

Issues and Options Consultation – Main Matters

March 2025

www.wyre.gov.uk

1. Introduction, page 3
2. Key matters of concern, page 4
3. General comments, page 5
4. Questions 1-27 – main matters arising, page 6
 - Q1: Sustainability appraisal, page 6
 - Q2: Spatial portrait, page 10
 - Q3: Key issues, page 12
 - Q4: Vision, page 14
 - Q5: Objectives, page 16
 - Q6: Spatial strategy, page 19
 - Q7: Employment land, page 22
 - Q8: Retail hierarchy, page 24
 - Q9: Retail policy, page 25
 - Q10: The number of homes, page 26
 - Q11: Affordable housing, page 28
 - Q12: Meeting housing needs, page 30
 - Q13: Custom and self-build, page 31
 - Q14: Small and medium sized builders, page 32
 - Q15: Accommodation for Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, page 33
 - Q16: Design, page 35
 - Q17: Heritage, page 36
 - Q18: Flood risk, page 37
 - Q19: Green Belt, page 40
 - Q20: Nature, page 41
 - Q21: Green infrastructure, page 43
 - Q22: Net zero, page 44
 - Q23: Energy efficiency, page 45
 - Q24: Renewable energy, page 47
 - Q25: Adaptation and resilience 48
 - Q26: Healthy and active environments, page 49
 - Q27: Infrastructure, page 50
5. Question 28 (sites), page 52
 - General comments, page 52
 - Location-specific comments, page 53
 - Main matters arising, page 57
 - Proposed new sites, page 85

1. Introduction

The Wyre Local Plan (2011-2031) (incorporating partial update of 2022) was adopted on 26 January 2023 following a period of public examination.

The council is now reviewing the adopted Local Plan. To date, the council has undertaken public consultation on the scope of the new plan (January 2022) and carried out various Call for Sites consultations. The latest stage in the plan preparation process was reached in July 2024 when the council launched a seven-week consultation on an Issues and Options document, the purpose of which was to highlight and consult upon the key planning issues for Wyre and the range of options or recommended approaches the Local Plan should consider to tackle them. Issues and Options is an important early stage in the plan-making process.

To aid consideration of the issues and options, the Issues and Options document included a series of 28 questions, some with more than one part.

The council received representations from 353 individuals and organisations. All of these have been read and considered and will inform the development of the Local Plan policies and the evidence needed to support them.

This document is intended to capture in summary form the wide range of comments and issues raised through the Issues and Options consultation. It is organised around the questions but also includes general comment. It does not include comments on matters outside of the remit of the planning system.

The Issues and Options document identified 56 sites that could form part of the Local Plan allocations for residential, employment and mixed-use development. The document identified a possible need to allocate land for 1,400 residential properties. However, and critically, the day after the launch of the consultation, the new UK government published draft amendments to the National Planning Policy Framework and a proposed revised Standard Method formula for calculating the housing requirement for the plan period. The effect of the proposed change to the formula was to suggest a significant increase the council's housing requirement from 280 dwellings per annum (p.a.) to 637 dwellings p.a. The council amended consultation material to bring this to the attention of consultees. The council undertook a pre-planned series of staffed exhibition events most of which were well attended. The events provided the opportunity for officers to explain the proposed changes in government planning policy and Standard Method, particularly to local residents.¹

¹ During the drafting of this report the government has published its revised Standard Method formula. The new local housing need figure for Wyre is 582 dwellings per annum. This represents the minimum number of houses to be planned for in the new Local Plan.

2. Key matters of concern

Perhaps unsurprisingly, the implications of more development in Wyre featured heavily in the responses from local residents and organisations. This concern was reflected in responses to many of the questions set out in the document.

Comments both reflected a concern about the impact of development on Wyre as a whole and on specific named settlements such as Knott End, Great Eccleston, Hambleton, Inskip, Forton, Hollins Lane, Scorton, Garstang and others.

Key matters raised were:

- Overstretched medical and other local services will become even more so with additional development.
- Inadequate existing surface water drainage and sewers.
- Concern about existing flood risk and that additional development will make this worse.
- Highway network at capacity, including the A6, and implications for safety including that of pedestrians and cyclists.
- Inadequate rural road network – in terms of its physical characteristics and condition - to accommodate additional development.
- Impact on the rural character of much of Wyre – over development and urbanisation of existing villages and loss of identity, including concern that areas of separation (as designated in the adopted Local Plan) may be lost.
- Concern that Wyre as an attractive place to live and work is being ruined by development.
- Basic lack of local services in many villages to support additional growth.
- Impact on the natural environment including wildlife and loss of habitats.
- Lack of local jobs to support additional residential development with consequent increase in commuting and congestion.
- Concern about the loss of farmland on the rural economy and food production.
- Concern that new residential development will not be sufficiently affordable or have a range of smaller house types or be suitable for an aged and ageing population.
- Lack of evidence to support the claimed need for housing in light of a falling birth rate.
- Concern that the scale of residential development proposed is inconsistent with environmental and climate change objectives.
- Concern about increasing crime levels as a result of new affordable housing.
- Support for brownfield development – including in Preston and Lancaster first - rather than building on greenfield.

In addition, there was a concern that the mapping used for the Issues and Options document does not reflect development already undertaken and therefore provides a false picture.

3. General comments

Responses logged: 87

Although the Issues and Options document was structured around a series of questions, the council received many general comments not specifically aligned to a particular question. Many of the issues raised have been identified above. In addition, the following matters were highlighted:

- The Local Plan should set criteria-based policies to ensure the protection of designated biodiversity and geological sites, protect and enhance valued landscapes, and should be underpinned by up-to-date environmental evidence including an assessment of existing and potential components of local ecological networks, to inform the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).
- The Local Plan should identify areas of tranquillity.
- The Local Plan should give weight to the roles performed by soils as a finite multi-functional resource and should safeguard agricultural land grades 1,2,3a.
- The Local Plan should include strategic policies to conserve and enhance the historic environment and consider the role which the historic environment can play in delivering other planning objectives. Should undertake a heritage impact assessment before allocating any sites to assess the contribution to the significance of heritage assets and what impact development might have. The Plan should avoid allocating those sites which are likely to result in harm to the significance of the heritage assets.
- One person disagreed with the population data, stating that the low number of children and young people is incorrect.
- Suggestion that we need to review our settlement boundaries as some do not make sense.
- Need to produce an up-to-date Viability Assessment. Without this it is difficult to ascertain if any of the options put forward are realistic or deliverable. By limiting scrutiny of the Local Plan Viability Assessment, the council is reducing the opportunities for comment on a crucial element of the evidence base and the Local Plan would be less robust as a consequence. The viability of specialist housing for older people should be assessed separately to mainstream housing.
- Need to ensure that designated zones around key operation defence sites at Inskip and Warton are not adversely affected by development outside the Ministry of Defence estate.
- Should consider building homes close to the roundabout at Lancaster so traffic can go straight onto the M6.
- Suggestion to start building up and not out.
- Rather than filling fields with solar panels, put funding into the approved Fleetwood barrage with the addition of a road over to Knott End. This would mean that Knott End could be expanded. If not an option, solar panels should be fitted to every new house and public buildings to avoid using more land.
- Need to consider the marine environment and apply an Integrated Coastal Zone Management approach. Plan should also refer to Shoreline Management Plans. Need to consider the natural assets of coastal habitats which can support climate resilience, flood risk management and are

essential in supporting nature recovery and relocate valued environmental assets away from risk.

- Policies should protect Public Rights of Ways and National Trails, link existing rights of way and provide for new access opportunities. Should avoid building on open space of public value and make provision for appropriate quantity and quality of green space to meet identified local needs.
- The Plan should plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement, and management of networks of biodiversity and set out the approach to delivering biodiversity net gain.
- Should consider the impact of air quality on the natural environment through the Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment, including traffic impacts of new development, effects on designated sites and avoidance and mitigation measures.
- In advance of the publication of any further stage of the plan, Wyre Council may wish to consider producing an initial version of the statement of common ground.
- Suggestion to have an exception allowing infill development in the countryside, drafted to accord more closely with the phraseology in current local plan policy SP4 to cover no adverse impact on the open and rural character of the countryside, and the site being suitably accessible to facilities by means other than public transport.
- The plan period is considered insufficient and should be extended by an absolute minimum to 2042 which would result in an increase in the housing requirement/supply to cover the extra years.
- The Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment needs to be revisited as it is highly likely that Wyre will need to identify additional sites moving forwards to address the development needs across the Plan period.

4. Questions 1-27 main matters arising

Note that where yes/no or options are sought not every logged response answered the question in that way.

Question 1: Sustainability appraisal

Responses logged: 95

Do you have any comments on the Sustainability Appraisal?

Comments on the Sustainability Appraisal were many and varied. A number of comments indicated a concern about the availability of the Sustainability Appraisal document and its basic complexity. This included the readability of the document and requests for a summary document and for plain English to be used.

There were also comments that suggested the Sustainability Appraisal will need to reflect the proposed amendments to the National Planning Framework and the Standard Method of calculating the housing requirement.

In terms of the general structure and content of the Sustainability Appraisal, comments included:

- It should be clear from the Sustainability Appraisal why some policy options are progressed and others rejected using a comparative and equal assessment of each reasonable alternative so the decision making is robust, justified and transparent.
- The Sustainability Appraisal should also include further commentary on how constraints can be addressed through appropriate assessments and mitigation measures within the development proposal.
- The Sustainability Appraisal should present an overview of the entire Wyre area and should also have a clear focus on different settlements within the borough. Each settlement presents its own unique challenges.
- No one arm of sustainable development is afforded more weight than the other in national planning policy so the Sustainability Appraisal should recognise a planning balance must be struck. It must also assess reasonable alternatives when it comes to considering the scale of development required to meet local needs.
- It is the role of the Sustainability Appraisal to consider the implications of sustainable development policies in the round. Simply adhering to the Directive and Strategic Environmental Assessment regulations is therefore not enough in itself to assess the impacts of a Local Plan and its associated policies.
- There is inconsistency and vagueness in many of the assessments e.g. option 4 is shown as positive for education on the grounds that it is 'expected' that schools would be built, but no substance as to how or where funded.
- There is a need to ensure the results of the Sustainability Appraisal process clearly justify its policy choices.
- Reasonable Alternative Policy approaches moving forwards (Para 7.1), should include, but not be limited to exceeding the minimum standard method housing need, potentially by considering the alignment of housing and economic growth, seeking to deliver additional development in all settlements to maintain their vitality and sustainability, fully assessing the viability and deliverability of sites if option 1 is pursued; and if the current standard method strategy is pursued, the potential implications for the shortfall in the deliverability of affordable housing throughout the plan period.
- The criteria applied within the site assessments should be supplemented with additional criteria to more broadly understand the implications and effects of the development of sites, both individually and collectively (to take a more localised view as regards 'Secondary, Cumulative and Synergistic' effects as recognised in the Sustainability Appraisal at para. 6.2.5).
- The sustainability appraisal of the Vision for Wyre appears very harsh in not identifying the Vision as compatible with the majority of Sustainability Appraisal Objectives:
 - The positive effects of the plan objectives related to economic development on the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives for crime, education, health and housing have not been recognised.

- Overall, there seems to be a lean towards identifying environmental compatibilities but not economic and social compatibilities.
- Option 4 new settlement – circumstances of any proposed settlement are understandably vague. There seems to be an element of creativity in reaching some of the conclusions that lead to negative scoring for this option.
- The scoring for retail policy identifies the fourth bullet point to have incompatibility with a number of Sustainability Appraisal Objectives, which reflects comment on the policy.
- The site scoring criteria judge sites on proximity to existing infrastructure, which applies a presumption that new development will depend on that existing infrastructure, rather than new infrastructure being provided to support the development. This could include reliance on existing infrastructure that lays outside Wyre. The scoring should be neutral on this factor and assume that infrastructure is provided where needed.

There were a large number of comments on the detail of the SA including references to incorrect information or a perceived incorrect information. Many comments are reflective of a general concern over the amount of possible development and its impact on local services and facilities and the local environment.

Key matters raised included:

- Incorrectly states that Fleetwood hospital has an Accident and Emergency (A&E) department (paragraph 4.5.4).
- The claim that building in the west of the borough would result in residents having excellent access to a wide variety of frequent and affordable public transport links and essential services is wishful thinking. Rail line not materialised (para 4.5.13 re Option 1).
- Sites in Scorton collectively unsuitable for development for a range of reasons including limited local services, impact on the Forest of Bowland National Landscape, poor/constrained highways access, flooding, struggling sewage plant, visitor impact on traffic generation.
- The statement the A6 Corridor having 'good access to the motorway network' is incorrect.
- Page 5 2.i.i.i sustainable transport modes are poor compared with the volume of private road transport making them unattractive and/or impractical for many residents.
- Levels of traffic a concern (A6, Snapewood Lane, Scorton, Inskip, Great Eccleston, Singleton, Poulton mentioned). Concern further development on A6 would be unsustainable.
- Need to improve infrastructure for non-motorised users (e.g., railway station at Garstang, Thornton line, bus services in rural areas and safe cycle lanes).
- Too much expectation on using public transport. Whereas desirable, in reality people use cars and access to roads and motorways should be considered.
- The promotion of vibrant town centres should be through more and better paid local jobs and improved transport connectivity (para 4.5.6).

- Given the lack of employment in the west of the borough there is a need to create employment opportunities irrespective of any plans for more housing in those areas (Para 4.5.7 re employment/option 1).
- Important to consider how new businesses can be attracted to the Borough to boost the local economy and create new employment opportunities to support the proposed housing development. This is needed to reduce commuter travel. Co-operation with adjoining council's will be required.
- Sustainability Appraisal Objective 5 should be amended to 'sustainable access to employment, basic goods, services and amenities'. The criterion should be sub-split into two separate topics: Bus Access and Train Access. Reason – the distances of rail and bus do not equate.
- Building additional houses without the infrastructure and jobs would negatively impact on objective 5. The assumption that there are existing employment opportunities is a very bad assumption (para 4.5.8 re option 1).
- Regarding section 4.5.18 that Option 2 has a 'positive and negative' compatibility with Sustainability Appraisal Objective (Health), Option 2 should be wholly negative with Sustainability Appraisal Objective 3 (Health).
- Option 4 should be negative for education and access
- Regarding the sustainability of significant expansion of Great Eccleston, the village is no longer sustainable for the amount of people who live there. Schools/health facilities are oversubscribed. Largely reliant on other nearby conurbations.
- Crime rates have increased dramatically since the population increase of Garstang and Catterall. Lack of manned police station (section 3.1.9).
- The Sustainability Appraisal doesn't mention:
 - protecting existing communities,
 - maintaining or repairing existing infrastructure,
 - inconvenience on roads during development,
 - what action will be taken to improve access to healthcare,
 - improving transport links to schools in rural areas.
- Environmental impacts need to consider prioritising the planting of new trees in the Plan.
- Does not seem to take account of serious sea level rises because of ongoing Global Warming
- Specific to Fowlers Hill Lane - option to use land to count towards the biodiversity net gains targets and also have major positive impacts for the local wildlife, carbon capture, biodiversity improvement, boosted health and wellness from local green spaces and would be connected to somewhere already well established.
- Queries about whether water supply for all the new builds, and increased traffic pollution has been calculated given global warming.
- The Sustainability Appraisal is a mass of contradictions e.g., talks about preserving the environment, but then building more housing on countryside. Talks about demographics but doesn't insist on bungalows.
- The Sustainability Appraisal, in assessing potential housing sites, notes that the distances to service and other provision is based on the closest measurable proximity i.e. 'as the crow flies' which does not reflect reality.

- The potential sites are grouped in the same general location and so the combined effect on village character, traffic and service implications would be severe.
- A blanket removal of all sites in Flood Zone 2 and 3 is not a robust approach. All parcels should be re-assessed so it is clear why the most sustainable sites reflective of the chosen strategy can proceed to be allocated for development.

Some comments reflected a concern about the impact of developing sites specifically indicated as having the potential for development. This included the following:

- The assessment of site I&O - 08 - greenfield site, with high flood risk, posing risks of water pollution if developed - for industrial use, seems unfitting. The assessment of transport availability, given the extensive reengineering of the road network between it and Poulton Le Fylde, seems optimistic. The road infrastructure is not particularly cyclist friendly, either between the site and Poulton or the site and Hambleton.
- Disagreement with assessment of some of the impacts for site I&O - 45 in sustainability appraisal - in particular I&O - 45 objectives 4, 5, 6
- Disagreement with water scoring for I&O - 21 - Sustainability Appraisal has given the site a negative score for water because it is recognised that the site is located within Flood Zone 2. However, the majority of the site lies within Flood Zone 1. The site can deliver a significant amount of housing within Flood Zone 1, making use of land in Flood Zone 2 for access, green infrastructure and potentially flood reduction measures.
- I&O - 36 specifically, the site coming forward for employment-led development could only have a positive effect on participation or attainment in education through the potential that it might offer for apprenticeships associated with post-16 studies. An employment development will not in itself result in additional demand for school places, in the way that a new housing development might. The current recording in the Sustainability Appraisal suggests its allocation to be negative in an education context, when in fact the opposite is more likely to be the case.
- The Sustainability Appraisal may need to be reviewed to take account of current allocations in Forton. It should also be revised to consider an extended I&O - 55.
- With regard I&O - 55, the Sustainability Appraisal should be revised to acknowledge the 1ha of employment land that will be delivered on as part of the current allocation as well as a store, village hall and school extension.

Question 2: Spatial portrait

Responses logged: 111

a) Do you agree that the Spatial Portrait is factually correct?

There was strong agreement that the Spatial Portrait is factually correct with 80 respondents clearly indicating agreement and 25 disagreeing. One respondent outlined that the Spatial Portrait was unclear. Some comments were suggestive of alternative or additional facts and figures. Key matters raised were:

- There is concern that outdated population figures have been used.

- There is concern that maps in this section do not display current ongoing development, flood risk, sports facilities, doctors, or schools.
- There is concern that there is no mention of dedicated cycle routes.
- There is concern that it fails to mention anything in relation to school capacities – specifically how full secondary schools are.
- There is concern that there remains just one secondary school in Garstang.
- The role of the Lancaster Canal is cited as positive due to it being an important asset and its multi-functional role as a leisure, recreation, and tourism asset and as an ecological/green corridor.
- Note that the A6 is frequently used as a diversion for the M6 during roadworks and closures with no scope for widening the A6.
- There is concern that many residents (21,156) leave Wyre each day for employment.
- There is concern that residents must travel to Blackpool, Lancaster or Preston Hospitals as Fleetwood hospital does not have Accident and Emergency provision.
- There are broad concerns that the population has increased significantly in recent years and disproportionately to services and facilities that are required (particularly in Garstang).
- Vacancy rates in Garstang may have reduced but new shops are unable to open as there is an over-provision of certain establishments (such as barbers that are not open).
- There is concern that green infrastructure is identified but not (specifically) blue open space.
- There is support for the inclusion of flood risk as a significant constraint to new development.
- Wyre has several entries on the National Heritage at Risk Register.

b) Is there anything that should be added, deleted or amended?

- It is recommended that section 3.2 includes information relating to the historical growth in Wyre.
- Paragraph 3.2.1 (Spatial Characteristics) should refer to the “City” of Preston.
- It is recommended that heritage assets along Lancaster Canal and the Canal itself should be acknowledged within section 3.7 (Heritage and Built Environment).
- Section 3.7 (Heritage and Built Environment) does not mention the built environment or the distinctive character and image of Wyre (as stated in 3.7.1). Therefore, the inclusion of a map showing this data would be beneficial.
- There is no need to define conservation areas (3.7.2) as this has not been done for other asset types.
- Local heritage, fishing industry and other aspects that contribute to Wyre should be added.
- It is recommended that Lancaster Canal towpath has a role to play as a free to access sustainable transport route and should be acknowledged within section 3.8 (Infrastructure).

- It is recommended that reference should be made (within section 3.8) to the new junction 2 on the M55 in relation to connectivity between Wyre West and Preston.
- Paragraph 3.8.2 (Infrastructure) refers to the A585 as a single carriageway but does not mention the A6 is a single carriageway.
- Average household size – unclear whether these are increasing, constant or decreasing (2011-2021 data required).
- Property sizes in Wyre – unclear whether these are increasing, constant or decreasing (2011-2021 data required).
- Average number of bedrooms per household / under-occupied households (2011-2021 data required).
- It is recommended that 3.5.12 includes percentages (%).
- Wage levels and high commuter figures (outflow) should be included.
- It is recommended that the disused railway line between Poulton-le-Fylde and Fleetwood should be referenced.
- It is recommended that reference should be given to the latest open space audit, recognising specific deficiencies in provision, by area and ward.
- Recommendation to include or have regard to United Utilities Drainage and Wastewater Management Plans.
- Paragraph 3.8.3 states that the current local plan is supported by highway and transport evidence. The statement acknowledges that this needs to be updated and so this paragraph will require to be updated once readily available for the new local plan. Until such time, the statement “that the local highway network is heavily constrained”, remains an unevidenced generalisation and should be rephrased.

Question 3: Key issues

Responses logged: 122

a) Do you agree that the key issues are factually correct?

Overall, 111 respondents answered this part of Q3. There was strong support with 79 respondents agreeing, and 32 respondents disagreeing. In addition to the yes/no responses, there were few additional comments. Of those that were made, key matters raised were:

- Support for the fact that the council has highlighted the need for affordable housing and a need for a greater mix of housing types.
- More detailed clarification required as to the expectations for infrastructure provision, which should form an integral part of a consideration of any sites proposed for development.

b) Is there anything that should be added, deleted or amended?

Of the 122 comments received, 77 respondents commented on this part of the question. Key matters raised were:

- Key Issues and Challenges are presented in a way that might lead them to be read as mutually exclusive. They are interrelated. Topics and matters should be linked.
- The need for balanced sustainable growth should be more widely referenced and should be part of the Key Issues and Challenges.

- Recent housing development has not been included in the I&O mapping and should be shown.
- Some respondents stated that brownfield should be promoted first (and in city areas outside of the borough first).
- Concern raised about development in Garstang, due to high water tables.
- More emphasis should be put on the limitations of the facilities in existing settlements.
- Local infrastructure needs to be expanded (schools, doctors, dentists) in line with any population increase.
- The needs of the health services should be embedded into the Local Plan in a way that supports sustainable growth. 4.1.2 Refers to an 'overall ageing population' but makes no mention of improving healthcare facilities to meet this need.
- There is too big a time lag between development taking place and the required infrastructure being delivered. Placing burden on current infrastructure.
- There is a lack of key issues which consider the specific needs and requirements relating to the elderly (70+ and 65+). Explicit references need to be made to meeting the needs of this population. Paras 4.1.8 and 4.1.22 do nothing to recognise the issues associated with meeting the housing needs of the elderly. Key issues relating to this specific age demographic need to be explicitly added and referenced in the Key Issues section and addressed in Local Plan.
- Key issues should acknowledge the Borough is not particularly well served by public transport (few train stations, limited access to rural buses, considerable distances to M6 motorways junctions). Reducing need to travel through mixed communities is important. The network of rural settlements must help to promote sustainable patterns of development.
- 4.1.22 Refers to "reliance upon private transport will continue" but provision of parking in retail/employment centres to accommodate the car use is not mentioned. Transport links for Garstang are limited because of the lack of train station and motorway junction. A6 is at full capacity.
- Infrastructure section should be expanded to cover roads and private cars.
- Flood risk should be added separately as a key issue and there should be mention there is significant flood risk to many areas. Should state that new developments should not increase the risk of flooding to existing properties.
- There is no estimate of those people who would want to work in the Wyre area. There is a need for more local work opportunities and vibrant town centres.
- Important that affordability increases. Reducing number of four bed properties would improve demographic of the area.
- A key issue is access to quality homes that are distributed across the Borough. Should incorporate need for provision of bungalows and housing suitable for the rising elderly population.
- New housing methodology - the Key Issues and Challenges should reflect the significant (housing figure) implications, and that identifying sufficient land for new homes is a principal consideration.

- Need to consider bigger picture — how the network of settlements operate as a whole.
- The Historic Environment should be referenced separately in the Issues and Options document. Concern that the Historic environment is omitted from sections 4.1.9 to 4.1.14 and referenced under Natural and Built Environment when not all heritage is built form.
- The Issues and Options document does not provide any information on the issues and challenges of the historic environment. Recommends a separate subcategory be introduced which covers design as well as heritage.
- Schemes should be resilient to climate change and respect the context and heritage of the surrounding area.
- Mitigation of climate change impacts should be a key issue.
- Wildlife protection is not made clear.
- Climate change is not mentioned in natural and built environment paragraphs nor wildlife/biodiversity in the climate change/infrastructure paragraphs or green/blue infrastructure in infrastructure paragraphs.
- Green lungs of Garstang and Wyre as a whole help to off-set the vehicle pollution generated on the A6 and thereby make an important contribution to Wyre tackling climate change.

Question 4: Vision

Responses logged: 122

a) Do you agree with the proposed vision statement?

Responses agreeing with the vision statement: 56

Responses disagreeing with the vision statement: 58

b) Is there anything that should be added, deleted or amended?

Comments proposing amendments included:

- The Vision should go further in addressing climate change.
- Include reference to character and distinctiveness of the area and good design would enhance the vision statement, it is noted that this is included in objective 2. Terminology in the vision should match all sections of the plan to ensure consistency.
- Referring to para 5.2.2, 10% biodiversity net gain is required and is not an option.
- Environmental vision could be stronger e.g. improvements to biodiversity net gain of at least 10% and to green/blue infrastructure and connectivity.
- The Vision should address ambition for opportunities for the natural environment, strategic approach for the protection and enhancement of the natural environment, including biodiversity net gain.
- The Vision (5.2.2) should be amended to delete “where opportunities arise” to be more ambitious.
- The Vision should go further on the issue of an ageing population
- The Vision (5.2.8) should be amended to include greater detail regarding the range of provision of specialist housing for older people and people with disabilities. Proposed wording to read:

Environmentally sustainable communities have been created. Sustainably located, good quality housing that provides affordable and market housing options to meet the needs of the whole community, will be provided, with a range of size, type and tenure. Provision of a range of specialist housing for retired and older people and people with disabilities has been delivered in the locations where it is needed, to meet the diverse housing needs, aspirations and choices of an ageing population and to free up family housing by enabling down-sizing.

- The Vision does not say how many homes are needed for the elderly and downsizing or refer to bungalows, perhaps it should also refer to sheltered accommodation.
- Support the Vision reference to provision of accommodation appropriate for older people and people with disabilities to meet housing needs of an ageing population and free up family housing, but the Vision should go further and provide support for care and assisted living arrangements.
- The Vision should be amended to refer to a need to attract skilled, working population through high-quality, affordable and aspirational new housing in the right places to support economic aspirations alongside attracting new businesses.
- The Vision (5.2.7) should be amended "Our people will be supported to live in thriving, safe, welcoming communities and to feel empowered. Quality of life will be improved, and people will be provided with equitable opportunities to lead healthy, active lives through the creation of built and natural environments which are well designed, accessible and fully integrated into communities for everyone to enjoy".
- Should mention preserving and enhancing village life/ community.
- Should be more focused on outdoor leisure opportunities such as public footpaths.
- The Vision (5.2.8) should refer to the creation of "good quality, climate-resilient housing".
- The Vision (5.2.9) should be expanded to have ambition for expanding necessary infrastructure e.g. schools, hospitals.
- The Vision (5.2.9) – there are no cycle routes in Garstang and the canal is not appropriate.
- The Vision should include new railway station at Garstang, even if Network Rail unwilling to provide.
- The Vision (5.2.3) states new development has been located in areas in lower flood risk. Should also consider new development not impacting on flooding of existing properties.
- The Vision needs more focus on drainage and flood prevention.
- The Vision should be expanded to account for flood modelling, mitigation and compensation measures, it should say "having regard to the nature of the Borough (river and coast),.....and due consideration will also be given to development in areas that can be appropriately mitigation to be a lower risk of flooding."
- The Vision should include reference to tackling existing under provision of open space across Wyre.

- Environmentally sustainable communities should be a realistic prospect and there should be a clear and measurable way of achieving this.
- The Vision should be to increase total number of jobs in Wyre to reduce out commuting.
- The Vision should have clearer language that the community can understand.

Comments in support included:

- Support reference to 'rich heritage'.
- The Vision recognises a need for good jobs and housing by effective transport and utilities infrastructure and access to range of services.
- Support the Vision referring to sustainably located affordable housing to meet needs, given the Borough's very high unmet affordable housing needs.

There were general comments, including:

- Current Vision in local plan is not being delivered, including - new development does not preserve or enhance rich heritage, rural landscape or valued biodiversity, climate change is low on developers priorities, no enhanced walking and cycling around Garstang, no new jobs, no new medical, education and public transport and insufficient housing for older people/those with a disability.
- Concern whether the vision can be delivered/ too aspirational.
- The Vision is not for Wyre residents who have proposed development and been ignored. A sixteen-year vision is not democratic and government policy could change.
- The Vision does not say how infrastructure will be addressed.
- New development should happen at existing towns that have infrastructure to accommodate increase in population.
- Development should occur with co-ordinated plans for necessary infrastructure.
- Areas benefiting from flood defences or mitigation measures should not prevent development in flood zone 3.
- The new Local Plan should improve areas of deprivation.
- Building houses will not achieve the environmental aspects of the vision.
- Must protect green spaces at all cost.
- Need to provide adequate sustainable transport improvements, including cycling across the whole borough including linkages between new development and existing settlements.
- Garstang Town Centre is not vibrant, existing shops are being replaced by barbers.
- The plan period for the Local Plan should be extended.

Question 5: Objectives

Responses logged: 127

a) Do you agree with the proposed objectives?

66 responses supported the objectives; 51 responses did not support the objectives; and 10 responses were neutral. Responses included a wide range of

general comments many of which are identified in Section 2 above. In addition, the following matters were raised:

- Impact on Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (now known as National Landscape).
- Need smaller site allocations in villages; need self-build and custom build and accommodation for older people. Need small site exception policy.
- Stalmine is too small to include future infrastructure provision to support new development.
- All residents do not benefit from economic growth from housing development
- Should challenge governments housing targets.
- Should challenge government on flooding.
- Flooding being caused by poor maintenance of drains and ditches.
- A village green in Inskip would enhance the community and protect the natural environment.

The responses included a wider variety of general comments specifically on the objectives, including some suggested amendments:

- There should be an objective to preserve the rural nature of Garstang and the east of the borough.
- Tackling the climate emergency should not be the first priority as climate change measures will make us poorer, colder and less able to move and more prone to power outages.
- Helpful if explanatory detail to objective 1 to tackle climate emergency included specific reference to the importance of sustainably managing water through high quality sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) and efficient use of water.
- New development can meet objective 1 via solar panels and EV chargers.
- The vision does not follow “objective 2 designing beautiful communities” as large areas of land are developed.
- As a result of the proposed amendments to the National Planning Policy Framework delete reference to ‘beautiful’ in objective 2.
- Support for objective 3, new development should look to enhance the environment by creating green space which include trees, pond and places for wildlife.
- Support objective 3 in both protecting the natural environment and environmental impact. Use of supplementary documents and plans should be clarified as the plan advances.
- Support for objective 4 is important for the economy and for vibrant town centres but requires communities to engage.
- Support for objective 4 supporting jobs but this should be more of a priority
- Objective 6 should refer to older person accommodation.
- Support for objective 8 infrastructure and objective 7 promoting sustainable transport but infrastructure needed alongside development.
- The current local plan objectives are not being met ahead of higher housing targets: objective 1 due to development in flood risk areas; objective 2 as development is unsympathetic; objective 3 as environment has been

impacted, objective 4 as no jobs created; objective 5 as towns are less vibrant; objective 6 as the houses don't meet local need or affordable, objective 7 due to lack of sustainable transport improvements, objective 8 due to no infrastructure being provided.

- Support for objective 9 designing healthy environments.
- Objectives not specific enough to meet vision and no targets to measure delivery. Revision to objective 8 proposed "to meet the current and future needs of the community and to support new development."
- Wording amendments to objective 10 to read "including flood risk and pollution and where necessary ensure appropriate mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures are provided where detrimental impacts cannot be avoided."
- The Government proposed increase in Standard Method and implications of tackling unmet need in Blackpool is a cross-boundary issue that should not undermine providing family homes.
- Mitigation and compensation can meet objective 1 and 10 to tackle climate change and minimise environmental impact.
- Need for homes to support economic aspiration at Hillhouse Enterprise Zone and to support sustainable communities so residents do not need to travel beyond their immediate area to access employment opportunities and services. Support for objective 5 to have opportunities to live and work locally.
- The Lancaster Canal can play a role in achieving objectives 1, 3, 7, 9 and 10.
- Objectives fine but delivery is important.
- No cycle routes in Garstang and links between developers are poor. Proposed development on west of A6 Garstang to Claughton need to be successfully linked to current development on east of A6.

b) Is there anything that should be added, deleted or amended?

Objective 2: Designing beautiful communities

- Should be extended/amended to read "to protect and enhance the character, identity and distinctiveness of settlements including, as appropriate, their landscape setting".
- Delete references to beautiful to reflect draft National Planning Policy Framework.

Objective 3: Natural environment

- Include reference to 10% biodiversity net gain.
- Include 'restore'.

Objective 5: Promoting vibrant town and retail centres

- Add "safe."
- Do not feel that everywhere in the borough needs to be "vibrant".
- Should include objectives to retain the current character of our quieter, more historic towns.

Objective 6: Meeting future housing needs

- Should be amended to read "to provide housing to meet people's needs, including affordable housing and specialist housing for older people, which

meets a diverse range of needs over people's lifetime." Other support received for referring to providing accommodation for older people

- Should be amended to read "to provide housing to meet people's needs, including affordable houses, low-cost private starter houses for first time buyers and bungalows for the elderly and those with restricted mobility."

Objective 8: Infrastructure

- Include reference to wider connectivity to green and blue infrastructure.
- Should be amended to read "collaborative working with partners and stakeholders to secure necessary infrastructure needed in parallel with new development."
- Should be amended to read "to meet the current and future needs of the community and to support new development."

Objective 10: Minimise environmental impact

- Should be amended to read: "including flood risk and pollution and where necessary ensure appropriate mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures are provided where detrimental impacts cannot be avoided."

Question 6: Spatial strategy

Responses logged: 231

A general comment was made that it is recommended that the Spatial Strategy should include a strategic approach to identifying specific natural environmental objectives as well as areas for enhancement and strategic projects and include green infrastructure, ecological networks, biodiversity net gain, designated and local sites, irreplaceable/priority/protected habitats/species, landscape, geodiversity, soils, natural capital assets/ecosystems, climate change adaptation and Local Nature Recovery Strategies.

a) Which of the options do you think should be taken forward as the spatial strategy which shows where development will be directed?

Note that the option selected may be affected by the address of the respondent.

Option 1 – Fylde Coast Peninsula Main Urban Area Focus

Responses in support: 110

General comments in support of this option:

- The option makes use of existing infrastructure, including schools, medical facilities and services, although these facilities need to be further enhanced with sustainable safe transport routes provided to provide better access to Poulton station.
- Has the greatest employment opportunities.
- Support regeneration of Fleetwood and the most deprived areas of the borough.
- Opportunities to build on brownfield land supported around Fleetwood and Thornton.
- More opportunity to build a range of house types such as flats and small houses to support younger workers in the urban area.
- A developer suggested this option provides an opportunity to mitigate and

- address flood risk so that all four settlements could be developed.
- A developer suggested this area has the largest acute need for housing.
- Development on the peninsula could take advantage of connections to Blackpool.
- The area could be expanded to include Great Eccleston and Hambleton which have not seen the same level of over development as Garstang and Forton.

Option 2- A6 Corridor Focus

Responses in support: 45

General comments in support of this option:

- The option makes use of existing infrastructure in Garstang, including schools, medical facilities and services, although these facilities need to be further enhanced. The area is accessed also by Wyre residents in the rural / over Wyre area.
- Greater amount of housing could help justify new railway station in Garstang and could make a sustainable community with a cycle network. Could also justify a new M6 motorway junction.
- Support provided infrastructure improvements, including health, highways and sustainable safe transport options.
- Reduces development on agricultural land which impacts on food security
- There is demand for housing in this area.
- A developer supported new development along the A6 due to it being a sustainable transport corridor.

Option 3 – Sustainable Dispersal

Responses in support: 20

General comments in support of this option:

- Provides a balance and more flexibility on development areas.
- Shares out the development pressure over Wyre.
- Support this option if it's a combination of option 1 (focus) with some development under option 2.
- Support as this may reduce the cumulative impacts and larger infrastructure requirement for tackling flood risk.
- A developer supported this option - the main urban areas which are at the top of the settlement hierarchy are the most sustainable settlements and need to take the greatest amount of development.
- A developer supported this option, this option is already being delivered in the current local plan and should be continued into the new plan.

Option 4 – New Settlement/Urban Extension

Responses in support: 17

General comments in support of this option:

- A6 corridor at capacity and new settlement could alleviate this.
- A new settlement could help to justify a new railway station or motorway junction (M6 or M55) but should be considered in conjunction with neighbouring local authorities for health and education provision.

- A new settlement would ensure sufficient housing to fund infrastructure for health, schools etc and better serve new residents.
- Needs approved funding to provide infrastructure.
- A new settlement should be close to Poulton to take advantage of existing infrastructure.
- A developer suggested this could meet the longer-term housing needs providing it is viable, but does not address short term acute housing needs in the borough.
- This option could provide an opportunity to direct development to a new settlement away from flood risk. An urban extension provides a significant opportunity to manage surface water in the most sustainable way.

None of the options

Responses in support: 35

General comments submitted why none of the options should be considered:

- All options are flawed and none should be taken forward.
- Should develop brownfield sites in Preston and Lancaster first.
- Local infrastructure, including schools, doctors, dentists, highways are at capacity and need to be expanded, a new settlement could do this.
- Some support for new settlement along the A6, although comments also received against this due to concern it would be a commuter town to Preston and not support Wyre.
- Do not agree development is needed in rural area to sustain rural communities.
- Concerned development in the urban peninsula is not viable.

It is noted that some respondents supported more than one option.

There were also general comments received, including:

- Should be tackling long term empty homes, including compulsory purchasing before building new homes. This could extend to homes that are no longer fit for purpose.
- Concerned over piecemeal development and inadequate infrastructure.
- Highway capacity will prevent options being met.
- Need to support the reopening of Fleetwood – Poulton railway line.
- Concern over settlements merging along the A6 and merging with Lancaster and Preston.
- The spatial options should be reviewed in light of the government increase in housing targets.
- None of the options will create jobs needed.
- None of the options will address the lack of existing green infrastructure provision for existing residents.
- Concern option 4 for a new settlement would not meet local needs.
- Concern over option 1 would require the development of south-east Poulton that is visible due to prominent hill, loss of remaining agricultural land in Poulton.
- Object to development in Knott End due to loss of functional linked land and harm to SPA and flood risk.

b) Can any of the options be amended to make it more sustainable, deliverable or increase the extent to which it would help to achieve the vision and objectives?

There were many comments regarding the need for adequate infrastructure, services, facilities, job opportunities and sustainable transport improvements.

In addition to the comments raised in question 6(a), further comments included:

- There were general comments that the various options could be blended together to include the option 4.
- Need a joint plan with Blackpool and Fylde, and possibly Preston to build a new town at M55 junction 2.
- Engage with Lancaster, Preston and Blackpool councils to explore if they can fulfil some of Wyre's housing needs where better infrastructure and less environmental impact.
- Should review the Green Belt in the urban peninsula to meet higher housing need proposed by government.
- Each option should be assessed against the vision and objectives. Do not believe option 4 meets the vision.

c) Is there an alternative or hybrid option which would be more appropriate?

In addition to the comments raised in question 6(a) and (b), further comments included:

- Suggestion for a central Lancashire new town.
- Hybrid options suggested, including option 1 and 2; option 1 and 3; option 2 and 3, option 3 and 4 or option 2 and 4.
- Suggestion that there should be some development in rural areas such as Calder Vale, Scorton, Dolphinholme.
- New settlement between Bilsborrow and Barton as close to motorway and rail line.
- Explore flood resilient building techniques to allow development in flood-prone areas, allowing some development in stagnant villages.
- Reclaim and develop on Jubilee Quay at Fleetwood Dock.

Question 7: The amount of employment land we need

Responses logged: 91

a) Do you support Wyre's objectively assessed employment land need?

There were 90 responses to this part of Q7. There was support for the objectively assessed employment land need with 47 respondents clearly indicating support and 29 respondents stating they do not support. Other responses did not state whether or not they supported the objectively assessed employment land need. Others reserved the right to comment until the employment evidence is in the public domain.

Key matters raised were:

- Some responses stated people want to commute to Preston/ Manchester/ Liverpool to work, or to work from home (as opposed to working in Wyre).

- The council must ensure that a sufficient number of employment sites are allocated and developed throughout the local plan period.
- Pressures on existing employment areas for alternative forms of development, such as retail, is not necessarily a negative trend.
- Allocations should not just be for B1/B8 uses. There must be a balanced provision of employment opportunities, retail, and other essential services.
- Comments the council can do much more to adopt a flexible approach to the allocation of employment land, particularly in addressing the priority of tackling the climate emergency.
- Research needs to be conducted to determine what incentives are required to attract new businesses to the Borough.

b) Are there constraints to justify setting a lower employment land requirement?

There were 33 responses to this part of the question, including one response which only replied to this part. Key matters raised were:

- It was stated in some responses that this depends on the amount of housing development and new housing targets.
- Comments stated that this would depend on allocations in neighbouring areas.
- Because of homeworking there should be flexible housing that would incorporate small, domestic scale office spaces.
- Flooding was raised as a constraint.
- Statement that it is farms that are needed.
- Comments stated that brownfield, grey belt and areas already built on/defunct previous industrial sites should be prioritised over greenfield sites.
- Traffic constraints on A6 and that employment will add to this.
- Some comments queried whether there is actually a demand.
- Some comments queried whether jobs are to be created for those in Wyre.
- Comments that sites are needed close by to reduce travel, or close to existing employment to create employment hubs.
- Comments also included that land is needed for start-up businesses.
- Some comments state there is a need to support economic growth in rural areas by supporting expansion of tourism.
- Concern that Wyre is losing employment land to housing.
- Some comments that the council should be identifying land for organisations that might expand in the future as well as new site locations.
- Refers to the council's new evidence and that there needs to be consideration by Wyre whether to allocate/safeguard more land.
- Concern about level of commuting out of the borough and that local businesses are struggling to fill some current jobs in the area despite the number of new residents living in the area from recent development.
- Rural area also needs high quality jobs as well as significantly improved public transport not just for work, but also services.

Question 8: Retail hierarchy

Responses logged: 72

a) Do you agree with the current retail hierarchy set out in table 7.1 of the Issues and Options document?

There was overall support for the current retail hierarchy with 48 respondents clearly indicating agreement and 20 disagreeing. In addition to the yes/no responses, there were few additional comments. The key matters raised were:

- Respondents want to see the study on Wyre's proposals for town centres.
- If Forton is to be developed further, it needs more facilities to be more sustainable and allow people to shop locally.
- The needs and age of community should be taken into account. The ageing population can't walk great distances to bus stops or can use computers and home deliveries.

b) Is there anything that should be added, deleted or amended?

- Comments state that Great Eccleston village's current retail facilities are appropriate but if villages continue to be 'overdeveloped' more facilities will be required.
- Numerous comments mention a lack of free parking and limited public transport and that this should be addressed if retail is to thrive.
- A number of respondents were concerned about allowing major giants (supermarkets/McDonalds) in small towns and that this puts self-employed people out of business.
- Some respondents were unhappy about the types of retail on offer in Garstang and mention shops closing and being replaced with barbers
- Some comments stated Knott End and Preesall do not have appropriate businesses to support the proposed building.
- Some responses were concerned that there are already empty shops on the high street and stated new build is not needed. They state that there is a need to encourage businesses into existing space.
- Some respondents want to see policies being more supportive of office development and development of business hubs in rural areas.
- Comments made that larger towns (including outside the borough) benefit from larger roads, safe cycle routes, more parking spaces and more frequent public transport routes, whilst being able to shop for a larger variety of items.
- Some comments stated Fleetwood Town Centre is dying (due to Freeport).
- Businesses should be monitored to prevent proliferation of some types (e.g. barbers).
- There is no mention of High Street Banks and Post Offices and consider these key retail service offerings.

Question 9: Retail policy

Responses logged: 72

a) Do you agree with the recommended approach to retail policy?

There were 68 responses to this part of the question. There was strong support for the recommended approach to retail policy with 43 respondents agreeing, and 18 respondents disagreeing. Some respondents neither agreed nor disagreed.

The key matters raised were:

- Comments state that flexibility across retail areas is what creates truly mixed-use areas.
- Comments state that the creation of Use Class E signals the government's intentions to help combat the vacancy of former retail units across the country.
- Comments state there is a need to ensure that retail developments are available close to places of work and homes. Will reduce travel, including out of the borough.
- Some responses state that Wyre's traditional retail centres must be protected from out of centre retail development whilst giving consideration to a wider range of commercial, community and residential activity.
- Concern the option of doing nothing could have cross-boundary effects which would not be in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and undermine the established consensus on the roles of centres in the Fylde Coast. Request that the approach in the fourth bullet point is not taken forward in future iterations of the Plan
- Hard to see with current trends in retail shopping that any of the centres will become more vibrant. Depends on attracting new businesses to regenerate.

b) Is there anything that should be added, deleted or amended?

- Comments state that Great Eccleston village's current retail facilities are appropriate but if villages continue to be 'overdeveloped' more facilities will be required.
- Numerous comments mention a lack of free parking and limited public transport and that this should be addressed if retail is to thrive
- Some responses state that policy should consider the target audience e.g. local communities, visitors, tourists.
- Some comments raised concern that Garstang town centre boundary is tight and there are no available sites in it to accommodate convenience retail expansion to match the scale of past and future population growth.
- A few comments that Garstang Town Centre cannot be expanded. There is an opportunity for the emerging local plan to consider this and identify a suitable site for retail expansion in an out of centre location within the settlement boundary.
- Some respondents stated the 'questions and options' is not an appropriate strategy for Garstang town centre, nor potentially Poulton le Fylde.
- Query the statement "Garstang town centre has a strong independent shopping offer." Used to, but many units now empty, and the High Street is primarily comprised of charity shops and barbers. Large newly built shops, i.e.

the old council offices and Discovery Centre, have failed to attract retailers and remain empty.

- Would like to see Garstang prioritised for retail, service and commercial uses. Acknowledge that there are some empty retail properties in Garstang predominantly due to the high lease/rental prices. Parking is difficult with limited times on supermarkets and pay and display car park having a reduced number of spaces owing to adjacent building.
- A focused policy is needed which considers the scope to allocate an out of centre site for retail expansion to serve the needs of the existing and planned population growth, suitably located for modern retailing and operators.
- Knott End and Preesall do not have appropriate business to support the proposed building.
- Many responses stated large corporates should be kept away. Losing character through identical retail stores.
- Some responses stated local businesses/independents should be promoted by reducing rates and parking charges.
- A relaxed approach to pavement dining areas and temporary changes of use to support the high street.
- Would like to see reference to supporting pop up shops, small businesses and charities.
- Town centres should be prioritised for retail, service and commercial uses, as there are already a number of retail properties.
- More funding to enhance town centres through events, improvements to street furniture, building works and community centres.
- High streets should remain unique whilst being supported by retail/commercial parks with some chain stores but some local businesses.
- Each area should be assessed individually and hybrid policy put in place as opposed to a 'blanket policy' which doesn't fully suit any one area.

Question 10: The number of homes we need

Comments logged = 115

a) Do you support the use of the Standard Method?

Approximately half of the responses expressed support for the principle of using the Standard Method (SM). However, it was acknowledged by many people that since the publication of the Issues and Options document, the governments proposed revisions to the SM will result in a different (higher) housing requirement figure. Accordingly, although Q10a) was referring to the methodology rather than a specific housing requirement figure, it is difficult to confirm with confidence if some of the respondents were supporting the current SM and housing requirement figure or the proposed SM and housing requirement figure.

There was support from the development industry for the use of the SM as the minimum housing need. It was also recommended that the council investigates the exceptional circumstances set out in the government's Planning Practice Guidance and consider if a further increase in requirement is necessary as this could assist in delivering more affordable housing in accordance with the need for 284 affordable homes p.a. in the Local Housing Need Survey 2024.

It was also recognised that there is a need to maintain cooperation with neighbouring councils on the matter of the SM.

b) If not, what are the exceptional circumstances to justify an alternative approach?

The responses included a wide variety of general comments regarding mitigating factors which should be considered in assessing if new homes were needed or where they should be located, including:

- Current lack of infrastructure including roads, medical services, education, employment as well as biodiversity, flooding, food security and funding issues. Younger people move away to find cheaper housing and jobs.
- Consideration should be given to the effects of more development on the current population and green belts/green areas.
- As an alternative to new houses consideration should be given to utilising empty/ derelict houses either locally or elsewhere or reclaiming salt marshes/other green space or the future release of housing from a large cohort of elderly residents or the redevelopment of sites at a higher density.
- The new revised standard method calculation and resulting figures should be used.
- Recent changes to the standard method by the government have not been covered or are very concerning. The standard method does not consider the birth rate or recognise environmentally protected areas cannot be built on.
- Population increase does not align with the number of homes needed.
- Demand is created by developers and developers should contribute to infrastructure and affordable housing.
- More housing is not needed, there has already been too much built recently, some building sites locally have stalled and some allocations in the current local plan have not yet been built out.
- Green corridors in the A6 should be preserved.
- Increase in housing will help to deliver affordable housing/homes for the elderly/help with the housing crisis and should be aligned with sustainable economic growth.
- The housing supply buffer should be altered/increased/flexible to respond to delayed delivery/ under delivery/ non implementation rate/ future changes.
- Supports the council's use of the SHOP@ for Older People Analysis Tool.
- Support for a new settlement and support for extensions to settlements on the peninsula to address delivery in the short term.
- Build in less developed areas.
- More affordable homes should be built in towns.
- The issues and options consultation clearly establishes the environmental constraints that face Wyre.
- Restrictions on growth due to geographical factors and lack of infrastructure in the borough.
- Investigate the reuse of empty properties and redevelopment of sites at a higher density.

In addition, a few responses specifically noted there were exceptional circumstances to justify an alternative approach, including:

- The need to provide more affordable housing.
- Potentially need to take some of Blackpool's housing requirement (and the necessity for all three Fylde Coast Authorities to work together to address this issue).
- The provision of a wide range of sites for small, medium and large developers with a wide variety of products.

The exceptional circumstances to justify a reduction of the standard method figure included issues related to:

- Flooding.
- Current lack of infrastructure.
- The existence of protected landscapes in the borough.

Question 11: Providing affordable housing for our communities

Responses logged:112

a) Do you agree with the recommended approach to affordable housing?

- Of those that expressed a clear opinion, more people agreed with the approach to affordable housing (49) than those that did not (28).
- Many respondents highlighted there were too many large market executive homes being built and not enough affordable housing available for local people.
- Some respondents acknowledged the significant level of affordable housing need (identified by the housing need study) across the Borough and in turn highlighted whether this should increase the standard method number.
- A respondent raised that affordable housing should include self and custom build and asked whether this could be considered when allocating affordable housing sites subject to a mix being achieved.
- There was a common theme about whether the affordable housing being delivered is genuinely affordable for the people who need it.
- It was suggested throughout that any affordable housing policies the council devise must consider viability matters.
- It was commented that older person's affordable housing differs from general needs and as such should have its own policy specifically considering viability.
- Whilst many accept the need for affordable housing there were concerns around viability and deliverability including whether the policy requirement is set too high or a fixed percentage across the Borough and as such it was believed that it will jeopardise future delivery of affordable housing.
- Affordable housing for local NHS staff should be provided or allocate sites for affordable housing nearby to health facilities to enable staff recruitment and retention within the business.
- It was queried whether affordable housing policies spanning 15 years are appropriate. It was recommended that policies should provide more flexibility as and when needs/demand fluctuate.
- It was highlighted that Wyre should ensure that the emerging local plan demonstrates how affordable housing needs can be met on sites that are viable and where the need is most acute.

- Several respondents raised overall concerns about whether the affordable housing being delivered is being allocated for local people.
- A respondent highlighted a lack of affordable 1 bedroom housing in Forton specifically.
- It was highlighted that the housing needs assessment will need to be reviewed considering the proposed changes to the National Planning Policy Framework. A respondent expanded on this, and felt the sub-areas with the need levels will be unduly restrictive to the deliverability of affordable housing and that the needs of the entire Borough should be considered.

b) Is there anything that should be added, deleted or amended?

- It was suggested that Wyre undertake viability studies specifically for older persons affordable housing and that the current Housing Needs Survey does not go far enough and in fact does not differentiate between different types of older persons housing.
- There was some support for homes specifically for first time buyers.
- It was highlighted that the homes should be genuinely affordable specifically for those in need from the locality.
- Several respondents stated that affordable housing should only be placed where there is demand.
- A few respondents raised concerns around whether affordable housing in rural areas is acceptable due to sustainability (transport/GP/shops) but also whether it is needed at all in parts of Wyre.
- Respondents would like to see the council make a commitment to provide a small number of homes in every village via exception sites or through the creation of a 'small development policy'.
- Respondents wanted more affordable housing in general, specifically social housing tenures.
- It was suggested that there should be restrictions on the number of larger homes built on development, with a minimum number of 2 bedrooms required on sites.
- It was recommended that the council utilise already empty homes in the Borough for affordable housing.
- Some respondents felt that First Homes should not be a priority for Wyre due to the ageing demographic however others believed that they are needed for young families to get on the property ladder.
- It was suggested that due to the affordable housing need being so high, perhaps sites with a willing landowner could be allocated for 100% affordable housing to meet need.
- It was recommended that brownfield development should be prioritised.
- Several respondents suggested the council should update the housing needs assessment following the National Planning Policy Framework proposed changes.
- It was suggested that all affordable new build homes should have solar panels with battery storage to help with the cost of living.

Question: 12 Meeting housing needs for people at all ages of their life

Responses logged: 101

a) Do you agree with the recommended approach to meeting housing needs for people at all ages of their life?

- Of those that expressed a clear opinion, more people agreed with the approach to meeting the housing needs for people of all ages (55) than those that did not (22).
- More people than not agreed with the recommend approach and felt it was appropriate.
- Establishing policies for older and vulnerable persons was 'strongly supported' by many of the respondents.
- Most of the respondents identified that larger homes tend to be built on new schemes and therefore no smaller homes to allow the elderly to downsize.
- It was also highlighted that there are not enough bungalows for elderly people.
- Equally others felt there was already enough provision for older people and several comments suggested that many older people are moving into the newer developments (containing larger homes) from other areas for their retirement.
- Concerns around Part M4(2) requirements affecting deliverability and viability on future supply. Specifically, as a larger plot size is required to deliver M4(2) compliance thus driving up the cost of housing.

b) Is there anything that should be added, deleted or amended?

- A number of responses stated that the council should consider specific retirement villages, focusing on an allocation for such a scheme.
- Older persons housing should be incorporated into the local plan separately as there is a definite distinction between wheelchair adapted housing and housing for elderly. Plus, there is an array of different types of housing for the elderly which may require different Part M requirements depending on the cohort.
- The council should purchase empty homes and adapt them for older persons, depending on demand.
- The need for social housing for the elderly is often overlooked.
- The council should provide a local assessment to justify the inclusion of optional higher standards for adaptable and accessible homes.
- The existing Local Plan is too simplistic in its requirements for Part M4(2) requirements. Understanding the needs and providing a diverse range of accessible homes is critical for the Borough.
- The Elderly Accommodation Council glossary provides standard definitions of age exclusive housing and sheltered housing. 'Housing in Later Life' (HiLL) is the only publication that addresses planning for specialist housing for older people and is the only relevant toolkit referenced by the Royal Town Planning Institute.
- A suggestion to consider site allocation for older person/retirement bungalows. Others also highlighted the need for any housing for this group

should be in a sustainable location which has disabled friendly access to the facilities including footpaths etc.

- Some went further to specifically mention useable gardens of the homes being accessible for older or disabled persons, and the benefit of gardens for health and wellbeing for this group.

Question 13: Custom and self-build

Responses logged: 86

a) Do you agree with the recommended approach to refine Wyre's demand for self-build plots?

There was strong agreement with the approach to refine Wyre's demand for custom and self-build plots, with 52 respondents clearly indicating agreement and 21 disagreeing. Key matters raised were:

- Concern that not enough context or information is provided within the recommendations.
- Concern that self builds can result in inappropriate properties (scale, location and need).
- Any identified sites for custom and self-build should consider the environmental impact along with the impact on local character, historic environment and distinctiveness of Wyre.
- Self-builds should be granted to applicants with local historic connections.
- Dedicated self-build plots would be welcomed and encouraged.
- The registration fee of a two-part register will suppress demand therefore making true demand for the council to provide plots.
- There should not be a fee to enter onto the register.
- Custom and self-build should be encouraged as these homes are generally built to a better standard, well designed, good architecture and more energy efficient (when compared to homes built by major housebuilders).
- Policy approach needs to be developed before appropriate comments can be issued in response to this question.
- The Local Plan should include policies that seek to address all housing needs of the community, including making the provision for plots sold for custom or self-build, including in the context of policies for mixed-tenure sites.
- Appropriate evidence needed to ensure self-build/custom build can boost supply, including engaging with landowners and developers. Recommends allocation of specific small and medium scale sites and permitting self-build/custom build sites outside but adjacent to the settlement boundaries.
- Policy should ensure a co-ordinated approach to the delivery of on-site infrastructure. There is a risk that such sites can be delivered in a fragmented manner if not carefully controlled. It is requested that any development of such sites is governed by policy that requires site-wide infrastructure strategy for foul, surface water and clean water to ensure sites are delivered sustainably.

b) Is there anything that should be added, deleted or amended?

- It is recommended that small and medium scale sites are allocated for custom and self-build.

- It is recommended that custom and self-build sites outside of the settlement boundary, but that are directly adjacent, are permitted.
- It is recommended that policies adopt a more flexible approach to self-build when the proposal relates to single plots that are often located outside of settlement boundaries.
- It is recommended that the council identifies sites in localities that have demand for custom and self-build properties.
- It is recommended that policies include reference to both self and custom-built housing to ensure a sufficient supply to meet the demand in the Borough.

Question 14: Encouraging small and medium sized builders

Comments logged: 96

a) Do you agree with the recommended approach to deliver a greater proportion of smaller and medium development sites?

The majority of the responses specifically indicated strong support for the recommended approach to the policy (64). 17 of the responses specifically disagreed with the recommended approach with very few offering a specific reason for their disagreement. Key matters raised were:

- Concern that it could lead to piecemeal development and urbanisation by stealth across smaller settlements.
- Concern that smaller and medium sized builders do not contribute to local infrastructure or services.
- Impression that this type of development is only for affordable housing or self-build housing.
- Large developers do not care about the environment, sustainability or quality.
- Houses would be more attractive if they were built on larger plots.
- Support development of smaller sites that would utilise infill plots, creating diversity in design/characteristics, address specific needs and respect the local environment.
- Approach is logical in terms of required supply increasing and physical constraints in the borough.
- Provides opportunity to develop in lower flood risk areas which may have been overlooked in favour of larger sites.
- Sites would come forward earlier in the local plan process to maintain supply without departing from the provisions of the Local Plan.
- 10% of requirement, or marginally higher, on small sites is accepted and ensures a variety of land supply.
- When allocating smaller sites, prioritise those with a sustainable surface water discharge system in favour of schemes which use the public combined sewer.
- Sites for such use should consider the impact on the distinctive character of Wyre and the historic environment.
- Increasing the amount of smaller development sites allocated for development could secure development in lower flood risk areas previously overlooked in favour of larger, more strategic sites.

b) Is there anything that should be added, deleted or amended?

- Clarify that the policy is not specifically referring to custom/self-build or affordable housing.
- It is recommended to review the settlement boundaries as some of them don't make sense.
- Strong emphasis on well-designed schemes, sympathetic to the environment
- Two major barriers to growth for small/medium developers are delays in the planning system, under resourced Local Planning Authorities and lack of appropriate land availability. At least 10% of the housing requirement should be on sites less than 1 ha and clearly allocated. The council should ensure there is a variety of land supply.
- Small/medium enterprises often discharge surface water to the public combined sewer which is the least sustainable option. The site selection process for such sites should ascertain the proposed approach to manage surface water from landowners so that sites which have more sustainable alternatives than the public combined sewer are prioritised for allocation.

Question 15: Accommodation for Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Responses logged: 80

a) Do you agree with the recommended approach to meet our needs for Travelling Showpeople?

Of the responses received, 75 respondents answered this part of the question. Overall, there was support for the recommended approach with 41 respondents in agreement. However, 31 respondents disagreed with the recommended approach. Some respondents neither agreed nor disagreed with the question.

The key matters raised were:

- There are no open fields for travellers that are not children's playing fields.
- Any additional locations for plots for Travelling Showpeople should not be on greenfield sites and should be located away from the existing residential area.
- The storage of equipment/transport should not be detrimental to the landscape.
- Some respondents agreed with the proposed review of the current local plan criteria-based policy for the location of windfall sites.
- Some comments were made that more attention is needed in practice to this matter.
- A small number of comments stated accommodation should be time sensitive and not permanent residences.
- Some responses stated the matter is irrelevant unless there is a complete rethink is given to infrastructure and public services.
- Some comments were unsupportive of the approach citing either perceived problems, or problems they state have been encountered, between the existing settled community and Gypsies/Travellers.

b) Are there any additional sites for Travelling Showpeople that should be considered?

Of the responses received, 19 respondents answered this part of the question. The comments regarding additional sites are summarised as follows:

- There are no additional sites to be considered.
- Some respondents were not aware of any additional sites that could be considered.
- Some respondents commented there are already sites in the area.
- Fylde is a transient area.
- Some responses were in support of the expansion of the existing site at Cabus.
- Some respondents mentioned that power, water supply, drainage and some basic facilities would be needed.
- Some respondents were unclear whether the need was for 1 site with 13 plots, or 13 separate sites.
- Comments received that the sites should not be on greenfield land
- Some comments stated that buildings on the sites/yards have a negative impact on those living next to the sites.

c) Are there any additional criteria that should be considered in a windfall policy for Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?

Of the responses received, 17 responses were to this part of the question. Key matters raised were:

- A number of respondents were not supportive of a windfall policy.
- Should be compliance with council policy.
- Some respondents stated the sites should be in Poulton.
- Road access and the movement of commercial vehicles needs to be considered when assessing sites for Showpeople and how these activities will affect any surrounding properties and local communities.
- National planning policy guidance identifies caravans for permanent residential use as “highly vulnerable” and therefore not appropriate in Flood Zone 3. Any new accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople should avoid areas of high flood risk, whether the sites are identified through an allocation in the local plan or as windfall sites during the local plan period. An updated local plan policy should specifically seek to ensure that sites are not located in areas that would place them at a high risk of flooding.
- The criteria for assessing such sites should be the same as other residential proposals e.g., any flood risk, whether a site is located in a groundwater source protection zone, proximity to existing operations such as wastewater treatment works.
- Any policies/ sites for such use should consider their impact on the character and distinctiveness of Wyre and the historic environment.

Question 16: Ensuring high quality design and promoting local character

Responses logged: 97

Of the 97 responses received 64 agreed with the recommended approach, 12 disagreed and remainder simply made further comments without committing either way.

a) Do you agree with the recommended approach to ensuring high quality design and promoting local character?

- Strong support for a design approach which reflects local character, with new development designed and constructed to be sympathetic with its surroundings so that local towns and villages retain their heritage and character.
- Concern that current and recent new developments show little evidence of good design and erode local character and distinctiveness by adopting a nondescript approach to design that lacks local influence.
- Support for development includes space for greenery and trees that will mature in developments to enhance their long-term usability and appeal.
- Support for the development of a design code or local design guide that includes waterways and nature requirements.
- A number of respondents noted that the reference to creating 'beautiful places' has been removed from the revised (draft) National Planning Policy Framework and should not be reflected in the Local Plan.

b) Is there anything that should be added, deleted or amended?

There was strong support for excellence in design and local character especially through the adoption of either a design code or local design guide in sync with the National Design Guide. This includes comments in support of:

- A village green model of housing development with children and pedestrians given priority, road designed so cars move slowly and with care, adequate but discrete parking, gardens large enough for children to play in and wildlife encouraged, e.g. bat/swift boxes, hedgehog gates.
- A manual for streets commitment in discussion with Lancashire County Council Highways.
- Public realm as a key aspect of creating quality in design and meeting the objective of 'beautiful developments'. Development should include:
 - Solar panels and energy efficient heating systems.
 - The sustainable management of surface water as a critical component of high-quality design that should be reflected in any policy / design code.
 - High-quality contemporary designs.
 - Alternative, lower carbon materials such as timber, straw bales etc.

Other matters raised include:

- Support for the allocation of sites no larger than one hectare to encourage local builders to develop homes promoting local character.
- Concern that Garstang has a high-water table, yet more residential building is proposed. Should make special provision for this.

- Support for the protection of local heritage as fundamental to planning decisions.
- Further development of rural settlements should be proportionate to the current size of those settlements.

Question 17: Preserving and enhancing our heritage

Responses logged: 99

Of the 99 responses received 71 agreed with the recommended approach, 12 disagreed and the remainder either made no comment either way or added further comments.

a) Do you agree with the recommended approach to preserving and enhancing our heritage?

Overall support for the policy approach. Comments included:

- The Lancaster Canal corridor and related infrastructure are at least 200 years old, it will be important that this is reflected in the policy/local lists.
- Need to review heritage assets before development takes place.
- Great care should be taken in the siting of any new developments to avoid them being positioned adjacent to any heritage structures.
- Policy should cover national and local heritage assets.
- Concern that there is a risk of short-term events or ideas influencing long term policy.
- The National Planning Policy Framework contains robust policies on this subject. Policies should reflect this and any new wording as and when that is released.
- It is imperative that a review of all heritage assets is undertaken with respect to new development.
- Local small village retention such as Knott End is part of preserving heritage.

b) Is there anything that should be added, deleted or amended?

Some respondents have blurred the boundaries between built and natural heritage, with references to farmland and trees, presumably with reference to conserving historic landscapes and the impact of development on local areas. Matters raised in relation to built heritage include:

- No mention of scheduled monuments or archaeology.
- The Local Plan should positively reinforce new design which can enhance the historic environment.
- Heritage is being lost by overdevelopment and inappropriate development. Preserving heritage should be paramount.
- Wording to include all types of built heritage, including scheduled monuments and buried archaeology but also more recent heritage, i.e. from the 20th Century including WW2 structures.
- Support for a local list of non-designated assets to protect locally important buildings.
- Support for a comprehensive review of conservation area appraisals and management plans.

Question 18: Flood risk

Responses logged: 101

a) Do you agree with the recommended approach to tackling flood risk?

There was broad agreement that the approach to tackling flood risk is appropriate, with 61 respondents clearly indicating agreement and 30 disagreeing. Key matters raised were:

- Agreement that development sites should be located outside of flood risk areas and all sources of flood risk should be considered.
- Flood risk both now and in the future (factoring in climate change scenarios) should be considered when allocating sites.
- There is concern that building more houses with inadequate drainage systems or wider infrastructure is contributing to existing flooding issues.
- There is concern that new development (outside of flood risk zones) could still contribute to flood risk issues elsewhere.
- Consideration should be given to whether more could be done to create sustainable drainage schemes and attenuation ponds (thus benefitting flora and fauna too).
- Essential that learnings from Our Future Coast and other initiatives such as Shoreline Management Plans and Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management policy are incorporated.
- Agreement that the approach aims to manage flood risk and deal with site drainage in accordance with established best practice procedures.
- Tree/hedgerow protection and planting should be considered as a flood prevention method.
- There is acknowledgement that some of the identified Issues and Options sites are in areas identified as flood risk. In these circumstances it is recommended that further assessment is undertaken through a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) to determine whether the sites are sequentially acceptable.
- There is support for the review of Coastal Change Management Areas (CCMA's).
- There is concern that a blanket approach to flood risk has been applied to potential sites and this approach does not comply with the National Planning Policy Framework or Planning Practice Guidance.
- Sites in flood risk zones should not be instantly rejected.
- There is concern that flood risk is affecting all areas, not just those that are to be developed.
- There is concern that developers are not mandated to take long term responsibility for inadequate flood provision.
- Significant infrastructure improvements are required across Wyre, including substantial upgrades to existing water systems.
- There is concern that building on greenfield sites is taking away the natural floodplains.
- There is acknowledgement that new developments can only mimic greenfield runoff rates.

- There is concern that landowners do not maintain or manage watercourses and ditches/dykes that flow into main rivers, which then causes flooding.
- Agreement that flood risk can be managed through appropriate Green Infrastructure policies and Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).
- The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment recommendation to allocate land in areas of lowest flood risk is misguided with negative implications, placing a moratorium of coastal/river sites and potentially straining the local transport network along the A6.

b) Is there anything that should be added, deleted or amended?

- It is recommended that engagement with the Rivers Trust will help people understand flood risks and how to limit these. This is particularly important with the housebuilding, agricultural and farming industries.
- It is recommended that reference is made to water environment/River Basin Management Plans.
- Local Plan should contain policies which protect habitats from water related impacts and seek enhancement focused on European sites, Sites of Special Scientific Interest and local sites.
- It is recommended that a tree policy is introduced which will contribute to reducing flood risk issues.
- There is the potential for surface water drainage to Lancaster Canal. This would be subject to a separate agreement with the Canal and River Trust on a case-by-case basis. There would be the potential for canal water to be used for sustainable heating and cooling of development adjacent to the waterway. This would assist the Trust in helping to meet the carbon neutral aspirations of the council.
- The River Wyre should be mentioned more, particularly when discussing settlements that it flows through or adjacent to. There has been riverbank erosion which has caused culverts to become blocked.
- It is recommended that sites are “cut down” to exclude areas of flood zone, thus enabling them to be considered.
- It is recommended that sites in flood zones (2&3) should be considered for development as flood risk can be mitigated.
- Avoiding allocations in sustainable settlements that are identified as at risk from tidal flooding undermines their long-term viability and the need for growth to support sustainable communities – therefore, the approach to allocating sites should be revised/re-considered. This point is also applicable for other types of flood risk across Wyre’s rural settlements.
- Consideration should be given to natural flood management and other natural processes, including salt marsh creation will help with flood risk matters.
- It is recommended that land is safeguarded for future flood risk management.
- The Local Plan should seek to locate development in areas at the lowest risk of flooding (from all sources) now and in the future. As such, consideration should be given to:
 - peak river flow
 - peak rainfall intensity

- sea level rise
- offshore wind speed and extreme wave height.
- It is recommended that existing public sewer records (for flooding) that are within or near to proposed sites are considered.
- It is recommended that sewer flood risk modelling should be incorporated into the site's allocation process.
- It is recommended that new development should manage foul and surface water in a sustainable way in accordance with a drainage hierarchy with discharge to the public combined sewer as the least favourable option.
- It is recommended that flood risk and surface water management are two separate policies.
- It is recommended that a policy is considered for water efficiency that uses optional building reg standard.
- It is recommended that a policy is considered to engage with statutory undertaker for water to determine whether any proposal is on land used for public water supply catchment purposes.
- Emphasis should be placed on the importance of the evaluation of surface water management opportunities to be undertaken early in the design process. It is imperative that the approach to design including site analysis is intrinsically linked to *making space for water*.
- A sustainable drainage approach should be considered to alleviate flood risk.
- It is requested that areas of future flood risk (7.6.12 and 7.6.13) are identified in the Local Plan.
- LPA is encouraged to include a policy on the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems in development. If flood risk is increased through development the impact should be reduced through Sustainable Drainage Systems, Natural Flood Management (NFM) and contributions to flood infrastructure. Point 4 policy HA-5 of the draft Halton-with-Aughton Neighbourhood Development Plan provides a good example of how measures to reduce flood risk can be secured through planning policy.
- It is recommended that a tree policy is introduced which will contribute to reducing flood risk issues.
- Need to protect Groundwater Protection Zones (GPZs).
- Recommend policy approaches for the following: Flood risk, On-site flood risk, modelled sewer flood risk, sewer flooding incidents, reservoir flooding, sustainable drainage (foul and surface water) water efficiency, groundwater source protection zones, water catchment land, development next to wastewater treatment works, wastewater tanks, pumping stations, overflows and other wastewater assets and investment in future infrastructure.
- For allocations it will need to be demonstrated that the site will be safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

Question 19: Green Belt

Responses logged: 90

Do you support the recommended approach to not review the Green Belt or are there exceptional circumstances to justify reviewing the Green Belt?

There was very strong support from the majority of respondents that the Green Belt did not require reviewing and that it should remain as it is.

However, a quarter of responses did support a review but for two different reasons. Firstly, a review was considered necessary due to the recent publication of the draft National Planning Policy Framework, the need to follow the guidance and, as a result, the need to provide more housing. Secondly, some responses recommended a review to increase the area covered by Green Belt including considering if it is now appropriate to designate Green Belt around certain settlements in the eastern part of the borough to prevent coalescence i.e. review countryside areas.

Many responses illustrated that respondents incorrectly thought land in the eastern part of the borough was designated (or formerly designated) as Green Belt and yet had been built on or was the subject of a planning application or a site is identified in the Issues and Options report as a potential development site.

Other key issues raised were:

- There are already sufficient brownfield sites/grey belt sites to accommodate any future development.
- The Green Belt should remain sacrosanct and not altered.
- Any change should consider the impact on local character and distinctiveness and the protection of agricultural land.
- Consider optimising density.
- Former Green Belt in Carleton should be reinstated.
- It would be acceptable to build on, or consider first, Previously Developed Land/low grade farmland/grey belt/land with no landscape impact within the Green Belt, under-utilised land.
- Discussion with other neighbouring local authorities is required.
- Green areas help with drainage.
- Green Belt could be built on as long as green spaces are provided.
- Support for separation zones and extension to the separation zones.
- No wish to extend development to join up with Lancaster or Preston.
- Unmet development needs – there is a need to support sustainable economic growth through the delivery of housing in the right places and a spatial strategy that includes a substantial increase in growth in the peninsula area with optimal connectivity to Blackpool comprise the exceptional circumstances to justify reviewing the Green Belt.
- Due to proposed government changes to Green Belt policy a review of the Green Belt in Wyre may be required if unable to allocate sufficient land outside the Green Belt.
- Any sites/policies for such use should consider their impact on the character and distinctiveness of Wyre and the historic environment.

- All of the potential exceptional circumstances should be considered particularly if housing needs across the borough can be met and Green Belt boundaries can endure beyond the plan period.
- The council will have to ensure it has examined all other reasonable options for meeting its needs e.g. making use of brownfield land, underutilised sites, optimising density and discussions with neighbouring local authorities.
- Request that policy supports investment in water management infrastructure in constrained locations such as local green space, open countryside and Green Belt. National Policy is broadly supportive of expansion of key sites of operational infrastructure in the Green Belt however consider that this should be specifically referred to in the Local Plan policies. The following policy wording is recommended:

The council will support water and wastewater infrastructure investment including development proposals for water and wastewater infrastructure in protected areas such as the Green Belt, open countryside or in existing green spaces, where the investment is needed to respond to future growth and environmental needs.

- In relation to existing water and wastewater infrastructure sites the following policy should be included:

Development proposals at existing utility sites in the green belt or open countryside either in the form of infilling or redevelopment, will be supported where they are needed to respond to future growth and environmental needs.

- Sites that are located in open countryside / green belt should be specifically identified on the policies map where investment in future water and wastewater needs would be acceptable.

Question 20: Biodiversity net gain, local nature recovery and ecology

Responses logged: 100

Question 20 on Biodiversity net gain provides three options for the Local Plan policy direction as outlined below.

Option A: Draft a separate policy on biodiversity net gain establishing the council's requirements including identifying areas of strategic importance.

Option B: As above, however introduce a minimum biodiversity net gain requirement above 10%. Note that this option will require the council to develop a firm evidence base to support this approach.

Option C: Maintain the current policy (CDMP4) of protecting areas of habitat value and species, without further amendments.

a) Which of the options do you think should be pursued?

This part of the question was answered by 76 respondents. Of these the following results were obtained:

Option A was supported by 27 respondents.

Option B was supported by 19 respondents.

Option C was supported by 30 respondents.

b) Do you think we should explore more than one option?

c) Are there any other options to consider?

Respondents were asked to consider whether more than one option should be explored and whether there are other options. 30 respondents indicated that the council should explore more than one option. However, most did not indicate which options these should be. There was limited support for combining options A and B. Although no respondents articulated an alternative option, the need for the council to identify off-site biodiversity sites to support sites unable to meet the net gain objectives was raised.

Other main matters raised:

- There is a need to consider the impact of biodiversity net gain policy on small brownfield sites with open mosaic habitat which could be addressed with developer contributions towards off site provision.
- Concern that a biodiversity net gain requirement over and above the statutory minimum 10% would impact on development viability, compromising housing delivery, and would need to be clearly evidenced. A view was expressed that biodiversity net gain above 10% should be a matter for the developer.
- Due to the impact on land-take, the council may need to allocate more land for development to compensate for the reduction on housing units per site. Assessing biodiversity net gain requirements should be part of the site allocation process.
- biodiversity net gain policy should consider how biodiversity net gain will be delivered and adhered to.
- National biodiversity net gain policy will evolve and as such biodiversity net gain policy should not be part of the local plan.
- There should be a long-term plan for biodiversity net gain.
- Support for green roofs and walls.
- It is important to consider the economics of Natural Capital when considering the value of the environment.
- Need to set out areas of strategic importance.
- biodiversity net gain land needs to be local to the loss (and accessible) such that the local community can benefit.

Question 21: Green infrastructure

Responses logged: 77

a) Do you agree with the recommended approach to Green Infrastructure?

Of the 77 responses, of those that directly answered part (a) 49 agreed with the recommended approach to green infrastructure and eight disagreed although some of those responses were more concerned about development leading to a loss of greenfield land. Key matters raised were:

- Concern that some green infrastructure sites are in private ownership and offer no community benefit other than a visual break. Green infrastructure should be reviewed to focus on those that provide community benefit.
- Extend the idea of green infrastructure on commercial developments to all new development.
- Embed green infrastructure in local policy using the Urban Greening Factor standard and the five key components of Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework.
- There is a need to acknowledge the canal corridor as an important green/blue infrastructure corridor.
- Support for contributions from developers for improvements to sporting facilities and recreational open spaces.
- Support for the protection and enhancement of watercourses and waterbodies within the plan but not necessarily within the green infrastructure policy as well.

b) Is there anything that should be added, deleted or amended?

- Support for play areas for children.
- Support for sports facilities as key to mental and physical well-being.
- Support for infrastructure that allows sports for all age groups and more youth provision.
- Support for the use of a design code such as Building with Nature.
- Need to ensure that policies consider their impact on the character and distinctiveness of Wyre and the historic environment.
- Review Natural England's latest guidance published in Sept. 2024.
- Request for a village green for Inskip.
- Request that green infrastructure at Cabus (walks along the lanes and footpaths that cross the Parish) is protected from development and increased traffic (as no formal green infrastructure such as playpark or playing pitches).
- Green infrastructure should include footpaths, hedgerows and tree planting.
- The Local Plan must address existing deficiencies in the green infrastructure network by strengthening and enhancing the network.
- New developments built on the edge of towns must have the necessary links and services and not be detached from existing centres of population.
- Consider blue-green infrastructure (e.g., watercourses, Sustainable Drainage Systems) within the approach to green infrastructure. Consider opportunities to protect and, where appropriate, enhance existing watercourses through site layouts, in line with Policy OWC2 of the county councils Ordinary Watercourse Regulation document.

- Consider the contribution of multifunctional Sustainable Drainage Systems towards blue-green infrastructure, by integrating water management with opportunities for amenity and recreation.
- Comprehensively review green infrastructure focusing on sites that genuinely provide community benefits.
- Emerging policies should also enable development on other privately owned green infrastructure sites where the economic, social, and environmental benefits outweigh the harm.
- Support swift bricks for swifts and house martins.
- Request that policy supports investment in water infrastructure in constrained locations such as local green space, open countryside and Green Belt.
- Need a robust policy in place to cater for development next to the canal.
- Crucial that a distinction in approach is made between development next to the canal and a river, as these are both very different in terms of usage, character and nature.

Question 22: Net zero, the location of development and the promotion of active travel

Comments logged = 96

a) Do you agree with the recommended approach to net zero, location of development and promotion of active travel?

There was strong support for the recommended approach to this policy with 52 respondents clearly indicating agreement and 23 disagreeing. Key matters raised were:

- Concern about additional house building and the impact on the environment - pollution, air quality, additional road traffic and will work against emissions reduction.
- Development in rural areas including Inskip and Knott End does not accord with the approach to net zero.
- The A6 corridor needs investment in bus and rail services as an alternative to the car.
- Concern that occupiers won't use public transport.
- Overly focused on the National Planning Policy Framework environmental objective to the detriment of others. Development should be in sustainable locations with access to services and facilities and public transport routes.
- Need to acknowledge that meeting development needs will require development on greenfield land. Not all brownfield land is more sustainable than greenfield land.
- The geography of the borough means there will still be a reliance on the private car. Development will be needed across the settlements not just those with good public transport access.
- Need to consider the Lancaster Canal including towpath as a sustainable active travel option.
- Need to prioritise previously developed land.
- Need to focus development on main settlements with more services and facilities.

- Support for policies that promote carbon neutral development and the securing of financial contributions where on site carbon mitigation requirements cannot be met.
- Net zero targets should be stepped in line with government targets and proposed changes to building regulations.

b) Is there anything that should be added, deleted or amended?

- In delivering net zero policies there should be consideration of the historic environment.
- New houses should be ecological and sustainable.
- Maintain safe and well-maintained routes for active travel.
- Support for safe cycle routes, facilitating use of railways and public transport. However, a concern that routes for cycling and pedestrians involve poor quality surfaces, high congestion and narrow. Roads.
- Concern that presence of a bus stop does not mean this is a sustainable option – depends on routes, journey times and whether the route provides access to facilities such as GPs.
- Provide more cycling routes around main areas and housing.
- Consider sustainable travel solutions for rural communities.
- Consider more electric vehicle charging points in rural areas.
- Need a train link to Fleetwood and a better bus service to Over Wyre. Reinstate the rail line from Poulton to Fleetwood.
- Allowing more residential development in town centres at the expense of retail must not have a detrimental impact on the high street and must not deprive settlements of key services.
- Promote brownfield land before greenfield land.
- Support for policy on water efficient development.
- Recommendations reflect a narrow view of sustainability that doesn't consider the borough's specific characteristics and is more suitable for areas with better transport links.
- Concern about development in Knott End and Inskip – unsustainable.
- Should only extend main settlements. However, there is a limit to which urban areas can accommodate more development. Need to maintain the separation between settlements.
- Support for housing near employment locations to reduce out commuting.
- Policy on any local energy efficiency standards should be consistent with government policy.

Question 23: Energy efficiency

Responses logged: 97

Question 23 on energy efficiency provides four options for the Local Plan policy direction as outlined below.

Option A: Allow new development to comply with building regulations on energy efficiency without any local plan policy requiring higher standards.

Option B: Require applicants to set out in an Energy Statement how their development is considering energy efficiency by applying the energy hierarchy.

Option C: Require applicants to set out how their development is considering heating and cooling through passive design solutions as set out above.

Option D: Implement a local plan policy that requires development to meet higher energy efficiency standards than that allowed for by the building regulations. Undertake the necessary evidence base research to justify such a policy.

a) Which of the above options do you think should be pursued?

This part of the question was answered by 91 respondents. Of these the following results were obtained:

Option A was supported by 21 respondents.

Option B was supported by 11 respondents.

Option C was supported by 12 respondents.

Option D was supported by 47 respondents.

b) Do you think we should explore more than one option?

c) Are there any other options to consider?

Representations arguing for Option A were particularly focused on the development industry. Concerns included consistency with national planning policy and building regulations, the required evidential need, and impact on development viability and timescales (see further below).

Respondents were asked to consider whether more than one option should be explored and whether there are other options. 21 respondents indicated that the council should explore more than one option. However, most did not indicate which options these should be. There was limited support for combining options B and C and also B and D, and B, C and D. In terms of part c to the question there was support for a policy requiring sustainable energy solutions could be such as solar power, wind power or heat pumps etc. There was also a concern expressed that the options as set out do not act to minimise the whole life carbon impact of buildings as they omit the impact of embodied carbon.

Other main matters raised:

- Development should include solar energy.
- Development should be self-sustainable.
- Energy efficiency should reflect national standards set out in the Building Regulations.
- Concern that there may not be the expertise to assess energy statements.
- Concern about impact on development timescales and consequent impact on costs.
- Due to an ageing population, heating and cooling requirements should safeguard the most vulnerable.
- As set out in the National Planning Policy Framework local standards should reflect national technical standards. There needs to be compelling evidence in support of locally higher standards.

- Concern that the council will be unable to monitor compliance with a higher standard.

Question 24: Renewable energy

Responses logged: 69

Question 24 on renewable energy provides four options for the Local Plan policy direction as outlined below.

Option A: Continue with the current positively framed policy clearly supportive of renewable energy development in appropriate circumstances but without identifying specific areas of search or sites. This would involve continuing the current policy of identifying the whole borough as an area of search for wind energy.

Option B: In relation to solar farm development, maintain the current policy of managing the impact on agricultural land but reduce the area of search to Wyre borough from the whole of the Fylde Coast.

Option C: Continue to support renewable energy development as set out in the current policy but identifying specific sites and/or areas of search for commercial scale renewable energy use, based on new evidence as outlined above.

Option D: Move to a more strict criteria based policy which would represent a less supportive approach.

a) Which of the above options do you think should be pursued?

This part of the question was answered by 55 respondents. Of these the following results were obtained:

Option A was supported by 25 respondents.

Option B was supported by 2 respondents.

Option C was supported by 20 respondents.

Option D was supported by 8 respondents.

Do you think we should explore more than one option?

b) Are there any other options to consider?

Respondents were asked to consider whether more than one option should be explored and whether there are other options. There wasn't any clear preference for a hybrid option although certainly responses indicated this is a possibility. In terms of other options, the need to renewable energy policy to include the following was raised:

- Hydrogen.
- Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS).
- Extend solar panel requirements to car parks and commercial buildings.

Other main matters raised:

- Suitable new renewable energy sites must have good road and grid access, abundant weather resources (wind/solar), and ideal ground conditions while having limited environmental effects.
- Concern about the loss of agricultural land, including loss to solar power developments.

Question 25: Adaptation and resilience

Responses logged: 59

Question 25 on adaption and resilience provides two options for the Local Plan policy direction as outlined below.

Option A: Develop a specific policy requiring applicants to demonstrate how their development supports climate adaptation and resilience for instance through a Climate Change Statement.

Option B: Continue with the current local plan approach of including polices that are relevant to climate adaption and resilience but without a specific policy.

a) Which of the above options do you think should be pursued?

This part of the question was answered by 56 respondents. Of these the following results were obtained:

Option A was supported by 38 respondents

Option B was supported by 18 respondents

b) Are there any other options to consider?

Respondents were asked to consider whether there are other options. This received a very limited number of responses. Those that were submitted included support for the adoption of options building regulations standards relating to the wastewater efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day.

Key issues raised were as follows:

- Suggestion that a specific policy (option A) should be applied to all development regardless of size.
- Concern that decision makers will not have the skill set or resources to assess climate change statements, putting additional pressure on developers.
- A number of policies will have relevance to climate change. Suggest that a Climate Change Statement will be useful as an overview of how a development is tackling climate change.
- Need to protect the resilience of the natural environment to climate change.
- Need to consider the role of Nature-based Solutions within the Local Plan including climate change adaptation and resilience policies.
- Support the principle of adaptation and resilience as a golden thread running through all policies.

Question 26: Supporting healthy living and active environments

Responses logged: 90

There was strong support for the recommended approach to this policy with 75 respondents clearly indicating agreement and seven disagreeing.

a) Do you agree with the recommended approach to supporting healthy living and active environments?

- Well established link between planning and health. The planning system is critical to improve existing and future health services and infrastructure.
- Believes that the Canal corridor has a key role in achieving a healthy environment. Important for Local Plan to contain a robust canal related policy.
- All developments need to consider safeguarding and incorporating open space.
- This is very limited in tackling health inequalities that already exist in Wyre.
- The Local Plan should take advantage of sites such as that off Hall Lane and Forton Parcels D-E (extended I&O – 55), which is capable of delivering significant on-site green infrastructure.
- Need public footpath improvements.
- A complete rethink of the infrastructure and public services is needed.

b) Is there anything that should be added, deleted or amended?

- These are good recommendations but there is concern that they can be overruled by a high authority such as Lancashire County Council.
- Protect local footpaths/areas of natural beauty for the promotion of health and wellbeing.
- Any sites/policies for use should consider the distinctiveness of Wyre and the historic environment.
- Specific reference to the protection of playing fields should be added to the recommendation text.
- Sport England's Active Design guidance could be embedded or referred to in the council's design code.
- Green spaces are essential for healthy living and active environments, they should not be reduced.
- Specific policy requirements – proposals should consider local health outcomes including a Health Impact Assessment. Design schemes that encourage social interaction.
- Should be a mention of social prescribing and benefits of access to nature.
- Access to health-related facilities e.g. hospital, GPs and dentists should be considered.
- Opportunities for health and exercise are "woefully" inadequate in Over Wyre and transport makes it difficult to access to leisure centres elsewhere in the borough. Over Wyre needs a gym.
- Restrict the number of unhealthy outlets such as fast food and vape shops.
- Good, safe cycle lanes, create an off-road cycle network in the east of the borough. Have well maintained paths along arterial routes.

- Green prescriptions from doctors and having a specific safe space for that would be good.
- The recommended approach should include the delivery of upgraded bus stops (covered bus shelters containing seats) and well-maintained roads (for cycling) and pavements to promote and support healthy living and active environments.
- Green infrastructure - reduce the net loss of wildlife from developments, reduce the stress placed on drainage infrastructure, enhance air quality and create opportunities for socialisation.
- When considering a range of sites to meet development needs, it would be more appropriate to identify new development sites, especially sensitive uses, such as housing, which are not close to a wastewater treatment works. This position is in line with the 'agent of change' principle set in the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice.

Question 27: Delivering infrastructure needed to support development

Responses logged: 102

a) Do you agree with the recommended approach to delivering infrastructure?

There was strong support for the recommended approach to this policy with 61 respondents agreeing to the approach, and 22 disagreeing.

Key issues raised were as follows:

- Development should not be focused on/in rural communities.
- Concerns that A6 corridor traffic problems are not addressed in new Local Plan to 2040 and that A6 mitigation strategies have no real content.
- Some respondents state there should be a new motorway junction off the M6 (I&O - 36 has been mentioned specifically as a location).
- Concerns that when infrastructure is promised it is not delivered.
- Comments made about current infrastructure - roads inadequate, cannot get local dentists, doctors are at capacity and people struggle to get appointments. Traffic at Knott End is specifically mentioned.
- Comments received that infrastructure needed includes police, doctors, schools, more wetlands and mitigation for flooding
- The recommendations are too vague. More detail needed.
- There are a number of electricity and gas assets in the borough. High standards and a creative approach to new development around overhead lines and assets and gas transmission pipelines and assets is needed.
- The plan should maximise access and the use of the waterways as non-trafficked leisure and recreation routes. Infrastructure improvements should be provided for including towpath resurfacing and access improvements. Provision should be made within the Local Plan for financial contributions for such improvements to the Canal towpaths.

b) Is there anything that should be added, deleted or amended?

- Large investments are needed in infrastructure as it needs to keep pace with increasing population

- There is no mention about increasing school places, extra doctors' places, schools etc. for the people in the new houses.
- Developers should pay for infrastructure in advance.
- In Over Wyre there are no mains sewers and drainage/pipelines do not compare to the infrastructure on the A6. Therefore, concern about development.
- Comments specifically about overdevelopment in Great Eccleston having made the infrastructure unsustainable.
- Comments made that there needs to be effective implementation mechanisms to deliver health infrastructure alongside new development
- The previous plan included statements on what health infrastructure was needed but the situation has got worse e.g. Hambleton.
- Roads are frequently blocked in and out of Urban Peninsula and would get worse with more people.
- Likelihood of funding for roads and schools and timescales needs to be assessed.
- The rail line to Fleetwood and upgrades to A585. Comments supportive of the railway line re-opening. The council shouldn't just be considering the protection of the disused Fleetwood to Poulton-le-Fylde former railway line, it should be doing it (including finding and protecting a route into the centre of Fleetwood). The Plan should state if the Fleetwood railway line re-opening is to be pursued and incorporate this into Policy in addition to safeguarding the route.
- That there should be a railway station or tramline to serve Garstang.
- Development shouldn't be on greenfield due to flooding and its value for wellbeing. Specific comments that Cockerham Road/ Park Lane, the A6 and surrounding farmland should remain a green corridor.
- Roads need upgrading.
- Policy should require schemes to be adaptable to climate change, consider the impacts of pollution and microclimates.
- Policies aimed at preventing the loss or change of use of community facilities (where healthcare facilities are included) can have a harmful impact on the NHS's ability to deliver essential services and facilities.
- The NHS requires flexibility in the use of its estate and the value of a redundant site may be required to fund a maintained/enhanced/new service. New policy wording suggested to cover this matter.
- Healthcare providers should have flexibility to determine a method of meeting healthcare needs.
- Health infrastructure should be clearly identified in the local plan as essential infrastructure.
- New development needs to make provision to meet the cost of health infrastructure made necessary by the development through developer contributions. The local plan should also consider the cumulative impact of smaller housing development and need for mitigation.
- New infrastructure can deliver green and blue infrastructure benefits when designed in conjunction with Lancashire Local Nature Recovery Strategy and delivered strategically.
- Important to ensure the sites allocated can, in principle, be drained.

- The Infrastructure Delivery Plan needs to be clear how the plan will develop if necessary infrastructure is not available, will not be provided or will not be provided in timescales that align with the development strategy.
- Keen to see a co-ordinated approach to the delivery of new infrastructure.
- As a guiding principle, new development should be proportionate to the existing settlement.
- Concerns raised about site allocations that are in multiple ownerships from a drainage, foul and surface water point of view.
- Should be infrastructure phasing and delivery strategies produced for larger sites.
- For strategic sites, recommend that early consideration is given to the infrastructure strategy.

5. Question 28 (sites)

General comments

Q28 identified 56 sites as having the potential for allocation in the Local Plan. The council received a number of general comments in relation to the mapped list of sites. These comments covered a number of issues as set out below, some of which have been identified in section 2 above. Section 6 and 7 below address location specific comments and comments on specific sites.

Responses logged: 35

a) Do you have any particular comments or concerns with any of the identified sites?

- Several respondents stated that brownfield sites should be developed first and were opposed to development on greenfield land (which should be protected).
- There is already too much development occurring across the borough, particularly in rural areas which lack the necessary infrastructure (roads, schools, doctors, dentists, shops etc.).
- Numerous responses stated that development should occur around the main urban area on the Fylde Peninsula where infrastructure exists. Deliverable sites on the edge of the main urban area should be prioritised over large scale sites on the edge of more rural settlements which look disproportionate in size.
- Given the uplift in housing, sites in the Green Belt need to be considered.
- Several respondents were concerned that the proposed sites will increase the risk of flooding.
- One respondent made a comment that not everyone wants to afford a new home and that council properties should be provided.
- A suggestion was made to reintroduce a policy for infill developments in the countryside, which could help meet housing targets.
- Development in the vicinity of wastewater assets should be avoided.
- Should allocate more sites than required to act as a buffer, deal with under delivery, provide flexibility and choice. Need the widest possible range of sites

by size and market location so small, medium and large housebuilding companies have access to suitable land and offer widest range of products.

b) What are the key issues that would need to be considered if any of the identified sites were to be brought forward for development?

- Common key issues reported by respondents were poor infrastructure including narrow and congested roads, a lack of school, doctors and dentist places, a lack of public transport, flood risk and a lack of employment opportunities and leisure services.
- Other key issues mentioned by some respondents were climate change, the proximity of sites to main rivers, neighbouring land uses, contaminated land, disposal of foul drainage and opportunities to improve or enhance watercourses.
- Concerns about green space provision and the impact of development on food production and wildlife species.
- House building takes place long before the rest of what is needed in an area when there is an influx of numbers.
- One respondent questioned whether sites are deliverable in the short term.
- Additional development will worsen the issues that already exist.

c) What additional services and facilities would need to be provided to ensure that development on these sites does not impact on existing infrastructure?

- Many respondents highlighted the need for doctors, dentists, roads, public transport and schools.
- Respondents also outlined the need for employment, water treatment, shops and green spaces.
- One respondent commented on the need for a noticeable police force.
- One response noted that some allocations on the edge of urban areas will have access to plenty of services and facilities and that additional services may not be required.
- One response said we need an external evaluation.

d) What is the most important infrastructure that needs to be provided within a settlement for it to accommodate new development in a sustainable manner?

- Many respondents highlighted that roads, schools, doctors, dentists, public transport need to be provided.
- One respondent commented that the availability of free car parking in Garstang has not been addressed given the current development, let alone future plans.
- Other infrastructure deemed important by some individuals were safe cycle routes, a rail link and railway station in Garstang, a new junction off M6, sewage facilities and employment infrastructure.
- One response stressed the importance of careful monitoring and mindfulness of everyone's needs.

Location-specific comments

Although Q28 was focused on specific sites, as well as general comments (above), the council also received comments relating to specific settlements or locations.

Where this has been the case, a summary is provided below. In some cases there were no comments relating to a settlement (although there may have been comments on specific sites, which are detailed in section 7).

Fleetwood

Lack of genuinely affordable or rental homes in Fleetwood.

Hambleton

Concerns about lack of services etc and environmental impact.

Stalmine

General comment on lack of local services.

Preesall Hill

Flooding (unspecified) and lack of services and facilities.

Over Wyre

General comments in relation to flood risk, environmental and ecological impact, lack of services and facilities, unsuitable road network etc.

Knott End

Comments made in relation to sites submitted through the Call for Sites. General comments in relation to flood risk, environmental and ecological impact, lack of services and facilities, unsuitable road network etc.

Gt Eccleston

- Parking (lack of) and congestion.
- Safety of pedestrians. Pavements access being narrow with people having to walk on roads.

Inskip

- The roads are small, single track, country roads not fit for the increased amounts of traffic. Roads are narrow, prone to subsidence, not in good repair and are a hazard.
- The exits from the village towards Woodplumpton and Catforth both have single track canal bridges with bad sight lines, and the new junction at the entrance to Woodplumpton has a problem with lorries turning and being unable to stay on their own side of the road.
- Traffic through centre of village has increased tremendously since opening of the Edith Rigby way off the M55.
- Highway network will not sustain increased traffic volume generated from new development and there are already concerns of highway safety with multiple crashes occurring on the local network.
- Flooding has increased over the last few years with Derby Crescent already flooding this year. Flooding around the village, making roads dangerous and impossible to use. Fields and proposed development sites flood very quickly after heavy rainfall. Drainage can't cope with amount of rainfall.
- Local primary school is near capacity and high schools are oversubscribed. Many local schools are not along a bus route.
- The high school offering currently is to travel to Kirkham (Carr Hill) with no bus route making it difficult to get to extra-curricular activities.

- Dentists at capacity.
- Poor bus services, no bus shelters.
- Local demand for low-cost housing so the units are being occupied by people outside the village/area and not attractive to low income families/ retirees because of the isolated location and costs of travel.
- No shop, pub or leisure facilities.
- Sites are prime agricultural land.

Scorton

- Flooding - Already problems with flooding with heavy rainfall on a regular basis particularly as you go out from the village past Wyresdale Crescent towards motorway- always floods due to continual blocked drains etc. Concerns regarding new property possibly needing treatment plants to drain into local watercourse as local watercourses already flood along Park Brook close to proposed sites 51 & 50.
- Over-subscribed local school.
- Nearest medical facilities in Garstang.
- Difficult parking. No bus service. Lack of footpath.
- Sewage plant struggling in past.
- Village constrained by railway bridges.
- Scorton has issues with higher than normal power outages and power blips. Local substation may need upgrade. More so for electric cars and heat pumps.
- Scorton has a small village hall (with no parking), the village should benefit from a new facility to support the increase in population.

Hollins Lane

Infrastructure improvements required for crossing the A6.

Forton

- Traffic volumes have risen substantially, particularly along Ratcliffe Wharf Lane, as a result of new development. Children of Garstang Secondary School have had near misses walking to bus stop. Inadequate pedestrian infrastructure and increased traffic creates a safety hazard, particularly for children. Local Authority has a duty to promote road safety. Increasing housing would undermine this duty. Forton's road network is ill-equipped to handle further development.
- Infrastructure improvements required for crossing the A6.
- Issues with youths causing damage to the bowling green, people walking dogs on playground as no dog area, issues with current bus stops- no suitable shelter, can't see bus coming, splashed by cars.

Catterall

Local infrastructure network cannot accommodate further development without significant upgrades.

Bowgreave

- Access to proposed sites (38, 39 and 40) via Calder House Lane (which also serves the industrial estate) is already a hazardous section of the highway network.
- Major congestion and safety issues already exist along Garstang Road.

- Dimples Lane raised as being too narrow, no footpaths for most of its length and includes a single stone track with humpback bridge over Lancaster Canal. Parked cars also cause congestion issues along this road.

Garstang

- Settlements are merging into a “Greater Garstang” but a larger development to the North and West of Garstang could benefit from its own identity whilst remaining near existing services.
- New train station required as it would serve Garstang, and other settlements located along the A6.
- Five Lane Ends junction (Croston Road/Cockerham Road/A6) - struggles with existing traffic. Capacity issues raised.
- The A6 “bypass” is no longer a bypass with residents opting to avoid certain junctions which causes significant increases in traffic through Garstang.
- Road quality has been raised as a concern.

A6 Corridor

- Concerns that the A6 corridor has already reached capacity causing traffic congestion.
- Infrastructure such as roads and health practices are full and cannot withstand more new developments.
- Due to regular M6 closures and temporary traffic lights, the A6 becomes a “car park” causing accidents and pollution for nearby residents.
- New town idea - the connection to M55 is relatively good and could be developed towards the mid to end of the current time frame. (As in the Preston northern distribution / link road) This may give a boost to the otherwise flat Fylde coast economy.
- No more housing especially large detached houses.
- A6 corridor sites area already overpopulated without the important services like doctors/dentists to support more growth.
- Road surface on the A6 is poor due to the amount of traffic.
- A long-term plan with support from developers to improve transport, health and education needed.
- Already very little separation between the settlements along and adjacent to the A6.
- The A6 is a single lane each way North/South.
- Improve public transport to reduce reliance on private cars and/or taxi as there is enough difficulty with staff and patients having to park on adjacent streets to use the medical centre.
- A motorway junction is needed - the distance between junctions 32-33 is far too long, when an accident occurs on this stretch there is no alternative but to use the A6 through Garstang, Catterall, Bilsborrow and Barton.
- With the move to occasional commute/work from home patterns, good transport links support for well-designed developments with green spaces, cycle paths and a village feel (original Cottam development).
- Train station is needed in Garstang.

Main matters arising

The following is a summary of comments made in relation to specific sites shown on the Issues and Options site maps. The summary is arranged in site reference number order. Note that some responses submitted by infrastructure providers are of a technical nature.

Fleetwood

I&O – 01

- Coincides with Our Future Coast site.
- Adjacent to Morecambe Bay & Duddon Estuary Special Protection Area, Morecambe Bay Ramsar, Wyre Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest and Marine Conservation Zone. A detailed assessment will be required to ensure the development of the site will have no adverse effects on the designated sites and their qualifying features.
- Development cannot be allowed to affect the ability to re-instate the rail line and its connection with the tram network.
- Should be reserved for employment and not used for housing due to the significant shortage of jobs in the urban west of the Borough.
- Development of land for employment must not prejudice the reinstatement of the rail line (that takes priority).
- Proximity to Sewer Flood Incident - YES. Wastewater Asset (sewer) within Site - 300 surface water & 450 overflow. Overflow through the middle of the site. Adjacent Dock Street Pumping Station. Combined sewer outflow. 450mm overflow through the middle of the site. In an area of flood risk.
- Reclaim shallow mud areas on both sides of dock channel.

I&O – 02

- Proximity to Morecambe Bay & Duddon Estuary Special Protection Area, Morecambe Bay Ramsar, Wyre Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest and Marine Conservation Zone. A detailed assessment will be required to ensure the development of the site will have no adverse effects on the designated sites and their qualifying features.
- Any development cannot be allowed to affect the ability to re-instate the rail line and its connection with the tram network.
- Should be reserved for employment and not used for housing due to the significant shortage of jobs in the urban west of the Borough.
- Development of land for employment must not prejudice the reinstatement of the rail line (that takes priority).
- In an area of flood risk.
- Near to Fleetwood Wastewater Treatment Works. Any development at this site must be informed by appropriate impact assessments including an odour impact assessment. This should be addressed in site-specific policy.

I&O – 03

- Adjacent to Morecambe Bay & Duddon Estuary Special Protection Area, Morecambe Bay Ramsar, Wyre Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest and Marine Conservation Zone. A detailed assessment will be required to ensure the allocations will have no adverse effects on the designated sites and their qualifying features.
- Any development cannot be allowed to affect the ability to re-instate the rail line and its connection with the tram network.
- Should be reserved for employment and not used for housing due to the significant shortage of jobs in the urban west of the Borough.
- Development of land for employment must not prejudice the reinstatement of the rail line (that takes priority).
- The site contains an on-site ordinary watercourse.
- Located in an area of flood risk. Proximity to Sewer Flood Incident - YES.
- There is evidence of erosion/adjustment of the shoreline at this location. Any development at this location should be mindful of this and the conservation designations and where possible restore natural processes/habitats as part of the development.

I&O – 04

The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g., a watercourse).

Poulton le Fylde

I&O – 05

- Site falls within an area of deep peaty soils.
- BAE Warton height safeguarding zone. Development of or exceeding 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement.
- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g., a watercourse).
- Proximity to Sewer Flood Incident.
- Wastewater Asset (sewer) within Site -150 combined sewer. Only on the edge of the site.
- Public Water Supply Asset within Site - 150mm water main. At the north of the site.

I&O – 06

- BAE Warton height safeguarding zone. Development of or exceeding 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement.
- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water. The site contains an on-site ordinary watercourse.
- Proximity to Sewer Flood Incident.

I&O – 07

- Site would be a disaster for the area, infrastructure could not support a major development of industry and housing. Healthcare, schools dentists, roads, car parks access to area, not coping/at a standstill.
- Landlocked.
- The land is prone to flooding alongside the railway line. Access is not shown - already there is a queue of cars leaving Poulton Industrial estate at rush hour with difficulty turning right to Garstang Road. There is a primary school on Carr Head Lane that is already struggling with rush hour traffic. The mixed use is unclear and is inconsistent with the rest of the area - unless the aim is to expand the existing industrial estate slightly.
- Site falls within areas of deep peaty soils.
- Potential cross boundary impacts could include landscape, cross-boundary archaeology, highways infrastructure, drainage/flood risk.
- BAE Warton height and bird strike safeguarding zones. Development of or exceeding 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement. Development might result in the creation (permanent or temporary) of an attractant environment for large and flocking bird species.
- Support for future allocation from three different developers with an interest in three separate parcels encompassing part of the site.
- The site contains areas of flood risk.
- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water.
- The site contains an on-site ordinary watercourse.
- There are watercourses to the north, east (Main Dyke) and south of this site, the latter two through areas of peat. This may make them suitable for re-establishing wetland / peat habitats. There may also be an opportunity to de-culvert sections of watercourse south of the site as part of the development.

Hambleton

I&O – 08

- Used for silage for dairy farms, impact on farming.
- Site benefits rural economy as regular game shoots creating jobs and support rural businesses.
- Very rural, single country roads. There's no pavement. These roads are used by farmers.
- Along with other Over Wyre sites there will be significant increases in the volume of traffic, particularly on the A588. B roads are not suitable for extra flow.
- Increased traffic over Shard Bridge. Increased traffic on the A588 - dangerous for vehicles, pedestrians and cycles.
- Existing pond on site rich in animal and plant life particularly amphibians and invertebrates.
- It will decrease the green space between Poulton including Mains Lane and Hambleton.
- Schools and medical centres are overstretched.
- Public transport links are poor.

- Loss of green spaces.
- The land also has a small copse and pond which is home to wildlife and should be retained.
- Pond with newts. Wading birds, including sandpipers and curlews and lapwings nest at high tide. Impact on wildlife, barn owls and pink footed geese use this site.
- Flooding issues, including on local roads.
- Detrimental to character of the village. Development will spoil the landscape. Would result in an unsightly industrial estate. Site has no connection to the village and is far from amenities for potential workers.
- Site is too big and increases the size of the village by 50%. The site is farmland and is out of character for the entrance to Hambleton.
- No main sewer and no gas supply. The high-pressure pipe from Hambleton over the bridge cannot be opened for additions.
- Limited public transport, one bus, train over 2miles away. No shops and amenities within easy walking distance. footpaths are unsafe, dependant on cars, increase traffic.
- Extend Poulton industrial estate rather than an Industrial estate on Shard Lane.
- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g., a watercourse).
- Flood Zone 2 or Flood Zone 3 - Yes. Sequential test applies - Yes. Exception test applies - Maybe.
- Main River on /adjacent to site.
- BAE Warton (height safeguarding zone). Development of or exceeding 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement
- Proximity to Morecambe Bay & Duddon Estuary Special Protection Area, Morecambe Bay Ramsar, Wyre Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest and Marine Conservation Zone.

I&O – 09

- Very rural, single country roads. There's no pavement. Roads are used by farmers. Opposite the School which generates outrageous traffic now before a big housing development.
- The roads to this site are not suitable for increased traffic, they are narrow country lanes with blind bends.
- Increased traffic over shard bridge. Increased traffic on the A588 - dangerous for vehicles, pedestrians and cycles.
- Moss Lane is single track road, not suitable for access to housing. Poorly maintained.
- Public transport links are poor.
- The area around I&O-09 is of great natural beauty.
- Beautiful park next to the site which is used by walkers and children. Would also destroy the rural character of the park (and area) which makes it a wonderful place.
- I&O-09 has a public footpath which is used by the public daily.
- Church Road, Sandy Lane, Moss Lane surrounding I&O-09 already flood terribly due to the huge development of the houses on Arthur's Lane.

- There is a drainage ditch which runs from Grange Road out to Saltcoats at Hambleton which is tidal. Concerned about how this would be impacted and the impact on existing local housing and land.
- Wildlife, owls hunting, 2 ponds on I&O-09 and on the park opposite.
- Hedge boundary to fields belonging to Hambleton Hall and Hambleton Hall Stables is a wildlife corridor for bats and barn owls.
- Would lead to loss of valuable farmland which is regularly used for growing crops.
- This area is a beautiful part of the oldest area of Hambleton village.
- There is lack of school places, doctors and dentists.
- BAE Warton (height safeguarding zone). Development of or exceeding 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement.
- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g., a watercourse).

I&O – 10

- Land is presently farmed for crops/animal feed/sheep grazing and provides wildlife habitat.
- Very rural, single country roads. There's no pavement. These roads are used by farmers.
- Increased traffic over Shard Bridge.
- Increased traffic on the A588 - dangerous for vehicles, pedestrians and cycles.
- Single road access to Over Wyre. Development would require direct access to Shard Bridge, highway safety. Need another bridge.
- A588 is not wide enough to support 2 HGV crossings/site entrances or increased volumes of traffic.
- Public transport links are poor.
- Detrimental to character of the village. Site is too big and increases the size of the village by 50%.
- Hambleton already had too much development, impact on rural character and heritage. Development out of scale with landscape.
- Existing pond on site rich in animal and plant life particularly amphibians and invertebrates.
- Schools and medical centres are overstretched.
- Over development as this is next door to the Wain Homes development.
- Issues with sewers and flooding (particularly on Church Lane).
- Bull Park Lane floods and unpassable during winter.
- Land is in Flood Zone 3, there is considerable tidal flood risk in Hambleton and other nearby areas.
- Should focus employment in Fleetwood.
- Outside the settlement boundary and in open countryside. Adds to further sprawl and destruction of surrounding landscape following the recent Arthurs Lane development.
- Land is working arable and good/medium quality providing crops for human/animal consumption and jobs for local people. Its removal would be at odds to the council's aims re. sustainability and tackling climate emergency.
- Moves pensioners away from hospitals/ infrastructure in area of poor transport links.

- Moves young families away from choice of schools and established commuter routes.
- Land outside settlement boundaries should be used for renewable solar power used to power houses within the settlement boundary.
- Need to have green space around all villages to make it a healthy desirable place to live.
- Flood zone. There is a watercourse to the north boundary of this site. There is some evidence of it being straightened/realigned. There may also be an opportunity to de-culvert a short section of watercourse as part of the development.
- Proximity to Sewer Flood Incident - YES
- Wastewater Asset (sewer) within Site - 225 Surface water.
- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water.

Stalmine

I&O – 11

- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water.
- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g. a watercourse).
- Wastewater Asset (sewer) within Site - Pressurised sewer – no diameter. Sewer around the perimeter of the site – may be used as an access road.
- Proximity to Sewer Flood Incident.
- Proximity to Stickland Lane Pumping Station.

I&O – 12

- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water.
- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g. a watercourse).

I&O – 13

- The site contains an on-site ordinary watercourse.
- Flood Zone 2 or Flood Zone 3 - Yes. Sequential test applies - Yes. Exception test applies - Yes.
- Too big.
- Promoted as suitable, available, and deliverable within the proposed Local Plan period.

I&O – 14

- The site contains an on-site ordinary watercourse.
- Support for housing on behalf of the owner.
- Proximity to Sewer Flood Incident.
- Waste water asset (sewer) within the site - 300 Surface water.
- Easement on a 12-inch trunk main – may be for the abandoned water main?

I&O – 15

- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water.
- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g. a watercourse).
- Flood Zone 2 or Flood Zone 3 - Yes. Sequential test applies - Yes. Exception test applies - Yes.
- Support for housing on behalf of the landowner.

Preesall Hill

I&O – 16

- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g. a watercourse).
- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water.
- The site may benefit from a masterplan surface water drainage strategy with the adjacent I&O 17.
- Waste water asset (sewer) within the site - Pressurised sewer – no diameter - through the middle of the site.
- Proximity to Sewer Flood Incident.
- Accessibility for traffic, narrow lanes, very steep hills, congestion at Preesall centre especially at school times (2 schools nearby).
- Lack of access to medical services.

I&O – 17

- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g. a watercourse).
- The site may benefit from a masterplan surface water drainage strategy with the adjacent I&O 16.
- Public Water Supply Asset within Site – 12-inch trunk main. Clips the edge of the site to the east.
- Waste water asset (sewer) within the site - Pressurised sewer – no diameter - through the middle of the site.
- Accessibility for traffic, narrow lanes, very steep hills, congestion at Preesall centre especially at school times (2 schools nearby).
- Lack of access to medical services.

I&O – 18

- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g. a watercourse).
- Unsuitable due to sloping nature of site access.

I&O – 19

- Potential cross boundary impacts could include heritage assets (Little Ecclestone Hall/The Old Barn/Little Ecclestone Hall Farmyard Buildings), transport infrastructure, health and education infrastructure, drainage/flood risk, landscape.
- BAE Warton height and bird strike safeguarding zone. Development of or exceeding 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement. Development might result in the creation (permanent or temporary) of an attractant environment for large and flocking bird species.
- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water.
- The site contains an on-site ordinary watercourse. There may be an opportunity to restore the river/wetlands and reconnect river and floodplain as part of the development.
- The village just simply cannot sustain, nor should it be expected to, a disproportionate amount footprint increase in a matter of a few years.
- Preservation of historically different villages/hamlets being converge. Loss of local distinctiveness.
- Loss of prime agricultural land.
- Lack of public facilities and local jobs.
- Impact on local wildlife, flora and fauna
- Sustainability aspect – automatically the majority of residents would expect to be commuters and the impact on roads and overall sustainability
- Support by the landowner. Sustainable and logical extension to the adjacent allocated site SA3/3 - opportunities for permeability between the subject land and adjacent development in terms of securing pedestrian and cycle connectivity to the community hub and employment land being provided by the adjacent development. Connects with the existing village including the existing primary school to the south of the site off Copp Lane. The subject land would also be accessible to public transport on Copp Lane and the spine road in the adjacent development.

I&O – 20

- Potential cross boundary impacts could include heritage assets (Little Ecclestone Hall/The Old Barn/Little Ecclestone Hall Farmyard Buildings), transport infrastructure, health and education infrastructure, drainage/flood risk, landscape.
- BAE Warton height and bird strike safeguarding zone. Development of or exceeding 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement. Development might result in the creation (permanent or temporary) of an attractant environment for large and flocking bird species.
- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g., a watercourse). Alternative sites in Great Ecclestone with on-site watercourses are identified in the issues and options document and may present better alternative options.

- Currently the hub of a functioning, productive dairy farm. Not sustainable use of the local resources to develop this land.
- Directly opposite what has been for centuries a rural Church, school and historic hamlet. Development would be a prominent extension to the village.
- In an elevated position impacting on the local vista and will impinge on the next hamlet, Copp.
- The integrity of two historically separate settlements will be completely obscured and is not aligned with the policy to preserve rural communities. Increased loss of local distinctiveness.
- Loss of prime agricultural land.
- Lack of public facilities and local jobs.
- Sustainability aspect – automatically the majority of residents would expect to be commuters with impact on roads and overall sustainability.
- Impact on local wildlife, flora and fauna.
- Support from the landowner for the future allocation of this site and additional land - suitable, available and deliverable for residential development.

I&O – 21

- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g. a watercourse).
- There is a watercourse to the east of this site. There appears to be an area that still has floodplain connection and there may be an opportunity to reconnect river/wetlands and floodplain as part of the development.
- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water.
- Flood Zone 2 or Flood Zone 3 - Yes. Sequential test applies - Yes.
- Proximity to Sewer Flood Incident.
- Pressurised sewer – no diameter - through the middle of the site. 150 Foul sewer on boundary.
- Public Water Supply Asset within Site - 4 inch main. Along the boundary.
- Proximity to Hall Lane Pumping Station.
- Serves as a drain off for any excessive rainfall which is on the increase. Since the new building on Copp the road floods continuously as there is no longer any drain off for rainfall and the increase in traffic is to a dangerous level. The land identified on Hall Lane will hugely increase the flooding risk to the village - currently the bottom part of the village floods.
- Potential cross boundary impacts could include heritage assets (Little Eccleston Hall/The Old Barn/Little Eccleston Hall Farmyard Buildings), transport infrastructure, health and education infrastructure, drainage/flood risk, landscape.
- BAE Warton height and bird strike safeguarding zone. Development of or exceeding 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement. Development might result in the creation (permanent or temporary) of an attractant environment for large and flocking bird species.

- Gt Eccleston has been expanded upon enough by at least five new housing estates incorporating an additional circa 500 houses. Further development would be overdevelopment to the detriment of the existing residents.
- Great Eccleston has already doubled in size in recent times and proposals would re-define it as a town.
- There is a lack of facilities in the locality - medical centre, dentist, schools, nurseries/preschools, sports facilities and transport links.
- Parking issues in the centre of the village force people to park on the local lanes which are not wide enough.
- Additional traffic - some of the roads in the village do not have pavements which makes them a safety issue for pedestrians and cyclists.
- The potential road which would be used for access is already very dangerous with blind corners and when an event is on at the cricket ground it makes it even more treacherous.
- Additional noise and light pollution due to the additional street lighting.
- Changed village ascetics - reduction in the number of green field sites and natural habitat in general.
- Loss of farms and farming village character.
- Over burdening of the services including health facilities and the drainage system and possible increased flood risk.
- Used for cattle and sheep grazing land.
- Currently children play on the playground safely without being overlooked and have access to fresh, clean air.
- Primary schools which are full to capacity. No funding or firm plans for new school, lack of secondary schools.
- Copp graveyard is already full and St Mary's will not be far off over the next few years and the land proposed is taking away land which the church can extend into - which would not impact the environment and habitats nearly as much as this housing proposal.
- Support from the landowner - proposed site includes St Mary's Catholic Primary School and St Mary's Roman Catholic Church (the latter to remain). Proposes residential (circa 120-150 houses) and possibly a new Catholic School to replace the existing. Site is well contained by existing development and natural features. Various constraints and opportunities identified including some flood zone 2. Vehicular access via Pennine View or Hall Lane. On-site green infrastructure options with improvements to adjacent Pennine View playing fields. Represents a logical, sustainable residential-led development site whose development would align with the Vision set out in the I&O Document.

Inskip

I&O – 22

- Potential cross boundary impacts on highways and other infrastructure.
- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g. a watercourse).
- DCSA Radio Inskip -consultation required for any building or structure.
- BAE Warton height and bird strike safeguarding zone. Development of or exceeding 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory

consultation requirement. Development might result in the creation (permanent or temporary) of an attractant environment for large and flocking bird species.

- Lack of amenities and employment opportunities means residents travel out. Single bus route.
- Rural roads and poor maintenance. Poor visibility leads to regular accidents.
- Roads flood in winter.
- Difficult access to doctors and dentist in Great Eccleston only access via car. Local school has limited places.
- Land is prime agricultural land that is productive. New developments in recent years have not met local needs, locals have left the area.
- Supported by the landowner. The site should be considered positively for allocation, presenting an appropriate form of sustainable development within Inskip. Planning history demonstrates landowner is supportive of residential development at the site. The site benefits from two access points. The site is in close proximity to the 'Inskip Extension'. Two bus stops are 0.4km east of the site. Consider due to previous allocations the council must consider Inskip to be a sustainable location. Site is in Flood Zone 1. Emphasises surface water flood risk can be mitigated through drainage design.

I&O – 23

- The site contains an on-site ordinary watercourse through the middle of the site. There is some evidence of it being straightened/realigned. There may also be an opportunity to de-culvert a section of watercourse as part of the development.
- DCSA Radio Inskip - consultation required for any large concentration of buildings or industrial site.
- BAE Warton height and bird strike safeguarding zone. Development of or exceeding 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement. Development might result in the creation (permanent or temporary) of an attractant environment for large and flocking bird species.
- Inskip is a small village with few amenities. Difficult access to doctors and dentist in Great Eccleston only access via car.
- Local school has limited places
- Rejected by the Government's Planning Inspector (2019 Local Plan) - the development of the land is "too much for the village" and it should not go ahead. No change in circumstances.
- Now proposing the same site for development when no improvements, additional amenities or services other than a few square metres of land for a small shop have been provided in the interim. To go ahead with development without infrastructure investment would cause damage to some of that infrastructure itself as well as the daily lives of existing residents. Should be removed from consideration for development until the key improvements the village infrastructure are at least secure:

1. Enlargement of the primary school consistent with accommodating the child numbers of new resident families.

2. A green space for youngsters and teenagers to play casual and team games (football, kickabout, jogging etc). The lack of this amenity could impact the health and wellbeing of young residents.

3. A fundamental rebuild of the road foundation from the north (Pinfold Lane is in a state of continual and increasing subsidence).

4. A shop on the land patch reserved on the recent development north of the B5269 and east of Pinfold Lane.

5. A village green in the vicinity of the Derby Arms Public House.

- Site is within areas of deep peaty soils. Evidence required to show the peat is not restorable.
- Lack of amenities and employment opportunities means residents travel out.
- Single bus route.
- Rural roads and poor maintenance, poor visibility leads to regular accidents. Roads flood in winter.
- Land is prime agricultural land that is productive.
- New developments in recent years have not met local needs. Locals have left the area.
- Potential cross boundary impacts on highways and other infrastructure.
- Support from the landowner. Allowing rural settlements to grow is fundamental in enhancing and maintaining the vitality and sustainability of rural communities. Inskip benefits from a range of essential services and facilities. The settlement's existing public transport provision will also be enhanced through financial obligations in association with existing committed development within the village. Inskip also benefits from a direct school bus service.

I&O – 24

- Potential cross boundary impacts on highways and other infrastructure.
- DCSA Radio Inskip - consultation required for any large concentration of buildings or industrial site.
- BAE Warton height and bird strike safeguarding zone. Development of or exceeding 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement. Development might result in the creation (permanent or temporary) of an attractant environment for large and flocking bird species.
- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g. a watercourse).
- Waste water asset (sewer) within the site - 100 foul and 150 surface water. Both at the south west edge of the site – may not be an issue?
- Proximity to Sewer Flood Incident.
- Lack of amenities and employment opportunities means residents travel out. Difficult access to doctors and dentist in Great Ecclestone. Only access via car.
- Local school has limited places.
- Single bus route.
- Rural roads and poor maintenance. Poor visibility leads to regular accidents. Roads flood in winter.

- Land is prime green belt agricultural land that is productive.
- New developments in recent years have not met local needs, locals have left the area.
- Support from the landowner. Allowing rural settlements to grow is fundamental in enhancing and maintaining the vitality and sustainability of rural communities. Inskip benefits from a range of essential services and facilities. The settlement's existing public transport provision will also be enhanced through financial obligations in association with existing committed development within the village. Inskip also benefits from a direct school bus service.

I&O – 25

- Potential cross boundary impacts on highways and other infrastructure.
- DCSA Radio Inskip -consultation required for any building or structure.
- BAE Warton height and bird strike safeguarding zone. Development of or exceeding 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement. Development might result in the creation (permanent or temporary) of an attractant environment for large and flocking bird species.
- The site contains an on-site ordinary watercourse. There is a watercourse on the north boundary of this site. There may also be an opportunity to de-culvert a section of watercourse to the north-east as part of the development.
- Flood Zone 2 or Flood Zone 3 - Yes. Sequential test applies - Yes. Exception test applies - Yes. Partially within modelled Flood Zone 3b.
- Site is within areas of deep peaty soils. Evidence required to show the peat is not restorable.
- Lack of amenities and employment opportunities means residents travel out. Difficult access to doctors and dentist in Great Eccleston. Only access via car. Local school has limited places.
- Single bus route.
- Rural roads and poor maintenance. Poor visibility leads to regular accidents. Roads flood in winter.
- Land is prime green belt agricultural land that is productive.
- New developments in recent years have not met local needs, locals have left the area.
- Support from the landowner. Allowing rural settlements to grow is fundamental in enhancing and maintaining the vitality and sustainability of rural communities. Inskip benefits from a range of essential services and facilities. The settlement's existing public transport provision will also be enhanced through financial obligations in association with existing committed development within the village. Inskip also benefits from a direct school bus service.

I&O – 26

- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g. a watercourse). A canalised main river runs along the north boundary of the site.
- Flood Zone 2 or Flood Zone 3 - Yes. Sequential test applies - Yes. Exception test applies - Yes. Partially within modelled Flood Zone 3b.

- Land to the south of the village lies on the lowest level in the village and is more prone to flooding. It is closest to Flood Zone 3 and the watercourse.
- Roads adjacent to this land regularly flood and cause a hazard to drivers on Preston Road/Higham Side Road/Woods Lane.
- Rural roads and poor maintenance. Poor visibility leads to regular accidents. Roads flood in winter.
- Potential cross boundary impacts on highways and other infrastructure.
- DCSA Radio Inskip - consultation required for any large concentration of buildings or industrial site.
- BAE Warton height and bird strike safeguarding zone. Development of or exceeding 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement. Development might result in the creation (permanent or temporary) of an attractant environment for large and flocking bird species.
- Lack of amenities and employment opportunities means residents travel out, single bus route. Difficult access to doctors and dentist in Great Eccleston only access via car. Local school has limited places - only a small village primary school, limited to 10 pupils per intake. Nearest High School is Broughton (with free bus service) which is oversubscribed and children not able to get into and have to travel to Garstang High School (cost of approximately £900 for bus service).
- There is no bus service for colleges.
- This is prime agricultural land currently used for grazing sheep and of great importance for farming sustainability.
- New developments in recent years have not met local needs, locals have left the area.
- There is a mains gas pipe running through this land. There is a large section either side of the pipe that cannot be built on. This means that there is only a small area to the West of the site that can be developed - nearest the Derby Arms pub - but this is also nearest the watercourse.
- The idea put forward by Inskip and Sowerby Parish Council for a Village Green on this land would only be allowed presumably if the landowner approved this. It would only benefit the villagers if the total area was set aside for this. This would take full advantage of the far-reaching views across to the fells and provide enough space for a pond/nature walks/community fruit trees and vegetables/dog walking area etc. All this would be ruined if housing was allowed and only a "small patch of grass" was left or indeed never materialised like the promise of the shop in the last development.
- Carrs Green attracts a wide array of wildlife which should be protected.
- If housing has to go ahead, the land to the south-east, opposite the Derby Arms is suggested to balance the village layout, pub may re-open, make a village green and reduce traffic pressure travelling through the village and avoid the bad bend.
- Support from the landowner. Allowing rural settlements to grow is fundamental in enhancing and maintaining the vitality and sustainability of rural communities. Inskip benefits from a range of essential services and facilities. The settlement's existing public transport provision will also be enhanced through financial obligations in association with existing

committed development within the village. Inskip also benefits from a direct school bus service.

Barton

I&O – 27

- BAE Warton height and bird strike safeguarding zone. Development of or exceeding 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement. Development might result in the creation (permanent or temporary) of an attractant environment for large and flocking bird species.
- The site contains an on-site ordinary watercourse.
- 6m sewer easement at the south-west of the site.
- Modelled Sewer Flood Risk - YES.
- Waste water asset (sewer) within the site - 300 combined sewer - through the middle of the site.

I&O – 28

- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water.
- BAE Warton height safeguarding zone. Development of or exceeding 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement.

Bilsborrow

I&O – 29

- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water.
- Flood Zone 2 or Flood Zone 3 - Yes. Sequential test applies - Yes. Exception test applies - Yes. Main River on /adjacent to site. Partially within modelled Flood Zone 3b.
- There are watercourses on the south boundary of the site which may represent opportunities for biodiversity net gain.
- Proximity to Sewer Flood Incident - YES

I&O – 30

- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water.
- Flood Zone 2 or Flood Zone 3 - Yes. Sequential test applies - Yes. Exception test applies - Maybe. Main River on /adjacent to site. Partially within modelled Flood Zone 3b.
- There are watercourses on the south boundary of the site which may represent opportunities for biodiversity net gain.
- BAE Warton height safeguarding zone. Development of or exceeding 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement.
- Support site I&O 30. Site is perfectly situated to support future development of Myerscough College if they wish to expand or accommodate any supporting rural businesses to help grow the local rural economy. An increase in student numbers may require more accommodation which could be accommodated on the site close to existing facilities. New partnership between the veterinary

centre may need future development or other future need and securing this site would support this rural enterprise.

Catterall

I&O – 31

- The site contains an on-site ordinary watercourse.
- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water.
- There are watercourses either in or in the vicinity of these sites and clearly some historical modification. There may be an opportunity to reconnect river/wetlands and floodplain as part of the development.
- Public Water Supply Asset within Site - 3x water mains. All water mains run through the middle of the site – also two easements.
- 10m easement & 15m easement on the water mains.
- Groundwater Protection Zones 1 & 2.
- Proximity to Franklaw Wastewater Treatment Works.
- Support - well related to the existing built form of Catterall, provides a natural extension and represents a suitable and sustainable location. No landscape quality designation, access from A6 which has capacity, required visibility splays can be achieved. Suitable buffer provided around the Grade II listed farmhouse. Site is in flood risk zone 1. Provision of green infrastructure will contribute positively to the landscape character, biodiversity, public open space and recreational facilities. Financial contributions towards infrastructure requirements will be secured.

I&O – 32

- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g. a watercourse).
- Public Water Supply Asset within Site - Small water main – 63mm. Near the East boundary of the site.
- Groundwater Protection Zone 1.
- Proximity to Franklaw Wastewater Treatment Works.
- Recommend expanding I&O – 31 to maximise its potential. Approximately 2.14 hectares. Between A6 and United Utilities Wastewater Treatment Works off Catterall Lane. Flood Zone 1 but some surface water flood risk. Could accommodate circa 67 new homes, providing opportunities for 2–4-bedroom dwellings. Access is proposed directly off the A6.

I&O – 33

- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water.
- The site contains an on-site ordinary watercourse.
- Main River on /adjacent to site.
- There are watercourses either in or in the vicinity of these sites and clearly some historical modification. There may be an opportunity to reconnect river/wetlands and floodplain as part of the development.

I&O – 34

- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g. a watercourse).
- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water.
- The site may benefit from a masterplan drainage strategy if allocated alongside I&O 35.
- Proximity to Sewer Flood Incident - YES
- Public Water Supply Asset within Site – 27 inch & 18 inch trunk mains through the middle of the site.
- 2x easements for water mains – one is 19 feet and the other doesn't have a width.
- Groundwater Protection Zone 2.

I&O – 35

- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water.
- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g., a watercourse).
- The site may benefit from a masterplan drainage strategy if allocated alongside I&O - 34.
- Flood Zone 2 or Flood Zone 3 - Yes. Sequential test applies - Yes. Exception test applies - Maybe.

I&O – 36

- The site contains an on-site ordinary watercourse.
- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water.
- Flood Zone 2 or Flood Zone 3 - Yes. Sequential test applies - Yes. Exception test applies - Maybe.
- There are watercourses either in or in the vicinity of these sites and clearly some historical modification. There may be an opportunity to reconnect river/wetlands and floodplain as part of the development.
- Public Water Supply Asset within Site - 1400mm through the south of the site.
- 15-foot easement on the 1400mm main.
- Groundwater Protection Zone 2.
- Previous Local Plan showed limited capacity at M55 junction with the A6 yet development has continued and continuing. Broughton bypass relived one bottleneck but improvement connecting to M55 junction was negligible with increased peak time traffic.
- Site should contain a new M6 Junction 32A and a short link road to the A6 which will double up as the site's service road making it a prime development site for employment. A mock up potential motorway junction has been drawn up. Advantages include:
 1. The link road between the A6 and the first motorway roundabout would be part of the I&O - 36, helping to split the funding.
 2. A new junction using this location will elevate this site to prime development land and encourage local employment.

3. Relieve the ever-increasing peak-time pressure on M55 junction 1.
 4. A new junction will save the nation's fuel consumption by more efficient travel with wagons etc. through the residential areas of the A6.
 5. Provide more efficient options for the emergency services.
 6. Ease costly congestion and especially disruption when the inevitable road works and accidents happen on the M6 or A6.
 7. This stretch of motorway between junctions 32 & 33 at 14 miles is one of the longest in Britain and a new junction is long overdue.
 8. A new junction would boost Garstang's local economy.
 9. Direct M6 access to this site will attract investment providing local jobs.
 10. It will ease flow of BAE SYSTEMS employees traveling to Warton and Samlesbury – an important major local employer.
- Due to the current and proposed scale of development a safety review is urgently required of the speed limits, traffic calming measures and cycle lanes through the increasingly dangerous 'residential' areas - especially Barton, Catterall, between A586 and B6430, Garstang, between Moss Lane and Ronson Drive.
 - Support from some of the landowners for employment led development.

I&O – 37

- The site contains an on-site ordinary watercourse.
- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water.
- Flood Zone 2 or Flood Zone 3 - Yes. Sequential test applies - Yes. Exception test applies - Yes.
- There are watercourses either in or in the vicinity of these sites and clearly some historical modification. There may be an opportunity to reconnect river/wetlands and floodplain as part of the development.
- Waste water asset (sewer) within the site - 300 surface water - through the middle of the site.
- Public Water Supply Asset within Site – 3-inch water main. On the southern boundary.
- Right on edge of Beacon Fell. Not supportive of new development in this location with less wildlife space and community areas/parks available.
- Support from the landowner for residential development.

Bowgreave

I&O – 38

- The site contains an on-site ordinary watercourse. There may be opportunity to de-culvert a section of watercourse as part of the development. There is also a large area of peat to the east of these three sites which may be suitable for re-establishing wetland / peat habitats.
- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water.
- Flood Zone 2 or Flood Zone 3 - Yes. Sequential test applies - Yes. Exception test applies - Yes.
- Main River on /adjacent to site.
- Public Water Supply Asset within Site – 15 inch trunk main through the middle of the site & 4 inch main. 12 foot easement for the 4 inch main.

- The field that constitutes I&O - 38 is extremely wet during the winter, with flood water already infringing on the lower end of Calder Park and the fields to the south.
- The Little Calder River overfills and spills directly onto I&O - 38 at the south end, and in the middle, regularly in winter. Any development of this field would remove a further 'sponge' from the area and force the flood waters elsewhere, which could pose a threat to our homes, as well as putting extra pressure on existing watercourses and settlements downstream.

I&O – 39

- The site contains an on-site ordinary watercourse. There may be opportunity to de-culvert a section of watercourse as part of the development.
- There is also a large area of peat to the east which may be suitable for re-establishing wetland / peat habitats.
- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water.
- Public Water Supply Asset within Site -180 mm water main. At the south boundary of the site – may not be an issue.
- Opposed to development on this site. The Little Calder River appears to originate in - and certainly runs through - field I&O - 39 to the north. Any development would force surface water down into I&O - 38 to the south - it already floods regularly on to the road and is well saturated in its own right - and add further pressure to land which should be a natural flood plain. A previous application to build 90 homes on that parcel of land was withdrawn before a decision was made.

I&O – 40

- There are watercourses running through and bounding site 38 and 39. There may be opportunity to de-culvert a section of watercourse as part of the development.
- There is also a large area of peat to the east which may be suitable for re-establishing wetland / peat habitats.
- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g. a watercourse).
- Site does not have access from Garstang Road (B6430), does not relate well to the village settlement form being a large development to the rear of the school playing fields with poor integration and connectivity to the village centre and bus stops on Garstang Road.

Garstang (including Bonds)

I&O – 41

- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water.
- The site contains an on-site ordinary watercourse.
- Site within approximately 50 metres of Environment Agency Flood Defence asset.
- Access – private road/single track road (Castle Lane) with no footpaths There is a primary school at the top of the lane, church and nursery which is very congested currently especially at peak times. There has been a road traffic

accident again at this junction which resulted in a fatality. There have been two recent crashes on the bridge at the junction which resulted in the Grade II listed bridge being repaired. There are no passing places on the single-track lane for cars to meet other cars. It is a very popular lane for walkers walking the Garstang loop and beyond.

- There is Greenhalgh Brook on one side of the road and housing the other so no opportunities for increasing the width of the road.
- Lancashire County Council Highways in their consultation responses to the Draft Wyre Local Plan in December 2017 indicated that significant upgrade of Castle Lane would be required to allow development of the land on either side of the lane.
- Development will have a detrimental effect on the scheduled monument and two listed buildings close to the site. The lane is dotted with historic places Greenhalgh Castle remains, Grade II listed buildings - Bonds Fold Farm, Greenhalgh Cottage, SS Mary and Michael church and a historic post.
- Most of the land is flood zone 2 or 3.
- Castle Lane is used extensively by the wider community for recreational activities such as walking and cycling and provides access to a series of footpaths that provide access to the countryside.

I&O – 42

- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g. a watercourse).
- Flood Zone 2 or Flood Zone 3 - Yes. Sequential test applies - Yes. Exception test applies - No (Flood Zone 2).

I&O – 43

- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water.
- The site contains an on-site ordinary watercourse.
- There is a watercourse to the west boundary of this site. There may be an opportunity to restore/reconnect river/wetlands and floodplain as part of the development.
- Main River on /adjacent to site. Site within 200 metres of a permitted intensive agricultural activity.
- Public Water Supply Asset within Site - 630mm trunk main & 1400mm water main both run through the middle of the site.
- 15m easement on the 1400mm main.
- Too big. It's the size of Bonds. The town's roads were not built for that much traffic and we don't have enough schools and doctors places to accommodate that amount of population increase.

Garstang/Cabus

I&O – 44

- There is a risk that the development may result in additional flows being discharged to the ordinary watercourse which crosses the site, before entering a culvert under Garstang. This may result in increased flood risk from the culvert and as such, it is advisable that an alternative 'plan b' discharge option is also identified for the site.

- The site may benefit from a more detailed level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
- The site contains an on-site ordinary watercourse.
- Modelled Sewer Flood Risk - YES.
- Proximity to Sewer Flood Incident - YES
- Waste water asset (sewer) within the site - At the east of the site.
- Public Water Supply Asset within Site - 12 inch main through the middle of the site.
- 15 foot easement on the 12 inch main.
- Will cause flooding problems as the area is too big. Snapewood Lane already floods.
- Low lying and floods after heavy rainfall.
- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water. Not supported by one of the owners of part of the site - would ruin existing business.
- Overstretched infrastructure - not enough school places/doctors/dentists etc
- Over development already.
- Additional traffic on the A6 and increase in commuting.
- No footpath on either side of Snapewood Lane. More development would cause problems on the lane which is very narrow. During summer months it is used by farmers. The lane becomes dangerous for people on foot, bikes or with pushchairs. Accident waiting to happen.
- Should all be included in the area of separation/green belt.
- Impact on local wildlife - Provides a haven for wildlife following a migratory route for deer and wildlife who traverse between Fowler Hill Wood – Winmarleigh – Lancaster Canal. The natural wildlife highway is one of the distinctive characteristics of this area and needs to be preserved.
- These sites are all the foothills to the Bowland Fells. Form part of a well-established, circular, recreational route from Garstang. Walkers, joggers, cyclists and horse riders all regularly use these lanes, bridle path and paths. Housing would take away a much needed local recreational and health giving resource that is free and accessible to all ages and economic means.
- Housing / employment on these sites would detract from the natural beauty of the Bowland fells, views of Nicky Nook, visitors are drawn to. It is a boost to the local rural economy, e.g. Garstang Walking Festival, caravan park on Snapewood Lane.
- The proposed site allocation, when combined with SA1/14 from the current Local Plan (Development to the west of Cockerham Road) would result in a merging of the settlements. To prevent this there needs to be a further area of separation introduced or the current area of separation to the west of the A6 extended.
- Views of the Lancaster Canal from the higher land to the east and the A6 are a visual asset and amenity of the area which will be destroyed if development takes places on this allocated site – impacting tourism, the local economy and the natural landscape.
- Support – considers the site to possess considerable strengths due to its accessibility from three sides including the East (A6), West (Cockerham Road) and North (Snapewood Lane). Excellent vehicular access to the site including

from key bus routes and cycle lanes. Will provide increased footfall to local businesses. As this site is in walking distance from the town centre, unnecessary car journeys will be reduced compared to sites where residents would need to travel further afield to access local amenities. A mixed development will provide housing options and employment opportunities for local residents. A potential medical centre, leisure facilities, open spaces/parks, and independent elderly living housing/village will benefit both existing and new residents in Wyre with its ageing demographic.

Cabus

I&O – 45

- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g. a watercourse).
- 19/00047/Out, this application was refused for building 4 new houses in 2019 on this proposed new site I&O - 45. Subsequent appeal to the Secretary of State was also refused. The reasons given were that the land is positioned on an elevated gradient to the rear of existing dwellings which front Gubberford Lane. The provision of four new dwellings, within this site, would lead to an unacceptable encroachment into the designated countryside area. This would lead to an undesirable form of back land development which would visually amalgamate the existing street picture in an elevated and prominent location. For this reason the proposed development would be injurious to the visual amenities and character and beauty and appearance of the area.
- Visual impact - this site is on an elevated position to the east of A6 for which views towards the Bowland Fells, Nicky Nook and of the surrounding natural landscape – would be severely impacted, affecting tourism, the local economy and the natural landscape.
- Being on an elevated position, development on this site would exacerbate the run-off flood water issue which is already experienced by lower lying residential properties on Gubberford Lane and would add further to the flooding experienced along the A6 and the lower lying land to the west of the A6 (including site I&O-44).
- Local residents use Snapewood Lane as part of a circular walk along the lane to Lancaster Canal.
- Should be included in the area of separation/green belt.
- Provides a haven for wildlife following a migratory route from Fowler Hill Wood down towards Acresfield health club.
- Attracts visitors from the west of the Borough and visitors from further afield. Housing / employment on these sites would detract from the natural beauty of the Bowland fells, views of Nicky Nook, visitors are drawn to. It is a boost to the local rural economy, e.g. Garstang Walking Festival, caravan park on Snapewood Lane.
- Although not close to a national park the area is elevated and in line of sight to Nicky Nook a treasured local beauty spot. Development here will significantly change the local landscape as it would sit higher than any current developments.

I&O – 46

- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water.
- The site contains an on-site ordinary watercourse.
- Field between Snapewood Lane and Fowler Hill, area of full of wildlife, will affect the natural beauty of the Bowland Fells. The adjoining Fowler Hill Wood is a haven for wildlife (including birds of prey and deer) and the proposed site is on the migratory route for deer and wildlife who traverse between Fowler Hill Wood – Winmarleigh – Lancaster Canal. The wood and the natural wildlife highway is one of the distinctive characteristics of this area and needs to be protected and preserved.
- These sites should all be included in the area of separation/green belt. Provides a haven for wildlife following a migratory route from Fowler Hill Wood down towards Acresfield health club. Attracts visitors from the west of the Borough and visitors from further afield.
- Bridle Path 2-8-BW11 runs along the easterly boundary of this site and Fowler Hill Wood borders the northern end with access to Public Footpaths 2-8-FP8, 2-8-FP7 and 2-8-FP2 leading to the Lancaster Canal. Together this forms an important part of the green corridor for Cabus and the Canal infrastructure.
- I&O 44, 46- & 48 form part of a well-established, circular, recreational route from Garstang. Walkers, joggers, cyclists and horse riders all regularly use these lanes, bridle path and paths. Housing would take away a much needed local recreational and health-giving resource that is free and accessible to all ages and economic means.
- Housing / employment on these sites would detract from the natural beauty of the Bowland fells, views of Nicky Nook, visitors are drawn to. It is a boost to the local rural economy, e.g. Garstang Walking Festival, caravan park on Snapewood Lane.
- Heritage interest - Roman road.

I&O – 47

- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water.
- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g. a watercourse).
- Being on an elevated position, development on this site would exacerbate the run-off flood water issue which is already experienced along the A6 and the lower lying land to the west of the A6 (including site I&O-44).
- Should be included in the area of separation/green belt. Each one provides a haven for wildlife following a migratory route from Fowler Hill Wood down towards Acresfield health club. Attracts visitors from the west of the Borough and visitors from further afield.
- Housing / employment on these sites would detract from the natural beauty of the Bowland fells, views of Nicky Nook, visitors are drawn to. It is a boost to the local rural economy, e.g. Garstang Walking Festival, caravan park on Snapewood Lane.

- This site is on an elevated position to the east of A6 for which views towards the Bowland Fells, Nicky Nook and of the surrounding natural landscape – would be severely impacted, affecting the tourism and local economy.

I&O – 48

- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g. a watercourse).
- Should be included in the area of separation/green belt. Provides a haven for wildlife following a migratory route from Fowler Hill Wood down towards Acresfield health club. Attracts visitors from the west of the Borough and visitors from further afield.
- I&O 44, 46- & 48 form part of a well-established, circular, recreational route from Garstang (see full response for details). Walkers, joggers, cyclists and horse riders all regularly use these lanes, bridle path and paths. Housing would take away a much needed local recreational and health-giving resource that is free and accessible to all ages and economic means.
- Housing / employment on these sites would detract from the natural beauty of the Bowland fells, views of Nicky Nook, visitors are drawn to. It is a boost to the local rural economy, e.g. Garstang Walking Festival, caravan park on Snapewood Lane.
- There is a question mark regarding the handling of sewerage and utilities at this site as it is understood that there are currently no services.
- The suitability of this site for employment would depend on the type of employment that was being proposed and whether it would enhance or detract from the surrounding area of natural countryside.
- Landowner supports the proposed allocation for employment purposes. Site is suitable for employment use, it is level with excellent access to the local highway network, no known flood risk issues, no close neighbours to be impacted upon, opportunities for public transport to site. Site can be successfully developed, desirable commercially and landowner will allow land to come forward.

Scorton

I&O – 49

- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g. a watercourse).
- Located within the designated conservation area and in part adjoins the listed St. Peters Church, the most significant building within the village.
- The open space around the church and its grounds, up to the boundary of the M6, is important and provides a setting for the church and is important in views from Snow Hill Lane, Tithebarn Lane and even from the M6.
- The open landscape defines the rural characteristics of the village and the tree clad M6 boundary is also an important element – which is visually permeable when the trees are out of leaf. The open aspect should be retained.
- Access to this site would be by way of Snow Hill Lane (visibility issues). It is not clear how the linear nature of the site with a sloping topography could satisfactorily accommodate residential development and how the relationships of internal built relationships might work.

- This site would be unsuitable for higher density development. Its proximity to the M6 would also raise issues of noise attenuation to the dwellings and the impact on boundary trees (to include root protection areas, which have broader beneficial effects for the conservation area and broader village environment).
- Area I&O - 49 has already been declined for planning due to the lack of access and the single track round access and close proximity to the local school.
- In I&O - 49 the access cannot be improved due to the limitations on the road, there is a school close by and no footpath or room to add a footpath. Access into the village would need complete redevelopment.
- It is understood that this site lies next to a Church for which space might be required by the Church to expand its graveyard.

I&O – 50

- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water.
- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g. a watercourse).
- Particular concerns about I&O-50 on the northern edge of Scorton between Factory Brow and the M6 and includes land which is part of the historic Wyresdale Park which is an undesignated historic designed landscape. Research for Lancashire Local List, by Lancashire County Council, Manchester Metropolitan and Lancaster University's and Lancashire Gardens Trust assessed Wyresdale Park at category 1, being one of the 19 Nationally Important landscapes out of the 242 locations covered in this study. As part of the review coordinated by Growth Lancashire a Statement of Significance for this site was recorded in late 2022 and it is understood that this document was forwarded for inclusion on the HER (Historic Environment Record).

I&O – 51

- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water.
- The site contains an on-site ordinary watercourse.
- Flood Zone 2 or Flood Zone 3 - Yes. Sequential test applies - Yes.
- A reduced area may prove more acceptable. Issues - tree and hedgerow cover, it is characterful and may well have consequent high bio-diversity value. It also presents a softening edge to the village approach and compliments the site frontage opposite site 50.
- Part within the designated conservation area.
- Access to the site may be problematical with respect to visibility. Site extends for a long length virtually to the Motorway. This would result in a long ribbon of development with an elongated form that would be inappropriate within the context of the morphology of Scorton.
- Land to rear of Brook Avenue and the brook that runs through the proposed site is subject to flooding and impact must be taken into account to ensure no increased risk is caused by the development.
- Surface water should not be drained to the watercourse that is already at capacity and exceeds capacity during heavy rain.

- After the development on the Mill Yard in Scorton some years ago the flooding of the land at the rear of Brook Ave was much worse. The garden and that of neighbours regularly flooded and on occasions narrowly missing getting into the house and flooding sheds etc.

Hollins Lane

I&O – 52

- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g. a watercourse).
- The scale of development in Forton in recent years has been excessive and disproportionate. Forton has increased the number of dwellings by 350% since 2016 and is at a greater scale than all other settlements and Forton has limited facilities and services.
- The scale of house building in Forton is putting a strain on health, education and social care services.
- Traffic is also a concern.
- Concern about the ability to staff medical centres and schools.
- Topography - the north end of this site consists of steep embankments, the east side of which forms the railway embankment for the West Coast main line. It is difficult to envisage the north end of this site being suitable for any type of development.
- Issue of access at junction of Hollins Lane and A6 which is already dangerous and inadequate, without the additional traffic burden from new development.
- Such a large number of extra vehicles adds to our pressing need for traffic calming measures on Hollins Lane. Hollins Lane/A6 junction would have to be radically redesigned and widened substantially to make it safer.
- Drainage problems exist here just like existing sites being constructed in Forton. Inadequate drainage provision through/behind existing houses (some properties have already been adversely affected by the recent new development adjacent and north of this proposed site).
- There are also breeding birds on the land - peregrine falcons to the East of Hollins Lane, behind Greycott.
- The topography of this site seems unsuitable for housebuilding given the steep gradient, plus the presence of a copse and pond which should be protected.
- Sewage removal - the problem of sewage blockages on the existing new development are well known to both the residents and Laurus Homes. United Utilities are working on finding a solution to this ongoing issue but to date haven't been able to find a resolution. Regular sewage pipe 'clearing' continues on the lowest part of the development, much to the concern of existing residents.
- Flooding - a very well-known issue with existing residents of Hollins Lane, local and regional councillors and MP for the area Cat Smith. The addition of further development would only exacerbate an ongoing problem.
- The site contains a large number of mature trees. Incorporation into a new development would be difficult and their removal would represent a great loss for local wildlife.

I&O – 53

- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g. a watercourse).
- Difficult to see how flooding can be mitigated against on site I&O - 52 as the location of the land drain into which surface water is being discharged from the Hollins Green development location is unknown.
- The low-lying land here flooded in the winter storms of 2020 to a depth of 30cm.
- The scale of development in Forton in recent years has been excessive and disproportionate. Forton has increased the number of dwellings by 350% since 2016 and is at a greater scale than all other settlements and Forton has limited facilities and services.
- Concern about the ability to staff medical centres and schools.
- This is a large site which would completely alter the character of Winder Lane which is one of our quiet country lanes much valued by residents.
- This site is poorly related to the Hollins Lane settlement and would not form an organic extension.
- Highly likely to have significant peat deposits on the site and would preclude construction.
- Traffic is also a concern.
- This site suffers from the same problems of access to the A6 at a really problematic point which could only be solved by substantial re-engineering in conjunction with parcel I&O-52.
- Great concern over the increased levels of traffic on Hollins Lane and the speed of drivers along Hollins Lane. Used as a 'rat run' to the M6. Additional development will only exacerbate this problem.
- The proposed development on land labelled I&O - 52 and also I&O - 53, will require a substantial redesign of the junction at Hollins Lane, the A6 and Ratcliffe wharf Lane. For those who live on Hollins Lane we are well aware of how dangerous the junction is. Additional traffic will only make it worse.
- Winder Lane is narrow and used as a quiet lane for recreation as the lanes around Hollins Lane, e.g., Cleveley Bank Lane are dangerous due to increased traffic.
- Concerns about road safety, topography, waste management, flooding.
- Has a well-used foot path which is used for recreation and enjoyment of the open space.
- Would it not be more appropriate to move housing developments to the North of Forton, near to Junction 33 of the M6. Commuting traffic will then have a shorter distance to travel and therefore reduce additional traffic on the A6 and surrounding lanes.

Forton

I&O – 54

- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g. a watercourse).
- The scale of development in Forton in recent years has been excessive and disproportionate. Representation outlines that Forton has increased the

number of dwellings by 350% since 2016 and is at a greater scale than all other settlements and Forton has limited facilities and services.

- The scale of house building in Forton is putting a strain on health, education and social care services. Traffic is also a concern.
- Concern about the ability to staff medical centres and schools.
- The owners of this site do not want to develop it and will not be available.

I&O – 55

- Proximity to Sewer Flood Incident – YES.
- The site contains areas at medium and high risk of flooding from surface water.
- Alternative sites in Forton at lower risk are identified in the Issues and Options list of sites and may present better alternative options.
- The scale of development in Forton in recent years has been excessive and disproportionate. Representation outlines that Forton has increased the number of dwellings by 350% since 2016 and is at a greater scale than all other settlements and Forton has limited facilities and services.
- Concerned that the landowner will submit plans for the rest of their fields in the area, and the scenic cricket field will be surrounded with houses.
- Infrastructure issues in Forton (lack of doctors, shops and roads full), concerns over removal of green spaces.
- Concern about the ability to staff medical centres and schools.
- The scale of house building in Forton is putting a strain on health, education and social care services. Traffic is also a concern. Building extra medical centres and adding extensions to schools is not a solution as there are no staff to fill them. It is common for medical centres to now divert patients to walk in centres at Fleetwood or Blackpool. Concerns relating to the staffing in schools is also raised.
- Important part of the village used for walking, recreation and peace and quiet.
- Opposes development of I&O - 55 - to the detriment of the adjacent cricket club. In the countryside. Forton should be protected.
- Development of this site would be unacceptable for the reasons set out in four planning refusals 17/00587/OUTMAJ; 19/01000/OUTMAJ; 20/01296/OUTMAJ; 23/00243/LMAJ.
- One of the landowners within I&O - 55 has expressed a keen interest to develop the land from School Lane with a fully affordable scheme adjoining the existing affordable development by Places for People. The land has the scope to deliver circa 80-units with a further opportunity to develop adjacent parcels totalling circa 30 acres that is currently land locked. The village of Forton lacks local amenities and development of this scale could provide both an opportunity for the council to ensure development met the needs of the community whilst provide a mixed tenure scheme with a focus on affordable housing for local residents.

I&O – 56

- The site does not have an obvious on-site discharge point for surface water (e.g. a watercourse).

- The scale of development in Forton in recent years has been excessive and disproportionate. Representation outlines that Forton has increased the number of dwellings by 350% since 2016 and is at a greater scale than all other settlements and Forton has limited facilities and services.
- The scale of house building in Forton is putting a strain on health, education and social care services.
- Concern about the ability to staff medical centres and schools.
- Traffic is also a concern.
- This is a large site of about 100 houses. It should not have an access on to Wallace Lane because this road is too narrow.
- An access on to the A6 may not have adequate traffic sight lines.
- Can be considered 'organic growth' but will further compromise safety on the road access on Wallace Lane and onto the A6. Understood that Lancashire County Council has reservations concerning access to I&O-55 which by itself should rule it out for further planning consideration.
- The site has many established trees which need protecting. Whinney Brow is used by lots of vehicles (including Lorries sometimes), and this is a totally unsuitable road. This proposal could exacerbate this problem.

Question 28 (sites): Proposed new sites

A number of new sites were submitted for consideration. In some cases there were proposed extensions to sites in the I&O document. Below is a summary of the sites submitted and comments made in support of their future allocation.

NEW - North of Rossall School and NEW – South of Rossall School

- Given the increase in housing requirement under the revised standard method the council should relook at potential sites including two at Rossall School. The two areas could deliver approx. 350 dwellings, including affordable homes. The sites are in the Green Belt but do not contribute significantly to its purposes.
- Retained land would prevent Fleetwood and Cleveleys merging.
- Can be delivered in the short term, close to services, facilities and public transport options, which helps the climate emergency.
- It would help investment funds of Rossall School in accordance with the provisions of adopted Local Plan policy SP3(4).

NEW – Land Off Tarn Road and Links Gate, Thornton (SHELAA ref. THN_52).

- Green Belt. To meet the increased housing needs identified in the revised Standard Method, the council should undertake a Green Belt review, with a preference for releasing any sites that constitute Grey Belt land, particularly those in more sustainable areas that are suitable of accommodating future growth. Represents a 'Grey Belt' site, with a significant amount of previously developed land, while the greenfield land is considered to make a limited contribution to the five Green Belt purposes.
- The council's approach to not allocate any sites that lie within Flood Zones 2/3 poses a significant barrier for any future developments.
- I&O doc - certain settlements could miss out on desired growth required to sustain the viability of existing facilities and service provision. However, several have a relatively wider range of services and facilities and could accommodate

a greater level of development. Contradicts the approach of the adopted Local Plan, whereby most growth is directed towards the larger and more sustainable settlements, notwithstanding any flood risks.

- Would also undermine the National Planning Policy Framework which supports development in rural communities to support their vitality.
- Focus on development in areas of lowest risk of all sources of flooding ignores situations where mitigation solutions are available. Effectively omitting these settlements from aspirations for growth will result in their further decline.
- The council is strongly encouraged to allocate sites where it is possible to demonstrate that they can be made safe from flood risks.
- Suggested site is Flood Zone 1. Most is not at risk of surface water flooding.
- The site is a logical location for growth, with the settlement boundary immediately due north with several dwellings to the north off Tarn Road, while several dwellings also lie off Links Gate.
- The site is located in a sustainable settlement with several services and public transport links.
- The site lies wholly outside of any flood risk areas, unlike large portions of Thornton and the Wyre Borough.

NEW - Land off Benedict Drive and Normoss Road, Poulton-le-Fylde.

6.5ha. Located in the Green Belt to the edge of Poulton-le-Fylde, which is a highly sustainable settlement and has substantial unmet development needs e.g. affordable housing need of 45 no. net affordable houses per annum. Can come forward in the short-term to help address affordable needs and general housing needs set out through the emerging standard method.

NEW - Land at Fouldrey Avenue, Poulton le Fylde

- The land is identified as PFY_05 & PFY_05_01 in the 2024 Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment report and was sieved out purely on the basis of being in Flood Zones 2 and 3.
- Given the uplifted requirement for housing the land should be reconsidered again for residential.
- The site is sustainably located on the edge of Poulton, within walking and cycling distance to the town centre, close to a variety of services and facilities including bus stops and train station.
- A significant of the land is Previously Developed Land and adjacent fields are grazed not cropped.
- The recently published Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has taken a more restrictive and broad approach to modelling. More detailed site-specific modelling is likely to refine and more clearly assess flood zones.

NEW - South of Moss House Lane, Stalmine.

- 4.80 ha.
- It would extend I&O-15 and together with the development of additional land to the west of Mill Lane, it would serve to round off the settlement at its northern limits.
- The provision of a more robust growth strategy for Stalmine would support housing needs within rural Wyre and help to support existing services and facilities.

- Additional housing, employment and retail in the village could be sustainability achieved during the next plan period. This approach would support Option 3 – Sustainable Dispersal.

NEW - Land South of Stricklands Lane, Stalmine

- Promotes a generally flat site comprising 2.3ha of land to the south of Stricklands Lane and west of Back Lane at the south of Stalmine.
- Abuts the settlement boundary on its northern and eastern sides and forms a logical extension to the settlement.
- It adjoins a number of existing dwellings including a small development of bungalows that has been recently completed.
- Partly greenfield.
- It is fully delineated and contained by development and hedgerows.
- Flood Zone 1.

NEW – Land at Sandy Lane, Preesall

The extent of sites identified around Preesall Hill (16 & 17) and Stalmine (11 - 15) are excessive, given the status of those small settlements. Land adjacent to Knott End/Preesall would provide a more appropriate and sustainable location e.g. land at Sandy Lane – Call for Sites reference CFS_2022_043.

The site is greenfield circa 4 hectares. Site is open countryside not Green Belt.

Is in a sustainable location directly next to Knott End/Preesall. Well related to the settlement and its services and facilities. Adjoins the existing settlement to both its west, north and north-western edges and as a significant road frontage to Sandy Lane.

The site has good accessibility to sustainable modes of transport, with the nearest bus stops located along the northern site boundary (Sandy Lane).

With regards to market attractiveness, the interest expressed from Housebuilders to date confirms that the site is in an attractive market location and a suitable location for residential development.

In landscape terms, the site is not subject to any statutory landscape designations such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Special Areas of Conservation etc. The site is located within an Sites of Special Scientific Interest Impact Zone (Wyre Estuary and Lune Estuary), a matter which can be considered during any future planning application process.

With regards to flood risk, it is acknowledged that the site is located within Flood Zone 3, Although the Borough of Wyre is heavily constrained by flooding matters, this area benefits from flood defences. Therefore, whilst flood risk matters would ordinarily be seen as a site-specific issue, given the wider context this site does not perform any less favourably than other large swathes of the Borough. Flood risk can be addressed at the planning application stage.

NEW – South of Lancaster Road, Knott End

- See Call for Sites reference CFS_2022_042.
- State site is greenfield, open countryside not greenbelt.
- Is 22.4 hectares in size.

- Is in a sustainable location directly next to Knott End/Preesall. Well related to the settlement and its services and facilities, adjoining it to both its northern and western boundary.
- The site has good accessibility to sustainable modes of transport, with the nearest bus stops located along the northern site boundary (Lancaster Road). There have also been bus service improvements for the 88 and 89 services between: Lancaster–Glasson Dock–Garstang–Pilling–Knott End.
- The Knott End-Fleetwood ferry which provides access to a range of employment opportunities.
- In landscape terms, the site is not subject to any statutory landscape designations such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Special Areas of Conservation etc. The site is located within an Sites of Special Scientific Interest Impact Zone (Wyre Estuary and Lune Estuary), a matter which can be considered during any future planning application process.
- With regards to market attractiveness, interest expressed from housebuilders to date confirms that the site is in an attractive market location and a suitable location for residential development.
- States that the National Planning Policy Framework supports sustainable development in rural areas and that the sites are well placed to meet this aim. State sites not subject to any designations (e.g., Sites of Special Scientific Interest).
- With regards to flood risk, it is acknowledged that the site is located within Flood Zone 3 but benefits from flood defences. Whilst flood risk matters would ordinarily be seen as a site-specific issue, given the wider context this site does not perform any less favourably than other large swathes of the Borough. Flood risk can be addressed at the planning application stage.

NEW - West of Smallwood Hey Road, Pilling, Lancashire, PR3 6HJ

- Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment ref. PIL_40 - 'sieved out' as it is considered to represent a 'Recreation Site'. 4.52ha.
- Notes that several sustainable settlements in the Borough are constrained by different types of flooding, including from rivers, the sea, and surface water. Applying the council's approach to not allocate any sites that lie within Flood Zones 2/3 poses a significant barrier for any future developments in said areas.
- The recommendation of the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment which involves allocating development in areas of lowest risk of all sources of flooding is therefore a misguided approach that ignores situations where mitigation solutions are available and is contrary to National Planning Policy Framework which supports growth in rural communities.
- It is strongly recommended that the council re-evaluate their stance on flood risk matters, considering the likely implications of the approach presented in the Issues and Options document, which has been informed by the Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and results in a disconnect from the options contained within the emerging Local Plan.
- The approach presented is misguided and will have severe detrimental ramifications for coastal and other rural settlements. Effectively omitting these settlements from aspirations for growth will result in their further decline.

- Consequently, in the interests of promoting sustainable communities, the council is strongly encouraged to allocate sites where it is possible to demonstrate that they can be made safe from flood risks.
- The site also benefits from flood defences.
- The council's previous Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment noted that "Based upon the level of risk presented in this SFRA, existing flood risk levels are unlikely to be a significant issue in this area" when referring to Pilling. Main potential source of flooding to the site is fluvial flooding associated with the unnamed land drain (Main River) which borders the south of the site. Low risk of tidal flooding, and Low to Moderate risk of fluvial flooding, while all other sources of flooding are considered to be Negligible to Low.
- The risk of flooding is not a technical constraint, with adequate drainage solutions, including raising the finished floor levels, helping to mitigate any risks both at the site and the wider area. There would be no risk to existing or future residents as a result of well-designed development.

NEW – Bilsborrow Lane, Adjacent M6

- Promotes land off Bilsborrow Lane adjacent M6.
- Approximately 3.7 hectares.
- Primarily open grassland with additional fields along the southern boundary.
- The Grade II listed Wesleyan Church is opposite the site but at a sufficient distance that its setting would not be materially affected by development.
- The village of Bilsborrow is accessible.
- Flood Zone 1.
- A Public Right of Way footpath (2-6-FP 3) running north to south through the site can be incorporated into any proposed residential development without requiring diversion or closure.

NEW – Extension to site I&O – 36, Catterall

- I&O - 36 Including additional land to the south.
- The Issues and Options document earmarks the site exclusively for employment use. The site has not been delivered as envisioned and no planning applications submitted.
- A rigid focus on employment uses solely is not the most effective solution. Considering the issues in the Issues and Options document and an increase in the housing target, a mixed-use development of employment, commercial and retail and housing is proposed as a more feasible approach to foster sustainable communities.
- The inclusion of retail will reduce residents need to travel given the current limited commercial development in Catterall.
- Two Masterplans have been included in the submission.
- The first, a mixed-use development on the southern portion of I&O_36 together with land to the south, proposes a new access point from the A6 and a new bridge across Lancaster Canal with employment and business uses, a supermarket, market and affordable housing, landscape buffers and conservation of listed structures.
- The second Masterplan expands the development to include the northern section of I&O_36, which is not currently under option but with potential for collaboration with the adjacent landowner. The expanded plan proposes an

extension of the B2 and B8 uses closer to the existing industrial estate, with housing to the east separated by landscape buffers.

- Other technical matters considered are, flood risk, ecology and biodiversity, trees, underground constraints, electricity pylons. The site will not come forward if the council maintains a preference for simply traditional employment uses.

NEW - Land off Garstang Road, Bowgreave

- Site to the north-west of Bowgreave settlement.
- Land provides an excellent opportunity to provide much needed age restricted specialist bungalows for retired and older people and/or with a mixed two storey housing development in a highly sustainable location, access from Garstang Road, relates well to the settlement form of Bowgreave.
- The site is referenced as BOW_15 in the 2024 Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment but rejected in sieve 2 as it is in the Strategic Area of Separation but otherwise it is available, suitable and achievable in all other respects. The sieve 2 in the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment is too crude and rejecting the site on this basis is a missed opportunity.
- The site and Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment evidence base should be reassessed following the increased growth of 637 dpa (11,466 over pp) in line with the revised standard method.
- All suitable, available and achievable land in the A6 Corridor should be more closely assessed before considering sites in less sustainable and suitable parts of the borough.

NEW - Land West of Forton

- Promotes an extension to I&O 55.
- That part of the extended site off Chapel Close has been recognised as being suitable for housing in the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment and could come forward during the Local Plan period.
- It forms a logical small-scale extension that could be served via Parcels C and D, with pedestrian links to School Lane.
- it would form an effective rounding off of the village in a sustainable manner.
- Notes that the larger area may have constraints such as gas pipeline and highway access.
- Notes that the Cricket Club has aspirations to expand and suggests that the logical option would be for the Club to expand into Parcel E and this could pave the way for further much needed housing to be delivered as well as the expansion of the Forton Trail and its associated Green Infrastructure benefits.
- Promotes Forton parcel D with C for comprehensive development, acknowledging the current issues regarding access arrangements across parcel C.