

**Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g**

**Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised**

**Q6 – SITES - Do you have any particular comments/concerns with any of the identified sites? What are the key issues that would need to be considered if any of the identified sites were to be brought forward for development? What additional services and facilities would need to be provided to ensure that development on these sites does not have an unacceptable impact on existing infrastructure? What is the most important infrastructure that needs to be provided within a settlement for it to accommodate new development in a sustainable manner?**

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
3	<p>IO_26, IO_27</p> <p>Objects to the planning application at IO_27. Contrary to the development plan and National Planning Policy Framework on the grounds of:</p> <p>Impact on the local traffic networks and hence environment. No social benefit from the development. Ecology And Countryside - on the edge of the award winning, nationally renowned and internationally protected nature reserve that is the Wyre Estuary Country Park. It is an SSI/SPA protected site. Almost no countryside land left in the Thornton, Cleveleys and Fleetwood peninsula. Visual Impact - The proposed development will have an enormously negative effect on the visual impact of the area. Numerous red bricked, grey roofed houses will be a visual blight on the country landscape. It would be prominently sited up to the top of a hill and would ruin the beautiful uninterrupted views to the Bowland Fells. Housing Supply - According to the latest Wyre Council housing document published in March 2013, Wyre has a 7 year housing supply with no necessity to build upon highly valued countryside. The Wyre Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2010 recognises that Thornton has already seen more development than anywhere else in Wyre over the last 10 years. This particular site is recognised (as reconfirmed by LCC) as having LOW ACCESSIBILITY and therefore undesirable for this level of development.</p>	Thornton IO_26, IO_27
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option 1 and option 3 would lead to a large increase in traffic using the A585 and A588.</li> <li>• Unwise to build more houses in Hambleton, Stalmine and Knot-End - A588 is already classed as one of the most dangerous roads in Britain.</li> <li>• Option 1 acceptable if more improvements were made to the A585 and A586 to ensure people living in these houses could access Poulton train station and the M55 more easily.</li> </ul>	Hambleton Stalmine Knot-End Poulton le-Fylde
15	See response to question 3.	IO_101

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Also, serious reservations regarding IO 102 it would completely ruin views that we have come to appreciate over the years and being a key reasons why we purchased the property in the first place.</p> <p>I do not understand how access can be safely achieved as the only potential access road is very narrow.</p> <p>I fail to understand how Castle Lane would be able to support any additional traffic as part of IO 101 and IO 102. Tractors regularly use the lane daily which is a real danger.</p> <p>Potential building plots need to be supported by other functions such as Highways etc to ensure that the infrastructure implemented is robust and meet the communities future needs.</p>	IO_102
16	<p>Concerned of size of IO_91 and if developed would have the following implications; road infrastructure not suitable, house prices would decrease, transform from beautiful country village to built up area.</p> <p>The school has limited places.</p> <p>If sites brought forward the following would need to be considered; infrastructure and safety, footpaths on roads, wider roads (but would ruin village feel) and lager school (but no capacity to increase).</p>	Scorton IO_91
20	<p>NEW SITE - I own 1.5 acres made up of grassland/paddock. The area is attached to IO_35. I express interest in my land being considered for development.</p>	IO_35
23	<p>Site IO_94 Lynnwood should be included, see plan. Country roads would need to be improved.</p>	Garstang IO_94
24	<p>Site IO_65 Proposal of 90 dwellings through current planning application doesn't constitute organic growth. Key issues; traffic, parking in village centre and health centre too small.</p>	Great Eccleston IO_65
27	<p>Option 3 gives good scope to improve the viability of our small settlements. Infrastructure must be in place before any development takes place; Roads, schools, doctors, green play areas and bugalows.</p>	
30	<p>IO_82, IO_83, IO_84, IO_85 (Forton) - understood that owners unwilling to sell.</p> <p>IO_86, IO_87, IO_88 (Hollins Lane) - will result in much more traffic leaving a very bad junction at the end of Hollins Lane where it joins a very busy A6 opposite another bad junction onto Ratcliffe Wharf Lane.</p> <p>Key issues - Traffic management at a bad junction, increase in traffic on an overloaded A6. Impact of existing permissions on same.</p>	Forton Hollins Lane IO_82, IO_83, IO_84, IO_85, IO_86, IO_87, IO_88

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
31	<p>IO_86, IO_87, IO_88</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will contribute substantially to the traffic flow on a dangerous narrow road with difficult junctions at the A6 and further awkward traffic areas as the lane heads north.</li> <li>• Minimal service facilities extant (part-time PO in the Methodist Church (Motorway Services are technically unavailable to pedestrians or motorists).</li> <li>• Will consume pristine agricultural land.</li> <li>• Occupants of housing adjacent to the A6 will be exposed to air and noise pollution from the heavy traffic.</li> <li>• Unlikely that young adults and families would be able to afford to purchase property in the area, thus failing to address the demographic issues with which the Plan contends.</li> <li>• The scale of the developments is out of keeping with the size of the current settlement.</li> </ul>	Hollins Lane IO_86, IO_87, IO_88
34	<p>IO_87 – should remain agricultural land skirting the AONB.</p> <p>IO_91 - huge site and as Scorton village skirts the AONB development should not take place. The village needs to retain its character to continue to attract visitors to it and the surrounding area. Need the visitors to keep the village viable with local business providing much needed employment.</p> <p>Key issues</p> <p>Nature of the local highway network - small winding lanes with many dangerous junctions that struggle to support local traffic as it is, particularly with heavy farm vehicles.</p> <p>Sites should be designated for much needed smaller starter homes for young people to move into the villages to keep them viable.</p> <p>Provision of homes for the elderly should be addressed as many older residents currently have to move away from a village they have lived all their life in due to lack of smaller units.</p> <p>Infrastructure is key and needs to be presented hand in hand with the Local Plan for all to see, not promised at the next stage.</p> <p>Sewerage/drains in the local area of Forton will not be able to support further development - much of the pipework is only six inches in</p>	Scorton IO_87, IO_91

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>diameter!!</p> <p>Need - new roads/upgraded roads, increase in public transport services for all villages in outlying areas to support growth, new school places in local schools for local children to support growth.</p>	
42	<p>Concerned about substantial development in Forton:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Homes in Forton attract people working at Lancaster University or Lancaster hospital. Building homes here will therefore not contribute to solving Wyre Borough housing problems.</li> <li>• Involves building on agricultural land.</li> <li>• Will be adding to traffic congestion on the A6.</li> <li>• Very poor public transport system. Teenagers and children have to be taken and collected by car wherever they go after school as walking along rural lanes with no street lighting or pavements is extremely dangerous.</li> <li>• Would have to start from scratch because here in Forton we have no shops, only a voluntary postal service in the Methodist church. No doctor, clinic or other medical service, no pub.</li> </ul>	Forton
50	<p>IO_01 and IO_03 - too large for what future use is perceived and could be released for housing and mixed use.</p> <p>IO_80 - neither the utilities or highways structure in place without causing severe bottlenecks at the junction of the A6.</p> <p>IO_86, IO_87, IO_88 - sewage systems would have to be completely revamped. Road traffic problems would be exacerbated on country lanes without footpaths and with A6 junctions.</p> <p>IO_91 - on a flood plain?</p> <p>IO_78, IO_79 - neither the utilities or highways structure in place without causing severe bottlenecks at the junction of the A6.</p> <p>Issues – nature and capacity of the rural road network and lack of pedestrian footpaths.</p> <p>Examples of standing water in several fields in the area show that the water table is rising and the ability of very old water gullies to remove such water is now not feasible at the present rate.</p>	<p>Thornton Winmarleigh Hollins Lane Scorton Nateby</p> <p>IO_01 IO_03 IO_78, IO_79 IO_80 IO_86, IO_87, IO_88</p>

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	Without major work by United Utilities to upgrade the sewerage system in many country areas then further expansion of housing in these areas is not practicable.	IO_91
59	Map for Thornton unclear and confusing so can't comment. Wyre Council needs to be open and honest.	Thornton
61	<p>Sites IO_94, IO_97, IO_98 and IO_99                      All sites should be removed, for reasons set out in question 5.                      Key issues include:                      1) Protection of Conservation Area, 2) Public Open Space, 3) Tree lined roads and 4) Enhanced services to towns affected by increased planning.                      Additional services:                      1) Medical facilities, 2) Schools, 3) Open spaces in towns and 4) Play areas.</p>	Garstang
62	<p>Already been a great number of planning consents. IO_84 and IO_85 would prevent the village farm from functioning.                      Urgent need got more classrooms at village school and would the secondary schools have space. There is problems with sewage and this would be exacerbated. Other issues; village shopping, public transport and access to A6. Already permission for 40 homes (80 cars?).</p>	Forton IO_84 IO_85
63	<p>Site IO_27 was donated for recreation. If built on would be breach of trust.                      Key issues; strain on road services and flood risk.                      With all development intended, a better road and rail network is needed. Garstang has opportunity to build new railway station and new junction on motorway. Poulton, although having a station, does not have the availability for extra parking.</p>	IO_27 Garstang Poulton
64	<p>Key issues; Where will house buyers work and therefore implication for road/rail provision. Impact on education, medical, commercial, retail, leisure, sewage, waste and water.                      Existing services and facilities close to capacity.</p>	
67	The land at Lambs Road was designated to the residents at Thornton and would be a breach of trust if developed.	IO_27
68	Would like IO_99 considered for development.	IO_99
69	All sites adversely affected by problems caused by sites themselves, i.e. schooling, sewage and effluent disposal, policing, road congestion, medical overload, public transport etc.	Great Eccleston
70	<p>Land at Kenyon Gardens Thornton not allowed to be released. It was Donated for recreational space.                      Key issues; road infrastructure, drainage, flooding, schools, leisure facilities, shops, health and dental care, banking, gas storage project (safety) and Stanah Country Park (kept).                      Services required; maintenance of greenbelt land, recreational space, preservation of the environment (wildlife, flora and fauna) and</p>	Thornton

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	improved services.	
71	IO_27 (no additional comment)	IO_27
72	Sites cannot comply with sustainability – issues – flooding, jobs, amenities, schools etc.	
83	<p>Scale of the sites in Garstang and Cabus is of concern.</p> <p>So much building on open countryside is unacceptable.</p> <p>Impact on the A6 - will have to completely change - speed limits and traffic calming along huge sections because of the increase in junctions. Plus the lanes surrounding the A6 - used by so many for cycling, walking, running - will become busy and dangerous.</p> <p>Any new developments should include houses which are 'eco houses'. Vulnerable people should be protected from the rising cost of utilities and this should be considered when building new houses.</p>	Garstang Cabus
90	<p>See response to question 5. Also, rural buffers between Forton, Garstang, Catterall, Bilsborrow and Barton are preserved and given a very high priority.</p> <p>Keu issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Sustainability with a precondition of adequate services and road &amp; rail links as a precondition of all and any development.</li> <li>2) Preserving existing settlements and villages.</li> <li>3) Prevention at all costs of ribbon development of the A6 corridor.</li> <li>4) Bias development towards settlements best able to provide necessary services and in the case of Fleetwood, ensure a vibrant local economy through improved employment opportunities.</li> </ol>	Forton Garstang Catterall Bilsborrow Barton
94	<p>Sites IO_26, IO_27 and IO_28.</p> <p>Key issues; no infrastructure for this area, schools, traffic country roads, congestions, green land, floods, employment recreational space.</p> <p>No services required if use derelict areas.</p>	IO_26 IO_27 IO_28 Thornton
96	<p>The basic principles outlined in the response to question 5 should apply to any site under consideration. At the present time we seem to have a flood of market driven planning applications for new housing which give no indication of there being any rational local planning behind them.</p> <p>The following should be considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Does it provide any economic benefit to the local community?</li> <li>2) Are the existing infrastructure and services adequate to cope with the increased demand?</li> </ol>	

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>3) Does it impact on Green Belt, or have a detrimental environmental impact?                      4) Does it remove agricultural land from production?                      5) Will it enhance the Wyre Vision?                      The development will establish what services and facilities need to be provided and these should be guaranteed before development begins, not left to future chance and budgets.                      Option 2 should not be considered without guarantee that the additional health and education services required are in place, and transport/infrastructure upgrades will be carried out in parallel with development.</p>	
97	<p>Cabus and Garstang. Sites IO_92, IO_93, IO_94, IO_95, IO_97, IO_98 and IO_99 will increase settlements by an estimated 50% at least. 4 of them are outside the A6 bypass. This is inconsistent with the Strategic Objectives 4, 5, 9 10, 11 and 12. By building on extensive countryside the wellbeing of the current local population will be compromised as our nearby country lanes will become urbanised. Traffic on the A6 and connecting minor roads will increase to unacceptable levels. Traffic levels need to be decreased in order to facilitate health and wellbeing of current and future residents.                      Sites IO_100, IO_101 and IO_102 will alter the rural nature of Bonds, where current roads (with schools and housing) are already busy and congested at times.                      Key issues:                      Impact on Garstang town centre – traffic, parking, use of shops/facilities                      Health and Education – provision for school places, access to NHS services,                      Green/blue infrastructure – needs protecting and increasing in these areas.                      Additional services:                      Transport connectivity – no mention anywhere in the Plan to provide for a car – free economy by vastly improving public transport, motor traffic free cycling/walking provision.                      Eco housing – no mention of promotion of low/zero carbon housing/businesses/                      Self build – no provision for lower cost housing through self build.                      Low cost larger housing – for families living and working in rural areas</p>	<p>Cabus                      Garstang                      IO_92                      IO_93                      IO_94                      IO_95                      IO_97                      IO_98                      IO_99                      IO_100                      IO_101                      IO_102</p>
98	<p>Option 1 will exacerbate an already poor transport infrastructure and severe flooding issue. Sites IO_20, IO_21, IO_26, IO_27 and IO_28 will make problems worse and turn the area into a concrete jungle.                      Site IO_01 will make Fleetwood Road North significantly worse, the area is already stressed and congested roads, especially from lorries.                      Key issues:                      Capacity of existing roads, loss of more green areas for locally dependant wildlife with no clear way of resolving them.</p>	<p>IO_20                      IO_21                      IO_26                      IO_27                      IO_28</p>

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	Additional services: Properly planned developments that focus on sustainability. Planning permission with strict conditions could help this.	
100	See response to question 6, ID 103	
102	<p>Strongly opposed to the proposed change of use to areas IO_33 and IO_34.</p> <p>If the land north of Fairfield Road was to be developed there would be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. a massive increase in traffic on Hardhorn Road, Longhouse Lane, Fairfield Road, Highcross Road and surrounding areas, which are already dangerously busy.</li> <li>2. a catastrophic impact on the wildlife on this large expanse of countryside (where there are currently at least 2 nesting buzzards and protected species of newts inhabiting the area.)</li> <li>3. a massive adverse visual impact for hundreds of properties.</li> </ol> <p>Any proposed development on such a large scale would be overbearing and negatively affect the character of the neighbourhood.</p>	IO_33 IO_34
103	<p>Developing Thornton to such a high level as is proposed will put severe pressure on local transport networks, local services and the environment.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Local transport networks – developing land around Lamb’s Hill and Raikes Road will increase the amount of traffic using the B5412 in particular traffic heading out towards the A585 and on towards the motorway.</li> <li>2) Local services – Increased housing in Thornton will increase pressure on schools, doctors and dentists. The Spatial Strategy outlines a will to attract younger families who will rely on these services.</li> <li>3) Local environment – Sites at Lamb’s Hill and Raikes Road will cause the loss of valuable green space and are flood risk areas.</li> </ol> <p>Key issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Improved local transport networks.</li> <li>2) Increased pressure on local services.</li> <li>3) Impacts on the local environment and ecosystems.</li> <li>4) Areas like Fleetwood would be better investing in the local economy rather than housing.</li> </ol>	IO_26 IO_27
106	<p>IO_13, 14, 15, 16, 17 only deal with part of the area near Fleetwood Docks and town centre that had need for planned intervention and development. Scope to do more here than the Local Plan suggests.</p> <p>IO_100 If developed this site would take away the landscape feature that defines Garstang.</p>	Cabus Garstang Catterall Fleetwood



Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>IO_92-99 &amp; IO_110-115: a largely continuous urban extension that will double the size, &amp; more than double the population, of adjacent settlements, add to major traffic problems on the A6, increase car use, destroy attractive countryside and important habitats and wildlife corridors, harm the tourist industry and encourage people to live further from the services, jobs and schools they rely on.</p> <p>IO_106 would completely and adversely change the rural setting of the historic Quaker Meeting House and of Garstang Community Academy. It would add to traffic problems, as would other sites in the area that also threaten to close the gap between settlements.</p> <p>Further development along the A6 corridor will require investment in junction improvement and traffic infrastructure.</p> <p>May require a new bypass to be built to the west of Cabus, Garstang and Catterall or additional junctions on, and link roads to, the M6.</p> <p>Will also require additional car parking in Garstang, and at employment destinations plus a major upgrading to public transport provision. This may include a new WCML station.</p> <p>Adverse changes to the character of Garstang may reduce its attraction for tourists and day visitors, and encourage some current residents to move elsewhere.</p> <p>Realising the potential of parts of the west of Wyre, especially near Fleetwood Docks, will take some development pressure off more rural areas and may give these a much more important role as a key part of a city scale, integrated, Fylde Coast urban conurbation.</p> <p>It is not clear if the proposals require investment in utilities or additional flood protection. There may be need for additional investment in educational, health and emergency services infrastructure.</p> <p>Doubtful that developments will be sustainable. A reliance on volume built estate housing denies occupants the opportunity to specify low impact or energy efficient homes. Gardens are likely to be too small to grow much. More allotments may help, but the lifestyles the plan promotes will be essentially corporate and globalised, car based and remote from the jobs, places and services on which its new residents rely.</p>	<p>IO_92, IO_93, IO_94, IO_95, IO_96, IO_97, IO_98, IO_99, IO_106, IO_110, IO_111, IO_112, IO_113, IO_114, IO_115</p>
112	IO_121, IO_122, IO_123, IO_124 and IO_125 - The parish has no objection in principle to the inclusion of these potential development	IO_121

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>sites.</p> <p>IO_26 – Major access problems and the parish does not consider suitable for development. However the parish has no objection for mix use development.</p> <p>IO_127 and IO_129 – The parish has no objection for medium quality hoses fronting Bilsborrow lane.</p> <p>IO_128 – The parish objects and site should remain an ‘Open Area’.</p> <p>IO_130 – The parish objects, the land is good quality agricultural land.</p> <p>IO_131 – The parish does not object but access from A6 not White Horse Lane. However, the parish does object to part of the site extending on to countryside to the West of Home Lea Farm as land is good agricultural land.</p> <p>IO_132 – The parish objects and land should remain open countryside.</p>	<p>IO_122</p> <p>IO_123</p> <p>IO_124</p> <p>IO_125</p> <p>IO_126</p> <p>IO_127</p> <p>IO_128</p> <p>IO_129</p> <p>IO_130</p> <p>IO_131</p> <p>IO_132</p>
113	<p>Cabus and Garstang</p> <p>Areas IO_92, IO_93, IO_94, IO_95, IO_97, IO_98 and IO_99 will increase Garstang/Cabus/Bonds by an estimated 50% at least. 4 of them are outside the A6 bypass. This is inconsistent with the Strategic Objectives 4, 5, 9 10, 11 and 12.</p> <p>By building on extensive countryside the wellbeing of the current local population will be compromised as our nearby country lanes will become urbanised.</p> <p>Traffic on the A6 and connecting minor roads will increase to unacceptable levels. Traffic levels need to be decreased in order to facilitate health and wellbeing of current and future residents. Wellbeing and highways constraints plus negative impact on rural characteristics.</p> <p>Areas IO_92 and IO_93 –completely unsuitable for new housing and should be removed as proposed sites for development. This is virgin greenfield land with no utilities, the natural environment is an asset which would be significantly damaged by development along Snapewood Lane as this is a popular wellbeing area for the community (which includes riders, walkers/dog walkers, cyclists, young families and older generations. Environmental, wellbeing and community enjoyment constraints.</p> <p>Areas IO_94 – unsuitable for large scale development, would alter the character of Cabus</p> <p>Areas IO_93, IO_95 and IO_96 will impede the view from Cabus – one which looks out onto an AONB, The Forest of Bowland. Sites are unsuitable.</p> <p>Area IO_95, planning on this site has been refused in the past due to poor access onto the A6 and impact on the community enjoyment of Green Lane. Highways and community enjoyment constraints.</p>	<p>Cabus</p> <p>Garstang</p> <p>IO_92,</p> <p>IO_93,</p> <p>IO_94,</p> <p>IO_95,</p> <p>IO_96,</p> <p>IO_97,</p> <p>IO_98,</p> <p>IO_99,</p> <p>IO_100,</p> <p>IO_101,</p> <p>IO_102.</p>

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Area IO_97 – unsuitable for large scale development                      Areas IO_100, IO_101 and IO_102 will alter the rural nature of Bonds, where current roads (with schools and housing) are already busy and congested at times.</p> <p>Key Issues</p> <p>Impact on Garstang town centre – traffic, parking, use of shops/facilities                      Health and Education – provision for school places, access to NHS services, a local 6th form, enlarged library, services for the elderly                      Economy – jobs                      Transport Connectivity – a local train station and transport links                      Green/blue infrastructure – needs protecting and increasing in these areas Environmental - eco-housing, adequate cycle routes and protection of existing green field and natural assets.                      Heritage and history – archaeological potential for discovery along the A6.</p>	
114	<p>Sites IO_26 and IO_27 would need much improved access to the A585.                      Sites IO_32 and IO_33, even minor developments would overload the existing road system. A new link road to Garstang Rd East would be a totally inadequate solution.                      Sites don't comply with the NPPF requirement for sustainable development.                      Rail travel is a key NPPF commuter requirement, but lack of parking at Poulton station, lack of capacity on peak time trains and lack of any safe route to the station other than car mean this requirement cannot be met.                      Key issues:                      Massive improvements required to the road network to connect to the M55.                      Additional services:                      GP surgeries, schools, policing, roads, additional parking in Poulton. Road improvements across Thornton and Poulton.</p>	IO_26 IO_27 IO_32 IO_33
115	<p>Concerns regarding Sites IO_21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_27 and IO_28.                      Traffic issues reaching the M55. School crossing are a safety issue. Not enough school places. Waiting lists to see doctors. Removing greenfields for unwanted housing will spoil Thornton. Too many houses unsold. No NHS dentists available.                      Only good thing development will bring is employment.</p>	IO_21 IO_22 IO_26 IO_27 IO_28

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
116	<p>Site IO_100</p> <p>The protection of Garstang’s visual, historic, and archaeological qualities is in the Planning Policy emerging Local Plan and paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2015 states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.</p> <p>Object for the following reason:</p> <p>Highway safety and Road access</p> <p>Vehicle access is a single track cul de sac with a small stream one side and ancient field boundaries on the other as well as being 5m from a river bridge, leaving cars unsighted.</p> <p>Effect on Listed buildings and conservation area</p> <p>There are 4 Listed buildings/sites down Castle Lane and a scheduled ancient monument.</p> <p>The site is in a ‘countryside area’. The boundary line for settlements follows the line of the river, therefore not including the site. The public footpath across the site is used by many villagers and tourists for recreation and walking dogs, building here would both diminish the striking view over the Bowland fells and historic Greenhalgh Castle and be prominent from most angles within the town.</p> <p>Archaeology</p> <p>Building on Flood Planes</p> <p>Site IO_100 is a flood warning area and covers Wyre Lane (north) and Castle Lane (South). The site is affected by emergency procedures for flood alert, flood warning, and severe flood warning. According to the Environmental Agency flood depths are expected to increase by 0.3m in Garstang. They say, quote, ‘....consideration must be given to the creation of further flood storage (i.e. site IO_100) and the possible setting back of existing flood embankments to increase channel capacity.</p> <p>Greenhalgh Castle is scheduled under the ancient monuments and archaeological areas act 1979 and is of National importance.</p>	IO_100
123	<p>There should be no more planning approvals over the next 18 years for housing within the parish of Forton as the level of approvals in the last two years far exceeds any reasonable increase in the size of the village.</p>	Forton
131	<p>Site IO_100 is used by the local community for recreational purposes. Any development in this location is likely to change the character of this area of Garstang. It will also obscure the view of the Castle from the town. Site IO_134, highway access to this site would be very problematic. Site IO_103 – IO_106 (inclusive), although it is appreciated some development here is inevitable, the proposed development for these sites appear to be out of proportion with the existing settlement.</p> <p>Additional services required:</p> <p>Primary school places, Doctors and Dentists, provision of public transport, open space and recreational facilities.</p> <p>Consideration needs to be given to existing road infrastructure to accommodate substantial increase in traffic volumes and movements.</p> <p>Expansion in Gartsang will impact on Barnacre-with-Bonds, in terms of local services, public transport and traffic volumes.</p>	IO_100 IO_34 IO_103 IO_104 IO_105 IO_106

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
136	<p>IO_102 the area immediately in front of Greenhalgh, (Garstang castle) is a major historical site and should not be developed. There are already houses on Spalding Avenue and, when these were built, restrictions were placed on developing any closer to the castle. The area is prone to flooding and is very close to the canal. Please do not take away our heritage.</p> <p>Key Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on the environment and heritage of our borough.</li> <li>• Ease of access and sustainability – road and rail infrastructure</li> <li>• Provision of essential services – health, education, recreation, shopping, etc.</li> <li>• Maintaining a balance of developed, green and agricultural sites.</li> </ul>	<p>Garstang</p> <p>IO_102</p>
137	<p>IO_132, IO_130, IO_131 – concerns:</p> <p>A6 at capacity. Congestion. Lack of services and facilities in the village e.g. doctor, dentist, shops. Schools full.</p> <p>Sewage and drainage – limited capacity.</p> <p>Existing approvals = 95 properties in a village of 450 is enough. An increase of over 20 per cent.</p>	<p>Barton</p> <p>IO_132, IO_130, IO_131</p>
146	<p>NEW SITE - Promotes a site off Sandy Lane, Preesall previously submitted through a Call for Sites exercise. Recognises may be too small for the plan but wishes the site to be recognised as part of any review of settlement boundaries.</p>	
148	<p>IO 21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28</p> <p>Concerned about the effects more houses would have on:</p> <p>Local road infrastructure - already congested. Roads would have to be improved greatly.</p> <p>GP surgeries, schools and safety of people who already live in the area. The current infrastructure will not sustain new housing.</p> <p>Also issue of flood risk.</p>	<p>Thornton</p> <p>IO 21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28</p>

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
149	<p>IO_22</p> <p>Concerned that an area of land off Bourne Way had been identified as an area for housing development.</p> <p>Already an area off Bourne Way being developed which leaves the surrounding area short of recreational land.</p> <p>When the planning application was passed for the current development should was it not agreed that this other land would be left as a recreational field?</p> <p>It begs the question where are children supposed to play if this field is also developed.</p> <p>Key additional services needed – Schools, GP, Fire Service, local amenities.</p>	<p>Thornton Cleveleys</p> <p>IO_22</p>
150	<p>IO_31, IO_32, IO_33, IO_34</p> <p>Concerned about:</p> <p>Loss of use of the area for recreational walking in the countryside. Loss of long distance views. The provision of a healthy and picturesque walking area is vital to the health of residents.</p> <p>Impact on garden wildlife – close to fields.</p> <p>Loss of views and consequently negative impact on house prices.</p> <p>A586 congestion - do not support development at IO_31 for this reason. Intersection of Hardhorn Road, Highcross Road and Beech Drive is particularly hazardous and congested, too.</p> <p>Question ability of Carr Head CP School to absorb an increased intake.</p> <p>Green belt and green field land should remain as such, and that only those areas which are already built up and offering affordable housing, e.g. Fleetwood and Blackpool should be further developed (and regenerated).</p>	<p>Poulton-le-Fylde Fleetwood</p> <p>IO_31, IO_32, IO_33, IO_34</p>

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
151	<p>General lack of accessibility, strain on local services, lack of employment and green space.</p> <p>IO_21 – earmarked for a cemetery which was the reasons Bourne Way houses could not be built on this site.</p> <p>IO_22 – recreational area and subject to flooding.</p> <p>IO_26 – access problems via Skippool Road.</p> <p>IO_27 – Part subject to a covenant and given to Wyre Council.</p> <p>IO_28 - access problems via Skippool Road.</p> <p>New primary school to service these sites needed. New link road would be needed.</p>	Thornton IO_21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28
152	<p>One site in Forton is a village playing field.</p> <p>Key issues: Access, narrow lanes, lack of amenities, public transport. Would require village school, elderly need accommodation, public transport and shop.</p>	Forton Fleetwood
153	<p>More appropriate development sites in Lancashire than Thornton. 900+ houses in Stanah should not be approved. Parking at school times is a concern. The land around Stanah was granted as public space.</p>	Thornton
154	<p>IO_21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_28 and IO_28</p> <p>Strong concerns on grounds of traffic congestion, pedestrian safety, lack of local employment, strain on infrastructure i.e school and doctors etc. encroaching on open space, impact on wildlife and visitor numbers.</p> <p>Thornton already has problems with flooding and the sites will make it worse.</p> <p>Need to link train services to Thornton, flood control measure and new road system.</p>	Thornton
155	<p>Site IO_84 Includes recreation space which was gifted to the village. The field adj. A6 appears constantly flooded.</p> <p>IO_81, already under development.</p> <p>IO_85, not for sale.</p> <p>IO_82, not for sale.</p> <p>IO_83, not for sale.</p> <p>IO_86, 87 and 88, How many accidents are envisaged at the junction on A6?</p>	Forton

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Key Issues:            IO_86, 87 and 88, a new road junction needed. Improved sewage system. Increased car journeys to school as there is only one. 39 houses already have planning with no improvements to infrastructure. Since planning has commenced, there has been increased noise, dust, traffic, damage to road. The road is not designed for heavy traffic. Potential for casualties from speeding traffic with no Police Presence.</p>	
156	<p>Sites IO_27 and IO28 - Roads already overloaded and in poor state. Last green areas in Thornton. Doctors, dentists and schools are in short supply.</p>	Thornton
157	<p>Small development in villages as the local need affordable housing.            Key issues, schools and hospitals currently not adequate. Need better road links.</p>	
158	<p>Bourne Road development ok due to adequate roads but Lambs Hill site not suitable poor access, narrow and twisted roads.            Key issues, schools, shops and need to leave green space for recreation.            Additional services, affordable housing and jobs.</p>	
161	<p>General lack of accessibility, lack of employment and green space.             Peninsula has limited scope for development even if A585 has significant improvements – likely to be on Fylde land.</p>	
163	<p>IO_21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_28 and IO_28            Strong concerns on grounds of traffic congestion, pedestrian safety, flooding, lack of local employment, strain on infrastructure i.e school and doctors etc. loss of countryside/open space.            Should use PDL instead of green areas, improve conditions of present housing. Development will affect rural nature, views and wildlife in Thronton.            Need to link train services to Thornton, flood control measure and new road system.</p>	Thornton
166	<p>Development sites IO_87 and IO_88 in Scorton are needed.            1) To encourage off street parking            2) Housing to maintain the school and energy in the village.</p>	IO_87 IO_88
168	<p>Issues – traffic chaos – roads before houses.             Unclear where the jobs will come from.             Could be more flooding.</p>	



Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
177	By developing the town with unwanted housing estates you are destroying the very reason people want to be here.	Garstang
178	<p>IO_103, IO_104, IO_105, IO_106 – development for housing will blend Garstang, Bowgreave and Catterall into one large settlement, risking the rural character of each being lost to a sea of identikit housing estates.</p> <p>The development of the large number of sites in Bowgreave and Catterall will significantly increase traffic on the B6430 - very congested at the start and end of the school day.</p> <p>Dimples Lane is narrow, unlit, has many blind bends, no pavement and a tight canal bridge. It is also regularly used by pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders, so it is not well suited to offloading traffic from the B6430 or serving new housing developments.</p> <p>Properties adjacent to site IO_103 are not connected to the main sewer system.</p> <p>The fields comprising sites IO_105 and IO_106 are prone to flooding. Careful consideration should be given to the additional water run-off resulting from paving large areas of these sites.</p> <p>Option 2 will place a significant demand on schools and other services in Garstang.</p>	Garstang Bowgreave Catterall
179	<p>Option 2 causes substantial impact on health, leisure and recreational opportunities of not only Cabus residents but for visitors and tourists to Garstang. Dog walkers, joggers, children, cyclists etc. need to be addressed.</p> <p>The CE (WBC) was quoted in the Courier “the plan is driven by developers”. Option 2 benefits an elite ruling class (politicians, solicitors etc.) which is against the democratic principles. Reports of “minutes lost” and meeting declaration not being declared causes serious concern.</p> <p>Option 2 does not have the capacity for important infrastructure (new roads, hospitals etc.).</p>	Cabus, Gartsang
184	Current approvals in Forton not on plan. Sites IO_85 and IO_84 eliminate good farmland. Difficult to see how small scale retail fits in to Forton and likely to remove long term agricultural employment than it provides. Key issues to be considered; infrastructure, better public transport, preservation of agriculture and related businesses, countryside, environment and village life. Local housing needs. Better financing and more resources to parish council/councillors. More school places.	Forton IO_84 IO_85
185	Bourne Hill site would bring traffic chaos. Lambs site would be a bottleneck and pollution would be a big problem for people living there. Important that buyers are assured River Wyre will not flood as area could be flooded by 2025.	Thronton
187	Proposed development for small scale, retail and employment and housing not suitable in Forton. Site IO_85	Forton IO_81

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Wallace Lane is not suitable (narrow, blind bends etc.) and would become more even more hazardous and more dangerous for pedestrians as no pavement. Site includes working farm up to A6.                      Site IO_84                      Site includes same working farm and includes important recreational facilities used by the village. Owner states site not for sale. Site IO_85 and IO_84 would increase traffic on to A6 which is already busy.                      Sites IO_82 and IO_83                      Sites along a restricted country lane. Owners state sites not for sale.                      Site IO_81                      Already approved for housing and includes parking for 75 cars so already more vehicles in village.                      Site IO_87 and IO_88                      Large sites would increase village and put pressure on school.                      General comments                      Bus service does not enter village. Sewage is an issue and at capacity. Sites would affect roads, school, recreation facilities and farmland. Not good plan for Forton. Site for 12 affordable houses (School Lane) not on plan and is already approved.</p>	IO_82 IO_83 IO_84 IO_85 IO_87 IO_88
189	<p>Sites IO_86, IO_87 and IO_88                      Increased traffic would be a disaster as the lane is already used as a short cut to and from A6 and M6.                      Development should not impact on existing infrastructure. There should be regular speedchecks or sleeping policeman.</p>	Hollins Lane IO_86 IO_87 IO_88
190	<p>Concerns: 1) air pollution, 2) open spaces and 3) Victoria Hospital coping with influx of people.                      Key Issues: Human beings need space.                      Drip feeding housing and facilities will reach breaking point. Start from scratch with new town.</p>	
191	<p>Residents of Churchtown have several concerns; proximity to sewage treatment works, extending beyond village and increased traffic.                      Propose new site at Mill House, Churchtown.</p>	Churchtown
193	<p>Concerns with housing Sites IO_92, IO_93, IO_96 and mixed use sites IO_94, IO_95, IO_97 and IO_98</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Huge increase of traffic on A6.</li> <li>• Need traffic control measures on A6.</li> <li>• Snapewood Lane important for the wellbeing of residents, e.g. for cyclists, dog walkers etc.</li> <li>• These sites will not protect the natural assets.</li> <li>• The sites will compromise tourism and farming and not entice visitors.</li> </ul>	Garstang Cabus IO_92 IO_93 IO_94 IO_95 IO_96

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IO_94 is a natural basin, very prone to flooding and would increase traffic volume on A6.</li> <li>• IO_92 also prone to flooding.</li> <li>• Building should not extend beyond Snapewood Land and Gubberfield Lane. As they provide a natural line north of Garstang.</li> </ul> <p>There isn't the land capacity due to geography and physical features to upgrade infrastructure; rail link, new roads, sewage etc. Market day (Garstang) will not cope with traffic from new housing.</p>	IO_97 IO_98
195	1) No facilities. 2) Extra use on dangerous junction (Hollins Lane/A6). 3) Expensive/infrequent bus service. 4) Sewage system barely coping. 5) New residents will have to commute on already busy A6.	Hollins Lane
196	Application 15/00449/OUT 1) No facilities near development. 2) Sewage system problems and at capacity. 3) Dangerous for children getting to bus stop on A6 and would there be sufficient schools places. 4) Approving application will adversely affect village life.	Hollins Lane
197	See ID 181 for matters/issues raised for question 6	Forton IO_81 IO_82 IO_83 IO_84 IO_85 IO_87 IO_88
198	Sites IO_26, IO_27, IO_28, IO_21 and IO_22 None comply with NPPF requirements for sustainable development, poor connectivity, lack of services, increased flood risk etc. SFRA 2007 stated estuary flood defences are at risk. Despite Travel Plans for Lambs Rd site, use of cars will be preferred due to limitations of rail use. Covenanted land around Stanah School (IO_27) must be protected.	Thornton IO_21 IO_22 IO_26 IO_27 IO_28
199	Sites IO_35 to IO_49 All suffer from lack of infrastructure in place. Key issues – 1) A588 already at capacity particularly Shard bridge, bottleneck at Park Lane junction, severe bend at Hall Gate Lane. Pedestrian access crossing A588. 2) Requirement for increased capacity at schools. 3) Over Wyre is serviced (Police) by Fleetwood and Garstang. 4) Health care provision and response times from ambulance service.	Hambleton Stalmine Preesall Knott End Sites IO_35

**Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES**

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	A588 would need expensive fundamental improvements making these sites less viable. Sites on the peninsula and A6 should be utilised.	to IO_49
202	<p>Object to development in Calder Vale</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Calder Vale is on the edge of the AONB and development would impact on the area.</li> <li>2) Village has substantial amount of affordable housing and housing is not in demand or required.</li> <li>3) Viable infrastructure is not in place to support development (e.g. gas, roads, shop etc.). Cost of providing suitable infrastructure would be out of proportion of any development.</li> <li>4) No public transport infrastructure, an increase in population would lead to unsustainable reliance on cars.</li> <li>5) Community facilities are limited, nothing for aged 14-18.</li> <li>6) Unacceptable impact on wildlife.</li> <li>7) Scale of proposed development will not attract new investment and services.</li> <li>8) Greenbelt would need to be released and green space needs protecting.</li> <li>9) Development is unsustainable.</li> <li>10) Site near centre of village unviable due to access, narrow lane and blind bend.</li> </ol>	Calder Vale
207	<p>Sites IO_26, IO_27 and IO_28                      High flood risk, pedestrian safety issues and poor connectivity.                      Site IO_27                      Given to WBC by local family for use of open space so should remain. Selling will destroy faith in council, councillors and memory of donated family.</p>	Thornton IO_26 IO_27 IO_28
208	All Thornton sites not suitable – flooding, loss of green space and lack of employment. Land near Stanah School was gifted to Thornton so shouldn't be sold or developed.	Thornton
213	See response to Q3. Also, volume of traffic on Hardhorn Rd, Longhouse Lane. Loss of green space and wildlife.	Poulton-le-Fylde
214	<p>Sites IO_42, IO_43, IO_44 and IO_45.                      This development would triple the size of the village. It would turn from a pleasant rural area community with cohesive structure to a huge, sprawling housing/Ind. Est. These areas are currently home to a diverse range of wildlife.                      Carr End Lane and Grange Lane are narrow and ancient. They are used by the community for exercise, promoting health and wellbeing in a quiet, safe area, away from busy traffic.                      Development of these areas and most of Over Wyre would create a huge increase in road traffic and pollution. Unless another crossing over the Wyre was built morning and evening will be gridlocked around associated junctions.</p>	Stalmine IO_42 IO_43 IO_44 IO_45

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Most people don't want to live in Over Wyre as they prefer the countryside to visit but prefer the convenience of being near Poulton for its facilities and transport links.</p> <p>Additional services required would be roads, drainage, schools, nurseries etc. These issues are of upmost importance for new development, particularly if proposed gas storage goes ahead. Increased emergency services are essential. Drainage already a massive problem around Carr End Lane, only recently addressed so building will make matters worse for existing and new properties. House insurance already difficult as many companies already class the Over Wyre, including Stalmine as a flood risk, so will not provide it. Over Wyre will therefore be even less appealing to any potential buyers.</p> <p>Further objections to the above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence this will create work/jobs.</li> <li>• Village is already overbuilt.</li> <li>• Don't want village to become another conurbation with increased levels of crime, noise and pollution.</li> <li>• Do the residents have a say?</li> <li>• Experience from Hambleton (Market Street) shows increased crime and antisocial behaviour.</li> <li>• Pollution – air and light</li> <li>• Local schools and nurseries already oversubscribed.</li> <li>• Proposed development beyond village boundary so should not be permitted.</li> </ul>	
215	See response 198	
216	See response 198	
217	Lapwings nest in the area which are nationally in decline.	
221	<p>Identified Thornton sites do not comply with the NPPF requirement for sustainable development due to: congestion, poor connectivity, road safety, strain on local services, unemployment, loss of green space and flood risk.</p> <p>Flood defences on the estuary are at risk.</p> <p>Rail provision at Poulton station has insufficient parking and passenger capacity. There is also no safe way to access the station other than by car.</p> <p>Covenanted land around Stanah School must remain protected; it was donated to the council to be used as public open space in perpetuity.</p>	Thornton, Poulton, Stanah School ref. IO_27.
222	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Identified Thornton sites do not comply with the NPPF requirement for sustainable development due to: congestion, poor connectivity, road safety, strain on local services, unemployment, loss of green space and flood risk.</li> <li>2) Flood defences on the estuary are at risk.</li> </ol>	Thornton, Poulton,

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>3) Rail provision at Poulton station has insufficient parking and passenger capacity. There is also no safe way to access the station other than by car.</p> <p>4) Covenanted land around Stanah School must remain protected; it was donated to the council to be used as public open space in perpetuity.</p>	IO_27.
223	<p>IO_132, There is no requirement for additional development here. Barton Heath via Preston CC and two other sites would be more suitable for development.</p> <p>IO_130 No safe way to provide junction at the A6 for this site.</p> <p>IO_131 Land owner is not interested in selling</p> <p>Transport issues on A6 would need to be considered.</p> <p>Health care provision will be required, i.e. dentists, doctors etc.</p>	IO_132 IO_130 IO_131
224	No additional comments submitted	
231	<p>Map references difficult to read on screen.</p> <p>Nateby - would swamp the village, doubling its size - there is one road up to the A6, already fast and busy.</p> <p>The Cleveleys/Thornton – has potential for manufacturing and industry (it needs road networks to M55 though)</p> <p>Apart from Great Eccleston, most of the villages are 'dead ends', Pilling, Stalmine, Hambleton, their road infrastructure is poor.</p> <p>Cabus/Garstang - development would be integral within the current town - the A6 is already very busy and services in this area and related areas are in demand, medical, dentists, schools are all under pressure already.</p>	Pilling, Stalmine, Hambleton, Nateby Cleveleys Thornton Cabus Garstang
235	IO_33 – issue of impact on local highway network as a result of a massive increase in traffic and adverse effect on the character of the area.	Poulton-le-Fylde IO_33
242	<p>IO_99, IO_08, IO_98, IO_97, IO_94, IO_92, IO_93, IO_95, IO_96.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development will increase the footprint by 50%.</li> <li>• Roads are already busy. Proposed building will compound the problem, unless the road network is outlined and built first – but will</li> </ul>	Garstang Cabus  IO_99, IO_08,

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>result in more greenfield sites destroyed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient local facilities – medical and educational. Limited car parking.</li> <li>• Proposed development disproportionate to the amount of public spending on facilities, this seems to be spent on the more deprived areas, e.g. Fleetwood, so it makes sense that they should receive the increased housing.</li> <li>• Will destroy rural feel of Garstang and Cabus.</li> </ul> <p>Need - Schools, dentists, doctors, youth facilities, walking routes, cycling paths, a possibility of an underpass to cross the A6 (all disability accessible). All built with sustainability at the forefront.</p>	<p>IO_98, IO_97, IO_94, IO_92, IO_93, IO_95, IO_96.</p>
249	<p>Concerned about the level of further proposed development in Forton - already had a huge increase in the number of planning applications.</p> <p>Already had fair share of development towards the apparent shortage of housing in Wyre.</p> <p>Any further expansion should be limited to starter homes and/or sheltered housing for the elderly - we do not need any more 3 and 4 bed roomed houses.</p> <p>The character of this small rural village is under threat.</p> <p>There are limited amenities in the area - any further expansion is just not sustainable.</p>	Forton
254a	<p>Key issues include: traffic, safety, schools, doctors, loss of green space and recreational space.</p>	IO26,27 and IO21,22
254b	<p>Key issues to be considered: Sustainable infrastructure and services. Schools, doctors, dentists, social care, transport and amenity value. A genuine understanding of what makes a place attractive and not to destroy it with over development.</p> <p>Additional services: School places, capacity of health centres, transport (incl. Rails and road)</p> <p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Garstang will lose character and desirability under development.</li> <li>• Commuter population will increase.</li> </ul>	Castle Lane, Garstang. IO_101 IO_100 IO_102

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>IO-101 – Site is used by school and local groups. How will such a vital amenity be replaced?</p> <p>IO_100 – Site is a flood risk area. Field is permanently flooded over winter. It also offers great views which attract visitors to the area.</p> <p>Access to sites IO_100, IO_101 and IO_102 has not been identified. Castle Lane is a single lane track and bounded on either side by housing making widening impossible. Development relying on this road for access would therefore be hazardous.</p>	
257	Governors at Calder Vale Primary school support all housing development with an emphasis on family homes. As well as affordable housing.	Land at Calder Vale
260	Congestion poses a risk to residents. Need for medical centres, dentists and schools.	
261	<p>Concerns over identified sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- One bus per hour</li> <li>- No cycle track asides roundabouts</li> <li>- Pavement too narrow for pushchair</li> <li>- No trains/trams/light rail</li> <li>- Nearest taxi ranks in Cleveleys or Poulton</li> <li>- Already overloaded road access at peak periods.</li> </ul> <p>Key issues needed addressing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Better footpaths</li> <li>- Cycle tracks throughout</li> <li>- Improved bus services</li> <li>- Nearer taxi ranks</li> <li>- Run trains/trams through Thornton</li> <li>- A+E department within 'urban' Wyre.</li> <li>- Higher education establishments within Wyre (incl. Evening classes).</li> </ul> <p>Additional services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- More shops</li> </ul>	IO_27 IO_28



Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Larger schools</li> <li>- New community hall</li> <li>- More employment</li> <li>- Improved public transport</li> <li>- Academic opportunities within Wyre</li> </ul>	
263	<p>Sites are unsuitable because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No existing public transport</li> <li>- Lack of amenities and employment</li> <li>- Access to A6 would be along Longmoor lane which floods</li> <li>- Junction joining Longmoor Lane with A6 is unsuitable to serve increased traffic</li> <li>- Public right of way runs through IO_78.</li> <li>- Site IO_78 suffers from flooding</li> <li>- IO_78 has a covenant to prevent built development</li> <li>- IO_78 is on Peat Land</li> <li>- Development of sites would be out of character with Village and wider landscape.</li> </ul> <p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- - character of settlement and wider landscape</li> <li>- Highways infrastructure</li> <li>- Service provision</li> <li>- Access to public transport</li> </ul> <p>Additional Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Education, health, public transport and employment must be built alongside housing.</li> </ul>	IO_78, IO_79 Longmoor Lane
264	<p>Concerns over Op. 1. Traffic on Hardham Road, Highcross Road and Garstang Road is gridlocked and therefore unsuitable for additional housing. The few open spaces there are need to be retained for health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Key issues: Infrastructure must be delivered so that development is sustainable (Incl. improvements to highways, schools, doctors, sewers/drains, shops and community facilities)</p>	IO_33

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Most important infrastructure to accommodate development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highway improvements</li> <li>• Schools</li> <li>• Shops</li> <li>• Health centres</li> <li>• Dentists</li> <li>• Community facilities</li> </ul>	
266	<p>Sites are liable to flooding (see housing insurance premiums).                      Churchtown conservation area should be preserved.                      Road infrastructure is unsuitable due to width.                      Old Lancaster Road, Catterall is hazardous due to traffic joining and leaving A6.</p> <p>Key issues to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preservation of greenfield sites</li> <li>• Capacity of roads</li> <li>• Infrastructure and services (incl. GPs, dentists and schools)</li> <li>• Environmental sustainability (increased pollution from traffic and lack of public transport in rural areas)</li> </ul> <p>Additional services and infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public transport, considering the length of time it has taken for the bypass to be built, planners should not rely new roads for their proposals.</li> </ul>	IO_110, IO_109, IO_108, IO_107
268	<p>Additional traffic will impact on noise, pollution, safety, loss of green space, recreational space and increase flood risk.</p>	IO_26, IO_27, IO_28, IO_21, IO_22
269	<p>Purchased bungalow because of view.                      Poulton is becoming too busy without proposed growth (incl. Housing &amp; business)</p>	IO_32, IO_33

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Development will devalue properties and disturb atmosphere of village.</p> <p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation of green spaces for environmental and wildlife value</li> <li>• Impact on traffic, sewerage, flooding and schools.</li> </ul>	
270	<p>Narrow roads don't have capacity for additional traffic.</p>	IO_32, IO_33
271	<p>Op.1 Development along FCP will not work due to highways and transport provision. If M55 link road is built then it will be more feasible.</p> <p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on greenbelt,</li> <li>• Travel infrastructure</li> <li>• Schools</li> <li>• Health services</li> </ul> <p>Any development must include provision for health care, education and roads.</p>	
272	<p>House prices will depreciate. Wildlife will suffer. Small roads don't have capacity.</p> <p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on sewers, transport and loss of greenbelt</li> </ul>	IO_32, IO_33
275	<p>Proposal would destroy agricultural land and disturb wildlife in the area between Woodland Drive and the railway where Lapwings, buzzards and other birds can be found.</p> <p>Station Road, Hard Horn Road and Woodlands drive would not be able to cope with increased traffic.</p>	IO_33, Station Road, Hard Horn Road, Woodlands drive
276	<p>Option will create problems with traffic which planners have not taken into account.</p> <p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased demand on existing services (Incl. Sewerage)</li> </ul>	IO_32, IO_33

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green field sites should not be used as first option.</li> </ul>	
281	<p>Site has no exit road apart from 1 country lane which cannot support heavy traffic.</p> <p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites are in the greenbelt. Council have previously assured against development of these sites.</li> <li>Such a big site will alter Hardhorn village and eradicate wildlife (incl. Birds, beautiful woodland and fishing pond).</li> </ul> <p>Additional services and infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no adequate bus service.</li> <li>The roads around Hardhorn are not suitable for heavy traffic.</li> <li>There are only 2 shops at Highcross and none in Hardhorn, nor clinics or doctor’s surgeries south of Garstang Road.</li> <li>Hardhorn is a beautiful place to live and must not be turned into a concrete jungle.</li> <li>New roads would be needed for the influx of traffic.</li> </ul>	IO_33, IO_34
282	<p>Sites IO_32, &amp; IO_33:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visual impact to existing properties,</li> <li>Character of neighbourhood would be greatly affected,</li> <li>Would lead to increased traffic on all roads which already cannot cope.</li> </ul> <p>Key issues: Roads, Transport, Sewerage, Flooding, protect the environment and local green areas.</p>	IO_32, IO_33
284	<p>In the middle of one site is one of the borough’s 6 scheduled monuments (17<sup>th</sup> Century Dovecote with historic significance). The monument is protected by law unless Historic England is consulted. The dove cote is one of the few remaining in the country and was a rural building which faced open countryside to the West and South to facilitate the doves using the building to breed. If houses are built in these fields it would destroy the setting of the building placing it in an urban environment as opposed to the rural context it sits in today and has for the last 400 years.</p> <p>Recommendation towards ‘The Setting of Heritage Assets. Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning 3’. The setting (open countryside to the south and West) is a key part of the setting. To allow development of this site would, thereon, destroy its key attribute (tranquillity and setting) and the context in which it was used.</p>	IO_63, IO_64, IO_65, Great Eccleston

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Sites IO_63, IO_64, IO_65 should be removed from the sites in the L.P.                      ‘Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the significance, notably scheduled monuments, should be wholly exception.’ – NPPF, para. 132.</p> <p>Fields are currently good quality farmland, home to owls and other protected birds (incl. Thrush). Development would damage habitats. Development of these sites would go against paragraphs 117, 118 and 119 of the NPPF.</p>	
285	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roads in this area are already too busy.</li> <li>• Impact to wildlife on the surrounding countryside.</li> <li>• Visual impact to existing properties.</li> <li>• Whole character of the neighbourhood would be negatively affected.</li> </ul> <p>Key issues:                      Roads, transport, sewerage, flooding, environmental pollution.</p>	IO_32, IO_33
286	<p>IO_92, IO_93, Completely unacceptable for development: greenfield areas with no utility connections.</p> <p>IO_94, IO_97, Completely unacceptable for development: too large, greenfield areas, no utility connections.</p> <p>IO_96, Completely unacceptable for development: access problems.</p> <p>IO_95, The only possible option: would require a reduction in size in Cabus.</p> <p>IO_100, Unacceptable: flood plain /views lost from Garstang/Greenhalgh castle historic site/ green fields.</p> <p>IO_102 Unacceptable: Greenhalgh castle historic site/green fields.</p> <p>IO_80, IO_91, IO_89, IO_90                      These are compact rural villages whose character must be retained. They would benefit from small [pockets of affordable homes to help local families. Mass increase of houses, retail etc is completely over the top.                      Areas identified are too large in scale.</p>	IO_92, IO_93, IO_94, IO_97, IO_96, IO_95, IO_100, IO_102, IO_80, IO_91, IO_89, IO_90

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	Utility infrastructure is vital.	
288	Key issues: Green areas, protecting environment and impact on roads.	IO_33
290	<p>IO_22 should not be used for development – could be used as an urban park. .</p> <p>Suggest half of IO_22 housing and all of 10.21 open space but the latter is already being built on.</p> <p>IO_27 – Part bequeathed to the Council for open space.</p> <p>Oppose development here on three grounds:</p> <p>a. The older local plans saw this land as important as a wildlife corridor related to the estuary and a major international salt march wetland. This has not changed; in fact the value of wildlife is greater than in past years with the reduction on many common birds.</p> <p>b. Countryside has almost all disappeared this side of the river and constitutes one of the characteristics of Thornton that makes it a good place to live.</p> <p>c. If you allow development along only one side of Underbank and Raikes Road it will be only a matter of time before the pressure mounts from developers to develop the other side of these roads.</p> <p>Key issues - a well thought out planning brief for each site to set out the parameters for development to guide the overall vision of how you see a site being developed: where is access to be taken, what open space must be provided, or a contribution to a greater area of open space elsewhere/ contributions to road network and other necessary planning matters (e.g. respect for conservation areas and other special sites of interest).</p> <p>A proactive planning system that has the interests of the community at its heart.</p> <p>Additional services/facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A585 improvements (if possible)</li> <li>• Rail network</li> </ul>	IO_21, IO_22

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open space and a strategy for parks and for tree planting</li> <li>• Preserving the Green belt where it is fulfilling its role as separating and retaining the integrity of different settlements</li> </ul>	
296	<p>Listed site concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of character of Poulton le Fylde</li> <li>• Congestion</li> <li>• Sprawl</li> </ul> <p>IO_31:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- concerns over parking provision and congestion,</li> <li>- Congestion on existing roads,</li> <li>- Loss of greenfield land</li> </ul> <p>Aside: Police action should be taken against loss of historic trees on 11<sup>th</sup> July 2015.</p> <p>Until more employment is provided towns to the west will continue to be dormitories. This cannot be a justification for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• expanding housing land</li> <li>• loss of greenfield sites</li> </ul> <p>Fleetwood should receive investment; housing and additional employment would improve the quality of life.</p> <p>Document does not show research to support proposal for 10,000 new homes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why are they needed?</li> <li>• How will they be integrated?</li> <li>• Why Wyre is providing housing for neighbouring towns and cities?</li> </ul> <p>The need for infrastructure provision to accommodate new residents has not been addressed.</p> <p>If homes are truly needed, priority should go toward expanding Garstang corridor and providing cheaper homes in rural areas.</p>	IO_19, IO_31, IO_32, IO_33, IO_34
297	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covenanted land around Stanah School must remain protected; it was donated to the council to be used as public open space in perpetuity.</li> </ul>	Stanah School

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Neighbouring roads and narrow and dangerous for cyclists and horse riders.</li> </ul> <p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking provision for new homes,</li> <li>• road provision for vehicles and</li> <li>• Fumes.</li> </ul> <p>Additional services: Schools, GPs and Open spaces</p> <p>Option – 1 will be detrimental to residents, traffic and greenfield sites.</p>	
301	<p>Poulton’s roots are in agriculture and must retain the agricultural land use.</p> <p>The area has already seen a large housing development at the bottom of Hardhorn Road and more housing would change the character which at the moment is nearer to being a rural location than an urban development.</p> <p>Valuable, sustainable arable land would be lost. The area is prone to flooding and development would add to the surface water and exacerbate the problem.</p> <p>Increased Traffic would lead to more congestion and carbon emissions.</p> <p>An unfair and adverse burden of change would fall on residents of Woodland Drive would face a double whammy of losing a magnificent view and their property reduce in value.</p> <p>Schools in the area are already over-subscribed.</p> <p>Key issues: Impact of development on local community. If it negatively impacts or irrevocably changes the nature of the area then it should not happen. How does the development complement/conflict with other issues e.g. biodiversity, conservation etc.</p>	IO_32, IO_33



Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Infrastructure: Water and sewage pipes, road, gas and electric supplies. Possible school expansion enhanced medical provision. They are all equally important.</p>	
303	<p>Development on these greenfield sites will lead to massive congestion and burden on the A6. The impact on the most historic and beautiful areas of Garstang would be devastating for locals and visitors. There is no practical access and much of the areas is classed as flood protection and was levelled by the council to ensure emergency drainage. The sewerage and other services are at capacity. The local primary school already has problems with Bonds Lane traffic which will be increased with the new estate off Byerworth Lane North.</p> <p>Additional Service: Health and wellbeing of the inhabitants. Focus should be given to improving local services (incl. Doctors, community care, transport, libraries, sports facilities, public parks, local shops) all of which do not match the local population numbers.</p>	IO_100, IO_101, IO_102, IO_103
304	<p>Key issues: traffic, doctors, schools, roads and safety.</p> <p>Additional services needed to support new development: new roads, schools, doctors, hospital and shops.</p>	IO_26, IO_27, IO_28, IO_21, IO_22
305	<p>Key issues to be identified: Proper thought and investment in infrastructure</p>	
306	<p>Far too much over development planned.</p> <p>Key issues with sites: None should be brought forward unless brownfield.</p> <p>Services and facilities to accommodate development: Roads, public transport, health, schools, etc.</p>	
307	<p>Concerns:</p>	IO_26,

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Traffic, loss of greenspace, recreational space, flood risk. Schools and doctors' surgeries are overfull.</p> <p>Lambs Road and Skipool Road are already struggling to cope with existing traffic.</p>	<p>IO_27, IO_28</p>
309	<p>Concerns:</p> <p>Traffic, loss of greenspace, recreational space, flood risk. Schools and doctors' surgeries are overfull.</p> <p>Lambs Road and Skipool Road are already struggling to cope with existing traffic.</p>	<p>IO_26, IO_27, IO_28</p>
310	<p>There will be a significant increase in traffic noise and pollution, major safety concerns, a loss of green space, recreational space and greater risk of flooding etc.</p>	<p>IO_26, IO_27, IO_28, IO_21, IO_22</p>
311	<p>Development of many houses on IO_33 would affect wildlife.</p> <p>Key issues:</p> <p>Possibilities of flood risk with underground dykes being built on.</p> <p>Additional services:</p> <p>Insufficient schools places, doctors' surgeries and public transport.</p>	<p>IO_33</p>
312	<p>Development in these areas would have a massive impact on wildlife which lives in the area. It would have an adverse visual impact for hundreds of properties. A large development would have a negative effect on the character of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Key issues:</p> <p>The houses being built would mostly be unaffordable. Building any development could cause a flood risk.</p> <p>Public transport is very poor around this area of Poulton.</p> <p>The traffic around Hardhorn Road, Longhouse Lane, and Highcross Road is very busy now and does not need to be massively increased by further development.</p> <p>Blackpool Victoria hospital is already extremely busy with long waiting times and well as GP's surgeries.</p> <p>Public transport is inadequate around this area of Hardhorn.</p> <p>Local schools are overcrowded.</p>	<p>IO_32, IO_33, IO_34, Hardhorn Road, Longhouse Lane, Highcross Road</p>

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
313	<p>Forton cannot support any more planning approvals. Additional housing will mean that school will need to expand. It is important that village children attend village schools. It is where community spirit begins.</p> <p>Key Issues –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roads in Forton include centuries of narrow winding lanes with dangerous junctions and are unsuitable for additional traffic.</li> <li>• Old lanes must be preserved, they are an asset to village life.</li> </ul> <p>Services and Facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sewerage system is already full to capacity,</li> <li>• Few amenities</li> <li>• Public transport is limited to A6</li> </ul>	Forton
315	<p>Key Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is this development needed?</li> <li>• By whom?</li> <li>• Too many green field sites are identified which are “easy meat” for developers.</li> </ul> <p>Additional services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public transport – much more is needed.</li> </ul>	
323	<p>Concerned about the development areas identified as IO_89, IO_90 &amp; IO_91.</p> <p>Plans will destroy the very essence of the village. Beautiful &amp; peaceful place to visit - would be destroyed forever. Roads could not cope with the amount of traffic that would be generated by such a scheme on such a scale.</p> <p>Issues - road traffic and associated noise, internal roads could not cope with extra traffic, destruction of the village - impact on tourism, insufficient educational capacity.</p>	Scorton IO_89, IO_90, IO_91
329	<p>IO_102 issues -</p> <p>Close proximity to Greenhalgh castle, a scheduled ancient monument and tourist attraction. Building houses so close to this monument will have a major and negative impact on the appeal of the castle as a local heritage feature, and will reduce its appeal to tourists. It will also destroy some of the important landscape context of the castle.</p>	Garstang IO_100 IO_101 IO_102

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>This site, and the adjacent proposed development site sit on the edge of the flood defence zone. At times the field just below the castle becomes completely flooded. Building on the adjacent fields - negative impact on land drainage, and increase the risk of flooding.</p> <p>The site can become very wet, and the drainage from this site, and down Castle Lane, can sometimes fail to cope with heavy rain.</p> <p>Access to the site is very poor, and the local infrastrucure could not cope with increased traffic flow, neither down Castle Lane, or through Pasture Drive, where existing housing restricts road width.</p> <p>The sale of community amenity land, adjacent to the site, without reasonable notice to local residents also brings into question the inclusion of this site in the planning proposal. The plot was sold at auction to the land owner of the site in question. The council failed to adopt the land from the developer, and various relationships between certain individuals around this purchase appear suspect. The land owner purchased the plot to allow access to the site should a development opportunity present itself - amazing vision! <u>DISCUSS</u></p> <p>IO_100 and IO_101 - Concern on the impact of flood risk, due to proximity of flood defence zone and river. Poor access. Increased traffic flow past primary school. Similar impact on Greenhalgh castle as listed above, but with a little less impact.</p>	
337	Traffic congestion, council already know this but nothing is done, except make it worse.	
340	<p>IO_84, IO_85</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agricultural land, greenbelt.</li> <li>• Errors in drawing as this encapsulates the playing field and bowling green already in existence in the village.</li> <li>• Entrance to the village – development would erode the rural nature of the village.</li> <li>• Dangerous A6 access - unsafe for the school children getting to the buses which are the only way to access secondary schools.</li> <li>• Will negatively affect the quality of life for residents by increased noise, traffic, movement, light and disturbance.</li> </ul> <p>IO_81 - already has planning permission and build is already underway.            IO_88 - already has outline planning permission.            IO_86 - planning application submitted and high levels of objections for many reasons including sewerage, safety, amenities and transport issues.</p>	<p>Forton</p> <p>IO_81,            IO_82,            IO_83,            IO_84,            IO_85,            IO_86,            IO_87,            IO_88</p>

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>IO_87 - would be as above - issues with sewerage, safety, amenities and transport issues.                      IO_82, IO_83 - would question need in view of permissions granted over the last 12 months.                      Planning permission for 12 houses opposite IO_81 not showing on plan, nor is the conversion for 12 care home spaces on Wallace Lane plus the other single plots approved.</p> <p>Key issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant increase in planning approvals – issue of whether or not it is realistic for a rural hamlet to support further developments.</li> <li>• Roads are narrow, mainly single track, with highway junctions that are already dangerous.</li> <li>• Pressure on the existing school - lack of space for local children and secondary schools are all over 5 miles away requiring transport for all journeys.</li> <li>• Sewerage issues exist on both side of the A6 for Forton - Hollins Lane already declared at capacity by United Utilities and south of the A6 the level of developments already underway or agreed have not yet tested drains that we already witness overflowing on School Lane.</li> <li>• Limited amenities within the village.</li> <li>• Availability of public transport - more development would lead to more cars, increased pressure on the A6 and negative impact on the environment and carbon footprint.</li> <li>• The village could be enhanced over the future by some single and infill development approvals not large scale developments.</li> <li>• All the developments already approved need to be monitored to establish take up and from that then measure if there is really a requirements/additional need.</li> <li>• Wyre should not look at its boundary villages in isolation but consider what the neighbouring boroughs are developing - and for the Forton area this is Galgate and Lancaster which are currently undergoing significant developments which align better to the employment opportunities within their localities.</li> </ul>	
353	<p>Concerns</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Massive increase to traffic on a choc a block road. Getting through Poulton and the A585 at peak times is a nightmare.</li> <li>2) Wildlife:                         <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Lapwings use the field behind woodland drive over winter. They are critically endangered (see RSPB site).</li> <li>b) Owl numbers are dropping (24% 1995-2008).</li> <li>c) Mistle Thrush 50% lost in the last 10 years.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	IO_32, IO_31, IO_33

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>d) There is a family of deer on the site of Woodland Drive. What else will become endangered through proposed development?</p> <p>3) Avoid green field sites:</p> <p>a) There is a visual impact. If I cannot see the fields I would be heartbroken.</p> <p>4) Stretched medical facilities in Poulton and Blackpool.</p>	
354	<p>IO_33</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not clear what is being proposed, i.e. proportion of industrial/residential/retail etc.</li> <li>• It is a very large area and its development would significantly and negatively impact the character of the existing neighbourhood.</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife in the designated area would be devastating. There are at least 2 pairs of nesting buzzards, protected species of newts and a family of deer inhabiting the area.</li> </ul> <p>Lack of publicity for plan. Residents of Woodland drive, which would be directly affected by development of IO_33, did not hear about consultation or proposals until after consultation period. Lack of publicity over consultation has promoted suspicion and mistrust.</p>	
355	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Size of South Poulton site at Hardhorn is a recipe for disaster on many fronts.</li> <li>• Hambleton and surrounding areas could provide some additional sites.</li> <li>• The additional traffic must be considered.</li> </ul> <p>Key issues: The A6 is a prime underused asset.</p>	Hardhorn, Poulton. Hambleton
358	<p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of local nature,</li> <li>• Excessive traffic.</li> </ul>	
359	<p>Site is to rear of house. The wildlife and view make up a big part of my life.</p> <p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of nature,</li> <li>• Hospitals are over-subscribed,</li> <li>• Loss of greenbelt,</li> <li>• Excessive traffic,</li> <li>• There's plenty of brownfield land available,</li> <li>• Lack of employment in the area.</li> </ul>	IO_33

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	Insufficient roads in Poulton to deal with additional residents, all back and side roads are desperate for repair.	
362	<p>NEW SITE: Bilsborrow playing field should be considered. The field is behind the council estate and currently underused by the local population. The parish council runs the field at a big loss. If an alternative facility were found (e.g. Myerscough college) then it should be developed for affordable social housing with little obvious visual impact for most residents.</p> <p>Key issues: Any development should be sympathetic, sustainable and in keeping with each particular site and its surroundings. Highways/access will be strongly considered for each site.</p> <p>Additional services: Infrastructure provision should be considered on a wider basis. Infrastructure provision is reactive but must not curtail future housing and commercial provision.</p>	Bilsborrow playing field behind Sycamore Rd
363	<p>Development should be focused around Garstang in order for investment and development to come to fruition. Elongating development along the A6 will not concentrate investment on an area, the community will not benefit and sites will be unsustainable.</p> <p>Supported sites: IO_100, IO_101, IO_103</p> <p>Supported employment sites: IO_05, IO_06</p> <p>Most suitable residential sites: IO_112, IO_118, IO_117, IO_116 Sites are capable of being accessed safely. Sites will focus growth centrally supporting town centres.</p> <p>Inappropriately scaled sites: IO_113, IO_115, IO_114, IO_110, IO_119, IO_120</p>	Garstang, Cloughton, Catterall, Bilsborrow, Barton, IO_100, IO_101, IO_103, IO_05, IO_06, IO_112, IO_118, IO_117, IO_116, IO_113, IO_115,

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Sites are out of proportion to Catterall and unsustainable. Gaining access to the A6 from these sites will be dangerous regardless of future improvements.</p> <p>Development of Bilsborrow and Barton should be proportional and focused around the centre to avoid sprawling housing estates along A6.</p> <p>Prior to development within the rural East (incl. Garstang, Catterall and Claughton) services and infrastructure MUST be put in place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Healthcare facilities,</li> <li>• Educational provision,</li> <li>• Highways capacity</li> </ul>	<p>IO_114, IO_110, IO_119, IO_120</p>
364	<p>Blue sites require a more detailed appraisal of economic possibilities. IO-100 has serious access issues and is subject to flooding. United utilities use the site to store flood water.</p> <p>View of Bowland Fells from Wyre Bridge is one of Wyre’s most attractive features and should be preserved.</p> <p>Site IO_101 and IO_102: Any further traffic along single track Castle Lane will lead to unmanageable traffic problems.</p> <p>Additional services and facilities would be provided to ensure that development on these sites does not have an unacceptable impact on existing infrastructure.</p>	<p>IO_100, IO_101, IO_102, IO_94, IO_99 Castle Lane</p>
365	<p>Listed sites cannot comply with NPPF requirement for sustainable development due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of local employment,</li> <li>• Traffic congestion,</li> <li>• Road safety issues,</li> <li>• Schools and bus services,</li> <li>• Poor connectivity,</li> <li>• Loss of green space, and</li> <li>• Flood risk.</li> </ul>	<p>IO_26, IO_27, IO_28, IO_21, IO_22</p>



Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>No additional services would make up for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of greenbelt,</li> <li>• Impact of increased traffic (incl. Congestion, green house gasses, road safety),</li> <li>• Increased flood risk due to location.</li> </ul>	
377	<p>Thornton sites identified cannot comply with the NPPF requirement for sustainable development on account of: Traffic congestion, poor connectivity road safety issues (people, animals and vehicles), strain on local services, lack of local employment, loss of green spaces, increased flood risk (According to the Wyre Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) of 2007 some of the Flood Defences on estuary are at risk).</p> <p>Rail travel is a key commuter requirement but lack of parking at Poulton Station, lack of capacity on peak time trains and lack of any safe route to get there other than by car.</p> <p>There is an area of land around Stanah school included with site reference IO_27 that has protective covenants on it which should prevent development. This area of land must be protected as it was given to the council that preceded WC by a local family for use as public open space in perpetuity. If it is sold for development it will be a very serious breach of faith by WC.</p> <p>Vehicular access to sites IO_26, IO_27 and IO_28 would have a severe impact upon highway congestion and safety contrary to NPPF para 32.</p> <p>HV power cables pass across the centre of IO_26 and close to IO_27. Regular and frequent occupation below these cables is not acceptable, as stated in Wyre’s refusal of Application 14/00845</p> <p>IO_26 is partly in category 3 (high) flood risk area, along part of Underbank Rd, and on the edge along Stanah Rd. Wyre should not be promoting development in or adjacent to flood risk areas.</p> <p>Development on the Thornton sites will have an unacceptable impact on the area - too little space, green land/countryside.</p>	Thornton Poulton-le- Fylde IO_26, IO_27, IO_28
386	<p>IO_48, IO_49, IO_50:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hambleton’s status as a rural location will disappear</li> <li>• Addition traffic will worsen existing problems</li> </ul>	Hambleton  IO_48, IO_49,

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>IO_49: Derelict land but must retain its rural agricultural use.                      IO_48: must also be retained for agriculture                      IO_50: part of continuous countryside and would have no connection to established settlement of Hambleton.</p> <p>Land formerly occupied by the catholic church, in the centre of Hambleton, hasn't been explored for development.</p> <p>Key issues:                      IO_49 needs to be overhauled but is abstract from established settlement. Village must retain buffer zone.                      Bull Park Lane and Grange Road must be retained as agricultural land.</p> <p>Carr Lane:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dangerous road (Britain's 10<sup>th</sup> most hazardous)</li> <li>• Additional housing will add to the problem.</li> <li>• Ignol Lane, Market Street and Church Lane cannot cope with current level of traffic.</li> <li>• Over Wyre is being damaged by new housing and associates traffic.</li> <li>• Developing away from centres of employment places more of a burden elsewhere and become commuter settlements.</li> <li>• It is vital that the rural feel and greenery is preserved.</li> </ul>	IO_50
390	<p>Thornton sites identified cannot comply with the NPPF requirement for sustainable development on account of: Traffic congestion, poor connectivity                      road safety issues (people, animals and vehicles), strain on local services, lack of local employment,                      loss of green spaces, increased flood risk (According to the Wyre Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) of 2007 some of the Flood Defences on estuary are at risk).</p> <p>Rail travel is a key commuter requirement but lack of parking at Poulton Station, lack of capacity on peak time trains and lack of any safe route to get there other than by car.</p> <p>There is an area of land around Stanah school included with site reference IO_27 that has protective covenants on it which should prevent development. This area of land must be protected as it was given to the council that preceded WC by a local family for use as</p>	Thornton Poulton-le-Fylde IO_26, IO_27, IO_28

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>public open space in perpetuity. If it is sold for development it will be a very serious breach of faith by WC.</p> <p>Vehicular access to sites IO_26, IO_27 and IO_28 would have a severe impact upon highway congestion and safety contrary to NPPF para 32.</p> <p>HV power cables pass across the centre of IO_26 and close to IO_27. Regular and frequent occupation below these cables is not acceptable, as stated in Wyre’s refusal of Application 14/00845</p> <p>IO_26 is partly in category 3 (high) flood risk area, along part of Underbank Rd, and on the edge along Stanah Rd. Wyre should not be promoting development in or adjacent to flood risk areas.</p> <p>Development on the Thornton sites will have an unacceptable impact on the area - too little space, green land/countryside.</p>	
395	<p>IO_81, IO_82, IO_83, IO_84, IO_85, IO_86, IO_87, IO_88</p> <p>Forton has already seen a massive rise in housing provision beyond what is economically sustainable.</p> <p>Insufficient provision for water, sewerage, medical facilities, transport, jobs and amenities.</p> <p>Inappropriate local highway network - small and windy, country roads that cannot sustain a considerable increase in traffic which would be inevitable.</p>	<p>Forton Hollins Lane</p> <p>IO_81, IO_82, IO_83, IO_84, IO_85, IO_86, IO_87, IO_88</p>
398	<p>Objections:</p> <p>IO_101/102 – prone to flooding, wild bird habitats, hedgehog area, wild newt and bat population will be threatened. Access is poor. Proximity to small school. Increased road safety issues at Castle/Bonds Lane junction.</p> <p>IO_101 – include school playing fields and should be protected.</p> <p>IO_100/102 – Historic significance should be protected. Numerous listed buildings should be preserved and enhance, not built on.</p>	<p>IO_100, IO_101, IO_102</p>

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Key issues: Amenity value, cultural significance and wellbeing (views) should be given more weight.</p> <p>Services: Roads, doctors, schools and local views should have a significant voice.</p>	
407	<p>Any sites of the FCP will cause concern.</p> <p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport infrastructure is unable to cope and will suffer more with proposed development.</li> <li>• Limited remaining greenbelt and open space on FCP. Further development would reduce standard of living.</li> </ul> <p>Additional services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• road link to M55,</li> <li>• rail link to Fleetwood</li> <li>• only develop on brown field sites</li> <li>• leave greenbelt farmland alone</li> </ul>	Fylde Coast Peninsula
408	<p>Greenbelt should be preserved. Walking, cycling, views and nature are a major attraction.</p> <p>Key Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessibility,</li> <li>• Leisure,</li> <li>• Species,</li> <li>• Quality of life</li> <li>• Habitats</li> </ul> <p>Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road link to M55,</li> <li>• Rail link to Fleetwood</li> </ul>	Fleetwood, M55
409	Sites (IO_83, IO_84, IO_85, IO_86, IO_87) should not be developed since they could double the size of Forton and Hollins Lane.	IO_83,

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Key Issues: Social fabric cannot cope with rate of planning approvals. Primary schools will reach capacity.</p> <p>Additional services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doctors surgeries for Garstang,</li> <li>• Primary school places,</li> <li>• Improvements to junctions on the A6.</li> </ul>	<p>IO_84, IO_85, IO_86, IO_87 Garstang</p>
410	<p>IO_32, IO_33</p> <p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wildlife is good in the area,</li> <li>• High water table and flooding.</li> </ul>	<p>IO_32, IO_33</p>
413	<p>Option 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Infrastructure would have to be improved (incl. roads, education, medical and transport facilities)</li> <li>- Investigation with Fylde borough council into planned development of land adjoining Station Road and Fairfield Road.</li> </ul>	<p>Land Adjoining station Road and Fairfield Road</p>
417	<p>Listed sites cannot comply with NPPF requirement for sustainable development due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of local employment,</li> <li>• Traffic congestion,</li> <li>• Road safety issues,</li> <li>• Schools and bus services</li> <li>• Poor connectivity,</li> <li>• Loss of green space, and</li> <li>• Flood risk.</li> </ul> <p>No additional services will make up for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of greenbelt,</li> </ul>	<p>IO_26, IO_27, IO_28, IO_21, IO_22</p>

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact of increased traffic (incl. Congestion, green house gasses, road safety),</li> <li>• Increased flood risk due to location.</li> </ul>	
418	Overcrowded in Poulton. Not enough doctors, dentists and schools.	
421	<p>Strongly opposed to Option 1 and loss of land at IO_33:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development on Land north of Fairfield would give rise to bad traffic (incl. Hardhorn Road, Fairfield Road, Highcross Road and Longhouse Lane),</li> <li>• Loss of the area's countryside,</li> <li>• Impact upon endangered wildlife and migrating species,</li> <li>• Loss of area's award-winning reputation,</li> <li>• Maintaining balance between housing needs and the surrounding environment,</li> <li>• Infrastructure provisions,</li> <li>• Creation of dormitory towns.</li> </ul>	IO_33
422	How will proposed housing benefit local people?	
423	<p>Strong objections to sites: IO_26, 27, 28 &amp; IO_21, 22</p> <p>Thornton Lambs Hill &amp; Raikes Rd (IO_26, 27, 28):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area provides recreation for the public and provides essential habitats for wildlife.</li> <li>• Beauty should be preserved for future generations.</li> <li>• The infrastructure is inadequate. More traffic would lead to higher health risks.</li> <li>• Poor schools would need to be addressed.</li> <li>• Construction over the estuary area will give rise to greater flooding.</li> </ul> <p>Bourneway (IO_21, 22):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of infrastructure and schools,</li> <li>• Loss of open green space.</li> </ul> <p>Main concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• loss of open green space,</li> <li>• overcrowding on the peninsula,</li> </ul>	IO_26, IO_27, IO_28, IO_21, IO_22

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Worries that the new housing will make the congestion worse.</li> </ul>	
424	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The small village site is inadequately prepared for flooding and suffers without the excess stress from new development.</li> <li>• New roads and drainage systems would have to accommodate the proposed changes.</li> </ul>	IO_33
426	<p>Concerns over the over congestion along Hardhorn Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of public transport increases car usage, congestion and pollution.</li> </ul> <p>With so much green space being taken up by construction, there's concern over how little parks have been mentioned in the plan.</p> <p>Option 1 would be detrimental to the character of the area.</p> <p>Traffic issues within Poulton have to be addressed. Merely diverting the traffic will not alleviate the problem.</p> <p>Access to main roads and better public transport would be desirable.</p>	IO_32, IO_33, IO_34
427	<p>Massive impact on current population and lack of consideration of wildlife.</p> <p>Are has poor road infrastructure and is unsuitable for HGVs</p> <p>Schools, fire and police service would all need enhancing.</p>	Site IO_33
431	<p>Unhappy about allocating sites IO_33 and IO_34. Concerned about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overlooking by other houses or industrial uses</li> <li>• Loss of views</li> <li>• Devalued properties</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitats</li> <li>• Should not become an industrial estate</li> </ul>	
435	<p>Any development in Scorton should be severely limited. Scorton has already been the subject of excessive development over the years. The most recent developments on the Mill Yard and Priory Gardens have already changed the character of the old Mill Village. While some affordable social housing restricted to those with a genuine tie to the village would be acceptable more executive housing will only increase the commuting load.</p> <p>Gubberford Lane, the main access route into the village, is a key cycle route being part of the National Cycle network Route 6. However cycling along it is already quite stressful due to the amount of motor traffic, much of it impatient and overtaking in unsuitable places.</p>	Bowgreave Garstang Cabus Catterall Scorton  IO_13

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>General issue of narrow lanes, some without footpaths, that are difficult to negotiate by pedestrians.</p> <p>IO_89 - this field adjacent to the motorway is not a good site for housing but it is probably the least bad of the three sites in the plan. Reasonable to allow a small number of affordable homes on part of this site close to the former council houses. However development should not be allowed beyond the present 30 mph limit.</p> <p>IO_90 – partly formed by the old mill pond. Unregulated tipping make this a very unsatisfactory site. Any housing here would be expensive to construct and would be unlikely to support affordable housing.</p> <p>IO_91 - this site is totally unsuitable for development. It is in a level 3 flood risk area that has been flooded a number of times (see submission for details of flooding events.) Any development there with flood protection will increase the flood risk for the houses on Gubberford Lane and probably back on Brook Avenue.</p> <p>Cabus, Garstang and Catterall - concerned to see large areas to the west of the A6 proposed for development.</p> <p>Development west of the A6 will result in lots more people driving from those developments into Garstang to access services as few will walk or cycle from the other side of the bypass. This crossing traffic will add to the delays and congestion on the A6. Of particular concern is traffic from the proposed sites at Nateby and site IO_99 which will cross or access the A6 at the Longmoor Lane junction which is already a dangerous and difficult junction.</p> <p>Sites IO_92, IO_93, and IO_94 seem to be a totally unreasonable extension of Garstang to the north.</p> <p>No great objection to the proposed sites around Bowgreave other than the fact that they will inevitably add to the unsustainable private car commuting however they should not be allowed without major improvements to the footway along Garstang Road (B6430).</p> <p>In Catterall the sites to the west of the A6 should not be allowed. The sites abutting the A6 on the east side should be subject to a continuous footway along the east side of the A6 from the Churchtown Junction to the B6430 Junction.</p> <p>Sites IO_13 and IO_15 should be subject to a new better junction for the B6430 to join the A6.</p>	<p>IO_15 IO_89 IO_92 IO_93 IO_94 IO_99</p>



Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
441	All sites on FCP have difficulties due to the historic failure to address the transport problems. Failure to address will drive residents and businesses away from the area.	
443	<p>IO_100, IO_101, IO_102</p> <p>These developments are on green fields and would obscure the local landmark of Greenhalgh Castle which is an important tourist attraction for Garstang. Additionally they feed onto Castle Lane which is already a significant traffic hazard as it exits onto Bonds Lane by the bridge due to obscured traffic coming over the bridge. At SS Mary &amp; Michaels school-times it is even more hazardous, particularly to children due to increased traffic.</p> <p>IO_103, IO_105, IO_106</p> <p>Again these are on green fields and also the current Dimples Lane is very very narrow and not of good repair to sustain significant vehicular traffic and no room for footpaths let alone construction traffic.</p> <p>Need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prove that all brownfield sites have been considered first.</li> <li>• Provide details of how the transport networks will be enhanced to absorb extra traffic.</li> <li>• Prove how new starter and elderly homes will be built in sufficient number by developers rather than more and more 5 bed palaces that no-one can afford, no-one wants and only benefits the developers.</li> </ul> <p>Need - A new M6 junction near Garstang, a new rail station near Garstang, road widening at Dimples Lane and footpaths. Repair the existing B Roads.</p>	<p>IO_100, IO_101, IO_102 IO_103, IO_105, IO_106</p>
449	<p>Forton has already seen a large number of planning approvals and a substantial development is currently underway effectively increasing the size of the village by around 15 – 20%; the village cannot continue growing and remain a village. The basic infrastructure of the village does not have the capacity for more housing.</p> <p>The village school is already attended to near capacity and further development would risk Forton children being unable to access their local school.</p>	Forton

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Local amenities are already limited e.g. village shops, post office, doctor’s surgeries.</p> <p>Understand that the sewerage/drainage system is near full capacity and was unable to handle surface water during heavy rain.</p> <p>The roads are already in a poor condition with numerous potholes. Wyre’s current policy of limited patching is akin to putting a sticking plaster on a major wound and is not effective.</p>	
451	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The places identified on the map are mainly owned by people who have NOT offered up their land.</li> <li>• IO_84 includes the only playing field in Forton.</li> <li>• Forton has seen a huge rise in planning approvals, none of which have been accounted for – also huge amount of housing around Forton in Lancaster and surrounding areas.</li> <li>• Issue of where people will work.</li> <li>• Local educational and health infrastructure will not be able to cope with additional development.</li> <li>• Local highway network is inappropriate - small winding lanes, with no footpaths.</li> <li>• Dangerous junction onto the A6 will be an accident waiting to happen.</li> <li>• Already overburdened sewerage system.</li> </ul>	Forton IO_84
452	<p>IO_33 and IO_3?</p> <p>Issues:</p> <p>Traffic volume and speed on Hardhorn Rd is already excessive. Disruption to wildlife and an adverse effect on hundreds of properties. Pressure on infrastructure in Poulton - schools, restaurants, bars.</p> <p>The green belt areas highlighted as potential development sites, would remove areas that currently take a lot of surface water and increase the flood risk.</p> <p>The motorway access from Poulton is not great, trains are already busy and parking in Poulton is scarce.</p> <p>It would have an overbearing effect on the neighbourhood and negatively impact the local area and amenities.</p>	Poulton-le-Fylde IO_33, IO_3?

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
461	<p>Hollins Lane and Forton –</p> <p>Proposed development is contrary to policy SP8 of the Wyre development plan and the Core Strategy and is disproportionate in scale.</p> <p>Conflict between the 2010 Rural Housing Needs Survey which showed that there is very little overcrowding in rural Wyre and the majority of those planning to move from Forton would prefer not to move within the area of Forton (nor was Forton preferred as a location to move to by many others in Wyre planning to move) and the 2013 Strategic Housing Market Assessment which argues that there is a clear need for housing in the Fylde coast area. Unclear as to why Wyre is identified as the area requiring the most new dwellings per annum when the demand for affordable housing is clearly identified as being primarily located in the urban areas of Blackpool, Lytham St Annes and Thornton.</p> <p>Development will be privately-led - tends to be low quality in terms of design, have poor levels of social interaction, doesn't provide social or community amenities, tends to be based on models of self-sufficient nuclear families and commuting to work. Seldom do private-led housing developments result in employment or improved infrastructure.</p> <p>Areas zoned for small scale economic activity give no indication of what this economic activity is supposed to be or how it is going to be initiated.</p> <p>Unclear how these proposed zonings achieve any of the issues raised in the 'Issues and Options' paper. Fail to see how the issue of an aging population is going to be addressed through private-led housing developments.</p> <p>Not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) - the proposed development has to improve the social, economic and/ or environmental features of an area.</p> <p>Proposed zoning does nothing to promote a local sustainable and resilient community and in fact replicates the economic model that has created and is exacerbating environmental problems.</p> <p>From the Wyre Borough Council 2010 Rural Housing Needs Survey the only demand that can be conjectured is for more affordable housing, or for new incomers from outside the rural Wyre area.</p> <p>The proposed zonings are thus a potential solution to a housing crisis that has emanated elsewhere, but will degrade the rural area of Forton/Hollins Lane (as well as others) if allowed.</p>	Forton Hollins Lane

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Supports proportionate and appropriate development- small-scale community-involved developments involving affordable housing, and community land trusts to protect green areas, develop natural amenities and promote a local circular economy.</p>	
468	<p>IO_100, IO_101 and IO_102</p> <p>Significant issues:</p> <p>Difficult access along narrow country lane. Development would necessitate a major development of this lane into an access road for significant numbers of vehicles, which would destroy a beautiful and popular area of rural Garstang.</p> <p>Impact on the historic Greenhalgh Castle and its environment.</p> <p>Development would destroy both the natural environment in this area and also the historic nature of the site.</p>	<p>Garstang</p> <p>IO_100</p> <p>IO_101</p> <p>IO_102</p>
470	<p>IO_26, IO_27, IO_28</p> <p>Inadequate local road infrastructure – will not cope with such a large increase in traffic.</p> <p>A585 cannot cope with the current amount of traffic at peak times</p> <p>Close to a school, which raises safety concerns with an increased amount of traffic in such close proximity.</p>	<p>Thornton</p> <p>IO_26,</p> <p>IO_27,</p> <p>IO_28</p>
472	<p>Agree in principle with: IO_101</p> <p>Disagree with: IO_100 and IO_102</p> <p>Nominally appropriate: IO_112, IO_110, IO_111, IO_113</p> <p>Totally inappropriate: IO_105 and IO_106</p> <p>Key issues for consideration:</p> <p>Healthcare facilities, highways and travel, rural areas should be treasured</p>	<p>IO_101</p> <p>IO_100</p> <p>IO_102</p> <p>IO_112</p> <p>IO_110</p> <p>IO_111</p> <p>IO_113</p> <p>IO_105</p>

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
474	<p>Site IO_48 concerns because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The primary school is oversubscribed; an area needs to be identified for future expansions.</li> <li>• Outskirts location is a distance from local facilities</li> <li>• Drainage and utilities not adequate, and need to consider flood risk.</li> <li>• If access if from Arthurs Lane, the road network would need to be improved due to current congestion and parking issues.</li> <li>• If access is from West side, the A588 is very dangerous and congested, and pavements are narrow.</li> <li>• Need to improve public transport, facilities for walking and cycling, drainage and utilities.</li> <li>• Provide additional zebra crossings along Carr Lane</li> </ul> <p>Site IO_49 concerns because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development on this site will severely affect the appearance and character of the village.</li> <li>• Outskirts location is a distance from local facilities.</li> <li>• Flood risks.</li> </ul> <p>Site IO_50 concerns because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The road network in this area is very narrow and not adequate for an increase in traffic if this land is used for retail / employment, especially along Church Lane where the road is unsuitable for two cars to pass.</li> <li>• Drainage / utilities are not adequate and need improving.</li> <li>• Outskirts location is a distance from local facilities.</li> <li>• There is a lack of continuous pavements.</li> <li>• Need to improve facilities for cycling, walking, and public transport.</li> </ul>	<p>IO_106</p> <p>IO_48 IO_49 IO_50</p>
477	<p>Concerns about Lamb’s Hill and Raikes Rd IO_26, IO_27, IO_27, IO_25, north of Bourne Way, IO_21, IO_22 due to: traffic, lack of infrastructure, lack of sustainable growth, diminishing green space and recreational space, lack of employment and risk of problems with accessibility for building work, flood risk, rail travel hampered by lack of capacity at peak times.</p>	<p>Thornton</p> <p>IO_26, IO_27, IO_27, IO_25, IO_21,</p>

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
		IO_22
479	<p>The development of IO_122 for housing is supported. The site can accommodate approximately 25 houses. Technical matters relating access, trees and flooding can be addressed. The self-contained nature of the site means that its development on the western edge of Bilsborrow would not result in an adverse impact on the character and setting of the village. The site is sustainably located with easy access to range of local services and facilities in the village. Bus services operating along the A6 provide access to a wider range of facilities in Garstang and Preston.</p>	IO_122
483	<p>With reference to IO_84 and IO_85 development sites it is a recipe for the destruction of the rural village of Forton and the loss of valuable farm land.</p> <p>It is not required to attain any of the objectives considered as being needed up to 2032 for Forton.</p> <p>In the last 12 months alone there have been enough new house permissions granted to supply almost all our quota up to 2032. Forton should be excluded from any more housing as enough new houses are already being provided for the future.</p>	IO_84 IO_85
484	<p>IO_85 IO_84 IO_81 IO_82)</p> <p>Forton has already nearly produced it's quota for new housing in this part of Wyre.</p> <p>Forton is a rural village-let us keep it this way-we don't even have a village shop in either side of Forton where the mass of population live-most of us have to use a car now to visit a shop.</p> <p>How are we supposed to support the local community- with the basics for rural living? the elderly have to use public transport (although it is a fair walk to a bus stop on the A6) or drive, or accept a lift to visit a shop.</p>	Forton  IO_85 IO_84 IO_81 IO_82
485	<p>Forton is a small village which has already been bombarded with planning approvals. We are a farming village and should remain so. We are surrounded by small winding lanes with no public amenities or transport.</p>	
487	<p>Poulton cannot take any further increases in housing. The roads are busy enough and the increased traffic will further diminish the quality of life for the Poulton residents.</p> <p>There are not any new services or facilities that could mitigate against the disastrous decision to increase the housing stock.</p>	IO_31
488	<p>None of the Thornton sites identified can comply with NPPF requirement for sustainable development on account of traffic congestion, poor connectivity, and strain on local services.</p> <p>Key issues for consideration: Covenanted land around Stanah School included in IO_27 must be protected as this was given to the</p>	Thornton  IO_27, IO_28

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>council by a local family for used as public open space in perpetuity.</p> <p>The area needs better flood defences, road access, facilities, public transport and green spaces.</p> <p>IO_27, IO_28</p> <p>Considers that these sites are unsuitable for development owing to the refusal of a planning application for residential development on part of IO_27 on the basis of encroachment into the countryside.</p>	
489	<p>Some of the flood defences on the estuary are at risk.</p> <p>There is no safe route to get to Poulton station apart from by car, and there is a lack of parking.</p> <p>Lambs road is inaccessible by HGV from both directions.</p>	
490	<p>IO_31 - must incorporate a new road to Garstang Road East. However there is already concern about the impact of the Persimmon application at the Shell garage junction.</p> <p>How can a further road discharging onto Garstang Road be sustainable.</p>	<p>Poulton-le-Fylde</p> <p>IO_31</p>
491	<p>Raike’s Road and Lambs Road are not wide enough for existing traffic, it is worse at peak times.</p> <p>Schools in Thornton, Stanah and Cleveleys area will not be able to cope with new houses being built.</p> <p>Wider roads, flood defences, transport, protect greenbelt.</p>	
492	<p>Raike’s Road and Lambs Road are not wide enough.</p> <p>Green land around Stanah School must be kept as it was given to the Council for public use.</p> <p>Wider roads, flood defences, green spaces and transport improvements are needed.</p>	
495	<p>Thornton Cleveleys does not have the road and infrastructure to support further housing. Houses currently being built are causing traffic problems already.</p> <p>People will have to use the already busy roads to get to work as there are no jobs here and Lambs Road is too narrow to support this.</p>	

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	Key issues: Roads, schools, shops (other than supermarkets), traffic in general.	
500	<p>Rail travel is a key commuter requirement but lack of parking at Poulton le Fylde Station, lack of capacity on peak time trains and lack of any safe route to get there other than by car.</p> <p>Covenanted land around Stanah school included with site reference IO_27. This must be protected as it was given to the council that preceded WC by a local family for use as public open space in perpetuity. If it is sold for development it will be a very serious breach of faith by WC.</p> <p>IO_26 is partly in category 3 (high) flood risk area, along part of Underbank Rd, and on the edge along Stanah Rd. Wyre should not be promoting development in or adjacent to flood risk areas.</p>	<p>Poulton-le-Fylde</p> <p>Thornton</p> <p>IO_26</p> <p>IO_27</p>
504	<p>IO_107</p> <p>In an area of high flood risk. Next to a water treatment plant - occasional issues with flies and smells. Would also alter the visual characteristic of the western side of the village dramatically.</p> <p>IO_108 probably offers the best options for development as it is reasonably hidden and is a lower flood risk.</p> <p>IO_109</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Owned by three different parties.</li> <li>• Section owned by the school would not be available, which effectively cuts off one of the other parts.</li> <li>• Development on the area adjoining the village hall would join the hall to the village but would change the visual character considerably.</li> <li>• This field is also used regularly for larger events in the village hall.</li> <li>• Traffic generation is a major issue.</li> <li>• Roads within the village are narrow – more traffic dangerous.</li> </ul>	Churchtown
507	IO_80	Winmarleig



Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unsuitable road infrastructure and lack of capacity - main route south from Glasson Dock, Cockerham and Winmarleigh. All routes to the A6 are via single lane Canal Bridges. Exit from School Lane to Park Lane has very poor visibility from both directions, increased traffic from School Lane on to this fast road is not sensible.</li> <li>• There is no Sewage System in the village. The dyke that takes the flow from School Lane properties runs through the centre of the proposed IO_80 area.</li> <li>• There is no Gas facility to this area.</li>   <li>• The Doctors Service in Garstang needs improvement in the availability of appointments currently and could not support the additional residential impact.</li> <li>• The facility of a Bus Service to Garstang/Lancaster needs to be considered.</li> <li>• Query whether or not Primary Schools and the one Secondary School option in the area cope with the proposed increase in residents.</li> <li>• Additional Higher Education facilities need to be provided.</li> <li>• Safe Pedestrian routes need to be provided for any increase in road volumes.</li> </ul>	h IO_80
509	<p>Concerns over IO_26, IO_27, IO_28, IO_21, IO_22</p> <p>Thornton sites are not in conformity with NPPF requirements for sustainable development due to traffic, poor connectivity, strain on services and lack of green spaces.</p>	IO_21 IO_22 IO_26 IO_27 IO_28
516	<p>Concerns about roads, especially Lambs Road, Skippool Road, Amounderness Way.</p> <p>Need to preserve and protect the countryside around Wyre Estuary Country Park.</p> <p>Concerns about loss of recreational space, more pollution, refuse, waste matters, flooding, medical services and schools.</p>	IO_26 IO_27 IO_28
517	<p>IO_26, IO_27, IO_28</p> <p>Traffic is heavy on Lambs Road and Skippool Road, building houses will make the situation worse as well as reducing the greenspace, covering the ground with buildings will also increase flood risks.</p> <p>Ned to ensure road improvements and school places</p>	IO_26 IO_27 IO_28
518	<p>All Thornton sites cannot comply with the NPPF requirement for sustainable development.</p>	Thornton

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Key issues: Traffic congestion, poor connectivity, road safety issues, strain on local services, lack of local employment, loss of green space, increased flood risk, access to Poulton Station is essential for commuting but there is a lack of parking. These are not practically resolvable.</p> <p>Covenanted land at Stanah School is intended for public open space (IO_27).</p>	IO_27
519	<p>IO_26 and IO_27 would need improved access to the A585.</p> <p>IO_32 and IO_33: even minor developments would overload the existing roads. A new link road to Garstang Road East would be inadequate and too expensive.</p> <p>None of the these sites comply with the NPPF requirement for sustainable development on account of traffic congestion, poor connectivity, road safety issues, strain on local services, lack of local employment, loss of green space.</p> <p>Rail travel is a key NPPF commuter requirement, but lack of safe access, lack of parking and peak train capacity means that this requirement cannot be met.</p> <p>Better connections of the road network to the M55 are needed. Along with increased GP services, schools, policing, roads, additional parking in Poulton. Road improvements across Thornton and Poulton.</p>	IO_26 IO_27 IO_32 IO_33
520	Lambs Hill and Raikes Road (IO_26, IO_27, IO_28)	IO_26 IO_27 IO_28
524	Thornton sites do not adhere to the National Planning Policy Framework – sustainable development is not possible due to the geography of the FCP which restricts options for improving transport infrastructure, and to attract job opportunities to the area.	
537	<p>IO_26, IO_27, IO_29</p> <p>Don't comply with the National Planning Framework policy - flood risk, sustainability, transport links, infrastructure.</p> <p>IO_27 planning permission recently rejected by Wyre Council, strong objection to development from local residents.</p> <p>Impact on local community. Road safety, infrastructure, education, GPs, etc. loss of greenspace ,sustainability, attracting and keeping suitable employment, education and health services, road network and increased congestion, loss of rural habitats, loss of local 'identity', recreational land.</p>	Thornton  IO_26, IO_27, IO_29
541	IO_107, IO_108, IO_109 – concerns:	Churchtown

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>IO_107 Loss of recreation opportunities - use of local paths with views across open green areas. Two paths run through IO_107 and so development on that site would interfere with this and be in conflict with the conservation area.</p> <p>Loss of good agricultural land. Dangerous access from the main road. Access via the church would conflict with its status as a listed building and planning has already been refused because of this. Building close to the sewage works may create a nuisance – already issues e.g. with insects.</p> <p>IO_109 Actually 3 pieces of land and the middle one was acquired by the school because of a lack of play area. This land would not be available. Building between the school and village hall would be next to the river and high risk for flooding. This field is currently used as an extension to the village hall grounds for events such as our historic children’s festival. Any development on this land should thus be for recreational use and to improve the lives of residents such as safe walk to school route, full size playing field or to accommodate a children’s play area which was removed by the council from the village hall.</p> <p>IO_108 could possibly accommodate a very small development in keeping with the village but is attached to ancient woodland. It could also cause problems on the main road with even more congestion and an increased possibility of accidents at busy times.</p> <p>General issue of impact on the Churchtown Conservation Area.</p>	
543	<p>IO_26, IO_27, IO_28</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local road infrastructure lacks the capacity – severe congestion.</li> <li>• Lack of health and educational capacity.</li> <li>• Very little employment and no sign of any new works.</li> <li>• Loss of countryside and wildlife. Recreational space will be lost.</li> <li>• Development will cause a visual blight on the landscape.</li> </ul>	Thornton IO_26, IO_27, IO_28

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing flood risk that development will not help.</li> </ul>	
549	<p>Object to the development of the sites on the west side of the A6, which would have a negative impact on landscape value, local ecology, and cultural heritage. The sites are considered disproportionate. The proposals will fail to achieve the economic, social or environmental aspects of achieving sustainable development, and contrary to the Vision and Strategic Objectives for Wyre.</p> <p>The potential development sites are in open countryside with most of the land classified as Grade 2 agricultural land.</p> <p>These sites were not identified during the SHLAA 2010.</p> <p>Development of these sites will intensify the boroughs environmental footprint, increasing pollution and flood risk, and the character and distinctiveness of the area will be lost forever.</p> <p><u>Churchtown</u>            Most of the village lies within a conservation area, and there are 27 Grade 1 and Grade 2 listed buildings and features. There are also two listed buildings outside the village’s conservation area. There are two Grade 2 listed buildings at Catterall Hall farmhouse and barn, located on the boundary of Churchtown and Catterall, whose setting would be adversely affected if housing development was permitted on site IO_107.</p> <p>St Helen’s Church is Grade 1 listed, there are only two Grade 1 listed churches within the Wyre district. The open countryside surrounding the village is an important factor in preserving the church within its historic, landscape and cultural setting. The potential development sites (IO_107, IO_108, IO_109, IO_110) are located on the boundary of this conservation area or in close proximity to it and are of great importance to the character and appearance of the village.</p> <p><u>Site IO 108</u>            Any development of this site would diminish the view and impact on local residents of ‘The Avenue’, and is close to the conservation boundary of Churchtown. Congestion and safety is of great concern for this site, especially when trying to turn right onto the A6. Access to this site is via Nook Lane a single track private road and is not a suitable access point for a large housing development. The road cuts through woodland, and its widening would have a severe impact upon the adjacent woodland which is of considerable ecological value. The proposed development site is less than 1km from the 126 metre high wind turbine at Dewlay Cheese manufactory, and contains pipelines from Abbeystead to Franklaw Water treatment works on Catterall Lane, which also makes this site less suitable for potential</p>	Churchtown : IO_107, IO_108, IO_109  Catterall IO_110

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>development.</p> <p><u>Site IO 109</u>                      This site is on the boundary and also incorporates some of the conservation area. Three landowners with a mixture of uses divide this proposed site. This site also regularly floods, and is categorised as Flood Zone 3. The land is next to Kirkland playing fields and is used by the community for Churchtown Children’s Festival, and camping by events hosted at Kirkland village hall. The second section of land is used by St Helen’s Primary school as a sports field and hence is a valuable resource for the school and the local community. The site also contains pipelines of untreated water from Abbeystead to Franklaw Water Treatment Works on Catterall Lane. In addition, the main sewer pipe from Garstang to Churchtown sewage works. Any development of this site would diminish the view and adversely impact on local residents on ‘The Avenue’. Congestion and safety remains a concern for accessing this site.</p> <p><u>Site IO 110</u>                      Lies within the parish of Catterall, but its development will have an effect on the landscape setting and the residents of Churchtown. Loss of prime agricultural land. The site also has numerous public footpaths that are regularly used.</p> <p><u>Biodiversity</u>                      All sites would have an extreme negative impact on the biodiversity and ecosystems of the area, contrary to the NPPF. No ecological, wildlife or biodiversity assessment has been undertaken however the properties adjacent to the site IO_108 regularly see numerous species of native birds and mammals. The Biological Heritage Site of St Michael’s on Wyre is located approximately 0.5 miles away from the potential housing development at Churchtown. This highlights that the sites are part of a mosaic that is rich in wildlife and a sensitive environment. Any impact on this environment should be minimised therefore this development will not comply with the requirements of section 109 of NPPF or section 8: to protect and enhance biodiversity of SEASA.</p> <p><u>Flood Zones and Soil structure</u>                      The village of Churchtown and sites IO_107, IO_108, IO_109 are located within flood risk areas, with a mix of flood zone 2 and 3. Developing on the flood plains will increase the risk of more localised flooding as there will be more impervious surfaces and surface run-off, and there will be less open land available to absorb the rainfall. Wyre’s SFRA 2007 says any residential dwellings would be considered vulnerable properties and not suitable for such sites, the exemption rules under PPS25 would not be applicable. Properties</p>	

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>that are vulnerable to flooding should not be built in a flood risk area.</p> <p><u>Infrastructure</u> Concerns over the lack of access to local services. Concerns over traffic and congestion, in particular for The Avenue, and Broughton roundabout at the junction of the A6 and M56 which has had money spent on it to tackle congestion, but this has not resolved traffic issues for commuters to Preston. The area has insufficient transport networks for rail use, pedestrians and cycling.</p> <p><u>Green Infrastructure</u> As referred to in NPPF, the green infrastructure should be a core consideration that would enhance the experience of residents and visitors. Protection of existing green infrastructure includes consideration of the value of open spaces e.g. agricultural land, playing fields. If this proposal goes ahead there will be a significant loss of productive agricultural land.</p> <p><u>Housing</u> Residents of Churchtown / Catterall do not feel there is need for houses or industrial units to encroach upon the open countryside on the west side of the A6, as there are many houses for sale within a one mile radius of Churchtown. In the past year 250 dwellings have been approved for development on the east side of the A6 with a further 642 awaiting approval within a 2 mile radius of the village of Churchtown.</p> <p>KEY ISSUES: The adverse effects of the potential developments at Churchtown cannot be dealt with satisfactorily by using conditions or obligations.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL SERVICES: Improvements within the road networks and the installation of safe cycle ways should be considered for all of Wyre’s networks. Within some European countries, cycle paths are not on busy main roads but are incorporated into local footpaths so the footpath is wider and safer for all users.</p>	
550	NEW SITE Promotes a site west of Bilsborrow for residential development. Well-located to the existing settlement of Bilsborrow and could be developed without detriment to the character or setting of the settlement and adjoining countryside areas. In an area at risk of flooding but such risks can be mitigated and a flood resilient form of development is achievable.	Bilsborrow
551	Sites IO_85 and IO_84 have been my family farm for generations, and the plans show complete devastation of a business and way of	IO_85

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>life if this land was used for housing. This land keeps Forton a rural village, we don't want that to change, we want to continue farming in Forton forever.</p> <p>On Wallace Lane and School Lane there are already houses planned for Forton that are passed and not shown on your maps.</p> <p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of business</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife and nature</li> <li>• Loss of wide-open quiet spaces</li> <li>• Loss of our heritage</li> </ul> <p>Additional services needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failing drainage land would have to be stabilised.</li> <li>• Sewerage – many of the dwellings on Wallace Lane are Septic tanks.</li> <li>• Country lanes are narrow without footpaths or passing places.</li> <li>• There would be more parking issues</li> <li>• Noise and environmental pollution would impact on wildlife</li> </ul>	<p>IO_84</p> <p>Wallace Lane and School Lane</p>
553	<p>Sites IO_85 and IO_84 are a farm and the plans show complete devastation of a business and way of life. This land keeps Forton a rural village; we don't want that to change.</p> <p>On Wallace Lane and School Lane there are already houses planned for Forton that are passed and not shown on your maps.</p> <p>Forton has provided enough new housing to see us through to 2032.</p> <p>Forton sewers and pipework will not stand any more properties</p>	Forton
558	<p>IO_133 and IO_134</p> <p>Key issues:</p> <p>Size of the proposed sites in relation to the size of the settlement.</p>	<p>Calder Vale</p> <p>IO_133</p> <p>IO_134</p>

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>IO_133 is set someway outside the village boundaries and almost looks like a new village or settlement - looks to cover almost twice the area of the village, if it was compacted into one area.</p> <p>IO_134 - although nearer to the village still extends the boundaries in relation to the present ones.</p> <p>Some development in the surrounding area may be good to sustain the community life of the area.</p> <p>The road into the village is narrow and poorly maintained. Any further access onto this road would seem to be dangerous.</p> <p>Properties touching IO_133 (already on Strickens Lane) have only the use of septic tanks for sewerage disposal. I understand their overflows go down the proposed field.</p> <p>We do not have a scheduled bus service, nor do we have any shop facilities. (Only a 2-half day a week Post Office.)</p>	
560	<p>IO_27 – area given in trust to the council to be used as a public open space and should not be being considered for development.</p> <p>Also all of the sections in the Fylde coast peninsular (IO_27, IO_26, IO_01) - concerned that by removing many of the green fields around this area will increase the amount of surface water that drains into the already existing built up areas increasing the flood risk.</p>	Thornton IO_27, IO_26, IO_01
563	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposed to all developments in Thornton, but particularly concerned about IO_26, IO_27 and IO_28.</li> <li>• Roads servicing Thornton, Cleveleys and Fleetwood need redevelopment, prior to increasing housing.</li> <li>• “Improvements” at Windy Harbour were minimal and pointless.</li> <li>• The intersection of Singleton Lane / Garstang Road/Mains Lane has been unbearable for drivers for years.</li> <li>• Issues for commuters in the area.</li> </ul> <p>Additional properties would cause even more congestion on the already dangerous Skippool Road. It is hazardous for all road users, especially cyclists.</p> <p>Who will buy these houses – we can’t sell houses in Thornton at present.</p>	All sites in Thornton IO_21 to IO_28



Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The road infrastructure would need a complete overhaul.</li> <li>• Need to review policing – additional people mean serious risk of additional crime.</li> <li>• Shortage of school places, doctors, dentists, etc.</li> </ul>	
565	<p>Investment in restructuring and improving accessibility in the Lambs Hill and Raikes road (IO_21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28) is needed. Will improvements be delivered by house builders? There are immense congestion problems in the area and increased traffic will compromise safety.</p> <p>Results of further development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• flood risk will be increased,</li> <li>• countryside and green space lost,</li> <li>• pressure on school facilities, and</li> <li>• increased demand for employment.</li> <li>• traffic congestion,</li> <li>• increased public transport facilities,</li> <li>• road and pedestrian safety,</li> </ul> <p>Where would inward investment come from? What are the benefits to the local area?</p> <p>Additional Services Required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road restructuring in the immediate area and through the M55/M6 motorways.</li> <li>• Opening up rail communications to/from Fleetwood-Thornton to the Preston-Poulton Link.</li> </ul>	IO_21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28
567	<p>Site IO_22 holds children’s football competitions. The site should be preserved for community use.</p> <p>IO_27 and IO_26 are used by Thornton residents for recreation.</p> <p>Key issues: There is a lack of recreational space to the north of Thornton for dog walkers and children.</p>	IO_22, IO_26, IO_27

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	Additional Services: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• enlarged doctors surgeries, and</li> <li>• sustainable transport links (incl. safe footpaths, and cycleways) to improve healthy living.</li> </ul>	
568	All Thornton sites are cause for concern as they cannot comply with the NPPF's requirement for <i>sustainable development</i> due to: traffic congestion; road safety issues; strain on local services; lack of local employment; loss of green space; and, flood risk. Some of the flood defences in the estuary are insufficient according to the WC Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.  Rail travel is a key commuter requirement.  Covenanted land around Stannah School (IO_27) must be preserved as public open space.	IO_27
569	Identified sites in Thornton cannot comply with sustainable development as there is: poor connectivity, road congestion, road safety issues, poor local services, lack of local employment, loss of green spaces and flood risk.  Site IO_27 is covenanted land and should be preserved as public open space.  Key Issues include: access, work, open spaces, medical facilities, schools, safety, and flooding.  Additional services required include: good transport systems, employment, and adequate medical facilities - especially GPS.	IO_27
571	Lambs Road development must be the least affordable to the council due to the cost of road improvements necessary to mitigate against the impact of housing development. Improvements should be funded by the developer.	
572	Sites of concern: IO_26, IO_27, IO_28, IO_21, IO_22 Key issues include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• traffic congestion,</li> <li>• shortage of school/dentist/doctor's places,</li> <li>• lack of employment,</li> <li>• outdated infrastructure, and</li> <li>• loss of green space and leisure areas.</li> </ul>	IO_26, IO_27, IO_27, IO_21, IO_22
572_1	Sites of concern: IO_26, IO_27, IO_27, IO_21, IO_22	IO_26, IO_27,

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Key issues include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• traffic congestion,</li> <li>• shortage of school/dentist/doctor’s places,</li> <li>• lack of employment,</li> <li>• flood risk,</li> <li>• outdated infrastructure, and</li> <li>• loss of green space and leisure areas.</li> </ul>	<p>IO_27, IO_21, IO_22</p>
573	<p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option 2 – Building and flood risk in Thornton Cleveleys.</li> </ul> <p>Additional Services required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access.</li> </ul>	
575	<p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure on roads.</li> <li>• Loss of greenbelt.</li> <li>• Lack of employment.</li> <li>• Congestion of roads.</li> <li>• Risk of flooding by development on flood plains – where will the water go?</li> </ul> <p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rail travel is a key commuter requirement, as is parking provision at Poulton station.</li> <li>• Lack of safe routes to get to the motorway junctions by car.</li> <li>• Poor public transport.</li> </ul> <p>Additional services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvements to roads.</li> <li>• Lack of employment.</li> <li>• Real risk of flooding if greenbelt is lost.</li> <li>• Loss of green space for residents.</li> </ul>	

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
576	<p>Neither Lambs Hill/Raikes Road (IO_21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28), Calder Vale, nor land more than ¼ mile away from A6 on the Eastern Side should not be developed.</p> <p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of countryside and amenity it provides.</li> <li>• Too close to Stanah Country Park (SSSI site) and should be protecting habitats and feeding grounds.</li> </ul> <p>Still poor infrastructure along A585 despite work.</p> <p>Additional Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A sustainable transport system would help the Wyre peninsular but Lambs Road should not be built on due to proximity to the country park.</li> </ul>	Lambs Road, IO_21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28
578	<p>Listed sites cannot comply with NPPF requirement for sustainable development due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of local employment,</li> <li>• Traffic congestion,</li> <li>• Road safety issues,</li> <li>• Schools and bus services,</li> <li>• Poor connectivity,</li> <li>• Loss of green space, and</li> <li>• Flood risk.</li> </ul> <p>No additional services would make up for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of greenbelt,</li> <li>• Impact of increased traffic (incl. Congestion, green house gasses, road safety),</li> <li>• Increased flood risk due to location.</li> </ul>	IO_26, IO_27, IO_28, IO_21, IO_22
578_1	<p>Listed sites cannot comply with NPPF requirement for sustainable development due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of local employment,</li> <li>• Traffic congestion,</li> <li>• Road safety issues,</li> </ul>	IO_26, IO_27, IO_28, IO_21,

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schools and bus services,</li> <li>• Poor connectivity,</li> <li>• Loss of green space, and</li> <li>• Flood risk.</li> </ul> <p>No additional services would make up for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of greenbelt,</li> <li>• Impact of increased traffic (incl. Congestion, green house gasses, road safety),</li> <li>• Increased flood risk due to location.</li> </ul>	IO_22
579	<p>Sites: IO_10_26, IO_27, IO_28                      Why are the housing targets so high?                      Roads, schools, and drainage systems cannot cope.</p> <p>Sites: IO_21, IO_22                      Will cause havoc on the roads.</p> <p>Access will need to be improved; travel must not cut through housing estates.</p>	IO_10_26, IO_27, IO_28
580	<p>Option 1, Sites: IO_29, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28, IO_21                      Access to the area is already a major problem at peak times.                      Schools and GP surgeries are under pressure.</p>	IO_29, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28, IO_21
580_1	<p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road access,</li> <li>• Flooding,</li> <li>• Traffic Volume,</li> <li>• Schools and services which are at capacity in the Thornton area,</li> <li>• Option 1 – Sites IO_27, IO_26, IO_28, IO21 and IO_22</li> </ul>	IO_27, IO_26, IO_28, IO21, IO_22, Thornton
581	Concerns	FCP

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Sites: IO_26, IO_27, IO_28</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of sites would make it impossible for walkers, cyclists and horse riders to enjoy using Raikes Road and Underbank if they are used to access new housing.</li> <li>• Open space is valued by the community and has health benefits.</li> </ul> <p>Key Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of greenbelt land between Thornton and Poulton-le-Fylde would be almost complete as far as accessibility is concerned if option 1 was adopted.</li> <li>• The two towns would be indistinguishable.</li> <li>• Local walks through the countryside would be lost due to safety issues.</li> <li>• Flood risk in the area would increase due to loss of natural drainage.</li> </ul> <p>Additional Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative footpaths and access for cyclists and horse riders.</li> <li>• Preventing gridlock of traffic accessing the FCP would prove difficult. Houses proposed in Option1 would require more than a new A585 to avoid bottleneck at intersections.</li> </ul>	
582	<p>Concerns over sites IO_26, IO_27, and IO_28 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood risk,</li> <li>• Loss of hedgerows, habitats and scenery by the River Wyre Estuary which is a tourist hot spot,</li> <li>• Strain on services (incl. schools, GPs, and Dentists),</li> <li>• Loss of green space and associated benefits (health and wellbeing),</li> <li>• Increased pressure on existing roads which do not have the potential for alteration, and</li> <li>• Safety of pedestrian and cyclists on the B5412.</li> </ul> <p>Additional Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing Garstang and the surrounding area can provide economic growth, jobs, school provision, doctors’ surgeries and dentists.</li> <li>• People are more likely to settle in the area as, road connections are good and, it is in close proximity to the open countryside.</li> </ul>	IO_26, IO_27, IO_28, Garstang
582_1	Sites IO_26, IO_27, and IO_28 have countryside designation. Roads surrounding the River Wyre roundabout are heavily congested	IO_26,

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>(B5412 and A585). The route from the area to the motorway is mostly '1' lane traffic. Existing infrastructure cannot sustain more traffic.</p> <p>Key issues: Builders offer the new bus stops on the B5412 and re-routing of existing bus service. The majority of new build purchasers, however, are of working age and do not use the bus system because they drive to work outside the Borough. After 5 years the building firms would stop funding the busses and the council would have to step in, but, rural bus services are already being 'cut'.</p> <p>Additional services: Local schools, dentists, and doctors' surgeries are at capacity. Safety of school children trying to negotiate narrow roads (B5412/A585) should be considered.</p>	<p>IO_27, IO_28</p>
583	<p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure on roads.</li> <li>• Loss of greenbelt.</li> <li>• Lack of employment.</li> <li>• Congestion of roads.</li> <li>• Risk of flooding by development on flood plains – where will the water go?</li> </ul> <p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rail travel is a key commuter requirement, as is parking provision at Poulton station.</li> <li>• Lack of safe routes to get to the motorway junctions by car.</li> <li>• Poor public transport.</li> </ul> <p>Additional services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvements to roads.</li> <li>• Lack of employment.</li> <li>• Real risk of flooding if greenbelt is lost.</li> <li>• Loss of green space for residents</li> </ul>	
584	<p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure on roads.</li> </ul>	

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of greenbelt.</li> <li>• Lack of employment.</li> <li>• Congestion of roads.</li> <li>• Risk of flooding by development on flood plains – where will the water go?</li> </ul> <p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rail travel is a key commuter requirement, as is parking provision at Poulton station.</li> <li>• Lack of safe routes to get to the motorway junctions by car.</li> <li>• Poor public transport.</li> </ul> <p>Additional services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvements to roads.</li> <li>• Lack of employment.</li> <li>• Real risk of flooding if greenbelt is lost.</li> <li>• Loss of green space for residents</li> </ul>	
585	<p>Site IO_17 is a concern because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• there is already a large housing development close by;</li> <li>• the proposal does not show the completed development and remaining space;</li> <li>• the site is home to wildlife and is particularly beautiful;</li> <li>• further development would be intrusive on the new estate.</li> </ul> <p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• access – off Winward Avenue,</li> <li>• increase in traffic,</li> <li>• impact on wildlife,</li> <li>• impact on landscape,</li> <li>• negative equity on houses bought on estate, many were sold as exclusive collections due to location/views,</li> <li>• fish park and Haylights will cause pollution/noise pollution affecting wildlife and the quiet picturesque area people have paid big money to live in.</li> </ul>	IO_17, Winward Avenue, Harbour Village Estate



Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Additional Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• traffic congestion – traffic lights,</li> <li>• new road layout (only one access route to fish park and Harbour Village Estate),</li> <li>• emergency services,</li> <li>• council tax bands are too high – no longer an exclusive settlement.</li> </ul>	
586	<p>Inskip</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional housing has already been planned which denies a farmer part of his livelihood.</li> <li>• There is an inadequate bus service. The narrow roads will not take the additional traffic and existing medical facilities will be unable to cope.</li> <li>• We feel that there should be no further development as there are not the facilities to cope.</li> <li>• Where is Wyre Borough getting the money from to cover this development?</li> <li>• The Wyre Borough should not be bullied by a Government which has no respect for the countryside or farming community.</li> </ul>	Inskip
587	<p>See answer to question 5</p> <p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of conservation area which is enjoyed by visitors, residents and future generations.</li> <li>•</li> </ul> <p>Additional Services for A6 option:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schooling.</li> <li>• Doctors.</li> <li>• Road systems suitable for intense traffic.</li> </ul>	IO_100, IO_102
588	<p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not enough facilities (doctors' school places or work opportunities).</li> <li>• Impact upon traffic volumes.</li> <li>• Detriment to rural community.</li> <li>• Loss of greenbelt.</li> <li>• Road safety, Sunningdale is already dangerous and cannot support additional traffic.</li> </ul>	IO_26, IO_27, IO_28
589	Sites IO_26, IO_27, IO_28 would have a serious impact upon the road network.	IO_26,

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	Amounderness Way is gradually becoming gridlocked on a regular basis and traffic (Incl. HGVs) are making detours down Skippool Road which is unsuitable. More housing in the area would also increase pressure on schools and doctors surgeries etc.	IO_27, IO_28
590	<p>Concerns over site IO_80</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is a significant acreage and out of proportion with existing hamlet.</li> <li>• Road and transport is already an issue, canal bridges are becoming clogged by service vehicles unable to cope with icy road surfaces.</li> <li>• Winmarleigh has no public transport. Roads are narrow and used by agricultural vehicles. Further development would require significant investment in the road network.</li> <li>• Winmarleigh is the only remaining, unspoilt moss land in the county. Any increase in pollution from a larger population and traffic may impact adversely on the moss land.</li> <li>• Winmarleigh has major drainage problems and has no mains sewerage system. Proportionate housing development would be too small to justify a new adequate pumping station system. Water courses may become more polluted by septic tank drainage.</li> <li>• Winmarleigh has no gas supply which limiting the options for heating of homes and businesses. Alternative forms of generating electricity will be require (e.g. wind turbines which are affordable and sustainable).</li> <li>• New housing should be proportionate to existing communities and avoid social destabilisation. A 10% increase 20/25 year olds could be managed by providing housing which is affordable to the local population and sensitive to existing housing styles. Village communities need residents able to support the elderly and young families, not an expansion of expensive housing for commuters.</li> </ul> <p>Key Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment and education,</li> <li>• Transport and travel,</li> <li>• Affordable housing,</li> <li>• Health and social care services,</li> <li>• Impact on the environmental wildlife.</li> </ul> <p>Additional services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Options 2 and 3 would need a new bridge over the canal to link Winmarleigh and the A6.</li> <li>• A new sewerage system and mains drainage would be needed to accommodate new housing.</li> <li>• Public transport system to enable attendance at health appointments for the aging population.</li> <li>• Road widening and improved maintenance.</li> </ul>	IO_80, Winmarleigh

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
591	<p>IO_80 is a nominal 120 acres which is in excess of the total residential development in the area to date. Development at this scale does not comply with the vision and strategic objectives of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Key Issues: The drainage system in Winmarleigh is problematic. School Lane uses a septic tank which discharges to Black Brook. The ‘fall’ on the brook is small and the ability of the ‘dry weather flow’ to carry the ‘out flow’ is questionable. Further ‘out flow’ from development would place unacceptable pressure on the system. The problem could be resolved through incorporating mains drainage and pumping station. Unless the scale of development is substantial this will be unfeasible due to cost.</p> <p>Additional services: To access IO_80 from the A6 necessitates crossing one of a number of bridges across the Lancaster canal, some of which have preservation orders. Bridges are already carrying more and heavier traffic than intended when designed, this leads to frequent accidents which are sometimes fatal. The Local Plan should address this matter.</p>	Winmarleigh
592	<p>Sites of concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IO_74</li> <li>• IO_75</li> <li>• IO_76</li> <li>• IO_77</li> </ul> <p>St Michaels has very limited infrastructure, traffic problems and road provision (Rawcliffe Rd to the main highway).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IO_63</li> <li>• IO_64</li> <li>• IO_65</li> <li>• IO_66</li> </ul> <p>Great Eccleston’s high street is very congested.</p> <p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roads, Flooding, Employment, Shops, Schools, Accessibility.</li> </ul>	
593	IO_98 and IO_99 Issues:	IO_98,

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highways (incl. road safety and access).</li> <li>• Local schools and medical services.</li> </ul>	IO_99
595	None of the towns in Wyre, including Garstang, are able to accommodate huge developments. There are issues with the roads, doctors, schools and sewerage as well as no community centre.	General Garstang
601	<p>IO_79 &amp; IO_99 Concern about impact of development on increased traffic flow out of Longmoor Lane on to the A6 and on the A6 generally (including increased number of commercial vehicles.)</p> <p>IO_107</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning permission refused in 1972 so as to protect the setting of the Churchtown Conservation Area.</li> <li>• Significant impact on the setting of a Class 1 listed building - St Helens Church</li> <li>• Adjacent to a sewage works</li> <li>• Development would impact on the visual amenity of almost half the number of properties in Churchtown.</li> <li>• The land floods almost annually &amp; is classified as Flood Zone 3</li> </ul> <p>IO_108</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only one means of access via a private road (Nook Lane) – on a bend on the A586</li> <li>• Potential alternative access route could be from the East corner however the addition of traffic at this point would further increase the congestion at the A586/A6 junction.</li> <li>• Development would significantly increase pedestrian traffic, especially at peak school times</li> <li>• Classified as Flood Zone 2 and 3.</li> </ul> <p>IO_109</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contributes to the open setting of the Conservation Area</li> <li>• Classified as Flood Zone 2 and 3.</li> </ul> <p>Key Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential to flood.</li> <li>• Preservation of the Churchtown Conservation Area and setting.</li> </ul>	Churchtown IO_79 IO_99 IO_79 IO_99 IO_107 IO_108 IO_109

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development so close to a sewage works may certainly create a ‘statutory nuisance’.</li> <li>• Impact on visual amenity on existing dwellings.</li> <li>• Increased accident risk along the A586 especially around road entrances/exits into Churchtown, the school &amp; at the junction with the A6.</li> <li>• Surface water drainage.</li> </ul> <p>Additional infrastructure required to support development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Essential services and education</li> <li>• Increased bus services to key towns of Blackpool, Preston &amp; Lancaster.</li> </ul>	
603	<p>IO_21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28.</p> <p>Concerns about the development of sites proposed for Thornton on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to protect in order to meet Strategic Objectives for Wyre, including SO8.</li> <li>• The quality of life for existing residents would be severely compromised.</li> <li>• Would involve the loss of green areas which provide many health and well-being benefits</li> <li>• Loss of the natural beauty of these areas</li> <li>• Existing major traffic problems for residents with no solutions</li> <li>• Loss of recreational space.</li> <li>• Insufficient educational and health infrastructure.</li> <li>• Issue of safety - not enough police or fire services.</li> </ul> <p>Key Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of natural beauty</li> <li>• Impact on wellbeing and quality of life of residents</li> <li>• Impact on the character of the locality and surrounding landscape</li> <li>• Safety - risk of flooding.</li> <li>• Roads - limited access to major road networks in the area of the proposed sites. In the event of a major problem we could not evacuate the area easily. TRAFFIC JAMS ARE A DAILY OCCURRENCE . Nothing has been done in recent times to improve the TEXT MISSING – FIND ORIGINAL!!</li> </ul>	<p>Thornton</p> <p>IO_21</p> <p>IO_22</p> <p>IO_26</p> <p>IO_27</p> <p>IO_28</p>

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Additional infrastructure required to support development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More schools. Not enough school places.</li> <li>• Investment to create jobs. Investment needed in Thornton village to provide facilities for existing residents.</li> <li>• More money from the NHS to provide dental care, and Doctors.</li> <li>• Major investment needed in roads.</li> <li>• Bus services; would need much better service than now. Investment to bring the railway service back to life.</li> <li>• The environmental impact: pollution, landfill sites.</li> </ul>	
606	<p>If developing in Poulton, IO_31 is more suitable - already partly developed and having much better access.</p> <p>IO_33 - relatively high lying land. Development would have a negatively dominating presence over the rest of Poulton.</p>	<p>Poulton-le-Fylde IO_31 IO_33</p>
608	<p>General comment – concern about impact of development on the highway network and its capacity. IO_112 – planning application objected to.</p> <p>IO_116</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parish Plan seeks to protect from development - landscape views and maintains the village as a rural settlement.</li> <li>• The field stands in water in times of heavy rain and development would deprive the village of a natural soak away.</li> <li>• The underlying structure is running sand to which machinery has succumbed.</li> <li>• There are flooding issues with the close proximity of the River Calder and the canal.</li> <li>• Access is close to the South bound bus stop and, if considered, would mean the destruction of the toll road wall - one of Catterall’s few heritage structures and stretches the length of Garstang Road. The Parish Council would wish to retain this structure.</li> </ul> <p>IO_117 - No public access to land, the field can probably only be accessed via Stones Lane, which is a private road.</p> <p>IO_118</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on local farm business.</li> <li>• Potential for conflicting access points.</li> </ul>	<p>Catterall IO_06 IO_110 IO_111 IO_112 IO_113 IO_114 IO_116 IO_117 IO_118</p>

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>IO_114 (plus IO_110 and IO_113)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would create a separate and isolated estate from the rest of the village.</li> <li>• A6 forms a hard to cross barrier.</li> <li>• Impact on roads and junctions would be similar to 10-113.</li> <li>• Note potential for chemical storage at Franklaw – see also sites IO_113 and IO_110.</li> </ul> <p>Employment:</p> <p>IO_06 - Supported – note access to the A6 across a private road.</p> <p>Mixed Use:</p> <p>IO_110</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Isolation from the Village.</li> <li>• Impact on the A6 junctions, especially close to Kirkland Bridge - traffic conflict.</li> </ul> <p>IO_111</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acceptable in principle.</li> <li>• Query split between the uses.</li> <li>• Confrontation of housing next to industry.</li> <li>• No access from the A6 and landscaped area between the road and any development.</li> <li>• Buffer site between any industry and housing would be necessary.</li> </ul> <p>IO_113</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outstanding planning application - <i>15/00248/OULMAJ</i></li> <li>• Impact of the number of proposed houses on the character of Catterall and on roads/junction access. Visual impact (landscaped buffer to the A6 required)</li> <li>• Should not be access onto the A6.</li> </ul>	

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Key Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access from the A6 and Garstang Road/congestion</li> <li>• Impact on the character of Catterall</li> <li>• Type and number of houses/industry</li> <li>• Lack of sustainability given the potential of population.</li> </ul> <p>Additional infrastructure required to support development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No facilities to sustain a community of this potential size</li> <li>• Health and social care provision</li> <li>• Education provision</li> <li>• Access to shopping/banking and other social provision.</li> </ul>	
609	<p>IO_33:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport capacity issues with relatively poor road access - heavy peak time congestion</li> <li>• Increase in traffic on the local road network</li> <li>• Poor condition of local roads</li> <li>• Large scale development would be overbearing and negatively affect the character of the neighbourhood and the historic character of Poulton-le-Fylde.</li> <li>• Impact on the wildlife - at least 2 pairs of nesting buzzards and protected species of newts</li> <li>• Adverse visual impact for hundreds of properties.</li> <li>• Development should be directed towards Fleetwood as the area with the highest level of deprivation.</li> <li>• Additional infrastructure required to support development:</li> <li>• Improved transport links and improved road access.</li> </ul>	Poulton-le-Fylde IO_33
613	<p>Matters raised in relation to Sites in Thornton around Lambs Road (IO_26,IO_27,IO_28) and north of Bourne Way (IO_21,IO_22):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on highway capacity and road safety.</li> <li>• Lack of capacity within the existing educational and health infrastructure.</li> <li>• Reduced recreational space.</li> <li>• Lack of local employment to support an increased population.</li> </ul>	Thornton IO_21 IO_22 IO_26 IO_27 IO_28



Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	Additional infrastructure required to support development: Health, education, roads emergency service infrastructure, local retail provision.	
615	<p>IO_08, IO_92, IO_94, IO_97, IO_98, IO_99</p> <p>Development would increase the number of junctions and hence accidents. Counter measures would slow traffic and lead to a demand for a new by-pass.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure required to support development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expansion of all basic infrastructure services.</li> <li>• Increased public parking with provision for the charging of electric cars.</li> <li>• Expanded services for the elderly (increasing proportion of population).</li> <li>• Enlarged sewage farm.</li> <li>• Enlarged library.</li> <li>• More checkouts at supermarkets.</li> <li>• Need for more police</li> </ul> <p>Wrap a green belt around Garstang, Catterall, Churchtown, Winmarleigh, Nateby, Cabus. Allow high quality ad hoc development within, but not on, the green belt.</p> <p>Concerned about increased run-off from Garstang/Catterall to Churchtown which is at a lower level.</p>	<p>Garstang, Catterall, Churchtown , Winmarleigh, Nateby, Cabus IO_08, IO_92, IO_94, IO_97, IO_98, IO_99</p>
632	<p>IO_26, IO_27 and IO_28 – matters raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vehicular access to these sites would have a severe impact upon highway congestion and safety.</li> <li>• Unacceptable loss of countryside</li> <li>• High Voltage power cables pass across the centre of IO_26 and close to IO_27. Regular and frequent occupation below these cables is not acceptable, as stated in Wyre’s refusal of Application 14/00845.</li> <li>• Flood risk (IO_26).</li> <li>• IO_26 and IO_27 should be classed as Green Belt following the recent refusal of planning permission at Lambs Road.</li> </ul>	<p>Thornton IO_26 IO_27 IO_28</p>
633	<p>IO_26, IO_27 and IO_28:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vehicular access to these sites would have a severe impact upon highway congestion and safety.</li> </ul>	<p>IO_26 IO_27</p>

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unacceptable loss of countryside</li> <li>• High Voltage power cables pass across the centre of IO_26 and close to IO_27. Regular and frequent occupation below these cables is not acceptable, as stated in Wyre’s refusal of Application 14/00845.</li> <li>• Flood risk (IO_26).</li> </ul>	IO_28
636	<p>IO_26, IO_27, IO_28 - Development not supported on the basis of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic congestion and poor transport infrastructure.</li> <li>• Inadequate local services, including health and educational infrastructure.</li> <li>• Road safety issues for people, animals and vehicles.</li> <li>• Loss of green spaces.</li> <li>• Negative impact on local businesses – would lead to the loss of caravan parks, riding stables would decline owing to urbanisation of Raikes Road and Underbank Road (used for hacking).</li> <li>• Negative impact on Wyre Estuary and loss of popularity.</li> <li>• Lack of local employment and consequent increase in commuting.</li> <li>• Increased risk of flooding.</li> <li>• Insufficient sewerage capacity.</li> </ul>	Thornton IO-26, IO-27, IO-28
640	<p>IO_33:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poulton and Wyre have transport capacity issues. Relatively poor road access.</li> <li>• Additional commuting would add to these issues.</li> <li>• Impact on Hardhorn Road – increased volume. Would exacerbate existing problems of a poor road surface in the locality.</li> <li>• Development would be overbearing and negatively affect the character of the neighbourhood.</li> <li>• Impact on the historic character of Poulton. Catastrophic impact on the wildlife, including nesting buzzards and newts.</li> <li>• Adverse visual impact.</li> </ul> <p>Additional infrastructure required to support development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved transport links and improved road access - this needs to be a priority.</li> <li>• The existing roads also need significant investment to raise quality standards.</li> </ul>	Poulton-le-Fylde IO_33
641	<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on the natural break between Bonds and Garstang.</li> </ul>	Garstang IO_100

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serious loss of amenity.</li> <li>• Additional infrastructure will not compensate for the loss of amenity such as views and the landscape.</li> </ul> <p>IO_100:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic impact on Castle Lane - narrow – and junction with Bonds Lane (visibility).</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land.</li> <li>• Safety implications of developing close to St Mary and Michaels primary school on Castle Lane.</li> <li>• Recreation impact - Castle Lane is a popular countryside walk up to the and past the historic castle.</li> <li>• Impact on the rural character of the area.</li> <li>• Impact on views.</li> <li>• Impact on a Scheduled Monument (Greenhalgh Castle).</li> <li>• Flood risk. Flood storage area.</li> </ul> <p>IO_101:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In use by the primary school for recreational purposes.</li> </ul>	<p>IO_101 IO_102</p>
643	<p>Comment against all Thornton sites identified as none can comply with the NPPF requirement for sustainable development on account, inter alia, of traffic congestion, poor connectivity, road safety issues, strain on local services, lack of local employment, loss of green spaces, flood risk. According to the WC Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) of 2007 some of the Flood Defences on estuary are at risk. Rail travel is a key commuter requirement but lack of parking at Poulton Station, lack of capacity on peak time trains and lack of any safe route to get there other than by car.</p> <p>Covenanted land around Stanah School included with site reference IO_27 - must be protected - given to the council that preceded WC by a local family for use as public open space in perpetuity. If it is sold for development it will be a very serious breach of faith by WC.</p>	<p>Thornton IO_27</p>
644	<p>Comment against all Thornton sites identified as none can comply with the NPPF requirement for sustainable development on account, inter alia, of traffic congestion, poor connectivity, road safety issues, strain on local services, lack of local employment, loss of green spaces, flood risk. According to the WC Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) of 2007 some of the Flood Defences on estuary are at risk. Rail travel is a key commuter requirement but lack of parking at Poulton Station, lack of capacity on peak time trains and lack of any safe route to get there other than by car.</p>	<p>Thornton IO_27</p>

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	Covenanted land around Stanah School included with site reference IO_27 - must be protected - given to the council that preceded WC by a local family for use as public open space in perpetuity. If it is sold for development it will be a very serious breach of faith by WC.	
645	<p>IO_26, IO_27, IO_28:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vehicular access would have a severe impact upon highway congestion and safety</li> <li>• HV power cables pass across the centre of IO_26 and close to IO_27.</li> <li>• IO_26 is partly in category 3 (high) flood risk area.</li> <li>• Covenanted land (to be kept as open space but now owned by Wyre Council) around Stanah school included with site reference IO_27.</li> </ul>	Thornton IO_26 IO_27 IO_28
646	<p>Sites in Forton:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question over how much more development the village can support. Lack of amenities.</li> <li>• Issue of design of local road infrastructure - narrow and winding.</li> <li>• Insufficient appropriate educational infrastructure.</li> <li>• Landowners have not been approached as stated in the documentation!</li> <li>• Land is being used for agricultural purposes.</li> <li>• Flood risk (top of School Lane bordered by the A6).</li> <li>• Insufficient capacity in the sewerage system.</li> <li>• Need for improved public transport.</li> </ul>	Forton
654	<p>IO_78:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area of archaeological interest (Roman settlement within the field.)</li> <li>• Wildlife impact (Sparrow hawk, buzzards and barn owls.)</li> <li>• Flood risk.</li> </ul> <p>Site IO_78 and IO_79 - both green belt areas and used by farmers.</p> <p>General:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact of increased pupil numbers of local school.</li> <li>• Impact on rural peaceful character.</li> <li>• Impact on local infrastructure (Nateby and Garstang) – education, health, policing.</li> <li>• Concerned affordable housing will be given to such as people from out of the area (Manchester and Liverpool - see new houses in</li> </ul>	Nateby Garstang Winmarleigh IO-78 IO_79

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Pilling.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about the condition of the roads around Nateby and Winmarleigh and impact of increased traffic.</li> <li>• Nateby and Winmarleigh should be kept as rural as possible for agricultural use.</li> </ul>	
655	<p>IO_80 (Winmarleigh):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not proportionate to the size of the village. Excessive. 10% of the current size of the village would be more appropriate.</li> <li>• Village not on mains sewers or main gas.</li> <li>• No fibre optic broadband to attract younger families</li> <li>• Local highway infrastructure unsuitable for additional traffic (narrow winding roads, narrow bridges.)</li> <li>• No bus services (or rail links) apart from the A6.</li> <li>• Development would lead to the use of private vehicles - more pollution.</li> <li>• Flooding - land adjacent to Park Lane and Broad Lane.</li> <li>• Limited ability of local infrastructure (school and church) to support only a small increase in the population.</li> <li>• Very few pedestrian walkways through the village at present.</li> <li>• Poor visibility emerging from School Lane onto Park Lane.</li> <li>• Risk of fire/explosion or other major incident (and noise) from the fertiliser depot.</li> <li>• Even the minimum amount of proposed development should not impact too adversely on the existing community.</li> <li>• Development would involve encroaching into green belt land losing valuable countryside</li> <li>• Development should be in-keeping with the present cottage style houses on Park Lane, retaining the countryside environment - could be plenty of green space in between with park areas.</li> <li>• A small mews type development for younger families, in proportion with the size of the village at present could be built, away from the main road area.</li> <li>• Suggest housing on a local garage forecourt in the immediate area – recently refused (Planning Ref: 15/00537/REM.)</li> </ul>	Winmarleigh Garstang IO_80
660	<p>Impact on Forton and Hollins Lane of new development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developments will add significant pressures. Nil or inadequate pavements along Hollins Lane and within Forton village.</li> <li>• No safe way to cross the A6 on foot – e.g. to get from Hollins Lane to the school in Forton. A footbridge is greatly required.</li> <li>• More housing will add to traffic congestion – enhanced public transport required.</li> </ul>	Forton Hollins Lane
669	<p>Comment against all Thornton sites identified as none can comply with the NPPF requirement for sustainable development on account, inter alia, of traffic congestion, poor connectivity, road safety issues, strain on local services, lack of local employment, loss of green spaces, flood risk. According to the WC Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) of 2007 some of the Flood Defences on estuary are at</p>	Thornton IO_27

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>risk. Rail travel is a key commuter requirement but lack of parking at Poulton Station, lack of capacity on peak time trains and lack of any safe route to get there other than by car.</p> <p>Covenanted land around Stanah School included with site reference IO_27 - must be protected - given to the council that preceded WC by a local family for use as public open space in perpetuity. If it is sold for development it will be a very serious breach of faith by WC.</p>	
670	<p>Comment against all Thornton sites identified as none can comply with the NPPF requirement for sustainable development on account, inter alia, of traffic congestion, poor connectivity, road safety issues, strain on local services, lack of local employment, loss of green spaces, flood risk. According to the WC Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) of 2007 some of the Flood Defences on estuary are at risk. Rail travel is a key commuter requirement but lack of parking at Poulton Station, lack of capacity on peak time trains and lack of any safe route to get there other than by car.</p> <p>Covenanted land around Stanah School included with site reference IO_27 - must be protected - given to the council that preceded WC by a local family for use as public open space in perpetuity. If it is sold for development it will be a very serious breach of faith by WC.</p>	Thornton IO_27
673	<p>IO_100, IO_101, IO_102</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implications of the large flood storage area.</li> <li>• Highway infrastructure – narrowness of Castle Lane, junction with Bonds Lane – bridge and poor sight lines.</li> <li>• Potential conflict with SS Mary and Michael school.</li> <li>• Impact on tourism and recreational use of the area.</li> </ul>	Garstang IO_100 IO_101 IO_102
674	<p>IO_26, IO_27, IO_28:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact of additional traffic on the local highway network.</li> <li>• Possibility of new development increasing run-off and potential for flash flooding as a result.</li> </ul>	Thornton IO_26 IO_27 IO_28
678	<p>IO_21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28):</p> <p>None can comply with the NPPF requirement for sustainable development of the account of: Traffic congestion; poor connectivity; school shortage of places; loss of green space; lack of local employment; increased risk of flooding.</p>	Thornton IO_21 IO_22 IO_26 IO_27 IO_28
679	<p>IO_21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28:</p>	Thornton

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	None can comply with the NPPF requirement for sustainable development of the account of: Traffic congestion; poor connectivity; school shortage of places; loss of green space; lack of local employment; increased risk of flooding.	IO_21 IO_22 IO_26 IO_27 IO_28
680/6 80a	IO_26, IO_27, IO_28: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vehicular access would have a severe impact upon highway congestion and safety</li> <li>• HV power cables pass across the centre of IO_26 and close to IO_27.</li> <li>• IO_26 is partly in category 3 (high) flood risk area.</li> <li>• Covenanted land (to be kept as open space but now owned by Wyre Council) around Stanah school included with site reference IO_27.</li> <li>• Part of IO_27 owned by self and will not be offered for development.</li> <li>• Strain on local services.</li> <li>• Loss of green space</li> <li>• Lack of local employment.</li> <li>• The land should be designated as Green Belt</li> </ul>	Thornton IO_26 IO_27 IO_28
681	Concerned that towns and villages will lose their identities. Builders do not take into account local opinion. Local infrastructure will be under massive pressure. Traffic will be at a standstill. Not convinced that views will be taken seriously.	Garstang
683	IO_26, IO_27, IO_28 Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic</li> <li>• Traffic infrastructure</li> <li>• Impact on schools</li> <li>• Flood risks</li> <li>• Loss of green space</li> <li>• Recreational space</li> <li>• Employment issues</li> </ul>	Thornton IO_26 IO_27 IO_28
687	IO_21 – under construction. IO_23 and IO_24 are part of the AAP and already have permission.	Thornton IO_21,

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>IO_22 - part of this is a public open space with a football pitch. 3 pitches have already been lost for housing development (IO 21). Poolfoot Farm is not an alternative for the houses in that area because most of Poolfoot is fenced off and it lies across Fleetwood Road North at some distance.</p> <p>The remainder of IO 22 is (was) earmarked for a cemetery – a facility which will be needed as the population grows. IO_21 only passed the test regarding flooding because it was deemed that IO_22 was needed for a cemetery.</p> <p>IO_26, IO_27,IO_28 – lack of supporting infrastructure. New access road would be required. Land for a new primary school would be required. The land around Stanah School does have a protective covenant which requires its use for recreation.</p>	<p>IO_22, IO_23, IO_24, IO_26,IO_27, IO_28</p>
689	<p>IO_21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28</p> <p>Do not constitute sustainable development - traffic congestion; poor connectivity; school shortage of places; loss of green space; lack of local employment; increased risk of flooding.</p>	<p>Thornton IO_21 IO_22 IO_26 IO_27 IO_28</p>
690	<p>IO_21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28</p> <p>Do not constitute sustainable development - traffic congestion; poor connectivity; school shortage of places; loss of green space; lack of local employment; increased risk of flooding.</p>	<p>Thornton IO_21 IO_22 IO_26 IO_27 IO_28</p>
693	<p>IO_80</p> <p>Local road infrastructure – narrow, school related congestion, lack of pavements, poor sight lines at some junctions. Significant works required to bring the road infrastructure up to standard.</p> <p>Although not in FZ2 or 3, local evidence of flooding associated with Black Pool Dyke.</p> <p>Access options – School Lane, Broad Lane, Park Lane (the latter with specific traffic control measures).</p>	<p>Winmarleigh IO_80</p>



Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>No mains sewerage or gas.</p> <p>Discrete development would be welcome (depending on actions taken regarding the above)</p>	
694	<p>IO_89, IO_90 Allocation would not greatly affect the character of the village.</p> <p>IO_91</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Includes a private garden.</li> <li>• Impact on the character of the rural and historic character of the village.</li> <li>• Includes land currently used for community activities and festivals.</li> <li>• Potential to greatly increase flood risk with potential impact on the embankment for the West Coast Mainline.</li> <li>• No public transport in the village.</li> <li>• Lack of essential infrastructure – education, health and retail.</li> <li>• Inadequate and inappropriate local highway infrastructure - narrow roads and bridges with poor sightlines.</li> <li>• Sewage network at capacity.</li> </ul>	Scorton IO_89 IO_90 IO_91
698	<p>General comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern regarding development in areas of flood risk – impact on health and well-being &amp; insurance costs.</li> <li>• Better roads and ease of access to employment needed.</li> </ul>	
700	<p>IO_103, IO_105, IO_106</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These sites include Mineral Safeguarding Areas hence not environmentally sustainable and contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.</li> <li>• Development associated with IO_103 and IO_106 would exacerbate existing flooding (Dimples Lane). Impairs pedestrian and vehicle movement and potential for additional flooding in the adjacent fields – impact on natural habitats and wildlife.</li> <li>• Sites IO_103 and IO_106 act as green buffers between Garstang and Catterall.</li> <li>• Impact on the gateway to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as accessed from Garstang along Dimples Lane and Calder House Lane. Impact on tourism.</li> <li>• Brownfield sites should be developed in preference to greenfield sites.</li> </ul>	Bowgreave Garstang Catterall IO_103 IO_105 IO_106

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on the local highway network. Dimples Lane unsuitable for additional traffic – narrow and twisty. Access down Dimples Lane to Garstang Road would be in close proximity to Garstang Academy.</li> <li>• Lack of capacity within the local educational infrastructure to accommodate additional development. Sites IO_103 and IO_106 should be retained for the expansion of the Academy.</li> <li>• Lack of capacity within the health and emergency services sector to accommodate the implied level of growth.</li> </ul>	
701	<p>IO_103, IO_105, IO_106</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These sites include Mineral Safeguarding Areas hence not environmentally sustainable and contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework.</li> <li>• Development associated with IO_103 and IO_106 would exacerbate existing flooding (Dimples Lane). Impairs pedestrian and vehicle movement and potential for additional flooding in the adjacent fields – impact on natural habitats and wildlife.</li> <li>• Sites IO_103 and IO_106 act as green buffers between Garstang and Catterall.</li> <li>• Impact on the gateway to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as accessed from Garstang along Dimples Lane and Calder House Lane. Impact on tourism.</li> <li>• Brownfield sites should be developed in preference to greenfield sites.</li> <li>• Impact on the local highway network. Dimples Lane unsuitable for additional traffic – narrow and twisty. Access down Dimples Lane to Garstang Road would be in close proximity to Garstang Academy.</li> <li>• Lack of capacity within the local educational infrastructure to accommodate additional development. Sites IO_103 and IO_106 should be retained for the expansion of the Academy.</li> <li>• Lack of capacity within the health and emergency services sector to accommodate the implied level of growth.</li> </ul>	Bowgreave Garstang Catterall IO_103 IO_105 IO_106
702	<p>IO_101, IO_103, IO_105, IO_106</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vital to the rural character of the area and Garstang as a tourist destination and as a gateway into the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</li> <li>• Development would end the separation between Garstang and Catterall.</li> <li>• Would lead to more cars on an insufficient road network (narrow). Insufficient educational, health and emergency service infrastructure.</li> </ul>	Garstang, Catterall. IO_101 IO_103 IO_105 IO_106
703	<p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roads</li> <li>• Doctor’s and emergency services</li> <li>• Schools</li> </ul>	

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public safety</li> </ul>	
704	<p>Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic congestion</li> <li>Public safety</li> <li>Overstretched public services – additional educational, health and emergency service infrastructure needed.</li> </ul>	
705	<p>IO_08, IO_92, IO_94, IO_97, IO_98, IO_99</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact of development west of the A6 on junctions – more accidents. Highways measures such as traffic lights would slow traffic and lead to demand for a new by-pass with loss of more green fields.</li> <li>Run-off from Garstang/Catterall down to Churchtown would increase flooding in the latter.</li> <li>Impact on the tranquillity of the area and loss of rural atmosphere.</li> <li>Effect on wildlife.</li> </ul> <p>Additional services needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All basic services.</li> <li>Public parking with electric car charge points.</li> <li>Increased services for the elderly.</li> <li>Enlarged library.</li> <li>Plant trees to keep rural atmosphere.</li> </ul>	<p>Garstang Catterall Churchtown IO_08, IO_92, IO_94, IO_97, IO_98, IO_99</p>
707	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Road congestion.</li> <li>Insufficient health and educational infrastructure.</li> <li>Insufficient jobs.</li> <li>Limit new development.</li> </ul>	<p>Poulton-le-Fylde</p>
709	<p>IO_33, IO_34</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact of development on wildlife and habitats especially use of fields as feeding grounds for bats.</li> <li>Special Area of Conservation.</li> <li>Existing road infrastructure inadequate to cope with excessive traffic levels.</li> </ul>	<p>IO_33, IO_34</p>
710	<p>IO_33</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Previous proposal on this part of the green belt refused on appeal.</li> <li>Issue of visual impact – vista looking up to T Wood.</li> </ul>	<p>Poulton-le-Fylde IO_33</p>

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Previous arguments remain valid – more so for a mixed use development.</li> <li>• Should remain an area of outstanding natural beauty.</li> </ul>	
711	<p>IO_33, IO_34</p> <p>Existing traffic issues including volume of traffic in the local highway network – more development would make this worse.</p>	<p>Poulton-le-Fylde</p> <p>IO_33</p> <p>IO_34</p>
714	<p>IO_92, IO_93</p> <p>Development in an area with no identifiable centre will create a residential corridor along a busy trunk road.</p> <p>IO_94, IO_97, IO_98, IO_99</p> <p>Concerns for access to the A6 – consequences for traffic flow and pedestrian safety.</p> <p>Key issues:</p> <p>To maintain the viability of Garstang Town Centre new retail development west of the A6 needs to be carefully controlled.</p> <p>Additional services and facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health, educational and emergency services need expanding.</li> <li>• Improved car parking in Garstang Town Centre.</li> <li>• Community centre with parking needed to maintain and develop a sense of community.</li> </ul>	<p>Garstang</p> <p>IO_92,</p> <p>IO_93</p> <p>IO_94,</p> <p>IO_97,</p> <p>IO_98,</p> <p>IO_99</p>
715	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use Thornton industrial land for mixed use development.</li> <li>• Land west of the A6 at Garstang should be developed as a last resort – would alter the local area and need much infrastructure.</li> <li>• Additional services and facilities: Roads, schools, health.</li> </ul>	<p>Thornton</p> <p>Garstang.</p>
717 & 718	<p>IO_80</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A6 has less public transport connectivity than the urban peninsula. Development would result in more car based commuting.</li> <li>• Would lead to increased expansion of a settlement into the countryside and Green Belt.</li> <li>• Scale of proposed development massively disproportionate to the existing village yet would not be sufficient to attract new services and facilities. Therefore issue of access to services and increase in travel by car.</li> <li>• Development would put greater pressure on existing infrastructure, especially the highway network, including Junction 1 M55.</li> <li>• Road infrastructure inadequate to cope with current demands and use by HGVs with poor and dangerous junctions; lack of footpaths</li> </ul>	<p>Winmarleigh</p> <p>IO_80</p>

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>within the village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No streetlights, mains sewerage or gas supply in the village.</li> <li>• No public transport.</li> <li>• Impact on local heritage and landscape, including impact on tourism related business.</li> <li>• Impact on local environment and wildlife habitat of local and national importance.</li> <li>• Massive infrastructure investment would be needed, contrary to the stated strategic objectives.</li> <li>• Residents have chosen to live in a small rural environment. Proposals have caused worry, anxiety and stress.</li> </ul>	
720	<p>IO_80 Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area currently designated green belt and therefore development contrary to policy.</li> </ul> <p>Location/Size</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development could in time be linked to that proposed around Nateby and could be absorbed into Garstang creating an even larger urban area.</li> <li>• Any increase in village site should be proportionate to the existing number and type of houses – e.g. 10%.</li> <li>• Winmarleigh is essentially a farming community with own ethos and way of life – would not convert easily into an urban lifestyle.</li> </ul> <p>Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing drainage problem.</li> <li>• Road network currently demonstrates problems – high volume of HGVs, narrow roads, single lane bridges. Accident blackspots on Park Lane.</li> <li>• Congestion on School Lane, including that associated with the school.</li> </ul> <p>Age Profiles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant elderly population. Development would attract more elderly residents whereas Garstang is a more appropriate location.</li> <li>• Development would lead to an increase in school age children. Present school limited by facilities and capacity.</li> </ul>	Winmarleigh Garstang Nateby IO_80
721	<p>Maps too small.</p> <p>Key issues: robust infrastructure including schools, health centres, public transport, road capacity, affordable housing, drainage,</p>	

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	sewerage, flood prevention.	
723	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development of any village needs to consider the lack of services which pose an existing problem.</li> <li>• Particular need for the provision of main sewers, surface drainage, gas and telecommunications.</li> <li>• Insufficient road infrastructure in rural areas will be unable to accommodate increased traffic.</li> </ul>	Winmarleigh IO_80
724	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited development if at all on the peninsula – already heavily developed.</li> <li>• Development needs to be shared around the borough.</li> <li>• Need adequate infrastructure in the peninsula and to connect the village in the rural area.</li> <li>• Infrastructure needs to be paid for by developers.</li> </ul>	
725	IO_80 Unsuitable road infrastructure to support so many dwellings.	Winmarleigh IO_80
726	IO_33 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overdevelopment in the existing area around IO_33 has had a negative effect.</li> <li>• Impact on personal views over the countryside that forms the site.</li> <li>• Increase in traffic on the local highway network, including junction of Hardhorn Road and Longhouse Lane.</li> <li>• Impact on local ecology – loss of habitat and wildlife.</li> <li>• Increased air and noise pollution from vehicles used in the development phase.</li> <li>• Development would have a serious, detrimental impact on the neighbourhood – negatively affecting its character, wildlife and lives of local people.</li> </ul>	Poulton-le-Fylde IO_33
727	<p>IO_80 – Ridiculous idea.</p> <p>IO_100 – would be better as a car park with footbridge over the Wyre linking with the riverside walk and town centre.</p> <p>Query why land west of Bowgreave has not been identified.</p> <p>Development must be supported by adequate health and educational infrastructure.</p> <p>Garstang needs proper services such as a combined sports centre.</p>	Winmarleigh Garstang IO_80 IO_100

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Need bungalows not houses, especially 4 and 5 bed detached.</p> <p>Need car parking.</p> <p>Need to encourage growth of jobs and the development of more industrial and business parks than currently planned for.</p> <p>Need a new motorway junction at Brockholes to support development.</p> <p>Need to find a niche role for Garstang.</p>	
729	<p>IO_33</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removal of a large area of countryside is detrimental to the small market town of Poulton-le-Fylde.</li> <li>• Impact on loss of wildlife and habitat.</li> <li>• Would cause flooding and pollution.</li> <li>• Lack of capacity on the local highway network to accommodate the development.</li> </ul> <p>Additional service and facilities needed:</p> <p>Sewage, road infrastructure, education and health infrastructure.</p>	Poulton-le-Fylde IO_33
731	<p>IO_33</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overdevelopment in the existing area around IO_33 has had a negative effect.</li> <li>• Impact on personal views over the countryside that forms the site.</li> <li>• Increase in traffic on the local highway network, including junction of Hardhorn Road and Longhouse Lane.</li> <li>• Impact on local ecology – loss of habitat and wildlife.</li> <li>• Increased air and noise pollution from vehicles used in the development phase.</li> <li>• Development would have a serious, detrimental impact on the neighbourhood – negatively affecting its character, wildlife and lives of local people.</li> </ul>	Poulton-le-Fylde IO33
732	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any development in Churchtown should aim to preserve and enhance the conservation area and its setting.</li> <li>• Any housing development should be proportionate to the size of the village i.e. 7 to 8 houses.</li> <li>• Any development needs to take into account factors such as heritage, loss of amenity, access and flooding.</li> </ul>	Churchtown IO_109

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Importance of visual amenity – see ResPublica – A Community Right to Beauty.</li> </ul> <p>IO_109 (that part between the school playing field and Vicarage Lane)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High landscape value, part of the conservation area, part of the attractiveness of the setting of Churchtown – retention is essential - “beauty” should be a material consideration.</li> <li>• Impact on the setting of listed buildings.</li> <li>• Development would be detrimental to residential amenity.</li> <li>• Narrow access – gated single track private road. Part of an ancient public footpath.</li> <li>• Flood risk. Standing water at times of the year.</li> </ul>	
733	<p>IO_21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of appropriate infrastructure to accommodate development – roads, schools, health.</li> <li>• Flood risk.</li> <li>• Loss of green space – will change the character of the area. 64% of people against building on the Green Belt.</li> </ul> <p>Additional service and facilities needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major road improvements and transport links.</li> <li>• Road safety on Lambs Road.</li> <li>• More schools and doctors.</li> </ul> <p>But preferably no new development. No development of Green Belt land.</p>	Thornton IO_21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28
735	<p>IO_21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28</p> <p>Key issues: Traffic, safety, schools, loss of green space, Green Belt review says 64% of people are against building on green belt.</p> <p>Additional service and facilities needed: Major roads, more schools no loss of green spaces.</p>	Thornton IO_21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28
738	<p>Major development would overload the road system and remove the valuable amenity of the Stanah Country Park area.</p> <p>Option 2 would cause least disruption and support ease of communication. Development would protect the character of Garstang by</p>	Thornton Garstang



Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>directing it to its periphery.</p> <p>Additional services/facilities:</p> <p>Most important is communications. Also education, health and utilities infrastructure – common to development anywhere.</p>	
739	<p>Thornton sites do not comply with the NPPF requirement for sustainable development: Traffic congestion, poor connectivity, road safety issues, strain on local services, lack of local employment, loss of green spaces, increased flood risk, lack of parking at Poulton station.</p> <p>IO_27 – land given to the council for local family use.</p>	Thornton Poulton-le-Fylde IO_27
740	<p>IO_26, IO_27, IO_28</p> <p>Impact on character and feel of the area. Additional traffic problems.</p> <p>IO_30, IO_33 No need for retail as part of mixed use sites.</p> <p>IO_30 best used for housing if Thornton must accommodate more development.</p> <p>IO_33 – large area of unnecessary retail – better used for employment/housing.</p> <p>Development proposals around the A6 corridor look small compared to the peninsula.</p> <p>Loss of countryside and Green Belt should be avoided at all costs.</p> <p>Road infrastructure at breaking point.</p> <p>Look at creating an ambitious vision for the east of the borough. Better placed to facilitate employment and investment.</p>	IO_26, IO_27, IO_28, IO_30, IO_33  Thornton Poulton-le-Fylde
741	IO_26, IO_27, IO_28	IO_26,

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Impact on character and feel of the area. Additional traffic problems.</p> <p>IO_30, IO_33 No need for retail as part of mixed use sites. IO_30 best used for housing if Thornton must accommodate more development IO_33 – large area of unnecessary retail – better used for employment/housing.</p> <p>Development proposals around the A6 corridor look small compared to the peninsula.</p> <p>Loss of countryside and Green Belt should be avoided at all costs.</p> <p>Road infrastructure at breaking point.</p> <p>Look at creating an ambitious vision for the east of the borough. Better placed to facilitate employment and investment.</p>	<p>IO_27, IO_28, IO_30, IO_33</p> <p>Thornton Poulton-le- Fylde</p>
742	<p>Option 1 impacts/issues: Traffic congestion, poor connectivity, road safety issues, strain on local services, lack of local employment, loss of green spaces, increased flood risk.</p>	
743	<p>IO_21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28 These sites do not comply with the NPPF requirements for sustainable development. IO_26, IO_27, IO_28 should be designated as Green Belt.</p> <p>Issues – traffic congestion, strain on educational and health infrastructure, employment opportunities on the peninsula.</p> <p>Has to be sustainable change in the road infrastructure to support development.</p>	<p>Thornton IO_21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28</p>
744	<p>IO_21, IO_22, IO_27, IO_28 These sites do not comply with the NPPF requirements for sustainable development.</p> <p>Issues – traffic, infrastructure, loss of countryside, and wildlife, sustainable employment opportunities.</p>	<p>IO_21, IO_22, IO_27, IO_28</p>

**Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES**

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	Additional services and facilities required – educational, health and road infrastructure.	
745	<p>IO_21, IO_22, IO_27, IO_28                      These sites do not comply with the NPPF requirements for sustainable development.</p> <p>IO_26, IO_27, IO_28 should be designated as Green Belt.</p> <p>Issues – traffic congestion, connectivity, strain on educational and health infrastructure, lack of employment opportunities on the peninsula.</p>	Thornton IO_21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28
746	<p>IO_27, IO_28                      These sites do not comply with the NPPF requirements for sustainable development.</p> <p>Issues – traffic, infrastructure, loss of countryside and wildlife.</p> <p>Additional services and facilities required – educational, health and road infrastructure.</p>	Thornton IO_27, IO_28
748	<p>Development needs to take into account the severe issues with infrastructure in the peninsula.</p> <p>Poulton and Thornton require separate relief roads. Public transport unworkable. Fleetwood largest provincial town in the UK without rail.</p> <p>Issues</p> <p>Option 1 – flooding, connectivity, local services – schools and health.                      Option 2 – Rail.                      Option 3 – no focus. Resources would be spread too thin.</p>	Poulton-le-Fylde Thornton
750	<p>Part of site 10_107 believed to be available for development. Could be developed without altering the character and image of the village. Access off Ainspool Lane. Far enough away from the UU facility so as not to create a statutory nuisance situation. Flood mitigation measures known to be held by the Environment Agency. Wyre Barrage means up-stream communities would benefit from flood protection.</p>	
751	<p>IO_26, IO_27, IO_29                      IO_27 – (planning application) rejected by Wyre Council. Strong local opposition.</p>	Thornton IO_26,

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	Lack of infrastructure Congestion Loss of green space Recreational land Poor road network Impact on nature of the area – wildlife and flora Loss of local identity	IO_27, IO_29
752	IO_26, IO_27, IO_29 IO_27 – (planning application) rejected by Wyre Council. Strong local opposition.  Poor road infrastructure at full capacity. Lack of local infrastructure – educational and health.	Thornton IO_26, IO_27, IO_29
753	IO_26, IO_27, IO_29 IO_27 – (planning application) rejected by Wyre Council. Strong local opposition.  Poor road infrastructure at full capacity. Lack of local infrastructure – educational and health.	Thornton IO_26, IO_27, IO_29
755	Issues – traffic and school capacity.	
756	IO_26, IO_27, IO_28 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on traffic congestion. Road improvements needed to cope with extra traffic.</li> <li>• Loss of green space.</li> <li>• Flood risk.</li> </ul>	Thornton IO_26, IO_27, IO_28
758	Development in rural villages such as Forton – massive rise in planning applications - will change their character – more development not needed. Transport network cannot cope. Inappropriate local road infrastructure – narrow winding lanes, bridges, lack of footpaths, dangerous	Forton

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>junctions.</p> <p>Issue of little regard to the role of agriculture – countryside and Green Belt should be used for food production not houses.</p> <p>Would need to be a huge investment in rural infrastructure such as sewers, schools, health services and public transport.</p>	
759	No relevant additional comments submitted	
760	<p>Option 2 is not an option – lack of local jobs, shortage of medical facilities – currently over stretched.</p> <p>IO_110 – issue of flooding in Churchtown.</p> <p>If more development is to take place need more medical, educational and retail facilities. Need additional car parking in Garstang.</p> <p>Flood risk needs to be addressed.</p>	Churchtown Garstang IO_110
761	<p>IO_42, IO_43, IO-44, IO_45</p> <p>Existing permissions and proposed development would change the character of the village – would no longer be a village. If Option 3 chosen, Stalmine would not retain its local character and distinctiveness (see Strategic Objective 2).</p> <p>Concerns relating to Stalmine, Hambleton, Preesall, Knott-End and Pilling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing educational, health, public transport and emergency facilities and services would not adequate.</li> <li>• Impact on increase commuting and road congestion.</li> <li>• Employment on mixed use sites unlikely to deliver more than a small proportion of medium/high skill jobs.</li> </ul> <p>Stalmine concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foul and surface water flooding – existing problems – more development = additional pressure on the existing system.</li> <li>• Increase in road traffic, including HGVs on an inadequate road infrastructure. Also potential rod traffic and access issues for residents and emergency services if there is a major incident at the gas storage facility.</li> </ul> <p>IO_42 – additional traffic, loss of agricultural land, impact on wildlife.</p> <p>IO_43 – and IO_45 - development would set an unacceptable precedent for the development of small sites on the outskirts of the</p>	Stalmine Hambleton, Preesall, Knott-End, Pilling

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>village.                      IO_44 – issues of surface and foul water disposal, increase in traffic, impact on wildlife.                      IO_45 – impact of recent gas storage permission.</p> <p>Concerned that Stalmine’s settlement boundary is being ignored.</p>	
762	<p>Village such as Forton have already seen large increases in development – more not needed.                      Key issues – school places, sewers, public transport, amenities – shops, parks and play areas.                      Additional services/facilities – need to address road infrastructure/traffic issues at Forton.</p>	Forton
781	<p>IO_26, IO_27</p> <p>See above re: traffic issues.</p> <p>Number of houses proposed for the Thornton area implies unrealistic employment development.</p> <p>Additional services and facilities required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional primary school and health centre.</li> <li>• New access roads through to the M55.</li> <li>• Re-opening of the railway to Poulton.</li> </ul>	Thornton Poulton-le-Fylde IO_26, IO_27
782	<p>IO_81 – has planning permission and is being developed.                      IO_83 – inappropriate extension of the village boundary. Would be an intrusion onto one of Forton’s much loved lanes.                      IO_84 – includes half of Forton Playing Field and so not available. Also flooding issues.                      IO_85 – unacceptable doubling of the size of the village.                      IO_86 – subject to a planning application which does not respect the settlement pattern as a heritage asset.                      IO_87 – would change the settlement pattern and by virtue of topography, would be intrusive.                      IO_88 – has outline planning permission.</p>	Forton IO_81, IO_83, IO_84, IO_85, IO_86, IO_87, IO_88
783	<p>IO_21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28</p> <p>Would result in the loss of green space and increase risk of flooding.</p>	Thornton IO_21,

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>IO_26, IO_27, IO_28                      In the light of the refusal of planning permission at IO_27, these sites should be designated as Green Belt.</p>	<p>IO_22,                      IO_26,                      IO_27,                      IO_28</p>
784	<p>Thornton is at capacity – issue of health service and school capability to service new development.</p>	<p>Thornton</p>
785	<p>Option 1 – Thornton – no work, no infrastructure, CO2 emissions will increase, quality of life will decrease, loss of green space, pressure of services.</p>	<p>Thornton</p>
786	<p>IO_21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28                      All Thornton sites are unsuitable – traffic congestion, poor connectivity, lack of local employment, loss of green space, flood risk.                      Kenyon Gardens covenanted to the Council.</p>	<p>Thornton                      IO_21,                      IO_22,                      IO_26,                      IO_27,                      IO_28</p>
787	<p>IO_21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28                      All Thornton sites are unsuitable – traffic congestion, poor connectivity, lack of local employment, loss of green space, flood risk.                      Kenyon Gardens covenanted to the Council.</p>	<p>Thornton                      IO_21,                      IO_22,                      IO_26,                      IO_27,                      IO_28</p>
788	<p>IO_21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28                      All Thornton sites are unsuitable – traffic congestion, poor connectivity, lack of local employment, loss of green space, flood risk.                      Kenyon Gardens covenanted to the Council.</p>	<p>Thornton                      IO_21,                      IO_22,                      IO_26,                      IO_27,                      IO_28</p>
792	<p>IO_80</p>	<p>Winmarleig</p>

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disproportionate scale of development.</li> <li>• Lack of services including mains gas and sewerage.</li> <li>• Flood risk.</li> <li>• Access for traffic including inappropriate local highway network (narrow, bridges)</li> <li>• Loss of productive farmland.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitats.</li> </ul>	h IO_80
793	<p>General concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of these sites would have a highly negative impact on landscape value, ecology and heritage.</li> <li>• Inappropriate expansion of Churchtown.</li> <li>• Would fail to achieve sustainability objectives.</li> <li>• Contrary to the Vision and Objectives.</li> <li>• Loss of productive agricultural land.</li> <li>• Not in the 2010 SHLAA.</li> <li>• Would intensify the boroughs environmental footprint – increase pollution and flooding.</li> <li>• Unsustainable reduction in openness.</li> <li>• Impact on conservation area and setting of listed buildings.</li> <li>• Lack of local services infrastructure.</li> <li>• Insufficient transport networks. Congestion and safety issues.</li> <li>• Loss of green infrastructure.</li> <li>• Increase in waste and pollution and carbon emissions.</li> <li>• No need for new housing - existing proposals equate to a large increase in the Churchtown/Catterall area. Existing housing for sale.</li> </ul> <p>IO_107 Poor air quality close to the sewage works – in appropriate location for development.</p> <p>IO_108 Increase in congestion. Limited access along a private road that cuts through wood land. Close to the Dewlay wind turbine.</p>	Churchtown or Catterall  IO_107, IO_108, IO_109, IO_110



Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Contains a pipeline from Abbystead to Franklaw Water Treatment Works. Impact on biodiversity, wildlife, habitats</p> <p>IO_109</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regularly floods.</li> <li>• Adjacent to Kirkland playing fields and includes the school sports field.</li> <li>• Contains a pipeline from Abbystead to Franklaw Water Treatment Works.</li> <li>• Contains main sewer pipe from Garstang to Churchtown.</li> <li>• Impact on the visual amenity of The Avenue.</li> <li>• Congestion/access issues connected to traffic backing up from the junction with the A6.</li> </ul> <p>IO_110</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on the setting of Churchtown.</li> <li>• Would create unnecessary urban sprawl into the open countryside on prime agricultural land.</li> </ul> <p>Need for safe cycle routes.</p>	
795	<p>Flooding problems.</p> <p>Safety issues arising from the Halite proposals.</p> <p>Provision needed for educational and health facilities, employment and roads/transport.</p>	
796	<p>IO_21, IO_22 Remaining area of public open space should be left for public use.</p> <p>IO_26, IO_27, IO_28</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites around Lambs Rd and Raikes Rd are old countryside and define the character of the area. Little access to the countryside – therefore remaining pockets need to remain untouched.</li> <li>• Traffic issues.</li> <li>• Area at saturation point.</li> </ul>	Thornton IO_21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
806	<p>Winmarleigh does not need more houses – already buildings – barn developments. Roads unsafe. Area of special natural significance and Special Scientific Importance. Starter homes no good for families.</p> <p>Need – gas, sewage, reliable electricity, broadband, bus route, maintained infrastructure.</p>	Winmarleigh
809	<p>IO_42, IO_43, IO-44, IO_45</p> <p>Existing permissions and proposed development would change the character of the village – would no longer be a village. If Option 3 chosen, Stalmine would not retain its local character and distinctiveness (see Strategic Objective 2).</p> <p>Concerns relating to Stalmine, Hambleton, Preesall, Knott-End and Pilling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing educational, health, public transport and emergency facilities and services would not adequate.</li> <li>• Impact on increase commuting and road congestion.</li> <li>• Employment on mixed use sites unlikely to deliver more than a small proportion of medium/high skill jobs.</li> </ul> <p>Stalmine concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foul and surface water flooding – existing problems – more development = additional pressure on the existing system.</li> <li>• Increase in road traffic, including HGVs on an inadequate road infrastructure. Also potential road traffic and access issues for residents and emergency services if there is a major incident at the gas storage facility.</li> </ul> <p>IO_42 – additional traffic, loss of agricultural land, impact on wildlife. IO_43 – and IO_45 - development would set an unacceptable precedent for the development of small sites on the outskirts of the village. IO_44 – issues of surface and foul water disposal, increase in traffic, impact on wildlife. IO_45 – impact of recent gas storage permission.</p> <p>Concerned that Stalmine’s settlement boundary is being ignored.</p>	Stalmine Hambleton, Preesall, Knott-End, Pilling

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
810	<p>IO_26, IO_27, IO_28</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large area of open countryside which is part of Thornton.</li> <li>• Flood risk issues.</li> <li>• Loss of habitat.</li> <li>• Extra traffic on unsuitable roads.</li> <li>• Additional strain on services including health and educational.</li> </ul>	Thornton IO_26, IO_27, IO_28
812	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to plan for better sewerage.</li> <li>• Development will increase traffic on Hollins Lane</li> <li>• No pavements.</li> </ul>	Hollins Lane
813	<p>IO_100</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is farmland and used for recreation.</li> <li>• Pedestrians crossing the Wyre Bridge take in views across farmland to the Trough of Bowland. Building on the site would destroy this amenity.</li> <li>• Any major expansion in housing must be accompanied by expansion in services and facilities – health, education, recreation, emergency services, retail.</li> </ul>	IO_100 Garstang
814	<p>Concerned about option 1 – flood risk, lack of distinctiveness between towns/villages – no green space means areas become large housing estates. Poor road network – increasing commuting as more people work away as not the salaries to support house process.</p> <p>Key issues: Flood risk. Road infrastructure improvements. Better bus service. Retain and create green space. More town squares and shared spaces. Some culture.</p> <p>Additional services/facilities: Educational and health infrastructure.</p>	Fleetwood Poulton-le- Fylde Thornton.

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Train link between Poulton and Fleetwood via Thornton. Maintain flood plains.</p> <p>No fracking.</p>	
817	<p>IO_81, IO_82, IO_83, IO_84, IO_85, IO_86, IO_87, IO_88</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forton is a village, Hollins Lane a hamlet.</li> <li>• Road infrastructure not designed to accommodate the scale of development proposed.</li> <li>• Forton’s position as the last village in Wyre before Lancaster needs to be recognised. Affected by decisions made by Lancaster. Issue of becoming a commuter location.</li> <li>• Issue of insufficient educational and health infrastructure and access to hospitals and further education.</li> </ul>	<p>Forton Hollins Lane IO_81, IO_82, IO_83, IO_84, IO_85, IO_86, IO_87, IO_88</p>
818	<p>IO_21, IO_22, IO_23, IO_24, IO_25</p> <p>Developing these sites will increase traffic to and from Cleveleys.</p> <p>Would be beneficial for the Sainsbury’s to proceed.</p>	<p>Cleveleys Thornton IO_21, IO_22, IO_23, IO_24, IO_25</p>
819	<p>IO_81, IO_86, IO_87 and IO_88</p> <p>Existing approvals in Forton and Hollins Lane already putting pressure on road infrastructure, sewerage system, school places. Limited amenities and bus service.</p>	<p>IO_81 IO_86 IO_87 IO_88 Forton Hollins Lane</p>
820	<p>IO_22, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28</p>	<p>Thornton</p>

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Issues – traffic, green space, no employment on the Fylde Coast, insufficient educational infrastructure.                      Silting up of the river which could cause flooding.</p>	<p>IO_22,                      IO_26,                      IO_27,                      IO_28</p>
821	<p>IO_01, IO_03                      Countryside sites – issues of visual impact – deterioration, loss of habitat, impact on roads through increased traffic.</p> <p>Need:</p> <p>Development of health services, consideration of, and solutions to, the impact of increased traffic in established areas.</p> <p>Expectation that increase in walking, cycling and use of public transport will compensate for increase in transport needs is unrealistic.</p> <p>Roads are the most important infrastructure.</p>	<p>IO_01,                      IO_03</p>
822	<p>IO_95                      Support for the development – would naturally extend Garstang.</p>	<p>Garstang                      IO_95</p>
823	<p>IO_86, IO_87, IO_88                      Hollins Lane is a ribbon development used by vehicles to connect with the A6 from communities west of Lancaster – issue of existing conflicts for existing residents – sites in this area will make it unsafe for pedestrians. Also lack of good air quality and impact on well-being.</p> <p>Needs to be provision for safe play areas on the eastern side of the A6 as an integral part of new developments.</p>	<p>IO_86,                      IO_87,                      IO_88                      Hollins Lane</p>
824	<p>Distorting developments allowed in villages. Rich village heritage. Sensitivity to historical issues should be a priority.</p> <p>Key issues – transport, health and educational infrastructure.</p>	
826	<p>Option 2 – traffic issues.                      More houses would add to A6 issues.                      Issues – traffic and parking, schools and nursery places, health facilities, leisure facilities, loss of identity.</p>	

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	Need a proper infrastructure plan. Prioritise brownfield sites.	
827	<p>IO_21, IO_22, IO_23, IO_24, IO_26, IO_27</p> <p>None of the Thornton sites meet the requirements for sustainable development in the NPPF – congestion, road safety, impact on local services, no employment, loss of green space.</p> <p>Covenanted land at IO_27 must be used as public open space.</p> <p>Lack of recreational space north of Thornton.</p> <p>Need to address – sustainable transport links, retail, health and education.</p>	Thornton IO_21, IO_22, IO_23, IO_24, IO_26, IO_27
828	<p>Issues – noise, pollution damage to Fleetwood Marsh.</p> <p>Recycling centre and fish park will have a detrimental effect on house prices (i.e. at Harbour Village).</p>	Fleetwood
829	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues – affordable mixed housing so the elderly can live amongst young families rather than ghettos for the elderly and estates for young families.</li> <li>• Need education and health infrastructure.</li> </ul>	
830	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development on the A6 at Catterall and Bowgreave should not be continuous.</li> <li>• Garstang/Bonds in the area of Castle Lane is not capable of taking increased traffic – already a hazard for drivers, the elderly and school children.</li> </ul>	
831	<p>IO_116</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area of high flood risk. Site floods after periods of heavy rain.</li> <li>• Development will close off views east of the village and reduce the rural feel.</li> <li>• Development would detrimentally affect the character of the village.</li> <li>• Amount of existing proposals in and around Catterall will affect its character.</li> </ul>	Catterall
832	Sites around Garstang would radically alter the nature of the market town.	Garstang
833	<p>Egress onto Longmoor Lane onto the A6 will not cope with increased traffic at peak times if more housing built at Nateby.</p> <p>Key issues – traffic, congestion, increased infrastructure. Possibility of fracking in the future. Poor roads due to the natural environment – e.g. moss roads into Pilling from Garstang.</p>	Garstang Nateby Pilling

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	Additional services/facilities – schools, doctors, banks better bus service in rural areas.	
834	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A6 – overcrowding, dangerous. Lack of alternative to cars therefore development will add to congestion.</li> <li>• If Option 2 – ensure does not take business away from the town centre. Sale of community centre – loss of parking.</li> <li>• Proper infrastructure plan needed. Use brownfield sites for development as opposed to building on Green Belt.</li> </ul>	
835	Concerned about impact of development – would destroy Garstang. Issues – insufficient health and educational infrastructure, impact on the A6, impact on tourism – loss of attractiveness.	Garstang
836	IO_96 Adjacent development (The Hawthorns) floods. Gradient of the land makes it unsuitable. No access. Impact on Shroggs Wood and wildlife. Noise. Key issues – another m-way junction, new health and educational infrastructure. Road infrastructure is inadequate.	IO_96 Cabus
837	Closure of community centre/loss of car park – detrimental especially when the town is growing.	Garstang
838	IO_105, IO_116, IO_117 Issue of loss of views of the Bowland Fells if developed. IO_116 – poor access on to the B6430 and part is in a flood zone.  Key issues – to ensure that proposed developments reflect the local heritage and environment. Developments on the edges of rural settlements should be softened by incorporating woodland areas, walks and cycleways, tree screening and planting of nature useful shrubs.	Bowgreave Catterall IO-105, IO_116, IO_117
840	General issue around Garstang – excess traffic use on lanes; lack of support services – education, health, emergency services.  IO_100 – poor drainage – site holds surface water in bad conditions. IO_103 - dangerous access, hill, bend, narrow pavement.	Bowgreave Garstang
842	Existing and proposed development would increase Garstang by 100%. Compared to the west of the borough which is 20%. Unbalanced. Proposals are for a whole new town not just an addition. Not feasible. Fighting for facilities. Area is a prime heritage site.	Garstang

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>No need to attract young people – the existing ones can't stay.</p> <p>A6 corridor overloaded with traffic.</p>	
843	<p>Need to undertake a full evaluation of flooding and to reduce risk of flooding.</p> <p>Key issues – public transport provision, flood risk and mitigation, affordable housing.</p> <p>Need joined up thinking with the county council on infrastructure/service provision.</p>	
845	<p>Issues – access, traffic, emergency services, schools and health facilities, libraries.</p>	
846	<p>IO_80</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal is out of proportion to the size of the existing village.</li> <li>• Narrow country lanes and bridges will not cope with additional traffic.</li> <li>• Contrary to the Vision being furthest from the M6 junction.</li> <li>• No mention of the importance of agriculture. The land is either prime agricultural land or land valuable to wildlife.</li> </ul>	Winmarleigh IO_80
847	<p>Sites at Lambs Road will not contribute to health and wellbeing or promote healthy lifestyles. Provides the only access to countryside in the Thornton area. Will not preserve local heritage or environmental assets. Cannot alter the difficult access without altering the character of the area.</p>	Thornton
848	<p>IO_133 and IO_134</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Out of proportion with the scale of the village – would more than double the size of the village assuming 35 dwellings per hectare.</li> <li>• Development of this scale would be out of keeping with the aims of the AONB.</li> <li>• Query whether or not land prices mean that affordable housing can be delivered.</li> <li>• If they can they should meet the needs of local community. No development of more than 10 houses. High quality design. Needs to be appropriate provision of services, including broadband and decent mobile signal.</li> </ul> <p>Note that:                      Limited services in the village.                      No public transport.                      Road improvements and provision of footpaths required.                      Provision of sustainable drainage schemes required.</p>	Calder Vale IO_133 IO_134



Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
854	<p>Upgraded electricity supply required.</p> <p>IO_130, IO_131, IO_132                      Barton is already undergoing significant change with the two developments taking place.                      A6 cannot cope with additional traffic.</p> <p>Key issues, Barton:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local schools are at capacity,</li> <li>• Lack of facilities,</li> <li>• Loss of countryside and wildlife.</li> </ul> <p>Additional services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If traffic issues can be solved all other service and amenities can be provided.</li> </ul>	<p>Barton,                      IO_130,                      IO_131,                      IO_132,</p>
863	<p>Concerns:                      IO_26, IO_27, IO_28                      Severe impact upon traffic congestion.                      Unacceptable loss of countryside.                      Urban sprawl would ensue.                      Negative impact upon wildlife, open space.                      Impact on physical health where outdoor activities and enjoyed by residents.</p> <p>IO_26, IO_27                      Planning applications here were refused due to pylons.</p> <p>IO_26 is flood risk.</p> <p>IO_27 is not up for development by land owner.</p> <p>Covenanted land around Atanah School IO_27 should be protected.</p>	<p>IO_26,                      IO_27,                      IO_28,                      Lambs Hill</p>

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Rail travel is difficult.</p> <p>Lambs Hill residential application was refused due to loss of rural character and insufficient road networks. Land should be turned into greenbelt.</p> <p>Additional Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safer footpaths,</li> <li>• Cycle routes,</li> <li>• Bridleways,</li> <li>• Safe and efficient road network with good access to health, education and recreational space,</li> <li>• Greenspace preservation.</li> </ul>	
865	<p>IO_100 and IO_102</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites offer the opportunity for sustainable growth;</li> <li>• Only opportunity for expansion along the eastern edge of Garstang,</li> <li>• It will be hard to integrate development on the western fringe into the grain and fabric of Garstang,</li> <li>• Site are within easy walking distance of services in town centre.</li> <li>• No impediments to bringing land forwardA phased approach should be taken for referenced sites.</li> </ul> <p>The delivery of these sites can help provide car parking provision to the town centre. The sites will provide housing, potentially employment and a direct link over the river to the town that could benefit the high street. The high street of Garstang must be protected from new forms of retail and supported by high quality infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	IO_100, IO_102
900	<p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary school places will need to be increased around Garstang.</li> </ul> <p>Additional services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road to Calder Vale would need widening and straightening if sites IO_133 and IO_134 are developed.</li> <li>• Improvements to Nateby cross roads will be required if IO_88, IO_98, IO_99 are included in final plan.</li> </ul>	IO_88, IO_98, IO_99, IO_133 and IO_134
901	IO_32, IO_31, IO_26 - Insufficient road capacity.	IO_32,

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Key Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poulton cannot cope with additional traffic. Bypass will be required.</li> <li>• Poulton has no local employment.</li> <li>• Schools, dentists and GPs are all full.</li> </ul> <p>Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road infrastructure needs to be re-thought. A Poulton by-pass is needed.</li> </ul>	<p>IO_31, IO_26</p>
902	<p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport is always a problem but always copes in the end.</li> </ul>	
903	<p>IO_04 Land is already allocated for employment but requires permission of owners.</p> <p>IO_51 Access may cause problems but housing is supported here in principle.</p> <p>IO_52 Poor access, land owner will not sell. Parish Council opposes use of this site.</p> <p>IO_54 Support for proposal. Footpath will be required.</p> <p>IO_55 Flood risk. Detriment to view of Pilling Mill (famous heritage feature) will be lost. Not supported by Parish Council. Land has seen much infill, Parish Council is interested to know how this will be developed.</p> <p>IO_57 Access is difficult. Land owner is unlikely to sell.</p>	<p>IO_04, IO_51, IO_52, IO_54, IO_55, IO_57, IO_58, IO_59, IO_60, IO_61</p>

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>IO_58 Permission for affordable housing has been granted and is being implemented.</p> <p>IO_59 North is not supported for development. Area behind Bodkin Hall has planning permission, if this changes to permission for housing it must reflect local needs.</p> <p>IO_60 Lacks public access. Flood risk. Land is landlocked.</p> <p>IO_61 Housing will detract from linear form of Garstang Road.</p> <p>IO_62 Supported – provided that access is provided off Garstang Road only.</p> <p>IO_53 Not supported – farm will be lost, centre of Pilling village will be opened.</p> <p>IO_56 Farm will be put out of business. Farmer is unwilling to sell.</p> <p>Key Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure,</li> <li>• Highways,</li> <li>• Sewerage removal and land drainage,</li> <li>• Education,</li> <li>• Flooding,</li> <li>• Health and Social Services,</li> </ul>	

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Amenities,</li> </ul> <p>Infrastructure in Pilling needs substantial consideration as to how it can cope with the number of developments demanded by the government.</p> <p>The built environment should not extend beyond existing boundaries.</p> <p>Additional services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning against flooding,</li> <li>• Public transport,</li> <li>• Maintenance of roads,</li> <li>• Employment opportunities,</li> <li>• Facilities for leisure.</li> </ul>	
905	<p>IO_84, IO_85 Access to A6 is poor. Development here will increase traffic.</p> <p>IO_86, IO_87, IO_88 Increase traffic along Hollins Lane.</p> <p>Public transport along a6 is not convenient.</p> <p>Key Issues: Forton has its share of housing development according to recent planning approvals. GP and School places are in demand.</p> <p>Additional Services: Roads need maintenance, School places, GP appointments, utilities (water, electricity, sewerage etc.)</p>	IO_84, IO_85, IO_86, IO_87, IO_88, IO_81
908	<p>Fear that plan will irreparably ruin the nature and charm and standard of life in Garstang and the surrounding area.</p> <p>Key Issues:</p>	Garstang

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Loss of amenity, traffic, overcrowding, urbanisation, demand for services.</p> <p>Additional services: No further development and hence no additional services required.</p>	
909	<p>IO_74, IO_75, IO_76, IO_77 St Michael's is a small village and lacks infrastructure. Development of sites will increase traffic problems.</p> <p>IO_63, IO_64, IO_65, IO_66, IO_107, IO_108, IO_109 Infrastructure and road provision are lacking.</p> <p>Other issues: Education, nature of A and B roads, doctors, shops, flooding, employment.</p>	<p>IO_74, IO_75, IO_76, IO_77, IO_63, IO_64, IO_65, IO_66, IO_107, IO_108, IO_109</p>
911	<p>Forton currently has sites with planning permission but:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing roads cannot support additional traffic,</li> <li>• Area lacks employment,</li> <li>• Proposals will diminish country life and wildlife.</li> </ul> <p>No more buildings in Forton, there's enough already. Any additional development will not be sustainable.</p>	<p>IO_85, IO_84, IO_88, IO_96, IO_87</p>
915	<p>IO_80, Concern over:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• loss of farmland,</li> <li>• lack of services (incl. Road connections, internet connectivity, sewerage and water pressure),</li> <li>• loss of marshland and green infrastructure/floodplain,</li> </ul> <p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents' opinions and needs must be paramount if sites are to be looked at further,</li> <li>• Parish councils were expected to understand and share plan with residents,</li> <li>• Council should arrange for council professionals/planning officers to attend consultations,</li> </ul>	<p>IO_80</p>

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statistics are not sufficient, consultation with residents is the only way for the council to understand what is appropriate and feasible,</li> <li>• Road infrastructure.</li> </ul>	
916	Highway Issues, Schools, medical centre.	
919	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing on IO_100 should be cautiously considered. Castle Lane cannot support additional traffic;</li> <li>• Loss of Greenfield by the riverside would be disastrous;</li> </ul> <p>Most important infrastructure to be provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IO_100 a path along the river and park designation would benefit walkers and make better use of the site.</li> </ul>	IO_100
920	<p>Concerns over expansion of Thornton (IO_27, IO_26) Previous application here was refused due to site’s location. Continued allocation of land in countryside and possibly greenbelt should be considered.</p> <p>Fields to East (abutting the wildlife park) should be given protected status to enhance wildlife and views.</p> <p>Allocation of employment land IO_1 and IO_3 is welcomed.</p> <p>In favour of allocation of employment land around dock area of Fleetwood (particularly IO_17) as opposed to mixed-use, as it is in keeping with the character of the area.</p> <p>Agrees with identified sites in Garstang and Catterall. Specific employment land would be favoured over mixed use.</p> <p>Key issues: Development sites within the western peninsular should not be brought forward until the LPA has a robust transport strategy identifying key improvement works along A585 and surrounding transport to manage the increase in vehicle usage. options to alleviate congestion at peak times should be investigated.</p> <p>Development in the western peninsular and eastern settlements should be accompanied by a sustainable transport plan which fully considers the expansion of public transport service and takes into account the opportunity to expand the existing rail link from Poulton-le-Fylde through to Fleetwood.</p> <p>A Transport strategy should be brought forward through collaboration with neighbouring LPA’s including Blackpool and Fylde to ensure</p>	IO_27, IO_26, IO_1, IO_3, IO_17, Garstang, Catterall

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>a strategic approach to the delivery of improvement measures across the Borough.</p> <p>The delivery of key services such as capacity of local schools and GP surgeries needs to be carefully considered. In smaller settlements the accessibility to services should be a key material consideration.</p> <p>The need for affordable and socially rented housing in the Borough should be addressed when bringing forward new housing sites. In some areas of the Borough the market for ‘market housing’ is saturated with many residents finding it difficult to sell homes. A high percentage of affordable dwellings should therefore be considered on development sites to meet local housing need.</p>	
921	<p>Concerns: IO_89, IO_90 were previously considered ‘unsuitable’ by WBC.</p> <p>IO_89: borders the AONB, is at risk of flooding and has an unsuitable gradient.</p> <p>IO_90: borders the listed Mill Ponds. Scorton has been disproportionately developed with housing of an unsuitable scale. Schools are full and roads are congested.</p> <p>IO_91: loss of farmland will lead to loss of character.</p> <p>Further development will lead to loss of heritage and culture. Station Lane development is too dense and materials are not to the Council’s conservation area policies. There is more suitable land around the Ward in Calder Vale, Forton and Scorton for development. Development should not exceed 2 dwellings in order to preclude the normalising effect of modern housing.</p> <p>Further development is unsustainable due to insufficient infrastructure in Scorton and Wyre. Access to the village is limited by railway lines and bridges. Meeting additional service requirements will destroy the village’s historical heritage. This is in contradiction to policy protecting natural and built assets which bring tourism and associated industries to the Borough.</p>	IO_89, IO_90, IO_91, Scorton
922	<p>IO_26, IO_27, IO_28 If these areas are developed many species (incl. Skylarks) will disappear and no longer be enjoyed by future generations in the locale. There are over 100 species of birds and mammals seen in this area alone.</p>	IO_26, IO_27, IO_28



Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Health benefits of nature are renowned.</p> <p>Key Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unsuitable, inefficient and congested road network;</li> <li>• Climate change;</li> <li>• Flood risk;</li> <li>• Effects on local residents and character of area;</li> <li>• Loss of biodiversity and habitats;</li> </ul> <p>Unbiased and accurate biodiversity surveys should be carried out throughout the year covering affected areas taking into account the functional links to Morecambe Bay and Wyre Estuary. This should be done before development is considered.</p> <p>Additional Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safe, efficient and robust road network with good access to local services, schools, healthcare, green and recreational space and sustainable public transport choice.</li> <li>• Safe footways and cycling facilities.</li> <li>• Areas for wildlife without threat of human disturbance, destruction or pollution. Mere siting of bat/bird boxes and holes in fences for hedgehog access in new developments is not nearly enough.</li> <li>• Climate change/flood risk mitigation measures.</li> </ul>	
923	<p>Against draft proposal of construction on White Horse Lane. And sites IO_130 and IO_131 on Barton and Bowgreave map.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roads leading towards the sites have had a dangerous increase in traffic.</li> <li>• White Horse Lane is unable to efficiently accommodate new construction and would negatively impact road safety for school children, and make for awkward driving.</li> <li>• A car dealership at White Horse Lane could contribute to possible vehicle collisions.</li> <li>• Negatively affects a nice area for pedestrians.</li> </ul>	IO_130, IO_131
925	IO_81: 27 new homes being built already.	IO_81 to IO_88

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>IO_82 to IO_83: Current land owners have no plans to sell land and didn't know it was allocated.</p> <p>IO_84: Already the village park and play area.</p> <p>IO_85: Currently one of the few working farms.</p> <p>IO_86 to IO_88: Excessive number of houses and bad traffic.</p>	
926	<p>Concerns:                      Development proposed for Forton is the same in all three options.                      Population figures are based on out- of-date census data. Housing projections do not take into account large new developments.                      Current properties on the market have not sold.</p> <p>IO_81 IO_85, IO_86, IO_88</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development at this scale is not feasible due to unsuitable, dangerous country roads.</li> <li>• A6 is at capacity,</li> <li>• Public transport provision is poor and costly,</li> <li>• Limited amenities (doctors, shops, dentists),</li> <li>• Sewerage system is out of date and previous applications have been refused as a result.</li> </ul> <p>An increased population will mean more cars travelling out of Garstang and Lancaster.</p> <p>Proposal is not sustainable due to reasons highlighted above. Additional traffic will also impact upon pollution/climate change.</p>	IO_81 IO_85, IO_86, IO_88
927	<p>Constraints on development in Inskip:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lack of infrastructure and Services:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nearest health centre/dentists are in Great Eccleston (4 miles away),</li> <li>• Nearest hospital and ambulance station is at Fulwood (6 miles away),</li> <li>• Extended response times for all emergency services,</li> <li>• Nearest shops are in Great Eccleston (4 miles away),</li> <li>• Nearest supermarkets are at Kirkham and Fulwood (6 miles away), or Garstang and Poulton (8 miles away),</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	IO_68, IO_69, IO_70, IO_71, IO_72, IO_73, IO_20

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No locally based taxi service,</li> <li>• Very limited bus service,</li> <li>• Secondary school students are bussed to to either Garstang or Broughton (with some bussed to Kirkham or Poulton),</li> <li>• No transport facilities for the 16 to 18 year olds attending college.</li> </ul> <p>2. Very Limited job opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local job opportunities limited to farming and a few local industrial units,</li> <li>• Most working age people have to commute out for work,</li> <li>• Many commute 10, 20, 30, or more miles out to work,</li> <li>• The nearest train station is 6 miles distant at Kirkham, which is on a branch line some way distant from the West Coast Main Line,</li> <li>• Nearest access to the motorway network is M6 Junction 32 at Fulwood.</li> </ul> <p>3. Potential Development Sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IO_72, IO_73, and IO_68 (part) are Grade 2 (high quality) agricultural land. The best agricultural land should be retained for farming and protected from development,</li> <li>• IO_68, IO_69, IO_70, and IO_71, are classified as Grade 3 (good/moderate quality). Whilst it is good to retain land for agriculture, these locations are more suitable for development.</li> <li>• IO_70, IO_71, and IO_72, are crossed by Ethylene Pipeline and as a result is anticipated that development should be precluded in these locations. A high quality development could be achieved including the Parish Council’s vision of a village green (at IO_71), whilst taking advantage of the forced open aspect to the Pennine Hills.</li> </ul> <p>4. Parish Council’s own vision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retain the essential farming aspect of the community by protecting prime agricultural land,</li> <li>• Modest development of the core Inskip settlement is accepted as appropriate – provided that it is within the 20% margin,</li> <li>• Development must be balanced towards the delivery of affordable and starter homes for the young and families. There should also be accommodation suitable for retired residents (incl. Bungalows) to free up existing stock by providing downsize dwellings,</li> </ul> <p>5. Focus housing development in the area around the Derby Arms IO_69, IO_70, and IO_71 with a village green at IO_71, ideally of a size sufficient to play cricket. Housing could then be sited around the ‘green’ both as a frontage development and in short cul-de-sacs. The Parish Council recommend a mixture of cottage and executive style housing. Land in front of the green should be reserved for a Village Hall. Both the proposed Green and Village Hall would benefit the community.</p>	

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of the Derby Arms area would be complemented by development of further employment opportunities at IO_20.</li> </ul>	
928	<p>Supports use of IO_35 for housing development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delivery of housing on site within 5 years is a realistic prospect.</li> <li>Potential yield at 28 dwellings per hectare would be 90 units.</li> <li>Whilst the site is greenfield, it is surrounded on all sides by residential development. Further development, therefore, would not encroach on the countryside.</li> <li>Development would be infilling of land between Meadow Avenue, Pinewood Avenue and Rosslyn Avenue. The use of this land would be well-integrated and sustainable, linking well to the adjacent McInerey Homes Scheme.</li> <li>The site is sustainable as it is within walking distance of services and facilities. Both Preesall and Knott End town centres' are within 1.5km of the site.</li> <li>0.4km from the site is a regular bus service running to Blackpool, Poulton-le-Fylde and Lancaster.</li> <li>Whilst the site may sit within Flood Zone 3, the majority of Knott End and Preesall are also within this zone.</li> <li>Other applications for housing within Flood Zone 3 have been granted permission.</li> <li>There are no ecological constraints and only a few trees of any merit on site, this would not restrain development of the site.</li> <li>There would be no requirement for substantial improvements to existing infrastructure as a result of development on IO_35.</li> <li>Site has good access.</li> <li>Additional vehicle movements would be low and therefore no upgrades to the highway would be necessary.</li> <li></li> </ul> <p>Sites IO_36 and IO_37:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites are physically separate from settlement boundaries of Preesall and Knott End and would therefore be unsustainable extensions.</li> <li>Sites are further away from existing services and facilities.</li> </ul>	IO_35
929	<p>Identified sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IO_81 Has full planning permission.</li> <li>IO_82 Potentially suitable for housing.</li> <li>IO_83 Not supported due to distortion of settlement boundary and extension along Winder Lane which is a valued amenity lane.</li> <li>IO_84 Not supported. Outside settlement boundary.</li> </ul>	IO_81, IO_82, IO_83, IO_84, IO_85,

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IO_85 Strongly against due to scale, narrow country lanes and topography.</li> <li>• IO_86 Not supported due to loss of character of Hollins Lane and concerns over infrastructure (incl. Sewerage).</li> <li>• IO_87 Not supported due to loss of character.</li> <li>• IO_88 Site has outline permission</li> </ul> <p>Key Issues for Forton Parish Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community needs time to assimilate large increases to their population. Scale of proposed development on all 8 sites is too severe.</li> <li>• Proposed development would be unsustainable due to lack of jobs and increased congestion.</li> <li>• Role of farming in creating an attractive landscape needs to be supported.</li> <li>• Developers need to be obliged to incorporate private starter and retirement homes in future major applications. This should be made clear to them at the pre-app stage.</li> <li>• Mandatory pre-application discussions with the Parish Council should apply to developments of 5 houses or more.</li> <li>• Further development put excessive strain on infrastructure. Primary schools, GPs and sewers are at capacity. There is no public open space on Hollins Lane and Children have to cross the A6.</li> <li>• There is no joined up thinking in assessing the collective impact of developments in Lancaster and Galgate.</li> <li>• The assumption that the parish will lose vitality without new housing is rejected.</li> </ul>	<p>IO_86, IO_87, IO_88</p>
933	<p>IO_48 would be more suitable for residential development. It benefits from close proximity to local services. Allocation of the site would aid in the delivery of a range of housing types required by Hambleton. The site is not constrained by greenbelt.</p> <p>Concerns over ‘soundness’ of Local Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of Objectively Assessed Need,</li> <li>• Lack of acknowledgement of Duty to Co-operate,</li> <li>• Spatial Distribution - need for housing should be considered before the location. Development of rural areas should be prioritised so as to address the lack of affordability in these areas.</li> <li>• Greenbelt Review in order to consider available development options a review must be undertaken. This is the only way for a decision to grant the release of land to be made.</li> </ul>	<p>IO_48</p>
937	<p>IO_26, IO_27, IO_28</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vehicular access to these sites would have severe impacts upon congestion.</li> <li>• HV power cables pass across IO_26 and close to IO_27. Regular occupation below these cables is not acceptable.</li> </ul>	<p>IO_26, IO_27, IO_28</p>

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IO_26 is in flood zone 3. Developing IO_27 would increase flood risk.</li> </ul> <p>Key issues: Over 900 houses are proposed for the listed sites, this will lead to a collapse in infrastructure. Biological and environmental protection to the Wyre estuary and Morecambe Bay would be adversely affected by the removal of this area of adjacent countryside.</p> <p>Additional Infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road widening to include footpaths,</li> <li>• New relief road for A585,</li> <li>• Major flood defences and SUDS,</li> <li>• Major increases to public transport,</li> <li>• New primary schools,</li> <li>• New hospital.</li> </ul>	
944	<p>Development of IO_133 and IO_134 would be to the detriment of Calder Vale and the AONB. Houses sell slowly in this area, therefore there is no demand for additional housing.</p> <p>There is also a lack of public transport and shops in the area.</p> <p>Access to IO_134 is poor due to dangerous corner.</p>	Calder Vale, IO_133, IO_134
945	<p>IO_100</p> <p>Access – Castle Lane restricted width, school and parking.</p> <p>Impact on the Castle and popular walk.</p> <p>Flood plain.</p> <p>IO_101 – includes the school playing fields.</p>	

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>IO_102 – best option of the three as backs onto a private road and adjacent to existing estate, but a still access issues along Castle Lane.</p> <p>Don't believe the sewers are in place to cope with additional development.</p>	
946	<p>IO_100, IO_102 these sites provide the potential for sustainable growth. Sites are within easy walking distance services and facilities.</p> <p>It will be challenging to integrate sites to the west of the A6 with Garstang.</p> <p>A phased approach should be taken to the urban expansion at sites IO_100 and IO_102. IO_102 can be accessed along Spalding Lane and can be brought forward in the short term.</p> <p>IO_100 can be viewed as a development opportunity in the medium phase of the Local Plan. Due to flood defences the site falls outside the flood zone.</p> <p>Additional service and facility requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Car parking - this could be provided at IO_100,</li> <li>• Pedestrian bridge over the River Wyre,</li> <li>• Garstang High street needs to be supported by new high quality infrastructure,</li> <li>• Improved access,</li> <li>• Integrated recreational routes along the eastern edge of Garstang.</li> </ul>	IO_100, IO_102
948	<p>Housing: This should suit local need and viability should never prevent good sustainable planning.</p> <p>Employment: There will not be a massive need but there are some businesses that require start up units.</p> <p>There are no public highways issues related to IO_80, although, public transport is very limited.</p> <p>IO_80 is an odd shape and has a brook running through it. It is therefore not ideal for agriculture and would be better suited to housing. The site is of an appropriate size.</p>	IO_80  Winmarleigh

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>The local primary school is within easy reach of the site.</p> <p>Currently there is no real village centre (Winmarleigh).</p> <p>The village benefits from a hall, public house, school and church. There are also two employment areas close by.</p> <p>Neighbouring Garstang also provides health care provision, a shopping centre and improved public transport 2 miles away.</p> <p>There is no risk of flooding on site.</p> <p>Additional comments:                      Option 1 – the importance of maintaining the hamlets and their limited services should not be overlooked, they will benefit from development.</p> <p>Option2 – the creation of a village centre would be beneficial.</p> <p>Option 3 – this discusses the significant expansion of Winmarleigh and offers the potential to create a development of up to 90 homes, including affordable homes and bungalows.</p>	
949	<p>Potential Development Sites – Fleetwood                      This is very close to the Wyre Estuary SSSI, Lune Estuary SSSI and Morecambe Bay SPA/SAC/Ramsar. PFG and air pollution - possible issues that will need consideration</p> <p>Potential Development Sites - Poulton-le-Fylde and Carleton                      May be possible issues around recreational pressure and water quality issues - Wyre Estuary SSSI and Morcambe Bay SPA/SAC/Ramsar.</p> <p>Potential Development Sites - Knott End and Preesall                      May be potential issues relating to PFG and other SPA birds due to the open nature of the fields.</p> <p>Potential Development Sites - Hambleton and Stalmine</p>	IO_05 IO_119



Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Due to the open nature of the fields Pink Footed Geese (PFG) issues will need consideration.</p> <p>Potential Development Sites – Pilling All of these sites have the potential to impact on PFG functionally linked land so this would need consideration if these sites were to go forward.</p> <p>For housing allocations sites recreational disturbance on designated sites needs to be considered alongside water quality impacts, there may be hydrological links to the designated sites.</p> <p>Air pollution issues may also need to be considered dependent upon the type of development.</p> <p>Potential Development Sites - Great Eccleston Due to the open nature of the fields PFG needs to be considered. There is a direct hydrological link to the designated site via the river Wyre and hence consideration needs to be given to this.</p> <p>Potential Development Sites - Forton, Hollins Lane, Scorton and Winmarleigh IO_80 this site falls in the PFG mapping so this will require careful consideration.</p> <p>Potential Development Sites – Nateby Low potential for PFG based on the mapping but still requires consideration.</p> <p>Potential Development Sites - Bowgreave, Catterall and Churchtown PFG maps do not show anything for these sites but that does not mean they are not here so still require consideration.</p> <p>IO_119 and IO_05 may need further scrutiny.</p> <p>Potential Development Sites - St Michaels These look like infill sites but the PFG maps show high potential for PFG so this will need consideration. There is a direct hydrological link to river Wyre and eventually to designated sites.</p>	

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Potential Development Sites – Inskip The open field system means that PFG will require consideration even though there is nothing showing on the PFG maps.</p> <p>Potential Development Sites - Barton and Bilsborrow For all these sites there are no PFG recorded but does not mean that they are absent. Consider a policy wording to capture this.</p>	
953	<p>Consulted party has an interest in sites IO_113 and IO_115. They have submitted a planning application for the sites which has gone to appeal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites are appropriate for mixed use development and can provide the mix of housing required.</li> <li>• Residential development can help fund the infrastructure required and new link roads providing access to proposed employment land.</li> <li>• Additional residents in Catterall will increase the vitality and sustainability of the town; thereby reducing the need to travel out.</li> <li>• Development will not have any significant impacts upon the operation and safety of the highways network.</li> <li>• Sites are of an average arable quality in relation to the region.</li> <li>• Sites have no special designation.</li> <li>• Site is on flood zone.</li> <li>• Delivery of the sites would have a significant impact upon the local economy by attracting and retaining a skilled work force. Existing businesses will also profits from the increased population.</li> </ul>	IO_113, IO_115
955	<p>NEW SITE - Suggested site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sailing Club, River Road, Thornton-Cleveleys</li> </ul> <p>Map included in response.</p> <p>The site is well related to existing dwellings and local services. A site specific flood risk assessment has been undertaken which indicates that flood risk is not a constraint for development</p>	
956	<p>IO_26 Site limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor public transport links,</li> <li>• Lack of local railway stations,</li> </ul>	IO_26, IO_27, IO_28

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An electricity transmitter on site,</li> <li>• Development will have a severe ecological impact as the site is close to a SSSI.</li> </ul> <p>IO_27 Previous applications for the site have been refused due to substandard access roads (Skipool Rd).</p> <p>IO_28 Woodhouse Road and Raikes Road are not suitable to serve this potential development due to lack of footpaths and narrow carriageways.</p>	
957	<p>The consulted party owns part of IO_106. Housing is deliverable on the site without having a detrimental impact upon the local highway network, ecology, flood risk or the amenity of existing properties in the area.</p> <p>Development of the site would fit with all three options.</p> <p>Issue to be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preference should be given to sites within flood zone 1.</li> </ul>	IO_106
958	<p>Option 1 – Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development should not be concentrated in Poulton and Thornton due to strain on services and road links.</li> <li>• Development and the associated costs/strain on services should be spread out.</li> <li>• Dispersal will prevent loss of identity for each community.</li> <li>• Loss of greenspace and wildlife, particularly in Poulton and Thornton.</li> </ul> <p>Additional services for option 1: A direct link from Fleetwood/Thornton to the M55 would be needed to prevent gridlock in Fleetwood/Thornton/Poulton.</p> <p>If option3 is adopted minor work would probably be sufficient.</p>	
960	<p>Site IO_132 s available, deliverable and suitable for housing development and has the support of the land owners. The site also benefits from a regular bus service between Preston and Garstang giving a good level of access to shops, services and jobs.</p>	IO_132, Garstang, Barton

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	Barton village has a primary school within 400m of the site which lies on the other side of the district boundary. Preston Council has allocated nearby land (Forest Grove Road, Barton) for development, this confirms the inherent sustainability of the village.	
962	No sites shown in Out Rawcliffe. Growth around Hambleton and Stalmine should take account of flooding.	Out Rawcliffe Hambleton Stalmine
964	<p>Sites IO_07 –62 should be considered in light of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The possible development of the Wyre Barrage, and,</li> <li>• The underground gas storage system which may make sites within the vicinity less desirable for development.</li> </ul> <p>Sites IO_131-132 contribute to an unwelcome ribbon development.</p> <p>Site IO_126 - There is little need for a large mixed use development here.</p> <p>Sites IO_133-134 are good examples of infill which will support the local community infrastructure.</p> <p>Sites IO_69 and IO_100-102 merit consideration, however, mixed use developments are optimistic.</p> <p>Sites IO_63-67 would make good compact infill developments.</p> <p>Sites IO_43-47 would also work well as infill developments.</p> <p>Sites IO_42, IO_35-45 and IO_48-50 seem optimistic and ignore potential effects of the Wyre Barrage.</p> <p>Development of sites on pages 50, 52-56 and 59 are dependent upon the development of appropriate medical and educational infrastructure in Garstang.</p>	IO_07- IO_62, IO_131, IO_132, IO_126, IO_133, IO_134, IO_96, IO_100, IO_101, IO_102, IO_63, IO_64, IO_65, IO_66, IO_67, IO_43, IO_44, IO_45, IO_46, IO_47, IO_42, IO_48, IO_49,

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
		IO_50, IO_35, IO_36, IO_37, IO_38, IO_39, IO_40, IO_41, IO_42, IO_43, IO_44, IO_45
974	<p>Site Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IO_02 is a concern due to adverse amenity impacts currently being faced by Cala Gran from the waste recycling facility.</li> <li>• IO_02, should not be developed as it would lead to erosion of the countryside surrounding disturbing industries surrounding sites IO_01, IO_24, and IO_17</li> </ul>	IO_02, IO_01, IO_24, IO_17
980	<p>IO_94, IO_97, IO_98, IO_99</p> <p>Sites on the west of the A6. Will create a need for a by-pass to by-pass the by-pass.</p> <p>Garstang will no longer feel like a small market town.</p> <p>Hope no planning permission is given on Grade 1 agricultural land.</p> <p>IO_95 – past application refused due to poor access. Traffic now even heavier.</p>	Cabus Garstang
981	IO_30 – mixed use supported but should be described as a "residential-led mixed use scheme" with flexibility to take account of scheme viability.	IO_30 Cleveleys
985	NEW SITE - Promotes a site for housing development off the A6 opposite St Lawrence Avenue at Barton. Poor quality agricultural land. Within close proximity of the local school. Development should encourage more local services to be developed. Good public transport.	

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
989	<p>Important that sites are deliverable. Discussions should be held between developers and promoters of sites to identify barriers to delivery.</p> <p>Should ensure that any planning obligations are not unduly onerous.</p> <p>Need to provide a buffer over and above the housing requirement – housing requirements are a minimum plus some sites will not come forward as expected. A 20% buffer of sites is recommended.</p>	
995	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for IO_17 and suggests but clarification over land being brought forward for development by the land owners (plan provided.)</li> <li>• Broad support for a mixed-use designation but with specific details reserved for planning applications.</li> <li>• “Small scale retail” is not defined and could form part of the mix of uses on the site but to provide flexibility should be removed from the designation.</li> </ul>	Fleetwood
996	<p>Note potential impact on primary school places and potential for a shortfall in school places in the Poulton-le-Fylde and Staining area over the next five years. Less concern over secondary places but requires monitoring.</p> <p>Plans should aim to minimise adverse effects on the natural environment and allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. No evidence that the sites put forward have been selected on this basis.</p>	Poulton-le-Fylde
1,002	<p>IO_100, IO_101, IO_103 - supported as sustainable locations.</p> <p>IO_05, IO_06 – supported employment sites.</p> <p>IO_112, IO_116, IO_117 IO_11 - supported – acceptable in scale in a relatively safe location (in terms of access.)</p> <p>IO_110, IO_113, IO_114, IO_115, IO_119, IO_120 – not supported – inappropriate in scale in relation to Catterall. Some such as IO_113 are also inappropriate in terms of their relationship to the A6.</p> <p>Prior to any development, health and education services must be put in place and highway capacity addressed.</p>	Catterall
1,005	<p>We support a Site Allocation for Residential Development in relation to Site Ref: IO_105 located on the edge of Bowgreave. This is primarily due to: its sustainable location; sense of containment by housing and natural features; strong functional/economic</p>	Bowgreave

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>relationship to Garstang and Catterall; it's deliverability as a high quality residential site; it's ability to significantly boost housing land supply, choice and affordability in this rural hinterland; and as preference to releasing large areas of Green Belt for housing on the western side of the borough.</p> <p>Key issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) the need to minimise the release of Green Belt for housing</li> <li>ii) the need to avoid over-burdening Site Allocations with the need for affordable housing and other community benefits to a point where they become commercially unviable;</li> <li>iii) the need to boost significantly the supply of housing, particularly in and around the rural settlements to support local services and attract more inward investment/reduce out-commuting.</li> </ul>	
1,012	<p>IO_32 – support for the site as a development opportunity in a sustainable location close to existing services and public transport options, can make a meaningful contribution to Wyre's housing needs, is closely related to the existing settlement, has minimal landscape value and will minimise harm to the natural and built environment.</p> <p>Noted that the site is in multiple-ownership but is considered deliverable – available and viable.</p> <p>Noted that the site does not fall within the Green Belt, nor falls within any environmental designations, is within flood zone 1, no technical impediments to development and does not impact upon any existing heritage asset.</p>	Poulton-le-Fylde IO_32
1,015	<p>IO_114</p> <p>Promoted for mixed use development including housing, commercial, sport and leisure and a site for Gypsies, Travellers and travelling showpeople.</p> <p>Provides an opportunity for Catterall to grow in a planned and sustainable way.</p> <p>Provides an opportunity to round off the existing settlement curtilage with a new centre/area of focus. Could support new enabling infrastructure.</p>	Catterall IO_114
1,021	The settlement of Nateby and other villages need to grow slowly, allowing new residents to integrate in to the new community. Rural	Nateby

Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	Wyre should be protected and developed for tourism related activities. Substantial development will lead to congested and dangerous roads particularly for cyclists and pedestrians.	
1,022	Key issue is deliverability. In terms of larger sites, land ownership needs to be considered – need for owners to agree on a clear strategy.	
1,025	Sites should be monitored and developed only to meet the vision. Will be necessary to provide services as early as possible and before developments are complete.	
1,026	<p>IO_26, IO_27, IO_28 Development would result in loss of green space and raise risk of flooding.</p> <p>IO_21, IO_22</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development would result in loss of green space and lead to increased urbanisation – risk of continuous development from Thornton to Fleetwood.</li> <li>• No significant employment.</li> <li>• Biggest issue – road network/traffic generation.</li> </ul>	Thornton IO_21, IO_22, IO_26, IO_27, IO_28
1,027	<p>IO_84, IO_85</p> <p>Access to the A6 is poor. Development would lead to more traffic.</p> <p>IO_86, IO_87, IO_88 – would create more traffic on Hollins Lane and again access to the A6 is particularly bad from Hollins Lane.</p> <p>Public transport on the A6 is not convenient.</p> <p>Forton – has had more than its fair share of development and planned development. Issue of access to school places and health facilities. Also issues around utility (water, electricity, sewerage etc).</p>	Forton Hollins Lane
1,033	<p>IO_42, IO_43, IO-44, IO_45</p> <p>Existing permissions and proposed development would change the character of the village – would no longer be a village. If Option 3 chosen, Stalmine would not retain its local character and distinctiveness (see Strategic Objective 2).</p>	Stalmine Hambleton, Preesall, Knott-End, Pilling



Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7g - Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised – Q6 - SITES

ID	Planning Matters Raised	Settlement /Site
	<p>Concerns relating to Stalmine, Hambleton, Preesall, Knott-End and Pilling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing educational, health, public transport and emergency facilities and services would not adequate.</li> <li>• Impact on increase commuting and road congestion.</li> <li>• Employment on mixed use sites unlikely to deliver more than a small proportion of medium/high skill jobs.</li> </ul> <p>Stalmine concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foul and surface water flooding – existing problems – more development = additional pressure on the existing system.</li> <li>• Increase in road traffic, including HGVs on an inadequate road infrastructure. Also potential road traffic and access issues for residents and emergency services if there is a major incident at the gas storage facility.</li> </ul> <p>IO_42 – additional traffic, loss of agricultural land, impact on wildlife.            IO_43 – and IO_45 - development would set an unacceptable precedent for the development of small sites on the outskirts of the village.            IO_44 – issues of surface and foul water disposal, increase in traffic, impact on wildlife.            IO_45 – impact of recent gas storage permission.</p> <p>Concerned that Stalmine’s settlement boundary is being ignored.</p>	
1,034	<p>Promotes a site for housing development – land to the rear of Dunollie, Kepple Lane, Garstang.</p> <p>Need for retirement living. Site also well suited to market housing. Small scale site and hence no particular highway issues. Not high quality agricultural land. Within close proximity of the local school and other amenities. Available for development.</p>	Garstang