of such a road.</p>
361	638	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - Received 17/9/12</p> <p>As a near neighbour to the proposed site, I wish to express my concerns with regard to the amount of development that as been undertaken and is proposed in our area in recent years. We have had more than our fare share, on what once, was a quite rural area when we first took up residence in 1968. It was a pleasure to live here, but is now becoming more stressful with the increased volume of traffic etc. We did expect changes but the density of development is becoming to much. We have had Five developments completed and Two more in the pipeline.</p>
362	639	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - Received 17/9/12</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The builder of our bungalow told us that the land behind our bungalow was unsuitable for building because the land was low lying and not fit for drainage purposes.</li> <li>2. During heavy rain Brindle Road is often flooded and overflows into Stephendale Avenue due to inefficient drainage. This then drains into the field at the back of the bungalows and our inspection tank overflows covering the garden in effluent, etc.</li> <li>3. Brindle Road is very busy with traffic coming from Gregson Lane due to the level crossings and motorists taking a shortcut to the motorways. A further increase in housing would add to this congestion and poor air quality.</li> <li>4. This area has always been considered Breen Belt and further development would cause a beautiful area to be spoilt.</li> </ol>
363	640	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - Received 29/9/12</p> <p>I am writing to object to the above planned development. I was only recently made aware of it after seeing posters put up by a neighbour on Brindle Road and cannot understand why we did not receive notification of this.</p> <p>I have lived in this area all my life; in Stephendale Avenue from birth until I was 22 years old and in Cottage Gardens for the past 11.5 years. I chose this road due to its peaceful location and the fact that it is surrounded by fields full of wildlife. I do not want to look out over hundreds of houses.</p> <p>My main concern is the increase in traffic, both volume and noise, with most households these days owning two vehicles. Brindle Road and Kellett Lane are currently busy enough and the railway crossings at the Hospital Inn already cause long delays. Children cycling/walking to the various schools in the area will have to take extra care.</p> <p>I am not sure where the access points to the site are to be located, but these too will cause further traffic problems. I do hope that there will not be an access via Cottage Gardens. This would prevent the children playing out and will cause excess noise.</p> <p>There are so many unsold new properties in the surrounding area, why do we need more? I understand there are also to be houses built on Brindle Road just over the railway crossing.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you would show this letter to the Inspector next year.</p>
364	641	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - Received 19/10/12</p> <p>As a resident of Farington Moss I wish to make objections against the proposed residential development along Croston Road, the details of these objections are as follows.</p> <p>Use of Green field land</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed development area includes agricultural grazing and land used to grow crops on, before land of this type is used alternatives should be explored particularly the use of brown field or land that was previously used for industrial purposes. Land of this type may be earmarked for employment use but considering the economic downturn the council should consider if this will ever be a reality.</li> <li>2. As a regular walker around this area many of the hedgerows and fields are home to birds, ground nesting birds and many other wildlife which will be significantly affected by any residential development.</li> <li>3. The development at Buckshaw should be completed and all housing built and occupied before any further large scale residential developments are approved, particularly on green field land.</li> </ol> <p>Environmental Concerns</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With summers getting progressively wetter, and expected to do so for the next 10-20 years, the loss of such large open ground areas capable of holding rain water as a buffer into the rivers would be extremely detrimental to properties surrounding the River Lostock. With dwellings further downstream of the proposed development already being flooded this year by the River Lostock any reduction in this buffer land will only increase this risk.</li> <li>2. As a resident of the Barn Hey drive development it is easy to see where developers have blocked natural drainage ditches, causing trees to be sat in permanent 'baths' of water. Indeed most of the original trees that were in my own garden from before the development, died presumably because they are now sat in a permanent pool of water, water can be</li> </ol>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/ Chapter/ Paragraph	Representation
			<p>found by digging down just a few centimetres even during dry summers. I have no reason to believe that the new development will be any different.</p> <p>3. Vehicles waiting at the junction of Longmeanygate, Golden Hill and Leyland Lane sometimes for long periods causes increased pollution.</p> <p>Traffic and safety Concerns</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This area of Leyland in my opinion is particularly poor for public transport resulting in more people using cars.</li> <li>2. The junction of Longmeanygate, Golden Hill and Leyland Lane is dangerous for drivers, pedestrians and cyclists in particular:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The junction is too narrow and the continued development has brought more traffic than the junction can cope with particularly at peak times.</li> <li>• Pedestrians crossing the roads are in blind spots due to the junctions being set back to allow vehicles to swing in.</li> <li>• There are no pedestrian crossing facilities.</li> <li>• Children walking to school have to cross one of the roads at this junction or at the equally dangerous roundabout at Flensburg Way and Croston Road.</li> <li>• The tight turn particularly for buses turning right off Leyland Lane into Golden Hill, results in the bit of the bus in front of the wheels passing over the top of the pavement resulting in pedestrians waiting to cross, jumping out of the way of moving buses.</li> <li>• The layout of the junction confuses some people.</li> <li>• Cars waiting to turn right into Leyland Lane from Golden Hill Lane and Longmeanygate are prevented from doing so by oncoming traffic, the very short filter time makes turning right here a frustrating experience and can cause delays for other traffic stacked behind them. As a driver who almost daily turns right out of Golden Hill Lane into Leyland lane, it can be a scary moment when you are sat in the middle of the junction waiting to turn right and all the traffic from the left starts moving towards you.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. If the development does go ahead the council should consider forcing the developer to make vehicular access off Flensburg Way and installing a new roundabout on this road, this will also reduce the speed of traffic on Flensburg Way.</li> </ol> <p>Other Factors</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is a real lack of facilities particularly for Children, no new playground was provided when the development around Barn Hey drive was built, indeed the one playground that was in the area adjacent to Heatherleigh had its equipment removed apparently because the supplier was not paid. The cumulative effect of these developments needs to be taken into account and new facilities provided, not just the size of individual developments.</li> <li>2. Croston Road traffic calming measures whilst being somewhat effective in reducing driver speed particularly during the day, the measures themselves appeared to cause more damage to the road surface around them with drivers hitting the same spot continually. Extra traffic will only increase this wear and tear.</li> </ol> <p>I would be grateful if these objections could be formally logged and taken into account in any planning approval process.</p>
365	642	Chapter C - Policies C2 and C3 - Sites FF and W	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 23/10/12</p> <p>I am writing to oppose the proposed LDF site W and FF for the following reasons:</p> <p>Already I find traffic heading both to the motorway and into Leyland via Croston Road to be heavy particularly during morning rush hour. Additional houses to this area can only increase this pressure.</p> <p>We moved to our current home for a number of reasons which included easy accessibility to motorway networks and schools. This proposed development will undermine this.</p> <p>On that note I would be interested to hear how you intend to fulfil the needs of these additional households within the current infrastructure of the town? Will you be building additional schools, GP surgeries, NHS dental practises etc? And if so where will these be placed and to what cost on our town?</p> <p>Children today seldom see green fields because of this current fashion of dumping new houses in every available patch of grass. Given the new developments on Buckshaw village, Next to Morrisons and next to Centurion Way is a further large development really in the best interests of our town? I think not. Especially when many of these are still unsold. Actually, when the estate I live on (see address below) was built, in the original planning it was agreed a swing park area would be built for the children to use. Clearly this has not happened. Can you answer why this is? Would similar false promises be made to win over the local residents then remain unfulfilled at a later date?</p> <p>I am also concerned as to the environmental impact of this proposed development. After recent heavy rain and flooding of footpaths around this area, the removal of hedgerows and disturbing of this land is likely to have a detrimental impact on here and surrounding areas, in terms of further flooding. Not to mention destroying of local wildlife.</p> <p>Currently these areas are also used by ramblers and dog walkers. If these proposed sites are to go ahead you are forcing people back onto the roads. In an age of such obesity is it in the best interests of our residents to remove footpaths and off road walking areas?</p> <p>I would ask that you lodge this letter as an opposition to these sites, and acknowledge receipt of this letter in the first instance. Furthermore I would like a response in writing (via email is sufficient) to the points I have raised.</p>
366	643	Chapter D - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 24/10/12</p> <p>I object to the proposed development, in particular the proposed development of 650 houses on land stretching from Heatherleigh to Moss Lane. I object to the fact that the local</p>

ID	Ref	Which Policy/ Site/ Chapter/ Paragraph	Representation
			<p>government officers of South Ribble have underhandedly proposed this development without notifying affected residents in the area of its intentions, they may argue that it has been featured in the local press but if you don't subscribe to the paper then you remain ignorant of the intent, it is surely incumbent on the proposers of a development to make aware, by all means necessary, their intentions so that objections can be registered.</p> <p>My objections consist of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Infrastructure: The roads surrounding this development are already at full capacity and with a potential for 2000 additional vehicles from this development alone I seriously question its viability. If the traffic from the other proposed development, at the old Leyland Motors test track, is added in then this will impact the already overloaded roads. Croston Road is already a rat run with traffic choosing to forsake the queues on Flensburg Way, add to this the traffic generated by the Global Renewables site plus the traffic from the Barn Hey Drive development and it is quite obvious that the roads were not designed for this volume of traffic. (It might be argued that the increase in traffic is less than 1% but this is against a traffic census undertaken within the last couple of years not against the census that brought about the creation of Flensburg Way and Farington Road.)</li> <li>I also have concerns that the current drainage system will not cope with the addition of the proposed number of residences. I fear that with the loss of this land to development that the natural areas of drainage for rainwater will lead to areas susceptible to flooding, as was the case in Fylde Avenue, as a result of development of what could be described as flood plains, in this case Barn Hey. You only have to look at the news reports of recent flooding up and down the country to realise that the areas of flooding occur where over development of areas of natural drainage have been allowed.</li> <li>2. Amenities: Are the current doctors, dentists, schools, etc, expected to cope with the increased demand or will this require further planning proposals.</li> <li>3. Environment: The proposed development will seriously reduce the amount of green belt land available with its impact being felt on the wildlife within the area, added to this is the potential for increased air, light and noise pollution together with an already present problem of littering along Croston Road.</li> <li>4. Asset Values: The owners of properties within the proposed development have already seen the value of their assets dramatically affected by the development of the Global Renewables site and this proposal will only compound this negative effect.</li> </ol>
367	644	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W	<p>LATE SUBMISSION - RECEIVED 25/10/12</p> <p>I am a resident of Hugh Lane, Leyland, and I am writing to you in order to raise my concerns about the planned development of land off Croston Road in Leyland.</p> <p>The first time I became aware of the development proposals was around August of this year. This was when I received a flyer through my door inviting me to attend the public consultation for the development. I had not heard anything or seen any notification that such development was to take place before this leaflet appeared. Naturally I was concerned and attended the meeting. During the consultation I learnt that there was apparently planning in place for the building of over 1,500 homes. Apparently the timing of the meeting gave residents less than a week to object using questionnaires handed out.</p> <p>I am aware that homes need to be built but the proposed area is not what I would deem as being suitable for such a large number. If we go with the numbers proposed, the first phase of development will see around 600 homes constructed. I don't know how the existing roads will support such large volumes. At present the surrounding main arterial roads are gridlocked at peak times. Hugh Lane, where I live, I usually a quiet street. However, at peak times motorists use this and Lowther Drive as a cut through to miss the traffic light junction situated at Golden Hill Lane and Croston Road. This is already a concern as vehicles speed through an area where children play. It is a matter of time before a child is knocked down. With the increased traffic flow I see this risk as being increased many times over.</p> <p>One of my other main concerns is flooding. I know from experience that the area around Hugh Lane already has problems with drainage. My own garden has been continually waterlogged for most of this year, so much so that I am looking at possible drainage solutions. With the loss of fields off Croston Road to the development the problem will no doubt be exacerbated. I was told at a recent residents' meeting that the fields off Croston Road are currently flooded. Also the River Lostock is at a very high level and is of concern to nearby residents.</p> <p>As Leyland is now a much smaller town than it was in terms of industry, and as the present economic climate is so bad, where are the new residents going to work? Where are the children going to go to school, and where are the families going to shop? I haven't seen or heard of any planned developments for schools, roads or shops.</p> <p>I'm not completely against the development but it seems that there are other local sites, actual brown field sites that can be used. One that comes to mind is the derelict Leyland test track. I believe this is already up for consideration as is termed as site 'FF' with the Croston Road site being 'W'.</p> <p>I would hope that you consider my objections as I see major knock on effects for the area. I'm sure that if more people realised what the actual impact of the developments meant then they too would complain.</p>

DP 251012