
Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.10	Other Documents
Policy MN2.10	Land at Sandbrook Road, Ainsdale	
Respondent No 725	Response Ref 7	Representor Name Paul Daly
Organisation Name Sport England		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

MN2.10 S Land at Sandbrook Road, Ainsdale

Paragraph 74 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Sport England's playing field policy seek to protect playing fields (and other land and buildings used for sport) from development unless specific criteria are met. In brief, Sport England would oppose the allocation of any site that would result in the loss or redevelopment of existing buildings and/or land used for sport unless it could be demonstrated that they are genuinely surplus to requirements or they would be replaced to an equivalent quantity and quality in a suitable location in line with the requirements of paragraph 74 of the NPPF and Sport England's planning policy objectives.

In the case of playing fields, Sport England would look to an up to date, robust playing pitch strategy to demonstrate that a specific site was not required to meet current and future needs. Whilst it is positive that Sefton has commenced production of a playing pitch strategy, the findings of the assessment and the strategy for addressing the issues it identifies have not yet been produced. It is therefore premature to assume that sites last used for sport will not be required to meet current or future need. The fact that a playing field or sports facility is not in current use is not a demonstration that the site is genuinely surplus to requirements. If this was the case, any landowner that wanted to develop a sports facility for a different use would simply have to stop people from using the facility to bypass the protection offered by planning policy.

In the case of sites with other types of sports facilities, Sport England would expect an assessment that complies with our guidance ('Assessing needs and opportunities guide for indoor and outdoor sports facilities - How to undertake and apply needs assessments for sports facilities') to demonstrate that they were surplus to requirement. The said guidance was produced to support paragraphs 73 and 74 of the NPPF and is referenced by National Planning Practice Guidance.

No evidence has been provided that any of the proposed allocations above meet any of the exceptions set out in Sport England's playing field policy, or those set out in paragraph 74 of the NPPF, Sport England therefore opposes the allocation of the sites. The loss of the sites is not justified by evidence to showing them to be surplus to requirements, and is therefore considered contrary to paragraph 74 of the NPPF. It is also considered contrary to the objectives of proposed policy NH5 of the Local Plan which seeks to protect playing fields.

Summary of Suggested Changes

The site should be deleted as an allocation. The alternative is to make clear that if the playing pitch strategy does not identify the playing fields to be surplus to requirements based on current and future need that the playing fields would need to be replaced. However, given the number of sites and area covered, there would be no certainty that such land would be available to allow for replacement provision.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.11	Other Documents
Policy MN2.11	Land south of Moor Lane, Ainsdale	
Respondent No 203	Response Ref	Representor Name Julian Austin
Organisation Name National Grid		
Obj/Sup/Com	Comment	

Summary of Main Issues

Land south of Moor Lane, Ainsdale is crossed by HP line Maghull to Woodvale

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name**Obj/Sup/Com** Objection**Summary of Main Issues**

I am writing to object strongly to the proposal for dwellings to be built at the above location. The site is entirely unsuitable for many reasons, including: It is Green Belt land- there must be many other sites more suitable which are not within the Green Belt areas. Once Green Belt land is used for housing it is a slippery slope towards losing more and more land to developers. The whole area is marshy and wet- adding acres of tarmac and tiles etc will only increase the problem in the area giving extra risk of flooding etc. Volume of traffic in the area-the junctions of Moor La/Liverpool Rd/Coastal Rd is already extremely busy and noisy. Even if new houses are kept down to 75. this would add a great deal of traffic movements, making access more difficult for everyone around.

Local amenities would be very pressured by all the extra families moving in- schools etc may need to be enlarged or new ones built. Nature conservation issues also need to be considered. The proposals for a conservation area/pond would simply not be enough to replace the habitats lost, and would probably not actually be created anyway. Finally the overall quality of life for all local residents would be reduced if we were to lose the open space, for it to be replaced by houses/garage/cars/people/extra noise etc. We hope that the proposal will not be given the go ahead.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.11	Other Documents
Policy MN2.11	Land south of Moor Lane, Ainsdale	
Respondent No 326	Response Ref 1	Representor Name John Baker
Organisation Name	Moor Lane and Moor Close Residents' Association	
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

The residents of Moor Lane and Moor Close would like to submit their objection to the proposed housing development on the Land to the South of Moor Lane (MN2.11). As part of this letter of objection please find attached a signed petition. On the 21st February 2014 residents in the locality decided to set up a residents' committee, namely, Moor Lane and Moor Close Residents' Association. The association has met on several occasions to discuss the proposed housing development. After our discussions we placed our original objections with our signed petition to the Southport Area Committee and Sefton Planning Committee in 26th March 2014. It was decided at the meeting: "That the Head of Planning Services be requested to take into consideration the petition submitted by the residents of Moor Lane and Moor Close as part of the Local Plan Public Draft consultation process scheduled for late summer 2014." (Southport Area Committee Minutes, 2014, p. 33) In February 2015 Sefton MBC advertised that residents have an opportunity to view the local plan. The association submit their objections with a new signed petition.

After consultation with academics and lawyers there are six reasons why this development should not take place: Green Belt. The proposed housing development is to be built on the Green Belt Land. We would like to point out to the council that this is going against Sefton MBC principles regarding building on Green Belt Land. To quote Sefton MBC local development objective plans: "To support urban regeneration and a sustainable pattern of development and physical change by restricting development in the Green Belt. To protect from development the best and most versatile agricultural land as a national resource. To enhance the environmental quality of Sefton's rural area." Over and above the policy context the implications of this loss of a green amenity are considerable for the local community.

Building on the land adjacent to Moor Lane would interfere with natural drainage as there is a pond in the middle of the site (see figure 1). The site is higher than the surrounding area hence there is an increased risk of surface water flooding after development and thus this is not suitable ground to build on (see figure 2). The implications for the local community are considerable - and this is highly controversial given the recent extreme weather, the flooding and the impacts on individuals and neighbourhoods. This proposed development would have a major impact on local amenities. We would like to place particular focus on education. Ainsdale has two local primary schools in the area that are at full capacity in various class sizes and there is no secondary school in the area to support the local education needs of an increased intake. This raises questions about the stability of the local community and the well-being of its young people.

The junction at Moor Lane/Liverpool Road/Coastal Road is already extremely busy and dangerous. More housing will make this situation worse. Without significant improvements to the roads, including the A565 (filter lanes, traffic lights or a roundabout) a number of safety issues will be created. The caravan park (Moor Lane Caravan Park) that is situated at the end of Moor Lane will be attracting more customers to the site as they have placed more caravans on the site. In addition to these matters the proposed development is contravening Sefton MBC's strategy of improving air quality. As the "Breathing Space: A Strategy to improve air quality in Sefton" report notes (1999 p. 3) the aim the strategy is to: "To improve air quality in localities with specific air quality problems. To promote ongoing improvement of air quality across the Borough of Sefton." Building new houses in the area will impact on pollution because new home owners will generate more cars in the locality. This will create adverse quality of life and health issues for the local community. Moreover, this development will have an impact on the Cheshire Lines cycle path.

Building near to the nature reserve will affect rare breeds, such as, the natterjack toad, sand lizard, red squirrels and bats. An extended phase habitat survey will need to be carried out. In particular, residents would expect a Great Crested Newt survey to be conducted. It is our belief as residents that this development is going against Sefton Council's Local Agenda 21, to quote the Sefton 2000+ plan: "To make a positive contribution to the prosperity and quality of life to all Sefton's communities by promoting sustainable development."

Building on this site will impact on the overall well-being of local residents. The small bungalows on Moor Lane are homes where people can retire to and live in a good environment. This location has lovely views over the fields. Local residents, argue that the proposed development will have a detrimental visual impact. There is also the loss of green amenity and the effective urbanisation of a very special place. As has been outlined in this letter we consider that the proposed development would have a negative impact on the character of the neighbourhood.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove site MN2.11 as an allocation.

Evidence Submitted

A number of photographs were submitted (which the text refers to).

A petition was also submitted.

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.11	Other Documents
Policy MN2.11	Land south of Moor Lane, Ainsdale	
Respondent No 375	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Jon Birch
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Support	

Summary of Main Issues

Site MN2.11 'Land south of Moor Lane, Ainsdale' has an area of 2.6 hectares with an identified capacity of 69 dwellings. It is suitable, available and deliverable and in a sustainable location with good access to a range of local services, schools and public transport.

Summary of Suggested Changes

None needed.

Evidence Submitted

App 1 - master plan and land use proposals, App2 - Phase 1 Habitats Survey, App 3 - 'Deliverability questionnaire' 2014, App 5 - Water Vole Survey, App 6 - Great Crested Newt Survey, App 7 - Heritage Assessment.

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.11	Other Documents
Policy MN2.11	Land south of Moor Lane, Ainsdale	
Respondent No 424	Response Ref 3	Representor Name Ian Brandes
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

In my opinion, is another instance of a land grab in a semi-rural area. Again 69 homes in this locality is NOT a valid planning proposition. There is little or no support from local residents in the area, and there are certainly alternative sites in areas, more deserving of renaissance, which should be earmarked for any future development.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.11	Other Documents
Policy MN2.11	Land south of Moor Lane, Ainsdale	
Respondent No 481	Response Ref 3	Representor Name Barrie Partington
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Moor Lane is not only on Green Belt but incorporates a small lake due the fact its on a flood plain. It has much aquatic life including great crested newts.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.11	Other Documents
Policy MN2.11	Land south of Moor Lane, Ainsdale	
Respondent No 492	Response Ref 9	Representor Name
Organisation Name Craig Seddon SIPP		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

Land south of Moor Lane (Site MN2.11) comprises 2.6ha of land, identified for 69 dwellings. The site is allocation in the UDP as falling within the Green Belt. The Site Assessment Form (reference SR4.10) identifies that there is the potential for the development of the site to impact upon protected species, yet only assesses this as a minor constraint. The Council have played down the ecological constraints of this site. The Assessment Form identifies that the site is adjacent to Formby House Farm, which is a grade II listed building, and forms a contextual setting. Whilst the Assessment Form states that this could limit the proportion of development that could come forward no further information is provided. The Selection Methodology identifies the impact of a proposal on a designated heritage asset and its setting as having the potential to be a Tier 1 constraint. Given a Heritage Impact Assessment has not been undertaken to assess the potential impact of the proposed allocation on Formby House Farm, it is questioned why this site has been included within the Draft Publication document.

The Assessment Form identifies that a Transport Assessment will be required to assess the cumulative impacts of the development on the capacity of the Formby Bypass/ Coastal Road junction. By the Council's own assessment, contained within the Methodology Statement, because the impact of the development on the wider highway network has not been determined, this must be considered as a Tier 1 constraint until assessed otherwise. Our client agrees with the Council's assessment that the existing Green Belt boundary is strong. All existing development lies to the north of Moor Lane. The Assessment Form acknowledges that the allocation of this site would not correspond to a strong geographical feature, which our client agrees with. It is therefore questioned why the site has been brought forward. The site would be segregated from all other development within the Ainsdale residential area. Given the significant ecological, heritage and highways constraints on the site, as well as its poor geographical location beyond all the existing development within the residential area, its deliverability is questioned and how it has been allowed to progress to this stage without further assessment being undertaken.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.11	Other Documents
Policy MN2.11	Land south of Moor Lane, Ainsdale	
Respondent No 703	Response Ref 12	Representor Name Jackie Copley
Organisation Name CPRE Lancashire		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

This site should remain undeveloped because it breaches the strong boundary of Moor Lane. A housing estate on this site would be incompatible with the character of the properties on Southport Old Road and the openness of their locations. It would also have an unacceptable adverse impact on the heritage asset setting of Formby House Farm, which is a Grade II listed property.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.11	Other Documents
Policy MN2.11	Land south of Moor Lane, Ainsdale	
Respondent No 716	Response Ref 17	Representor Name Robert Swift
Organisation Name Robert Swift and family		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

The 'Land south of Moor Lane, Ainsdale' (site MN2.11) would result in the loss of Greenfield land and a negative impact on rural economy objectives as set out within the Sustainability Appraisal. The 2013 Green Belt Assessment considers that the impact on the landscape is significant, and even with mitigation the impact would still be negative and we support this consideration. It is currently used for horse grazing, with farmyard animals such as ducks present on site and has a rural feel. It is located within the MOD consultation zone for the adjacent airfield, is remote from local services with poor accessibility and a number of ecology and habitat concerns such as red squirrels and pink footed geese. The site should be discounted.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Delete site MN2.11 from the policy MN2 allocations.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.11	Other Documents
Policy MN2.11	Land south of Moor Lane, Ainsdale	
Respondent No 1022	Response Ref 3	Representor Name Stephen McCloskey
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

The proposed development of at least 69 properties on land south of Moor Lane, Ainsdale is unsound as it constitutes both urban sprawl and incursion into Green Belt which is contrary to national policy. A previous proposal for development allocation at Segar's Farm, Ainsdale failed to be carried forward due to the site being Green Belt and the boundary of such being the Coastal Road. Moor Lane is the effective continuation of the Coastal Road and therefore the same reasoning should be used for the removal of this site.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.11	Other Documents
Policy MN2.11	Land south of Moor Lane, Ainsdale	
Respondent No 1288	Response Ref 1	Representor Name J.A. Hawkesworth
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

Moor lane and moor close, we all bought houses for the view. This land is not fit for houses or bungalows, it gets waterlogged. Also had to be piled so far down the first builder went bankrupt, the other took over, I have spent a fortune on this bungalow due to land slip and we cannot have an extension unless it is piled which costs too much. Not me only but others have had the same problem, also the swans come to have their young and I get natterjacks in my garden.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.11	Other Documents
Policy MN2.11	Land south of Moor Lane, Ainsdale	
Respondent No 1299	Response Ref 1	Representor Name
Organisation Name Moor Lane Petition		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

Object to the revised proposed housing development on land to the south of Moor Lane, Ainsdale

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Formby Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites	
Respondent No 8	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Derek and Barbara Cadwallader
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

We are very concerned about the local plan for Formby. We feel another influx of cars will create problems on the A565, slowing the flow of traffic, creating queues on the exit roads from Formby.

Our infrastructure cannot cope with another 800+ families, car parks are congested now and Doctor's surgeries will be over subscribed. Our small hospital at Southport is already having problems in the A&E during the winter months. Our station car park is overflowing causing on road parking around the station.

It doesn't make sense to overpopulate a small suburb using greenbelt land and spoiling the quality of life for the existing population, who are law abiding ratepayers with no voice in decision making.

Please preserve and protect farm land for the future as our population approaches 70 million.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Formby Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites	
Respondent No 17	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Marc Bourhill
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

The Local Plan is going taking away more of the green space in Formby and start to encroach on green belt. Some of the developments are taking place on former school sites - where will the inhabitants of the new properties send their children? Class size are already too big in many Formby primary schools. This plan is a typical response from Sefton to another appalling initiative from the government which is designed to line the pockets shareholders in building companies.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 21	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Ian Robertson
-------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Comment

Summary of Main Issues

My comments in relation to development proposed in Formby area. With around 850 new homes proposed what will be done with regard the following:

- will there be another doctor's surgery to cope with demand?
- will there be another dental surgery to cope with demand?
- will another primary school be set up and consequently plans for secondary education?
- will there be any more car parking spaces made available for the shopping area of Formby?
- will there be sufficient water supply & water pressure for these homes?
- can the drainage system cope with the extra usage?
- more waste disposal will obviously be created for the Council to collect - can they cope?

Further to the previous I would ask if consideration has been given to the following:

- a quarter of all shops in Bootle are empty. Could they be adapted? Many of them have suitable flats for habitation above them.
- Site sites as the Cabbage pub, Liverpool Arms and Priory on Gorse Lane are all empty and in residential areas and could be used for housing.
- There are empty premises all over Sefton [e.g. church site on St Johns Road, 2 empty sites on Crosby Road South, Crosby, Ainsdale and Formby police stations] - could these be used as well?

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 23	Response Ref 1	Representor Name M Patten
-------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I object to new homes that you want to build in Formby. Objections are:

- Don't want the green space used which could end up joining Ainsdale to Hightown
- parking at these homes could bring 3 more cars to a house
- parking in the village is inadequate
- overcrowding at schools, dentists and doctors, banks and building society. People in Hightown use all our services.
- Congestion in and out of Formby is terrible now. A new road is being provided and the new homes will create congestion on this.
- In the summer Formby is grid locked with cars to the beach. Are you trying to make Formby a place not to live in?
- Why knock schools down to build these homes. Schools overcrowded as it is.
- You are knocking down Ravenmeols Community Centre. Loads of Formby clubs use this club. Where are they supposed to go?
- The only things that are empty in Formby are all the restaurants that weren't needed in the first place.
- if you need more homes for people you need to create a new town for these people with their own facilities, such a Runcorn or Skelmersdale.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 26 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Babara and Ron Marsh
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We moved to Formby from Warrington and St Helens many years ago and Formby was a wonderful to be able to live in a rural area with lots of green space. Since then, there has been a limited amount of development but this hasn't affected the structure of the town or atmosphere in the village (as the shopping area is still called).

The area we live in has houses on the market for approx £200,000 and quite a number of these have been on the market for a considerable time and many of them are now being rented out as people are unable to obtain a mortgage for this amount. We would like you to explain why approx 800 more houses are required in Formby and what you consider to be (affordable) housing. In addition, we know that our neighbours had a lot of problems gaining places in one of the local schools for their children when they moved to this area 2 years ago, how on earth are the schools going to be able to accommodate the large number of children who would be living in the area. As well as schools, there are Doctors and Dentists to consider and it is already very difficult to gain an appointment when required.

There are already traffic problems in the village, especially at weekends and also problems getting in and out of Formby in rush hour. As far as Green Belt land is concerned, we are going to finish up without any and Crosby, Hightown, Formby and Ainsdale will become one, not a area we would want to continue to live in as it will no longer be a rural area but just another concrete jungle of unsold expensive houses!

We are sure the decision has already been made but we feel very strongly against these many additional developments, they will neither create more jobs, shops and cafes are closing in the village as they cannot afford the extortionate rates, but spoil what was once a lovely peaceful area to live in with more than enough properties already on the market. We would appreciate a reply with your comments.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 33 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Maureen Costello
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Formby cannot cope with the traffic on its roads most of which are lanes. How on earth will anyone get to see Doctors and Dentists with all these extra people and there is going to be a shortage of GP's if the media are right. Where are the children going to go school? The council has not long ago put Holy Trinity school up for sale, there isn't any spare land around the schools that are left, so will the council use the playing fields to make the schools bigger? Formby just cannot take anymore people or traffic.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 35 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Carol Duty
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Formby residents do not want to become part of an urban sprawl up to Woodvale and Ainsdale. The roads in Formby are becoming a danger due to the number of vehicles used every day. Irresponsible drivers leave their cars outside houses instead of using driveways.

New homes were built a few years ago on the Old Mushroom Farm on Cable Street. Many are still empty. The government has issued directives to build homes, thereby creating jobs but there is little point building houses if no-one can afford to buy them.

Assuming the new homes accommodate families where are the children going to be educated? The general consensus of opinion is that doctor's surgeries are full, dental practices are stretched to capacity, bus services have been scrapped and the rail car parks get full early.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 36 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Joan Rimmer
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The number of houses planned in Formby is excessive. The Formby traffic is already a bad and when the new development occurs this will make it even worse. We have reached saturation point and to even contemplate a further 999 homes is unreasonable. The infrastructure just cannot cope with any more development. We have experienced flooding, drainage and sewerage problems in the past and will do so again. Trying to access appointments to doctors, dentists and the clinic is difficult. The council should reject government directives. Formby cannot sustain any more new housing.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby

MN2 Formby sites

Respondent No 120

Response Ref 1

Representor Name Paul Swinburne

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Completely object to the plan to build on Greenbelt land and surrounding areas. My objections are listed below:

- 1) Currently the 6 primary and 2 secondary schools in Formby are well over subscribed. 2 proposed sites are currently closed schools. No-one living in Formby will be willing to send their children elsewhere in the borough to attend primary (or secondary) school.
- 2) More families moving into the area will need to register with a local GP. The surgeries are already well oversubscribed and GPs are currently struggling with their workload. It will be the same for dentists.
- 3) The roads in Formby are extremely congested during the morning rush. There are only 3 roads lead out of Formby towards Liverpool. There will be added pressure on public transport as people endeavour to commute to work each morning.
- 4) Flood plains. The River Alt bursts its banks during heavy rainfall. River Alt/Sea estuary gate in Hightown can't cope with amount of water flowing through it, hence flooded fields on Liverpool Road in Formby. Houses on these flood plains will cause flooding to stretch further inland towards the existing houses around them.
- 5) Southport Hospital can't cope with current workload, nor can the ambulance or Police. Fire station is retained at night due to expenses cuts.
- 6) Sewage works removing waste water, currently working to its maximum. Refuse collection has already been dropped to once every 3 weeks, more houses will mean even fewer collection days and an increase in household rubbish.
- 7) Water usage. United Utilities currently cut pressure to taps during summer time in an attempt to divide the water further.
- 8) More electricity will need to be generated locally. Does this mean more power stations?
- 9) There is already a high demand for gas, more houses using gas will deplete the supply faster.
- 10) Noise pollution of another 4000 family members in Formby
- 11) Few amenities/activities in Formby for teenagers, more bored teenagers can result in a rise in crime, graffiti, unsocial behaviour.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Formby Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites	
Respondent No 121	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Angela Johnson
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I object to the council's decision to build on Greenbelt land, fields and other areas in Formby. My reasons for objection are listed below:

- 1) Over subscribed schools currently, 2 proposed sites are currently closed schools. No-one living in Formby will be willing to send their children elsewhere in the borough to attend primary (or secondary) school.
- 2) More families moving into the area will need to register with a local GP. The surgeries are already well oversubscribed and GPs are currently struggling with their workload. It will be the same for dentists.
- 3) The roads in Formby are extremely congested during the morning rush. There are only 3 roads lead out of Formby towards Liverpool. There will be added pressure on public transport as people endeavour to commute to work each morning.
- 4) Flood plains. The River Alt bursts its banks during heavy rainfall. River Alt/Sea estuary gate in Hightown can't cope with amount of water flowing through it, hence flooded fields on Liverpool Road in Formby. Houses on these flood plains will cause flooding to stretch further inland towards the existing houses around them.
- 5) Southport Hospital can't cope with current workload, nor can the Ambulance Service or Police. Fire station is retained at night due to expenses cuts. The police station is completely shut, the closest enquiries office is Southport or Bootle. Fewer police, easier it is for a rise in crime as the population increases.
- 6) Sewage works removing waste water, currently working to its maximum. Refuse collection has already been dropped to once every 3 weeks, more houses will mean even fewer collection days and an increase in household rubbish.
- 7) Water usage. United Utilities currently cut pressure to taps during summer time in an attempt to divide the water further.
- 8) More electricity will need to be generated locally. Does this mean more power stations?
- 9) There is already a high demand for gas, more houses using gas will deplete the supply faster.
- 10) Noise pollution of another 4000 family members (minimum) in Formby.
- 11) Few amenities/activities in Formby for teenagers, more bored teenagers can result in a rise in crime, graffiti, unsocial behaviour.

Summary of Suggested Changes

All above objections to be addressed according

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Formby Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites	
Respondent No 141	Response Ref 1	Representor Name John McNaughton
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Formby appears to be at or below sea level. Sea levels are rising. Recently, the sand dunes protecting Formby have been very much reduced by action of the sea. The water table is high. Building more houses in Formby on currently empty land will decrease the ability of the land to absorb water, resulting in increased flood risk for everyone in Formby.

Summary of Suggested Changes

No houses should be built in Formby on currently empty land. If houses are required they should be built only on brown-field sites.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 163 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** T Yeoman
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to object to the Sefton Local Plan. We do not need any new houses, no one can afford them. Also the schools here are full. Also I object to any future retail park being introduced onto the Formby Industrial estate. The traffic down our road is very congested as it is. The government is cutting back on all services yet expecting people to fill houses and live here with no amenities.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 172 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Joyce and K P Hunter
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Most of Fomby and the surrounding area lies on a flood plain. The sand dunes being eroded we are constantly in danger of being inundated at high spring tides. It is a constant battle to provide funds for pumping stations and water course management. The fields around this area are vital for drainage as well as being prime agricultural land.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 197 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** M Woods
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I have lived in Formby since 1939 and have seen tremendous changes which have totally changed the whole area and not always for the better. Many of the features which made this such a pleasant place to live (and which, no doubt, attracted incomers) have disappeared. Now it seems that more development is planned which will further erode what we still have here.

This will be seen by some as a case of "Not in my back yard". However, it is a genuine assessment of the situation and I believe that the residents of Formby should have a real say in what further developments should take place. I know that a petition listing the valid objections to the Local Plan will be presented to you and I would support every one of these. Among these I especially note the lack of infrastructure and services to support a rising population and the effect of increased traffic problems which do not seem to have been given any consideration.

In view of the number of un-occupied properties in Formby (and rented properties which remain un-sold because of the lack of buyers) I do not understand the need for so much additional housing. We do need properties to meet the needs of younger people but developers are not interested in providing this type of housing as they wish to maximize their profits.

The Local Plan as it stands is totally unacceptable and must be rejected. Please listen to the views of the population in Formby and act accordingly.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Formby Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites	
Respondent No 210	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Gemma Harpin
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I object to the plan for the following reasons:

1. I object to any building on green belt land. We love walking near the fields and seeing the wild life there.
2. I believe that building should take place on brown field land first. I work in South Sefton and see numerous boarded up buildings and derelict buildings that should be used first before concreting on every last available bit of green belt.
3. I am concerned about the increase in pollution by building so many houses in Formby and the resulting increase in vehicle traffic.
4. Building on agricultural land seems short-sighted, surely we need this land to grow food for the growing population.
5. I am concerned with the difficulties with infrastructure if more houses are built in Formby. Schools are already full, the roads are extremely busy and getting out of Formby is a particular issue as is the pollution. Parking in the village is a nightmare and further building of housing will reduce the quality of life here.
6. There are flooding concerns in Formby and further building may worsen this further.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove all proposed allocations on land that is currently Green Belt.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Formby Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites	
Respondent No 224	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Mike McGibbon
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the local plan on the grounds that housing figures do not give "special circumstances" for building on the greenbelt. Housing demand is not likely to be as extensive as proposed homes numbers suggest. There are many vacant properties in Formby.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby

MN2 Formby sites

Respondent No 251

Response Ref 1

Representor Name C Bedford

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We have resided in Formby for over twenty years now and have always appreciated the friendly atmosphere of Formby village. Being able to relax outdoors in the open green spaces and enjoying the wildlife, that Formby is famous for.

We have raised our children here, they have been schooled here and have developed into responsible adults who contribute to society.

However, over the years, we have been aware that the character and small community feeling of Formby has been gradually eroded. We have witnessed the destruction of period properties to make way for smaller houses the size of shoeboxes, where only one residence stood, there are now three overpriced houses, due to the greed of developers. How does this benefit the young people in Formby? It doesn't, because they can't afford these shoebox homes and are being forced to rent or sadly move away.

So when we found out the plan to build on open green spaces, we were horrified. No doubt it is being justified by the tag line of we need more homes for the young, but it will not benefit the first time buyers because these homes would be being built in a prime location and therefore the young will be totally priced out.

When travelling into Liverpool City, there are so many areas of wasteland and vacant public houses which could be demolished, land which could be used to build affordable houses for families with easy travel links into the city. This would be preferable than reducing what little green spaces there are left in Merseyside.

The infrastructure of Formby will not cope, schools are already over stretched and it is so difficult to get a doctor's appointment now or find a dentist who has a place in their practice to register you are a patient. With the added populous which would be created by these homes, it would become impossible.

Driving on Formby's roads at the moment is difficult due to the high volume of traffic, the increase in vehicles would cause a hazard to both young and old. Trying to park anywhere in Formby Village is becoming a nightmare. The solution would be to build more roads to accommodate the increased traffic and so the madness continues.

We are very proud in Formby of the care that we have taken over our green spaces and the wildlife which inhabits it. We have been able to increase the numbers and nurtured the return of several species of birds and mammals. How will reducing their habitat and hunting grounds by drastically reducing the surrounding greenbelt lands impact upon their survival?

The lack of consultation with the people of Formby makes us fear for its future. How can we safeguard our community and surrounding areas when our voices are being unheard or ignored.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 255 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name**
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Our objection mainly concerns the increased risk of flooding in our town of Formby, which is very low lying (below sea level, we believe).

During periods of persistent or heavy rain, our drains back up and gardens become flooded, and so large scale building projects such as those proposed will tip the balance. Also is the concerns of low water pressure. The water board say that they will not be able to increase water pressure to the extra homes, which is bound to affect the already low water pressure in our town. It seems a shame to build on prime farming land when there are still plentiful Brownfield lands in the rest of Sefton.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 257 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Shirley Childs
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The plan to build 999 more houses and flats in Formby will be so overwhelming that I strongly object. Formby is a large community as it is now without any extra huge estates. As most households these days have at least 2 vehicles the roads will be dangerous and overcrowded.

It is difficult now to get an appointment at the doctors. With all the extra residents in these proposed 999 more properties the chance of appointments at the doctors will be impossible. The services will be as clogged as the roads are likely to be. Schools here are extremely popular and it will be impossible to take any more pupils at these schools.

To get out of formby on to the By-Pass to go to work is now extremely difficult with more vehicles it will be impossible, long queues and tailbacks is what we will then have.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 267 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Keith Fell
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We wish to object to any development in the 'green belt', particularly north of Formby, as this will erode natural boundaries and make it more difficult to control future development and so prevent urban sprawl. It would also upset the environmental balance of the area, particularly in respect of drainage and wildlife.

There is adequate housing stock available in the area as witnessed by the extensive range of property for sale in local estate agents; as well as more suitable sites without eroding 'green belt' land.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby

MN2 Formby sites

Respondent No 289

Response Ref 2

Representor Name Alan & Barbara Hodges

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I have great concern about many aspects of the proposed local plan.

There is a national shortage of houses particularly those which a young couple or a member of a single household might wish to buy. These are classed as being "affordable". However the developments which are being put forward are not for houses which are affordable for this area of the country.

The houses in my road and of neighbouring roads are amongst the smallest in Formby and therefore used to be bought by first time buyers or occasionally by an older couple moving to the area to be closer to family. The selling price range averages approximately £170,000 as it an area where houses have been extended. However, these houses are now being bought by investors who are letting them for £700-800 per month. The tenants are often a single parent with one or two children. Are the investors stepping in because mortgages cannot be obtained? Who will be able to afford the new houses?

The three roads in and out of Formby are already very busy at peak times. With only one access point to the site parallel to the the Bypass, traffic will come to a standstill not only on Liverpool Road but also on the Bypass. Add to this the cars used by those at Orchid Meadow, the site next to it and the houses in Altcar Lane! There will be a period when heavy construction traffic will add to the congestion as much will all be concentrated on the south end of Formby.

There are no plans for extra infrastructure. The development on the former Holy Trinity school in Lonsdale Road will take this provision for primary education out of the equation. There is no provision for increased parking near the village shops which will act as a deterrent. Does the community want more retail units across the Bypass?

The houses in Orchid Meadow have been built higher than the surrounding ground. This may alleviate possible flooding in that area but increases the risk of flooding to the houses in neighbouring Park Road. The land near the Bypass is already lower. Historically the natural course of the River Alt was closer to Liverpool Road whilst the water ream/table is not far below the surface in the Redgate Estate. What form of assessment has been made re the impact of so many extra houses on the water table, sewerage and the fresh water supply?

The council will become responsible for the wetlands which will be created, swale ditches and verges on the new sites which they will have to adopt. The Orchid Meadow estate is laid out with borders of grass which looks lovely now but for how long. Sefton Council has already abandoned maintenance on the footpath leading from Hoggs Hill to Ravenmeols Lane and many others.

The planners need to think long and hard about their local plan to ensure that the environment and the existing community are protected from inappropriate developments.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove proposed sites in Formby from housing and employment allocations and/or improve infrastructure.

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 295	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Barbara Kirkpatrick
--------------------------	-----------------------	---

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to appeal against the Local Plan .

No further development is needed in Formby except on the agreed brown sites. Existing Green Belt should remain protected.

The traffic in Formby is already excessive. Saturday 7th March Altcar Road was gridlocked due to restrictions on Liverpool Road to the bypass roundabout. There is simply no room for so many more vehicles.

Waiting list for doctors, dentist and school places are a real problem currently. Too many more residents would make the situation impossible.

As a resident of Savon Hook, my fear of flooding is very real. The adjacent green belt fields acts as a successful flood barrier for our properties and keeps the bypass water free.

I trust the Council will use its power to preserve the green belt and allow Formby to maintain some of its village identity.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove Green Belt sites in Formby as allocations in the Local Plan.

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 301	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Colette O'Neill
--------------------------	-----------------------	---

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Added pressure on services including doctors dentists schools and hospitals. Formby is a unique area including its coastline and what is left of its local history and deserves to be preserved.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby

MN2 Formby sites

Respondent No 306

Response Ref 2

Representor Name Jane Newby

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The building of all these houses will put even more pressure on local services. It is already very difficult to get a doctor's appointment and there are few NHS dental services to cope with Formby's population. Not everyone can afford treatment. Though some hospital services are based in Southport, many require travel to Ormskirk by public transport. Contrary to public opinion, not everyone has a car.

Where would children go to school in this area? There are two schools (primary) Freshfield and St Peter's. Trinity/St Peter's is over subscribed and yet Holy Trinity School in the village was closed down and I believe is now earmarked for further housing development. Another school would have to be built.

Traffic is another problem. The road by Trinity/St Peter's School is virtually a single track road at certain times of day and parents dropping off and collecting children park in the surrounding roads, e.g, Heatherways and Heathfield Close. It is very dangerous to cross Paradise Lane here, as vehicles restrict your view. Brackenway and Deansgate Lane North roads have now become main roads because Paradise Lane is inaccessible. Nobody bothers to stick by 20mph speed limit. More cars , more houses, more traffic - Formby just will not be able to cope!

Parking in the village from all those extra households is just not possible. Formby is already full and relies on the goodwill of Waitrose for free public parking and toilet facilities. No public toilet facilities in Formby are a disgrace, yet more numbers in the population.

Leisure facilities are also few and far between, unless you pay for Formby Hall or Sports Direct.com. At present Formby has a pool and small gym. Older residents like me have to do aerobics/pilates in the café screened off from the public! No prospect of a studio for those activities even though consultations and petitions have been filled in. Where in 10 years time are all the children of those households going to congregate - on street corners? They WILL because there are no leisure facilities in this village. At this end fo Formby there is a small swing area off Deansgate Lane North - not good enough for children of 289 houses - that'll be next in line for the house building though.

Brownfield sites must be used up before any Green Belt Land. Affordable houses for Formby young families. Any houses built will be between £200,000 - £300,000 or more, which puts them out of the reach of first time buyers or young families.

No common sense is being used in this project. Councils have to build their quota of houses - it doesn't matter where!

Access to this new estate would be a problem. Formby has one road in and out. Formby bypass and the area by ince Woods is regularly a scene of accidents.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove housing allocations in the Green Belt from the plan.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 325 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Bernard Ormrod
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

My objection is to all the proposed new housing in Formby.

This objection is based on the fact that Formby at present does not have the necessary infrastructure to support the number of new homes proposed to be built.

My experience is in particular to the access/egress to Formby/Freshfield. Even at present it can take a very long time to get access out of Formby especially in the morning. This would only get worse if the number of new houses proposed were built. I believe the more roads in and out of Formby would become gridlocked, with the number of new residents in the area.

Before any new houses are built, serious consideration should be given to the access/egress possibilities for Formby.

Therefore the plan would not be effective as it's main aim would not happen due to the lack of adequate access routes.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Consideration has to be given to the access roads etc before any new housing is built.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 331 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Joan Carruthers
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I object to the local plan on the following grounds

- 1 there are so many newly built houses for sale or rent in Sefton that have still not been taken that the building of more seems to be a total waste of money. The plan does not make any economic sense.
- 2 I have very little faith in the developers' claims that they will build affordable homes for first time buyers. All those being built currently in Formby on the site of the powerhouse are not starter homes.
- 3 All brown field sites should be used before any building on green belt. The plan does not address this issue to my satisfaction.
- 4 Proposed sites in Formby are on areas very prone to flooding eg Redgate estate. The proposals are unacceptable. If the plans go ahead and flooding occurs in residents' properties such as mine I will make sure local residents form an action group to sue the council and other parties because they already know the potential problems. As long ago as pre-war the local authority took steps to reduce flooding around the Alt.
- 5 Traffic and other infrastructure problems are not catered for in this plan.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove allocations in Formby.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Formby Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites	
Respondent No 346	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Frank Carruthers
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I have several reasons for finding Sefton's Local Plan unsatisfactory and therefore make an objection:

1 I live in Formby and at the time of writing, while new build is going on at the Powerhouse site, I know of a number of newly built houses (within the last five years) on sites such as Kirklake Rd/Formby Bridge and the estate behind Church Rd where houses have had to be let rather than sold because buyers could not be found. Developers will find there is very limited opportunity to sell new houses priced at £250k+ in the town.

2 I have no confidence in any promises from developers or councillors that the new build will include many homes at affordable prices for first-time buyers. The coalition govt has already backtracked and given up any requirement on developers to build at affordable prices. This is an absolute disgrace. The whole thrust of this local plan should be towards improving housing opportunities for the young. As it stands it is not.

3 Brown field sites should be used in Sefton FIRST without resorting to green belt. There should be no building on green belt when there is so much brown field still available.

4 Formby has a very high water table, in particular areas around the River Alt. Sites proposed in the plan near the river are on land that is prone to flooding. Residents in the Redgate area have much experience of past flooding. Any further build on adjacent areas will only exacerbate the problems for these residents and perhaps for the rest of Formby. I will hold the council responsible for any future flooding of my home (which has never experienced flooding since built in 1971) and take steps to form an action group of residents similarly affected to sue the council for damage, loss of value to my home etc. I have been informed by local bank staff that some banks do not provide home insurance on some homes in Formby already.

5 infrastructure problems such as traffic flow out of Formby towards Liverpool have not been thought through well enough.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove Green Belt housing allocations.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Formby Sites	Other Documents Flood Risk Assessment
Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites	
Respondent No 359	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Catherine Fraser
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I am particularly concerned that the council have chosen to develop areas around Formby which are particularly prone to flooding (see flood maps for river, ground water and surface water flooding). In fact some of the areas chosen are in Flood zone 3 and have flooded recently. The Green Belt areas chosen for development namely MN2.48, MN2.49 and MN2.16 will seriously add to the risk of surface water flooding in Critical Drainage Area 17. The council are aware of this since they provided the data for the Environment Agency flood maps in the first place. The Surface Water Management Plan is conspicuous by its absence and is now crucially dependent upon private developers who may or may not contribute to its delivery. There is no mention of the plan to provide much needed flood mitigation proposed for Duke St. Park. How will MN2.48 affect plans for Bull Cop culvert? I have not been able to find out an answer to these questions and the SWMP has disappeared from the council website. The SWMP should be reflected in the Local Plan.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 361 **Response Ref** 18 **Representor Name** A D Fraser
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would argue that the Local does not follow the framework because it does not protect the greenbelt. Maghull is likely to merge into Liverpool. Developments MN2.12, Mn2.48, MN2.49, MN2.16, MN2.17 and MN2.19 will reduce the openness of the countryside around Formby even the council's own landscape studies admit this. However, more importantly because the Local Plan doesn't make clear that the new Greenbelt boundary has some permanence we know this is the beginning of an unrestricted sprawl. Peel Holdings along with Sefton consistently over estimate the amount of jobs the port expansion is going to create. They confuse the increase in tonnage handled by the port with the likely increase in the number of workers required to handle it. Sections 4.42 — 4.43 will allow them to renege on the Local Plan making a nonsense of the whole consultation and planning process. The changes the council make will not be about flexibility but development they are already planning to make. Sefton will do whatever Peel Holdings ask them to do!12 The council have no intention of protecting the greenbelt in the future. Therefore it is in breach of the planning framework. Personally I do not think the plan is justified because it is based on a model of housing demand that is totally irrelevant to Sefton.. I for one like many other Formby residents have absolutely no faith in the objectivity of Sefton's housing model as it does not accord with my day to day experience of the housing market. The housing problem in Sefton is largely a problem of a lack of "effective demand" not a supply problem. The Local Plan presented by Sefton is the result of the council and the developers "gaming" the system, it makes no economic sense and will do lasting damage to Sefton's unique environment.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove Green Belt sites as allocations.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 361 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** A D Fraser
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Object to the Local Plan because it is not sound within the meaning of the National Planning Policy Framework. The plan has not been positively prepared nor are its conclusions justified. It is not consistent with national policy and it is extremely unlikely to be effective. Specific sites providing an example of this are MN2.12, MN2.16, MN2.17MN2.18, MN2.19, MN4 & MN5.

Summary of Suggested Changes

The plan should be found unsound.

Evidence Submitted

20 page document plus appendices with back up evidence including graphs, tables and maps.

Policy MN2 Formby

MN2 Formby sites

Respondent No 370

Response Ref 1

Representor Name Frances Horne

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The local plan is proposing to take a percentage of green belt land in Sefton for housing development. This will take away many of the unique features within the borough, causing urban sprawl in areas to which people have moved in order to escape that very thing.

Agricultural land, open countryside, prolific wildlife and their habitats are all features which would be curtailed. Many varieties of birds have been spotted in the fields around Formby, those very fields which have been earmarked for development.

The draft Local Plan shows a lack of infrastructure planning for additional housing. Pressure will be put on existing doctors, dentists, schools, not to mention the volume of traffic on the roads. As Sefton borders the coast in many places there is a limited number of roads for commuters from Southport, Ainsdale, Formby etc., these are already congested at peak times and will obviously become more so as housing is added. Formby by-pass is busy at all times, one area of development at least is next to this road, do people really want to live alongside a racetrack with all its noise and pollution?

Finally I would like to make the comment that many people have moved to Formby, Ainsdale etc to avoid urban development. They are prepared to drive the extra miles from the city in order to achieve living in a semi-rural environment. Is this pleasure to be diminished when brownfield sites could be considered before using up precious green belt land which can never be recovered. The Local Plan does not represent the majority views of local communities.

Summary of Suggested Changes

brownfield sites could be considered before using up precious green belt land which can never be recovered.

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby

MN2 Formby sites

Respondent No 378

Response Ref 1

Representor Name M J & E D Murphy

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We object to the Local Plan for the following reasons:

Object to building on the Green Belt. Formby is unique in that it has the sea to the West and is surrounded by prime agricultural land, 'Sites of Special Scientific Interest', and golf courses which all combine to provide natural flood plains. Building on these areas will increase the risk of flooding and place more strain on the local pumping facilities which the Environment Agency are very unlikely to upgrade. Furthermore, the loss of Green Belt will increase urban sprawl and enable the council to revisit the Green Belt boundaries and make further erosion more likely.

Loss of prime agricultural land with the loss of food production in the future with all the concerns associated with feeding an increasing population in the UK and the whole world.

Loss of wildlife habitats.

There is a distinct lack of infrastructure planning causing pressure on hospitals, doctors, dentists and schools. The new homes will not have new access to Formby but will filter onto the existing roads. From our point of view, new housing will all be forced onto our road creating a possible 500 more vehicles using the road daily.

We also doubt the need for so many new homes in Formby as many recent projects such as the 'mushroom farm' are still not sold.

Sefton Council will no doubt 'water down' the number of affordable homes in the grab for more cash. The aforementioned 'mushroom farm' affordable homes were in excess of £300,000.

The proposal to extend the Industrial Estate will be a death knell for Formby village as traffic will be as ever attracted to free parking. Formby does not need more tawdry buildings such as the recently built 'MJ's'. Again we see this as a means to generate cash for the council.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove allocations in the Green Belt.

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 412	Response Ref 1	Representor Name A M Woods
--------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Having lived in Formby since 1951 I have seen tremendous changes which have totally changed the whole area and not always for the better. Many of the features which made this such a pleasant place to live (and which, no doubt, attracted incomers) have disappeared. Now it seems that more development is planned which will further erode what we still have here. This will be seen by some as a case of NIMBYism. However, it is a genuine assessment of the situation and I believe that the residents of Formby should have a real say in what further developments should take place.

I know that a petition listing the VALID objections to the Local Plan will be presented to you and I would support every one of these. Among these I especially note the lack of infrastructure and services to support a rising population and the effect of increased traffic problems which do not seem to have been given any consideration.

In view of the number of un-occupied properties in Formby (and rented properties which remain un-sold because of the lack of buyers) I do not understand the need for so much additional housing. We DO need properties to meet the needs of younger people but developers are not interested in providing this type of housing as they wish to maximize their profits.

The Local Plan as it stands is totally unacceptable and must be rejected. Please listen to the views of the population in Formby and act accordingly.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 415	Response Ref 1	Representor Name T P Neal
--------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

While there are lots of brown field sites around the Merseyside area they should be built on first. There are enough Brownfield sites to accommodate your housing needs, once the open space/green belt and the top grade agricultural land has been built on there is no return.

Here in Formby we are below the sea level, you can see how the local fields hold the water, if the downholland brook bank was any lower the whole of Formby would be under water, you only have to go onto the Alt Road area gardens to see this. Is this why the new build Bellway Orchid estate has been raised, it is an island site 2 meters above the adjacent field and my bungalow in Park road. And I am against any expansion of that estate onto the green belt with the loss of wildlife and habitats.

The south side of Hoggs Hill lane at the railway end borders on the flood plain, has this now changed over night. Other factors the increase in population will put extra pressures 'on school places, doctors, and an increase in traffic which is already congested especially in the summer with day visitors to the beach. I feel extremely alarmed at the problems this expansion will cause.

Summing up I look at the expansion of building of even more houses in Formby you look at it as a un limited cash cow for your council.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Formby Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites	
Respondent No 419	Response Ref 1	Representor Name A Rowland
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

If 1000 homes are eventually built in Formby they could result in 500 school places. As two existing schools are included in the overall plan why destroy two schools which will be needed later.

The existing services, water, drainage, electricity seem to be able to cope with present demand but that may not be the case with an additional 1000 homes.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Formby Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites	
Respondent No 431	Response Ref 1	Representor Name C Domville
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

We would like to object to the local plan with regards to Formby. No real consideration appears to have been given to the effect all the additional housing will have on schools, Doctors surgeries, Dentists, or public transport. There is no room for expansion at any of the existing Surgeries and no land within Formby to build new ones. Flooding remain an issue, a site that has already seen the developers withdraw their application because of this problem is still in the local plan. Their solution would simply have moved the flood risk to nearby properties.

Two School sites in Formby are included in the plan, where will new ones go unless on to yet more greenbelt land? Parking is a massive problem, and local public transport within Formby is at risk at this moment which will make it worse. More people want to use the already overcrowded train services to commute to Liverpool or Southport

With a growing population to build on top grade agricultural land seems very irresponsible. We appreciate the need for affordable housing, but if the development at the Power House site in Formby is anything to go by, current planning is not going to provide it. The present development of 75 houses only includes 11 classed as affordable on the sales literature so if that percentage is the same on other sites it will not get us very far.

Despite the reports which suggest that these problems are simply solved or do not exist, those of us who live in the area know differently.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 443 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Jane Quintana
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

With reference to the plans for Affordable Housing in Sefton, I wish to object to the large scale developments that are proposed for Formby and Formby's surrounding areas.

As a Formby resident I am deeply concerned that Formby Village's infrastructure and amenities will be unable to cope with demands caused by these large scale developments.

Formby schools are already operating at full capacity. High school places have become more of a problem since the recent closure of Ainsdale High School. Families are put under strain as many nursery aged children are not being allocated places in the same junior schools as their siblings and likewise, many juniors are not being allocated places in the same high schools as their siblings.

Traffic congestion is already a huge problem in Formby and at peak times of day parts of Formby can be at a virtual standstill. Paradise Lane, for example, around school opening and closing times, is seriously affected by congestion and more homes in this area would make the areas around St Peter's school particularly hazardous.

Doctors appointments are already very difficult to get as are dentist appointment Development on three of Formby's main drainage areas will increase the risk of flooding, drainage is already a large problem especially on Formby's borders.

In addition to my concerns relating to our obvious lack of infrastructure and amenities, I am seriously worried about and morally against building on the Greenbelt. These areas provide habitation for local wildlife with regular sightings of swallows, water voles, foxes, bats, frogs and owls to name but a few. Housing figures do not give special circumstances for building on this land and a Brownfield first policy should be adopted. Urban Sprawl has already occurred in Sefton and Formby should be protected from this and allowed to maintain it's uniqueness with it's coastal landscape, village atmosphere and bordering countryside.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 455 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Jane Rigby
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am writing to express my concern at the proposed building of 999 more homes on Formby green belt land. I feel any open space should be cherished and more building will alter the whole feel of Formby. It's whole infrastructure will not be able to cope with what in affect could be another 2000 adults plus the usual 2.4 children. I am very aware through my job how difficult it is to get a GP appointment now. How will the roads be with another 2000 cars running around each day. And you propose to build on the site of the only moth balled school ! So I suppose that will be more fields that get built on in 5 years when suddenly all the current school places are over subscribed. I know how difficult it is to get a place at the school of your choice as it is now. All green belt land should be preserved. Please don't put it under more concrete. There must be another way.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby

MN2 Formby sites

Respondent No 506

Response Ref 1

Representor Name Lorraine Saunders

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to object to the local plan. Reasons being that Formby is already under great pressure on schools, doctors and dentist. I would also like to add that the drainage system and water supply is already at full capacity. The street in which I live floods if we have torrential rain and in the mornings or busy times of the day our water pressure drops significantly. We have a development going on at the back of my house now. The residents have had to put up with all manner of things like working out of hours. Sefton council do not tend to take into consideration the local residents objections or views. I know this from personal experience. We objected to this Bellway development due to the loss of privacy and being over looked and that the land was a flood plains. Our objection was disregarded and we were told we would not be overlooked, These house have been built significantly higher than the local properties, so the new houses don't flood but no consideration for our properties. We now have eight properties fronts looking right into our garden and no privacy what so ever. So I urge you to consider every objection on the Sefton local plan. Our council is over stretched already and more properties is only going to put even more strain on local resources.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Stopping building on green belt land. Update drainage systems to stop flooding on existing propertie. Listening to local residents objections and consult with each and every objection. Prove how the local doctors surgeries and dentist can cope with the volume of new housing estates. How the council intends to allocate school placements without putting a strain on education standards to present pupils attending local primary and secondary schools.

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I find it very difficult to believe the forecasted number of people moving to this area of the UK. The North West, and Sefton in particular has been in population decline for decades, but the Local Plan seems to believe this trend will be reversed and there will be a large influx of people to Sefton. I queried this with a Local Planning Officer at a meeting and she was unable to explain beyond the fact that the Office for National Statistics produced figures and then Sefton’s consultants generated the figures used to calculate housing demand in the Local Plan. These consultants no longer work for Sefton Council and so cannot elaborate further. There is a need for Affordable housing for our young people and the increasing number of separated families, but building in Formby will not satisfy that need.

There is a large number of proposed building in Formby. I firmly believe Sefton Council is proposing more development in Formby as the properties will be more valuable and therefore Sefton Council will receive more Council Tax income from these houses than if they were built in other areas where they would be a great deal more affordable to local residents.

Land prices in Formby are extremely high, it is one of the wealthiest areas in Sefton. Any housing built in Formby will not be “affordable” and will certainly be out of reach economically for young people, who are the people who most need affordable housing. Building “affordable” on the far cheaper land in South and Central Sefton will achieve Sefton Council’s objective to provide affordable housing, but they are ignoring potential sites there in the rush to build valuable property in Formby’s green belt.

Formby is already congested and it’s difficult to park in the village at peak times. Most households have two, or more cars and the proposed development will increase the number of cars in the village by at least 2000. The location of Formby on the coast also restricts access to the village to a small number of trunk roads which are already badly congested at peak times.

Formby’s schools are already full, although some pupils are bussed in from other areas, but I doubt there will be the capacity for the proposed development.

Formby’s GP surgeries are already at full capacity. My family and I have had to wait for too long for appointments in the past. A local paper claimed our nearest hospital was at full capacity for quite some time over the recent winter. How will they cope with the influx of new people. The plan does not address this issue adequately.

Loss of Greenbelt land in Formby.

All around Sefton there are large areas of derelict land, former industrial and dock sites in the main. It is these areas that would benefit most from redevelopment and provide affordable housing, rather than the unaffordable, for most, housing that will be built in Formby.

Developers Profits. Unsurprisingly, developers are keen to make the most profit they can from their enterprise and that is quite normal. What isn’t normal, or proper in my opinion, is Sefton Council’s relationship with the developers and both their enthusiasm to build on Formby’s precious greenbelt. The developers to maximise profit and the councils to maximise income. Councillors who approved the Local Plan have forsaken the very people who elected them and have failed to represent their views.

In summary, I object in the strongest possible terms to the housing development proposed in the Local plan. I find the forecasts of population growth dubious in the extreme, the loss of greenbelt to be a catastrophe to the locality, the risk of flooding caused by the proposed development has been largely ignored and the concentration of development in Formby appears to have been driven by the greed of developers, in league with local councillors whose eye is on maximising income and complying with party political objectives, rather than representing the wishes of those who elected them. If we must have a Local Plan, let it be one which serves the people of Sefton, not the developers and the council.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 561	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Bridget Carroll
--------------------------	-----------------------	---

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I object because the infrastructure of existing roads and communities have not been taken into account. The proposed building works around Ravenmeols Community Centre / Little Altcar is ludicrous. This area is already densely populated and the traffic queues in the morning & eve to get in and out of this area are long and heavy, exacerbated by the traffic to and from Range High & St. Luke's Primary.

There have been 2 new, lower speed restrictions introduced on the Formby Bypass & Ince Blundell woods since I have been living here (19 years) -the amount of traffic on the Formby Bypass already huge and adding more housing into Formby without altering the road access will cause unnecessary queues, pollution and increase the risk of accidents to the families who live here, many I whom have young children. There is also a sizeable elderly population. Adding more cars into an already very built up area will seriously undermine the quality of life for existing residents.

The proposed building is on land that has important functions as drainage. Building on agricultural land that has been used for centuries as part of the drainage management is absurd. Ditches are cut across the moss from Formby to Ormskirk and have been used for 100s of years to manage rainfall. The loss of significant agricultural land & farming communities is short-sighted. There is no need at all to build on prime agricultural land, when there are alternative brownfield sites available.

The developers in Formby make a lot of money because it is prime residential land. I believe the council is so concerned to make money that they have neglected to look at the effect of building housing on the sites they propose. I am deeply unhappy at the proposals and whilst pressure groups / action groups is not something I normally get involved in, I am concerned enough about this to make a personal objection. I am horrified that my local Council puts money above long-term sustainable living and I am disgusted that more housing is being proposed in an area that is already EXTREMELY congested, putting more pressure on already over-stretched services, such as doctors dentists and failing to show concern for the quality of life of residents who live here.

Trying to get out of Formby in the morning is already a nightmare I can't imagine what it would be like for the school children walking to school down Ravenmeols Lane were more traffic to be added.

There are alternative sites available for building which would be far more suitable

The issue of drainage is a serious one and has not been addressed

A Brownfield first policy is essential

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 562	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Amanda and Dave Mercer
--------------------------	-----------------------	--

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We are concerned that the current local plan for Formby and Sefton will result in:

- the loss of our green belt
- decrease the openness of the countryside
- increase risk of flooding
- loss of wildlife habitats and green space
- an increase in the volume of traffic on already busy roads
- an increase in pollution

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Formby Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites	
Respondent No 576	Response Ref 3	Representor Name J David Chambers
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

3. Formby. The Plan makes provision for 1,100 extra houses to be constructed mostly on pristine green areas with great emphasis on the South and West of the town. In addition there is to be constructed an extra business park, located directly on a site important to local nature conservation and abutting Downholland Brook which drains into the River Alt. Apart from pollution concerns in these waterways, run-off drainage from the new site will increase the volume of water that must be handled and will increase the likelihood of downstream flooding. A large housing development is scheduled for the agricultural fields to the South of Formby, along Liverpool Road. This is highly undesirable. It will degrade existing properties by removing the perception of closeness of open areas, and will very much increase the likelihood of flooding in the vicinity (a major concern, confirmed by Sefton's own ex-senior drainage engineer). It will, in addition, cause a massive increase in traffic congestion along Liverpool Road and Formby Bypass and will result in much degradation of air quality by the excess slow moving traffic. Another large housing development is scheduled for fields West of the railway line and just North-West of the extended development now in progress on the site of the old power plant. This proposed development is much too close to the existing nature reserve area in the coastal dunes. This important natural area will be severely degraded as a result of this development, with loss of habitat, much increased pollution, and resultant loss of biodiversity. Siting any new housing developments West of the railway line at Formby is completely at variance with the Plan's stated concern for preserving natural areas (and it bears repeating here that this will compromise dune systems that are of international importance). Developing on Green Belt land to the South of Formby adds to the inexorable closure of the gap between Formby and Ince Blundell; it is to be expected that if this trend continues, these areas will in the future inevitably become one single conurbation (probably linked to Thornton, Crosby, and the rest of Liverpool). Provision of 1,100 new houses at Formby would be expected to increase the local population by between 2,000 and 3,000. This will put unacceptable strain on medical facilities, schools, and other public services. New facilities will be needed, none of which are included, or even mentioned, in the Plan document.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Formby Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites	
Respondent No 593	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Alex Webster
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

The amenities, facilities and infrastructure presently in place in Formby are totally inadequate for the current population. Therefore, before considering the addition of any substantial housing development takes place the current problems need to be resolved i.e. all health provision (long waiting time for appointments), car parking, public transport (both bus and trains) road access (especially at rush hour and summer/fine weather periods). The two main concentration developments are not in locations suitable for the high number of proposed houses. I firmly believe that should this proposed over development take place it will be to the detriment of all, including those who move in.

Summary of Suggested Changes

I would suggest that any additional housing in Formby should be greatly scaled down and the infrastructure sorted out first.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 605 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Eric Irwin
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am writing to express my objection to Sefton's local plan. In particular I feel that the building of additional housing will only add to the already congested roads within Formby – in particular there are only three exits from Formby and they are already busy at peak times.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 613 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** R D Goodwin
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I understand it is proposed to develop significant areas of low lying green belt land in Formby and build a substantial number of houses. It is well known that Formby is low lying with a high water table, some of it below sea level and none of it much above. I contend that the development of green belt land for housing should only be considered in a crisis; there is no crisis and there are bf sites available in South Sefton.

The Council seems to set little communal benefits of green belt land, e.g. greenspace, the break up of urban sprawl, provision of wildlife. The Council seems to think that green belt land exists for the provision of expensive houses that would yield large sums of Council Tax. Such houses would certainly not satisfy any need for affordable housing.

Because of Formby's drainage/flooding problems, I believe it is intended to build 6 foot high platforms on which to construct the new houses to avoid such problems for them. This would, of course, lead to a high risk of drainage/flooding problems for nearby residents which the Council seems to ignore. We feel that any expenses caused by such problems would fall on us as residents and not the Council nor the developers.

The Council has been worrying secretive about the details of the development plan and avoided any reference to the potential drainage/flooding implications which would doubtless loom large and become alarming as the threat of global warming increases in the years ahead.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby

MN2 Formby sites

Respondent No 635

Response Ref 5

Representor Name Graham Nelson

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

- 1 It seems unrealistic to expect Formby to accommodate extra residents in the 1,000 houses envisaged.
- A. This is because Formby is full to capacity with vehicles, already creating serious problems of congestion and car parking. There are only road three access points from Formby and no alternatives.
- B. Also, surface water flooding is already a problem in some parts of Formby and can only become worse if soil is covered with concrete.
- C. Drains are already full to capacity, as evidenced by some parts of Formby suffering annually with drains and sewers overflowing into the street – e.g. Savants Hook.
- D. Plan takes no account of the capacity of schools to cope with an increase in population. Secondary schools are oversubscribed
- 2 The Plan does not take into consideration the effects of climate-change on flood risks, which will inevitably cause problems with additional heavy rainfall and rising sea-levels affecting the tidal River Alt.
- 3 The Plan will probably create out-of-town retail developments, which will put even greater pressure on the already struggling retail shops in the Formby “village” centre.
- 4 Development will radically change the character of Formby, spoiling it for residents who choose to live here because they like its character just the way it is.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Policy MN2 Formby

MN2 Formby sites

Respondent No 674

Response Ref 1

Representor Name Maria Jesus Torres

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I disagree with the assertion that the 'greatest opportunity to build affordable housing is on Green Belt sites' (3.7) and consider it unjustified for the following reasons:

1 Brownfield sites will always be more expensive to develop than greenfield ones, so if this argument is taken to its logical conclusion and profit margins are to be the main consideration, developers will inevitably make greenfield sites their first choice. Does it not make sense to develop brownfield sites first, given that the green belt is an important amenity and a scarce resource?

2 Brownfield sites tend to be nearer to areas with job opportunities. I have heard that the likely price bracket for housing in the Formby green belt may well be at least 200,000 GBP or thereabouts, and possibly as high as 300,000 - 400,000 GBP, which would make them unaffordable for first time buyers. I fail to see how this would tackle the housing shortage, since — as the Plan acknowledges in 3.5 and 3.6 — the greatest need is for affordable housing.

3 The Plan points to climate change as a significant challenge (3.15), and suggests that one of its consequences may be an increased risk of flooding in some areas of Sefton. Nevertheless, the two largest areas identified in 4.52 for housing development in Formby (MN2.12, Land north of Brackenway and MN2.16, Land at Liverpool Road) are both prone to flooding. Many Formby residents remain unconvinced that the flood mitigation measures proposed in this section would prevent flooding in the adjoining areas.

4 I am also concerned about traffic problems. Most of the prospective buyers of new homes in the Formby green belt would probably be commuters who would need to travel south on the A565, causing considerable congestion. This congestion would not be eased by the new Brooms Cross link road between Thornton and the motorways mentioned in 2.33; in fact, it will almost certainly worsen because the section between Thornton and Lady Green will still be single carriageway and be like a funnel into which traffic from two lengths of dual carriageway will be squeezed.

5 The nature, scale and positioning of the proposed developments in Formby will cause irreversible environmental damage and have a severe impact on the quality of life for those who already live in the area. For many of us, one of the main attractions of Formby is its semi-rural nature. Development of this type will turn it into an urban area. Sefton encompasses a wide variety of environments, ranging from densely populated urban areas to unspoilt beaches and pinewoods and small villages; my fear is that this Plan would turn it into an urban sprawl and destroy many of its most distinctive features.

1 The Plan is based on the false assumption that the Green Belt surrounding Formby is suitable for housing, yet admits that there is a potential flooding risk in these areas. (2.11, MN2) Although the effects of climate change are acknowledged, the proposals for managing flood risk are unclear and pay insufficient attention to the potential risks for Formby as a whole. (2.11, 3.15, 10.50)

2 The Plan underestimates the amenity value of this Green Belt for residents of Formby.

3 The Plan assumes that a significant proportion of the new housing in Formby will be affordable, but fails to explain the measures that will be taken to ensure this. (3.5, 3.6, 3.20)

4 The Plan asserts that there are insufficient brownfield sites suitable for development in Sefton (4.20 - 4.34), but fails to provide the detailed criteria used for selecting or rejecting such sites when potential development areas were assessed. (4.33 - 4.36)

5 Insufficient consideration has been given to the possible impact of the proposals on the local infrastructure, especially transport.

6 The Plan favours short-term gains to the detriment of the long-term interests and wellbeing of the population of Formby.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Policy MN2 Formby

MN2 Formby sites

Respondent No 675

Response Ref 1

Representor Name Michael Truman

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I attended the consultation session in Formby on 9th September 2013. In the video presentation it was stated that the Plan is designed to protect 97% of Sefton's green belt. This figure was also given in the booklet made available at the meeting. From the poster display I noted that Formby is expected to provide 890 'sites' (I presume this means plots) for development, of which 150 are classified as 'urban', 40 as 'greenspace' and 700 as green belt. This means, therefore, that about 83% of the new housing in Formby will be built on greenfield land. When this figure is compared with those for the other areas identified in the Plan, Formby seems to be bearing a disproportionate share of the loss of green spaces. When I raised this point, I was told that Formby was a commuter area with little industry, so there were few brownfield sites available for building. When I asked about the potential for building houses on brownfield sites elsewhere in Sefton, I was told that many of these were heavily contaminated and would be costly to clean up, making them unattractive for development given that house prices in these areas are low, so developers cannot expect big profits once the decontamination costs are taken into account.

I disagree with the assertion that the 'greatest opportunity to build affordable housing is on Green Belt sites' (3.7) and consider it unjustified for the following reasons:

1 Brownfield sites will always be more expensive to develop than greenfield ones, so if this argument is taken to its logical conclusion and profit margins are to be the main consideration, developers will inevitably make greenfield sites their first choice. Does it not make sense to develop brownfield sites first, given that the green belt is an important amenity and a scarce resource?

2 Brownfield sites tend to be nearer to areas with job opportunities. I have heard that the likely price bracket for housing in the Formby green belt may well be at least 200,000 GBP or thereabouts, and possibly as high as 300,000 - 400,000 GBP, which would make them unaffordable for first time buyers. I fail to see how this would tackle the housing shortage, since — as the Plan acknowledges in 3.5 and 3.6 — the greatest need is for affordable housing.

3 The Plan points to climate change as a significant challenge (3.15), and suggests that one of its consequences may be an increased risk of flooding in some areas of Sefton. Nevertheless, the two largest areas identified in 4.52 for housing development in Formby (MN2.12, Land north of Brackenway and MN2.16, Land at Liverpool Road) are both prone to flooding. Many Formby residents remain unconvinced that the flood mitigation measures proposed in this section would prevent flooding in the adjoining areas.

4 I am also concerned about traffic problems. Most of the prospective buyers of new homes in the Formby green belt would probably be commuters who would need to travel south on the A565, causing considerable congestion. This congestion would not be eased by the new Brooms Cross link road between Thornton and the motorways mentioned in 2.33; in fact, it will almost certainly worsen because the section between Thornton and Lady Green will still be single carriageway and be like a funnel into which traffic from two lengths of dual carriageway will be squeezed.

5 The nature, scale and positioning of the proposed developments in Formby will cause irreversible environmental damage and have a severe impact on the quality of life for those who already live in the area. For many of us, one of the main attractions of Formby is its semi-rural nature. Development of this type will turn it into an urban area. Sefton encompasses a wide variety of environments, ranging from densely populated urban areas to unspoilt beaches and pinewoods and small villages; my fear is that this Plan would turn it into an urban sprawl and destroy many of its most distinctive features.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Formby Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites	
Respondent No 676	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Salam Kenyani
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

It will result in the overdevelopment of Formby. No provisions have been made for infrastructure: doctors, dentists, hospitals, schools, traffic etc.

Drainage in Formby is poor and there are already problems with flooding. This will be exacerbated by the proposed developments.

All of Formby's Greenbelt is Grade 1 agricultural land and is classed as best and most versatile. This land should be protected.

Creating a large retail park in Formby will destroy small, local shops. The heart of the village will be lost. There will be huge implications for traffic too.

The way consultations have been handled is poor.

The Local Plan does not, in my opinion, serve the best interests of the people of Sefton

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Formby Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites	
Respondent No 677	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Adam Kenyani
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I object to the local plan as put forward by Sefton Council.

If this plan were to go through we would experience a loss of a large part of our green belt. I find this totally unacceptable. The Greenbelt was put in place to stop urban sprawl and it is serving that purpose in Sefton.

Our Greenbelt is too valuable to lose. The NPPF states that it should only be used in exceptional circumstances. As far as I am aware, housing figures do not constitute exceptional circumstances.

Brownfield sites should be used first for development and empty homes should be brought back into use.

Housing figures are too high. Formby's infrastructure is not suitable for what is planned regarding house building. There would be a huge strain on services and there would not be sufficient educational provision. There would be a huge increase in traffic causing an increase in pollution and carbon emissions. This would lead to a rise in health problems in our community.

I am also extremely concerned that the local plan ignores drainage and flooding issues.

I am very unhappy with the proposed industrialisation of Formby.

Loss of Greenbelt would have an impact on wildlife and habitats.

Our best and most versatile agricultural land would also be lost if these plans go ahead, leading to a rapid decline of farming which will result in a need to import resources in the future that were previously locally grown.

I think that if the Local Plan goes through as it exists currently then it would be disastrous for both Formby in particular and Sefton in general.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby

MN2 Formby sites

Respondent No 681

Response Ref 1

Representor Name Mike Walsh

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the local plan proposed by Sefton Council on the following grounds:

- I am concerned at the loss of significant tracts of greenbelt land across Sefton but particularly in and around Formby. People from towns and cities need access to open green spaces for their health and well being and quality of life. We need to preserve as much good agricultural land as possible so that we can be more sustainable as a nation and any encroachment on the green belt will mean loss of wildlife and habitat which we should instead be preserving.
- I strongly support a brownfield first policy and feel that this should be the guiding principle of any local plan. Why not give the developers an incentive to clean up the land and bring it back into use?
- I accept we need to build more decent and affordable housing for future generations but this should be led by communities in response to need - not by developers who have a clear self interest. My children will not be able to afford any 'affordable' housing being proposed in this area. Our next move will be downsizing and/or to a bungalow but I don't see many of these types of accommodation being built - they are mostly family houses.
- It is difficult to get a doctors appointment now let alone with added pressure on local services, such as schools and dentists, from a significant increase in population.
- Formby has one village street which is mostly now charity, coffee and betting shops. Where is the infrastructure which will support the increase in population? Where is the policy to support the investment and growth of our high streets? The developers are certainly not going to do this.
- The traffic in Formby is already bad enough - the car has a dominance to the detriment of pedestrians and cyclists - and pollution and carbon emissions are bound to increase. I find it difficult enough to cross Liverpool Road and I try not to cycle on the main roads, as I don't feel safe. It must be worse for families and children.
- Housing figures do not give 'special circumstances' for building on the green belt.
- Sefton has constraints on the land available to build on, with the coastline on one side, SSSI's, national trust land, golf courses - as well as large areas which are natural flood plains. We know people near the Liverpool Road site who are regularly experience flooding.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 683 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Alison Gibbon
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the local plan proposed by Sefton Council on the following grounds:

- I am concerned at the loss of significant tracts of greenbelt land across Sefton but particularly in and around Formby. People from towns and cities need access to open green spaces for their health and well being and quality of life. We need to preserve as much good agricultural land as possible so that we can be more sustainable as a nation and any encroachment on the green belt will mean loss of wildlife and habitat which we should instead be preserving.
- I strongly support a brownfield first policy and feel that this should be the guiding principle of any local plan. Why not give the developers an incentive to clean up the land and bring it back into use?
- I accept we need to build more decent and affordable housing for future generations but this should be led by communities in response to need - not by developers who have a clear self interest. My children will not be able to afford any 'affordable' housing being proposed in this area. Our next move will be downsizing and/or to a bungalow but I don't see many of these types of accommodation being built - they are mostly family houses.
- It is difficult to get a doctors appointment now let alone with added pressure on local services, such as schools and dentists, from a significant increase in population.
- Formby has one village street which is mostly now charity, coffee and betting shops. Where is the infrastructure which will support the increase in population? Where is the policy to support the investment and growth of our high streets? The developers are certainly not going to do this.
- The traffic in Formby is already bad enough - the car has a dominance to the detriment of pedestrians and cyclists - and pollution and carbon emissions are bound to increase. I find it difficult enough to cross Liverpool Road and I try not to cycle on the main roads, as I don't feel safe. It must be worse for families and children.
- Housing figures do not give 'special circumstances' for building on the green belt.
- Sefton has constraints on the land available to build on, with the coastline on one side, SSSI's, national trust land, golf courses - as well as large areas which are natural flood plains. We know people near the Liverpool Road site who are regularly experience flooding.

These are just some of the objections which I would like to make and hope they are given full consideration.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 734 **Response Ref** 9 **Representor Name** Maria Bennett
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Flooding

All these sites relating to Formby have flooding issues. The council like to say that it is surface water flooding but this is not correct, as the photos provided clearly show flooding and not surface water, indeed when properties are flooded and residents have to move out this cannot be classed as surface water.

It appears that the council are unable to appreciate the flooding problems and the existing drainage problems. Before any type of development takes place the flooding issues have to be addressed, you cannot just say "we will cross that bridge when we come to it", this is much like closing the gate when the horse has bolted. Indeed who would be responsible for compensating the residents, no doubt it would be like playing ping pong, council would blame the developers who in turn would say it was the council who gave the permission to build. However you want to look at it, at the end of the day it will be the council tax payer who will be left with the cleaning up bill.

You only have to look at what has happened to new development and existing housing next to new development during the past few years to see what is going to happen. It is totally irresponsible to build on these sites and if development is ever allowed then the developers should be made to set monies aside for any further flooding issues.

[The NPPF chapter10, Section 100]

"Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at high risk, but where development is necessary making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere."

Formby is unique in that there is only one way in and one way out, the Formby By Pass. During the past 40 years Formby has been built out to the extent that it can no longer cope in relation to the infrastructure. The schools have limited places and some have no places at all, traffic is at breaking point with Formby becoming gridlocked in many areas, particularly at weekends and during the summer with visitors. With an estimated 20,000 vehicles plus in Formby but only a few hundred parking spaces one wonders where all the additional traffic will go. The roads are in a disgraceful state, with potholes on every road and the council without funds to address the issues. These roads deteriorate on a daily basis.

In various areas of Formby there are serious problems with drains, where raw sewage come up into the roads after heavy rain. In fact there are only 2 main drains in Formby dealing with all the properties and it is very obvious that they cannot cope. The local plan does not address any of the infrastructure issues and nor does the council have a CIL in place, they say they are waiting to see what happens.

It appears that they want to rely on the generosity of the developers to help put the infrastructure into place and this is not going to happen, with no money available in the council one asks the question of how the infrastructure is going to be addressed? Who is going to pay to have this in place.

The plan should detail in full how they are going to address the infrastructure in the borough, in particular in Formby, where the money is going to come from and that this is finalised before any home is built.

What is so surprising is that many sites allocated in this plan will affect the wildlife and yet the council's answer is that they can mitigate this by moving them?

To continue to concrete over our land will destroy all of these sites for our future generations.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Overview of Formby and its natural assets

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 740 **Response Ref** 31 **Representor Name**
Organisation Name Formby Residents Action Group
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

An assessment of the impact of the proposed development on Formby. This considers housing need, schools, GP and dental services and traffic.

Chapter 18 [pages 130 – 134] and Appendix C [pages 218-224]

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 777 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Mike and Shirley Goffey
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We acknowledge that we need more houses but first build on all brownfield sites. Secondly, be honest and build houses our local young people can afford. We need young people to live close by so we can have old-fashioned families who can support each other. Grandparents, parents, children and grandchildren all close by looking out for each other, not being miles away. And, guess what, saving a fortune on the NHS!

We are also worried about who is going to make sure we have fa services ie: school places, doctors, dentists. Nobody seems to have been made responsible, we have no names who we can speak to personally and who are in a position to assure us they are listening to us.

We feel very strongly that we in Formby are being represented unfairly by our Councillors who think Formby is fair game. Nice area, bring them down a peg or two. If they are so keen on building on Green Belt, why are they not building in Lunt? Plenty of Green Belt there, good access to the New Road, but guess who lives there?

Let us take things slowly. Build on Holy Trinity Church School, see how quickly they are taken up. Let's see how the Power Site goes, although we have no promises they will be affordable for our local young people.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 780	Response Ref 1	Representor Name David Stevens
--------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

1. I totally disagree to building on green belt land as it is a loss of open space that is supposed to be protected. There are plenty of other spaces that can be used but the developers want Formby because they think they can commend a high priced for what they build.

2. We need homes that are affordable for first time buyers not the premium properties that the developers are planning. We already have unaffordable new homes in Formby that are sitting empty which is no good for anybody let alone the economy.

3. The proposed building of houses will have severe effect on natural habitat for wildlife. Consideration has not been taken into the loss of wildlife on the area.

4. The existing roads will not be able to cope with the extra traffic and with this comes more pollution. Each new home will have at least one car per family however statistics show most families have two or three cars per household. With the by-pass being the main road into Formby the roads will be congested possibly leading to more accidents/fatalities.

5. Local services are already being cut therefore to build more housing will stretch services even more. The developers are not interested in the infrastructure as once the homes are built they are long gone when the problems start to happen E.g. Flooding — which is a serious issue to home owners in Formby. Lack of drainage is well documented.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 782	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Karen Stevens
--------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I moved to Formby to be surrounded by rural countryside, if the building of these houses goes ahead the countryside will be lost to developers. We should be exploring what sites we already have. I strongly disagree with building on Green Belt land; it is our responsibility to protect these areas for future generations we shouldn't be building on greenbelt sites.

This year due to reduced funds changes have already been made to save money by Sefton council with even more cuts to take place next year. Sefton residents have seen our waste and recycling collections being reduced the green waste is now every three week collection and not one collection was made in December 2014 or January and February 2015, along with many other public services being cut. If more properties were built where is the money coming from to cope with the extra services needed for these new residents.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby

MN2 Formby sites

Respondent No 786

Response Ref 1

Representor Name

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

1. The current infrastructure will not be able to cope with the amount of houses the developers and the council are willing to let them build. The developers are not interested in building the necessary infrastructure to accommodate what's needed. It should be the people of Formby and all of Sefton residents to ensure we have the right amount of schools, doctors, and dentists to cope.
2. I have huge traffic concerns regarding the extra traffic this will bring to the area. What about the traffic on Formby bypass it cannot cope with another junction or roundabout leading into the bypass. This also creates more pollution and carbon emissions and even more traffic jams.
3. It is very clear affordable housing will not materialise if left to the developers. Building on the greenbelt has a premium so that will make the homes unaffordable.
4. Flooding has always been in big problem in Formby, building even more homes on the green belt will add to this problem even if new homes are built up it will be a disaster for the homes nearby, due to the lack of drainage in the area. The existing properties will get even more flooded because they will be lower than the new properties.
5. There are plenty of brown field sites that affordable housing could be built on for the young to get on the property market and the older generation to downsize to.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Policy MN2 Formby MN2 Formby sites

Respondent No 787 Response Ref 1 Representor Name Elizabeth Hogan

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Firstly, and in my opinion, importantly, I believe that no development should be permitted on the greenbelt, especially when the land in question is Grade 1-2 agricultural land. The Local Plan should protect this land from development, especially whilst there are new houses lying empty in our town and there are brownfield sites in the borough, which could be developed first. The greenbelt was established to prevent urban sprawl and to preserve green spaces for the enjoyment of all. This should remain the case whilst other options exist.

In a world where there is an increasing population, rising food prices and international instability it is essential that we utilise our agricultural land to its full extent for national security and international stability. New Zealand now refuses to sell its agricultural land to foreign companies so as to ensure food produced there is for their own country in the first instance.

Formby does not have the infrastructure to cope with such an increased population. There is already a shortage of dentists, it can take weeks to see a doctor, and schools are oversubscribed.

Also, Formby already suffers from severe traffic congestion during peak times, which will obviously become worse with a larger population. I believe the traffic survey that was commissioned in respect of the Liverpool Road application was undertaken mid-morning in the middle of the school summer holidays. Such practice must start alarm bells ringing. The local hospital could cope with the extra strain on its resources and I wonder how the police would supply increased policing to the area in the face of their savage budget cuts. Cuts that will increase year on year for the next five years.

To design housing estates in areas that become water locked is absolutely ridiculous. Formby slopes inland, away from the sea and towards the River Alt. The suggestion that the area can be raised by six feet and houses then built on the land will cause disastrous flooding. Not only will the land that held the floodwater be lost, but the water will run off the raised land causing flooding around it.

Formby has a glut of new houses that have remained unsold. The new houses on Ennerdale/Kirklake Road have been let out and the development on Cable Street has proven quite disastrous. Properties remain empty and unsold, and the building work has ended before the completion of all the houses on the estate. It is obvious that if another estate of houses is built, each house costing £300k - £400k, they will remain unsold.

This local plan has nothing to do with the requirements of the borough of Sefton. People in Sefton need housing that they can afford to buy in their own right, i.e. Houses in the region of £100k - £150k. However builders do not want to build houses of this value as it reduces their profit margins, and I believe this plan is a case of the builders telling Sefton councilors where they are prepared to build houses, not a case of Sefton councilors building to the requirements of their electorate.

Natural habitat will be destroyed. At a time when the endangered red squirrel has started to increase in number and we are beginning to see them spread around Formby, destroying the greenbelt will reduce their numbers and may lead to their extinction, as Formby is one of the few places left where they survive.

These proposed developments would have a significant detrimental effect in Formby. My house will be in danger of flooding, I will not be able to access healthcare easily, I will be stuck in congested traffic, and crime will increase as there will be a greater area for criminals to exploit with an ever-reducing police force. Perhaps it would be prudent to ask the current chief constable, Sir John Murphy, how many extra police officers he would be able to provide to the area after the extra houses were built, and which area of Sefton these extra officers would be transferred from.

I would also like to know, if these houses were built, who would be liable when the existing houses suffered flooding and became uninsurable, unsellable and worthless. Surely the builders and council would have a liability, but also the government as they are supporting local plans. I wonder would the councilors who voted for such building work have a personal liability, as they would have ignored sound, common sense advice for the sake of making a quick profit for the council.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 789 **Response Ref** 5 **Representor Name** JD and M-A Campbell
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The Plan makes provision for 1,100 extra houses to be constructed mostly on pristine green areas with great emphasis on the South and West of the town. In addition there is to be constructed an extra business park, located directly on a site important to local nature conservation and abutting Downholland Brook which drains into the River Alt. Apart from pollution concerns in these waterways, run-off drainage from the new site will increase the volume of water that must be handled and will increase the likelihood of downstream flooding.

Developing on Green Belt land to the South of Formby adds to the inexorable closure of the gap between Formby and Ince Blundell; it is to be expected that if this trend continues, these areas will in the future inevitably become one single conurbation (probably linked to Thornton, Crosby, and the rest of Liverpool).

Provision of 1,100 new houses at Formby would be expected to increase the local population by between 2,000 and 3,000. This will put unacceptable strain on medical facilities, schools, and other public services. New facilities will be needed, none of which are included, or even mentioned, in the Plan document.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 790 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Y Entwistle
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We agree with all the points on the 'Save Our Sefton' petition plus the following:

Formby, Hightown, Ainsdale and Southport are unique and attractive places to visit - if the plan went ahead we would merge into one area and the uniqueness would be lost.

We have had housing developments before, i.e. the mushroom farm in Cable Street. They are a white elephant the majority are still empty despite being built over 5 years ago. This fallacy about a certain percentage being affordable housing is a joke.

Developers see Formby and the surrounding areas as a cash cow, it is lovely area and the Green Belt should not be built on. There are lots of brownfield sites and industrial areas in Sefton which could be built on first. Drive around Bootle and Litherland and you will find a great many of these sites available.

They have shut down schools in Formby, saying they were not needed. If they build all these house were are the school places coming from? Doctors/dentists just can't cope with the xtra patients.

There are three exit roads from Formby and it is hell in rish hour. So building again puts much strain on the infrastructure.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 797	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Joanne Burke
--------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I strongly object to Sefton 's Local Plan for the following reasons: Loss of Sefton 's greenbelt. Sefton has plenty of brownfield sites that we should be building on first. Excluding coastal land (most of which is National Trust land) Golf courses, Altcar MOD Army training camp and RAF Woodvale airfield, all remaining land is high-grade arable land; we need to safeguard this land for our children and future generations.

Increased traffic and pollution. Formby already has traffic congestion at peak times, Whenever we have a temporary set of traffic lights due to a collapsed drain, road repairs, water, gas, electricity repairs...Formby almost comes to a standstill, building hundreds more houses will only add to a very difficult situation.

Parking at Formby Village shopping area is very difficult now, all the car parks are full during the day, and street parking has become such a problem the Council keep extending the areas of double yellow lines further and further out. The Village is struggling to survive with many of its shops being Charity shops, betting shops, coffee shops and wine bars... new retail parks with its ample, free parking will kill off our remaining Village shops.

Our Doctors, Dentists, and Hospitals will not cope with this (proposed) increase in new people.

It is very difficult to get young Children into a good School in Formby now; I am very concerned that our Schools will not cope with all these extra houses.

Formby already has hundreds of houses for sale, some asking prices are as low as £160,000 we don't need hundreds more built.

My garage, driveway and gardens flood now. This proposed greenbelt land is very low line, it floods every time we have heavy rain, the builders plan to raise the land up one to two meters to prevent them beingflooded, this will only pass the flood water on to other existing properties exacerbating an already difficult situation.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 798	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Arthur Finch
--------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I strongly object to Sefton's Local Plan, there are plenty of empty houses in Sefton many of which only need renovating before bringing back in to use. Renovation of there houses will bring much needed employment to local people and will boost local supply companies. The infrastructure for these houses is already in place and they are in the best position for employment, Schools, buses, trains, doctors, Dentists, Child minders, Hospitals. Sefton also has plenty of brownfield sites, which again the infrastructure is in place. Formby's best quality arable agricultural land has no infrastructure and suffers from extreme flooding problems. These fields lie below the level of all existing houses, Down Holland Brook and the River Alt, until very recently has always been within the flood plains of Sefton. To increase the height of this land to enable building will only shift water problems towards existing homes.

We should only build on greenbelt land in exceptional circumstances, as mentioned previously there are plenty of brownfield sites in Sefton to cater for our needs without building on our greenbelt.

Formby already has infrastructure problems with its parking, traffic, Schools doctors dentists hospitals, and has no local children's A & E.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 800	Response Ref 1	Representor Name P Finch
--------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I strongly object to Sefton's Local Plan, we should not build on greenbelt land. Greenbelt was put in place over 70 years ago; Formby has plenty of houses for sale, from as little as £159,000. The last large estate built in Formby off Cable Street (The old mushroom farm site) has been on the market for over 3 years and most of them empty and unfinished!

There are plenty of brownfield sites in Sefton that should be built on and hundreds of empty compulsory purchased first time buyers properties that could be renovated and brought back into use before considering taking the UK's best quality arable farmland. Clearly the Council and builders make more money from building executive homes in the greenbelt.

Houses built on brownfield sites are in the best place for employment and infrastructure: Schools, buses, train stations, doctors, Hospitals, Dentists, Child care, ... Formby's best quality arable agricultural land has no infrastructure and suffers from extreme flooding problems. These fields lie below the level of all existing houses, Down Holland Brook and the River Alt, and until very recently has always been within the flood plains of Sefton. To increase the height of this land to enable building will only shift water problems towards existing homes.

We should only build on greenbelt land in exceptional circumstances, as mentioned previously there are plenty of brownfield sites in Sefton to cater for our needs without building on our greenbelt. I can't see a need for well over 600 houses (plus extras and back log) totaling over 1100 houses per year up to 2030, as stated in Sefton's Local Plan.

Formby already has infrastructure problems with its parking, traffic, Schools doctors dentists hospitals, and has no local children's A & E.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 801	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Joan Wilkinson
--------------------------	-----------------------	--

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Formby does not need and cannot support additional housing / retail areas. Our Village shopping area has been declining for many years due to out of own retail shopping stores (Tesco...) any increase in large retail stores will only be detrimental to our village life.

Greenbelt was put in place to prevent small towns such as Formby becoming one with other towns.

All farm fields around Formby are high-grade arable land, and should not be built upon.

There are plenty of brownfield sites in Sefton to cater for our future housing needs without building on much needed, high productive farmland.

All the greenbelt land around Formby is very low line floodplain, and cannot be built on without adversely affecting other existing properties.

The roads in and out of Formby, including the Formby Bypass cannot support this level of extra traffic, three extra junctions onto the Bypass will seriously hinder both North/ South bound traffic with more, longer queues and added pollution.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 805 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Colette Larson
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Comment

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the local plan proposed by Sefton Council on the following grounds:

1. The local doctor's surgeries are already full. It takes 2 weeks to get an appointment at the moment and this situation will only get worse if more housing is built.
2. I live in Alt Road close to the proposed development on Liverpool Road. The possibility of flooding frightens me. What guaranties can the Sefton give me to ensure this possibility would not arise?
3. The roads in Formby are already at saturation point, you only have to see that when any of the three outlets of Formby to the bypass are closed.
4. It would lead to demise of Formby as a village.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 807 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** James O'Hara
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the local plan proposed by Sefton Council on the following grounds:

- The determination to build on green belt land will lead to the demise of Formby's existing open countryside structure and create the urban sprawl which has already incurred in the borough. The Liverpool Road project would lead to an intrusion to the natural flood plains in that area.
- The Council seem determined to build on greenbelt at any cost. Why don't they listen to the public who want them to conduct a Brownfield development before greenbelt?
- There are already insufficient school place in the area where the proposed housing is planned

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby

MN2 Formby sites

Respondent No 809

Response Ref 1

Representor Name Karen Edge

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I believe we must protect the greenbelt at all costs, these high quality, grade 1/ 2 farm fields are amongst the best in the country. England can't afford to loose such good productive, arable land . Sefton's Local Plan if allowed, will build on many of our best quality arable farm land before any brownfield sites are used, Sefton Council and the building companies stand to gain the most amount of money from these sites. Formby doesn't need any more houses, there are over 600 houses for sale at any time ranging from several million pounds to well below two hundred thousand pounds, there are plenty of first time buyer's houses for sale in Formby. Alt Road, River Close, Monks Drive, and Savon Hook all back onto the Liverpool road site, the original building company, Taylor Wimpy left this site un-built due to its difficulty's, it has always been a natural floodplain, I believe it was the original site for Down Holland Brook many years ago. Unlike Formby existing land which is pure sand (30 - 40cm's down) this field is made up of mainly river silt. Several of the end houses closest to the above field collapsed shortly after being built in the 1960's.

Formby's roads are already very congested at peak times; the buildup of cars when temporary traffic lights are set up due to, example collapsed drain brings Formby to a halt. The queues in and out of Formby on and off the Formby Bypass at peak times are already a huge problem, if the Highways alter the traffic lights system to allow more "green-time" to get in or out of Formby the traffic builds up the other way, Formby already has 4 junctions onto the Formby Bypass, to increase the number of junctions into the Bypass seven in such a short distance would only make matters worse.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Formby Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites	
Respondent No 812	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Alan Hall
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

The Local Plan has been ill conceived and poorly compiled when considered against a surprising number of important criteria.

1. Developing additional housing stock in the Formby area is particularly difficult to understand when the effect of increased volume of commuting vehicles trying to exit and enter Formby is considered. The approaches to the Liverpool road roundabout will see several hundred additional vehicles an hour at peak commuting hours attempting to access the Formby By-Pass. This is an environmental downside which just should not be allowed to be put in place. Queues trail hundreds of yards from the roundabout back along Liverpool Road and extend past Alt Road as it currently stands today. Several hundred extra vehicles will achieve longer waiting times and output an exhaust fumes pollution of a completely unacceptable level. The two other routes to the By-Pass will be similarly affected if the plans to develop the Industrial Estate are introduced as prominently included in the Local Plan.

2. Every increase in commuting cars containing one person causing all the problems above will actually entail an average increase of four people to the Formby population. These thousands of new residents will all reasonably expect to be adequately served by Doctors, Dentists, Schools and other domestic services — all areas of current concern in terms of the pressures of existing population levels impacting on service delivery performances.

3. Most of the areas put forward by the council seem to have been matched up with locations which are subject to flooding and drainage difficulties. Adding this huge additional strain on existing problem areas beggars belief.

4. The Local Plan targets significant areas of Greenbelt designated land and whilst I fully understand and except the need for actions to give more people the chance to build a life locally, we have all have a solemn duty as residents of today to protect the environment and important natural elements for tomorrow. Creating an urban sprawl of continuing mile after mile of suburbia stretching from Crosby to Southport, with all the gaps filled in-between is a particularly odious heritage which would be passed to our grandchildren and their children and we have a responsibility to resist with every means available to us.

The council have been informed of several viable alternatives to each element of their now produced Local Plan, and it seems that the needs of the very people they were elected to serve are being ridden over with an unedifying contempt, and this should not be allowed to proceed in its current form.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Formby Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites	
Respondent No 814	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Paul Edge
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Sefton's Local Plan is to build on many of Formby's best quality arable land before utilizing alternative brownfield sites, Sefton Council and the building companies stand to gain the most amount of money from Formby's best quality greenfield land.

Formby's roads are already very congested at peak times; the buildup of cars when temporary traffic lights are set up due to, for example, collapsed drains brings Formby to a halt. The queues in and out of Formby at peak times are already a huge problem, if hundreds of new houses are built and several extra junctions made on the Formby Bypass and the Highways alter the traffic lights system to allow more "green-time" I feel this will bring gridlock to Formby.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby

MN2 Formby sites

Respondent No 817

Response Ref 1

Representor Name Lynne Webster

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am writing to strongly object to Sefton Council's Local Plan. I live in Formby and I am fearful of the consequences of releasing green belt land. There are a number of reasons for my worries and they are as follows:

Formby is below sea level and many of the areas identified for development flood each and every year. At present they act as natural flood plains. My real fear is that present properties will receive this water and subsequently flood.

The green belt acts as lungs for the whole area and soaks up a high level of exhaust emissions. Formby Bypass is extremely busy and the present green belt is vital in allowing us to enjoy our environment. Higher pollution levels will increase the decline in health for the present inhabitants and also those newly relocating.

The rise in population and the subsequent pressure on Doctors, Dentists and Schools. The whole infrastructure of the area will be tested and I believe found wanting. This includes the present road system and a study of present traffic flow taken during school term time is vital to prove this point. Formby is a dormitory town and as such many commute during school term time and during these periods the pressure on the transport system is near breaking point.

The loss of habitat to the local wildlife. The hedgerows are alive with birds and the wild flora daily gladdens the heart. Once we have concreted over our green belt we will be unable to reverse our actions.

Local property is plentiful and some areas have many properties unsold. Is the future demand in Formby as high as the Council has predicted?

The loss of a Village due to urban sprawl. I have lived in Formby since childhood and know it to be a friendly and unique place to live. This will inevitably change if the green belt is lost.

These worries are real and the present population of Formby deserve to be heard above the roar made by those wishing to profit by future developments.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 818	Response Ref 1	Representor Name E Seddon
--------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I strongly object to the afore mentioned Local Plan, I feel the proposed number of new houses in the plan are not required, we have hundreds of houses in Formby and throughout Sefton for sale.

There are plenty of brownfield sites in Sefton that need to be cleaned up and regenerated without touching our top grade crop producing farm fields. We have hundreds of empty houses in Sefton that should be refurbished and brought back into use. This would bring employment to local people and help local supply companies.

All land around Formby is within the greenbelt, if you exclude coastline; National Trust land; golf courses; sports facilities; RAF Woodvale; MOD Altcar training camp; horticultural greenhouses; Merseyrail land; and riding stables; what's left is high-grade, arable, farm land that provides the UK with good quality food.

Traffic is already a huge problem in Formby, if you drive at peak times or just try and park at Formby shopping center, train station, GP Surgery, then you would know that we can't expand any further.

Formby has 2 main rivers, Down Holland Brook and The River Alt, They discharge into the Irish See just beyond Formby after travelling over 100 miles, when the North West gets a lot of rain the two rivers are full to bursting,

Formby's water cannot enter the rivers due to the height of water and the flap valves being closed, water then backs up into Formby causing water locking and our fields flood (lowest part of Formby) if builders build on this flood land by raising the ground artificially by 1 to 2 meters then existing houses will store this water in there houses and gardens.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 820	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Gail Walters
--------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am writing to strongly object to Sefton Council's Local Plan. I live in Formby and I am fearful of the consequences of releasing green belt land. There are a number of reasons for my worries and they are as follows:

- The green belt land bordering Formby By-Pass cleans the atmosphere and cushions the town from the air and noise pollution of extremely heavy traffic.
- This land also forms a precious habitat to a large and varied range of flora and fauna whilst providing a vital resource for the growth of crops.
- Releasing green belt land for housing which is not needed is a betrayal of the trust this community has placed in their council. There are enough empty houses in Formby as it is without adding more. There are also brown field sites available in the borough for the building of houses which would surely make more sense.
- Routes into Formby presently cause a bottle neck at peak hours and to increase the amount of traffic by this scale will create intolerable conditions for what is a dormitory town.
- I currently see an open farmer's field at the end of my road and abhor the thought of losing the peace, tranquility and privacy this affords me.
- Having moved to Formby in December 2012, I know how difficult it was to find local doctor's and dentist's surgeries willing to take new patients. The local infrastructure will not cope with a substantial influx of new residents.

Having only quite recently moved into this area from another local sprawling conurbation, I have strong objections to the possible destruction of what is a delightful village without any thought being given to the consequences for the local people.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby

MN2 Formby sites

Respondent No 822

Response Ref 1

Representor Name Frank A Boardman

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I have many concerns about this plan and I wish to object in the strongest terms and I would be grateful if you could take the following into account when the plan is due to be considered.

Firstly, and in my opinion, importantly, I believe that no development should be permitted on the Green Belt, especially when the land under consideration is Grade 1-2 agricultural land, which is amongst the best and most versatile in the country. Any council which professes to support sustainability would, and should, do all in their power to protect a high grade agricultural asset. The Local Plan should protect such land from development, especially whilst there are houses lying empty in Formby (some of them new builds) and enough brownfield sites in the borough which could, should planning permission be granted, accommodate proposed housing developments. The Green Belt was established to prevent urban sprawl and to preserve green spaces for the enjoyment of all. This should remain the case whilst other options exist. My understanding, from the information available to me, is that the housing figures do not give "special circumstances" for building on the Green Belt.

Proposed developments will lead to increased traffic and as a regular road user this will have a negative effect my journey's, in and around Formby. The increased traffic at "rush hour" and school start/finish times will increase the risk of road travel and may well place limitations on my choice of when and how to travel.

Anyone who has ever commuted from Formby during "rush hour" will be well aware of the queuing traffic on Liverpool Road attempting to access the Formby By-Pass. The increase in traffic from the proposed developments can only serve to exacerbate the existing situation. It is particularly important to recognise the impact that the proposed development on Liverpool Road will have on traffic flow. Traffic from the proposed development, on the outward journey, will add to the existing congestion at an extremely sensitive location in the road system. On the return journey traffic entering Formby from the south onto Liverpool Road and attempting to access the proposed development will present a potential hazard as access will be located in close proximity to the exit from the 60 mph Formby By-Pass.

Many of the roads in Formby are showing signs of deterioration with patches and pot holes not an unfamiliar sight. The increased challenge to Formby's road system from the extra traffic arising from any resulting development can only serve to hasten the requirement for and increase the amount of necessary highway maintenance with accompanying costs being carried by Sefton MBC.

I originally chose Alt Road as a place to live because it was a quiet area with not too great a traffic burden and was in close proximity to the Formby By-Pass. The development proposed in Sefton's Local Plan has the potential to negate all the reasons I chose to live on Alt Road.

I am concerned about the impact that the proposed developments will have on existing drainage systems. The Green Belt as well as offering the potential for food production also forms part of a natural integrated water management system. Water accesses this land and its passage through provides necessary control by delaying its arrival at surrounding water courses. Such a passive arrangement is critical and disturbance of this natural balance can only result in unwanted flooding.

Should Planning Approval be granted then any housing development will in all probability result in the building up of existing land levels. This increase in datum coupled with denial of permeable surface due to concrete and tarmac will result in water run-off to surrounding areas which are already at risk. The increased strain on the existing services, caused by run off, will take them to a position of failure as they will be unable accommodate demand.

I make this comment not to scaremonger but base it on personal observation as I have lived on Alt Road for 24 years and after heavy or sustained rainfall (N.B. not just limited to winter months) the foul sewers on the section of Alt Road where I live have been observed to overflow and I have reported this situation to United Utilities on a number of occasions. Not only does this situation result in flooding around the Alt Road - Redgate road junction [Formby] but it also causes the drains on mine and surrounding properties to back up resulting in standing water on drives, paths, patios and gardens. On occasion I have even been issued with sandbags as a precaution to prevent water ingress into my property.

Proposed developments will impose a further demand on a system which is already exhibiting signs of distress and is likely to impact on residents by resulting in more frequent overflow events of increased severity and possible accompanying damage to property. Locally, in the latter part of 2014, there have been lengthy road closures and restrictions to Alt road and Liverpool Road due to sewer works. Additionally I would note my concern that the proposed Liverpool Road development site which was historically a natural flood plain appears no longer to have flood plain designation.

Apart from the infrastructure implications noted in Objections 2 and 3 relating to traffic and flooding and drainage respectively the existing provisions in Formby for health care, education and leisure are already heavily subscribed. I find it increasingly difficult to obtain an appointment at my local surgery and the situation with regard to the limited number of places available in Formby's schools has been highlighted in the local press. The proposed developments will result in further requirements being placed on the current provisions which is likely to be to the detriment of the existing residents of Formby.

Car parking in Formby village is becoming increasingly problematic. Successive parking initiatives would appear to have resulted in increased parking on the roads surrounding the village. The proposed developments will only increase the demand for parking in Formby village which will make the situation worse for existing residents and at worst could discourage people from visiting Formby village altogether to the detriment of local businesses.

I would like to object to the approach adopted by Sefton's Local Plan in the identification of Green Belt/ Greenfield sites, in Formby, for housing development. Any credible plan must be open and transparent and above all place the needs of Sefton's residents above those of any potential developers. The process of identifying the likely increase in the population of Formby needs to be based on reliable and correctly used figures the results of which have been peer and independently reviewed to provide the necessary degree of confidence in their use going forward. The resulting housing figures then identified will need then to be reduced by the number of unoccupied properties in Formby (some of which will be new build). The resulting requirements then need to be assessed firstly against Sefton's Brown field land stocks. This should be done without consideration of any remedial costs as developer's profits should not be the concern of Sefton MBC.

Additionally Sefton's Local Plan should include for the provision of all necessary infrastructure e.g. schools, Doctors, Dentists suitable clinic facilities sufficient hospital availability, provision to allow correct drainage and traffic movement amongst others prior to seeking any development permission. Failure to make such provision is akin to building the roof of a house without providing the walls to support it.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter	6	Plan Order	MN2 Formby Sites	Other Documents
Policy	MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites		
Respondent No	824	Response Ref	1	Representor Name Maureen Jacques
Organisation Name				
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection			

Summary of Main Issues

As a resident of Formby, I would like to make the following points as to how the proposed plan would adversely impact the existing residents of the town:

The traffic is currently horrendous trying to get out onto the Bypass during the morning rush hour. Extra housing would inevitably result in more cars and exacerbate this problem.

Living near both St Luke's and Range schools, the traffic can be gridlocked at school start and finish times (especially when the level crossing gates are closed). Extra pupils from additional houses would result in even more traffic. The situation is a disaster waiting to happen. Parking in the village is already a problem. More cars would make this worse and ultimately deter people from going altogether with the knock-on effect that shops would close.

The bin collections are already on an unacceptable schedule. Without employing more staff, additional houses can only result in the collections being even further reduced. It is currently nigh on impossible to get a same day doctor's appointment (unless you are free to hang on the phone at Sam which is not always feasible for working people.)

Recent experience has shown that the average waiting time for a dental appointment is over 4 weeks (despite being willing to go at any time on any day).

In summary, Formby is already creaking at the seams and unless the infrastructure is improved the proposed local plan can only make matters worse.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 826 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** PJ Mowatt
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

As a Formby resident I wish to register my objection to Sefton Council's Local Plan for the following reasons:

1. Formby will in effect be joined up to its neighbours thus losing its identity.
2. Station Car Parks are already full by 9.00am every week day which means there is no space for additional vehicles. Any additional residents would therefore have to use their cars to travel to and from work. Volume of traffic coming into and going out of Formby at peak periods is already heavy. If the proposed Plan is carried out Formby will be gridlocked.
3. It will be difficult, if not impossible for emergency vehicles to get into and out of Formby which is a potentially life threatening situation.
4. The proposed green belt building land is fertile agricultural land the loss of which will affect future food production. Farming communities will be lost and there will be a risk of flooding to existing properties.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 828 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** S Brodie
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to formally object to the local plan in its current form, and offer these comments for consideration by the inspector.

It is very clear to anyone who lives in Formby and knows Formby that the sites proposed in this plan flood when it rains. Not only do they flood but the water will remain on the land for a considerable time, in some cases if it has been consistently raining for a period of time it will remain for weeks until it soaks away.

The school problems and places in the area are a major concern and I know of a couple of mums who actually have their children in separate schools as they are unable to get them in the same school as they have places in one year but not the other.

Getting out of Formby can be horrendous with long queues at peak hours. I work in Crosby which should have a journey time of no more than 20 mins. I start work at 8.45am but have to leave at 7.45 in order to arrive in work on time. The same applies to coming home. When road works are added into the equation the time is even longer. On some occasion it has taken me more than 2 hours to travel back from work.

I object to building on the greenbelt and this will alter Formby and in particular the entrance to Formby and its surrounding areas forever, we are not a town like Liverpool we are a commuter area for other area and we do not want to become a large town we want to remain as Formby Village.

Many people have made a lifestyle choice to live here and bring up their families yet this plans appears to want to extend Formby beyond all it boundaries with no concerns given to the issues of flooding or drains overflowing in the area. Who will be responsible if these houses are built and other properties then flood, will it be the developers or the Council who have carried on with this plan regardless of any major issues brought to their attention.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 829	Response Ref 1	Representor Name R Thompson
--------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Support

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the Local Plan proposed by Sefton Council on the following grounds:

Doctors surgeries in Formby at the moment are overcrowded and with the proposed increase in houses the situation will be a lot worse. My wife and I have to travel to Liverpool to travel to see a dentist. The local surgeries are full.

Please look at any objections with sympathy and understanding. We know we need more houses in Sefton but on the right sites.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 830	Response Ref 1	Representor Name D B Taylor
--------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am writing to object to your Local Plan. There are many issues that fuelled my concern for the plan but the main concerns are :

The loss of 'Green Belt ' land. The increase of the likelihood of flooding due to building on such sites. Lack of answers to many asked questions.

Before development of any Green Belt site is considered by the the Council, every other avenue for such development must explored fully, including 'Brownfield' sites. Green Belt land should be sacrosanct and not considered as available for any type of building consent.

Flooding in certain areas of Formby is and has been a problem over many years. Formby is below sea-level. When an ex-senior Drainage engineer from your own council has major concerns over such development, surely his experience and fears of flooding must be taken into account when deciding on such sites.

Many repeatedly unanswered questions from our council officials give me a real cause for concern. Having attended meetings and received little or no satisfactory responses to frequently asked questions does nothing to relieve my concerns for the future of Formby. Sefton Council must listen to the voices of the residents of Formby.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 835	Response Ref 1	Representor Name S Verell
--------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Formby will suffer from a lack of infrastructure of all type, not least shortage of schools, hospitals, doctors and dentist places. The roads are already crowded and increased usage will exacerbate already struggling maintenance.

The building of houses will mean the loss of farm land and their communities. Wildlife will be threatened and anial habitats reduced.

This particular land is subject to flooding and the Council will be responsible for services to combat this. The cuts in our services will have to be increased to generate funds for this added expense.

Following last years floods down south and all the media attention will anybody actually buy any properties on this land.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 837	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Colleen Bold
--------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Our understanding is that this is nothing to do with creating new social housing or 'affordable' housing, it's about developers wanting a `blank canvas' to work with in order to maximise profit. There are still vast swathes of 'brown field' land available in south Sefton on which the construction of new housing would be welcomed, the west side of Hawthorne Road being a prime example. Looking at the new developments on the east side of Hawthorne Road shows what can be achieved using brown field sites.

Throughout the 1960's and early 1970's Formby rapidly expanded from being a large village into a small town and there has been significant in-filling since. The shoreline, the airfield, the bypass and the river Alt are defined borders for Formby and they should stay that way. Anything that would threaten the stand-alone nature of the town is very unwelcome — and that certainly includes 'creeping urbanisation'. Formby's green and pleasant surroundings should be cherished, not compromised.

Significantly increasing the population of Formby will also put further strain on local services and create significant additional volumes of traffic and associated problems.

Sefton MBC should concentrate on clearing areas of dereliction in certain parts of the borough and using available wasteland to develop new housing estates and communities. Redeveloping the old powerhouse site should be as far as it goes in Formby.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 841	Response Ref 1	Representor Name John Wooder
--------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to make the following objections to Sefton's local plan proposals

Formby in general suffers from drainage problems, probably due to the low lying level of the area and the water table level and I feel that by allowing houses in the suggested sites would only add to the existing problems

The Liverpool Road site would seem to have undergone a metamorphosis from being a floodplain to not all at a time when this plan was being formulated?

By permitting houses to be built on these sites it would seem that due to the fact that these houses would be built on 'raised' ground it would compact the already existing flooding problems of the surrounding houses.

In allowing the construction of such a great number of housing it does not seem that the issue of traffic congestion has been addressed. Formby currently experiences considerable traffic flow problems at peak times and the increase in traffic would only add to this problem.

It would also appear that there are a large number of brownfield sites which could be used for housing before it might be necessary to build on the greenbelt.

Using the proposed greenbelt could lead to urban sprawl and lead to a loss of local identities by blurring local boundaries

The areas of greenbelt being put forward for construction are of the best and most versatile agricultural land and the loss of such would be irreversible and detrimental to food production in Sefton

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 846	Response Ref 1	Representor Name J Williams
--------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The loss of green belt would be detrimental to the residents of Sefton and would, in all probability, lead to urban sprawl and a loss of the openness of the countryside and a subsequent loss of wildlife habitat.

I feel that at the present there are a large number of brownfield sites available in Sefton and that these should be exhausted before consideration is given to the use of the greenbelt for expansion of housing and commercial building.

The Formby area suffers from traffic congestion, particularly at peak times, and the building of a potential 1000 homes with a possible 2000 vehicles would add greatly to this congestion

There seems to be a lack of consideration being given to infrastructure planning and I feel that too great a strain that would be put upon local medical services and educational services

It would appear that the proposed developments include large areas of green space which once the developments have been concluded would leave the maintenance of these to Sefton MBC adding costs to a council that already has to make huge cuts to balance its books.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby

MN2 Formby sites

Respondent No 856

Response Ref 1

Representor Name David Hogan

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

As a resident of Formby, the Local Plan will have a direct impact on my family and me. I have many concerns about this proposal and I wish to object in the strongest terms and I would be grateful if you could take the following objections in to account.

Firstly, and in my opinion, importantly, I believe that no development should be permitted on the greenbelt, especially when the land in question is Grade 1-2 agricultural land. The Local Plan should protect this land from development, especially whilst there are new houses lying empty in our town and there are brownfield sites in the borough, which could be developed first. The greenbelt was established to prevent urban sprawl and to preserve green spaces for the enjoyment of all. This should remain the case whilst other options exist. In a world where there is an increasing population, rising food prices and international instability it is essential that we utilise our agricultural land to its full extent for national security and international stability. New Zealand now refuses to sell its agricultural land to foreign companies so as to ensure food produced there is for their own country in the first instance.

Formby does not have the infrastructure to cope with such an increased population. There is already a shortage of dentists, it can take weeks to see a doctor, and schools are oversubscribed. Also, Formby already suffers from severe traffic congestion during peak times, which will obviously become worse with a larger population. I believe the traffic survey that was commissioned in respect of the Liverpool Road application was undertaken mid-morning in the middle of the school summer holidays. Such practice must start alarm bells ringing. The local hospital could cope with the extra strain on its resources and I wonder how the police would supply increased policing to the area in the face of their savage budget cuts. Cuts that will increase year on year for the next five years.

To design housing estates in areas that become water locked is absolutely ridiculous. Formby slopes inland, away from the sea and towards the River Alt. The suggestion that the area can be raised by six feet and houses then built on the land will cause disastrous flooding. Not only will the land that held the floodwater be lost, but the water will run off the raised land causing flooding around it.

Formby has a glut of new houses that have remained unsold. The new houses on Ennerdale/Kirklake Road have been let out and the development on Cable Street has proven quite disastrous. Properties remain empty and unsold, and the building work has ended before the completion of all the houses on the estate. It is obvious that if another estate of houses is built, each house costing £300k -£400k, they will remain unsold.

This local plan has nothing to do with the requirements of the borough of Sefton. People in Sefton need housing that they can afford to buy in their own right, ie. Houses in the region of £100k - £150k. However builders do not want to build houses of this value as it reduces their profit margins, and I believe this plan is a case of the builders telling Sefton councilors where they are prepared to build houses, not a case of Sefton councilors building to the requirements of their electorate.

Natural habitat will be destroyed. At a time when the endangered red squirrel has started to increase in number and we are beginning to see them spread around Formby, destroying the greenbelt will reduce their numbers and may lead to their extinction, as Formby is one of the few places left where they survive.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Policy MN2 Formby

MN2 Formby sites

Respondent No 857

Response Ref 1

Representor Name Francis Hogan

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

As a resident of Formby, the proposed Local Plan will have a direct impact on my family and me. I would like to object to the proposed Local Plan on the following grounds: -

Having spent many years in the building industry I cannot believe that anyone could consider building on flood plain or land that becomes water logged during rainfall. The planners are attempting to solve this problem by building up the land by six feet and then building on it. This can only have disastrous effects. The water that would have run to this land will have nowhere to go and will consequently flood the surrounding area. Also the water coming from the new higher land will also run off and add to the flooding. When we see more and more heavy rainfall caused by global warming it is disturbing to think that planners can just ignore such problems.

This problem will only be made worse, as currently there is significant pumping of the water down the River Alt out to sea, however this is expensive and DEFRA has long term plans to reduce the pumping, not increase it further. Who will be responsible for my house flooding, being uninsurable and worthless?

As a pensioner it is already difficult for me to get a doctor's appointment. Unless I want to try and phone daily at 8 o'clock in the morning, the nearest appointment is normally two weeks away. If these houses are built the nearest appointment will be double that.

Formby has a glut of new houses that have remained unsold. The new houses on Ennerdale/Kirklake Road have been let out and the development on Cable Street has proven quite disastrous. Properties remain empty and unsold, and the building work has ended before the completion of all the houses on the estate. It is obvious that if another estate of houses is built, each house costing £300k -£400k, they will remain unsold.

This local plan has nothing to do with the requirements of the borough of Sefton. People in Sefton need housing that they can afford to buy in their own right, ie. Houses in the region of £100k - £150k. However builders do not want to build houses of this value as it reduces their profit margins, and I believe this plan is a case of the builders telling Sefton councilors where they are prepared to build houses, not a case of Sefton councilors building to the requirements of their electorate.

I am sure that if Sefton Council put a tender out to other, possibly smaller, house builders then they would find businesses prepared to build houses that people in Sefton can afford to buy.

When these houses have been built where will the extra schools, surgeries, clinics and hospitals be built, and where will extra policing come from. Formby has seen a massive reduction in policing over the years as officer numbers have fallen. Criminals will be able to commit crime without fear of being caught, as fewer officers will be covering a larger area.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Policy MN2 Formby

MN2 Formby sites

Respondent No 858

Response Ref 1

Representor Name Ann Hogan

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

As a resident of Formby, the proposed Local Plan will have a direct impact on my family and me. I would like to object to the proposed Local Plan on the following grounds: -

My husband spent many years in the building industry I cannot believe that anyone could consider building on flood plain or land that becomes water logged during rainfall. The planners are attempting to solve this problem by building up the land by six feet and then building on it. This can only have disastrous effects. The water that would have run to this land will have nowhere to go and will consequently flood the surrounding area. Also the water coming from the new higher land will also run off and add to the flooding. When we see more and more heavy rainfall caused by global warming it is disturbing to think that planners can just ignore such problems. This problem will only be made worse, as currently there is significant pumping of the water down the River Alt out to sea, however this is expensive and DEFRA has long term plans to reduce the pumping, not increase it further.

Any layman can understand this is a recipe for disaster.

Who will be responsible for my house flooding, being uninsurable and worthless?

As a pensioner it is already difficult for me to get a doctor's appointment. Unless I want to try and phone daily at 8 o'clock in the morning, the nearest appointment is normally two weeks away. If these houses are built the nearest appointment will be double that. It takes even longer for a clinic appointment.

Formby has a glut of new houses that have remained unsold. The new houses on Ennerdale/Kirklake Road have been let out and the development on Cable Street has proven quite disastrous. Properties remain empty and unsold, and the building work has ended before the completion of all the houses on the estate. It is obvious that if another estate of houses is built, each house costing £300k -£400k, they will remain unsold.

This local plan has nothing to do with the requirements of the borough of Sefton. People in Sefton need housing that they can afford to buy in their own right, ie. Houses in the region of £100k - £150k. However builders do not want to build houses of this value as it reduces their profit margins, and I believe this plan is a case of the builders telling Sefton councilors where they are prepared to build houses, not a case of Sefton councilors building to the requirements of their electorate.

I am sure that if Sefton Council put a tender out to other, possibly smaller, house builders then they would find businesses prepared to build houses that people in Sefton can afford to buy.

When these houses have been built where will the extra schools, surgeries, clinics and hospitals be built, and where will extra policing come from. Formby has seen a massive reduction in policing over the years as officer numbers have fallen. Criminals will be able to commit crime without fear of being caught, as fewer officers will be covering a larger area.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 866	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Keith Bradley
--------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I have lived in Formby all of my life, and have seen many changers over the years, Formby has evolved from a large village into the small town. Over this period Formby's infrastructure has hardly changed, we now struggle to cope with its narrow roads, lack of parking, old drainage systems, lack of Dentists, GP's, and School places. I feel it would adversely damage our town if it was extended any further, as proposed in 'Sefton's Local Plan.

Greenbelt land surrounds Formby, on one side we have coastline, the other side, best quality farmland (Please see photo) it would be wrong to build on grade 1/ 2 quality arable land. Greenbelt was put in place just after WW2, 70 years ago to protect small Towns and Villagers like Formby becoming one.

Downholland Brook and the River Alt will not cope with increased drainage water at times of heavy rain; I fear the rest of Formby will pay the price by increased flooding and pooling.

The Local Plan makes way for two large retail parks, I feel Formby doesn't need this level of retail park, it will have an detrimental effect on our already struggling Village shops.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Photo of farmland

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 869	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Leanne McKee
--------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the local plan as proposed by Sefton Council on the following grounds
The loss of the greenbelt is irreparable. As a mother with 2 small children I value the greenbelt for them and for future generations. I know that there enough brownfield sites to accommodate the housing needs. I think we should build on those first. The loss of the greenbelt and the loss of agricultural land would be a travesty As a parent I am also concerned with the added presure these developments would place on schools, doctors and other health care professionals. It is already difficult getting a school place in your school of choice and trying to get a doctors appointment can be challenging at times. Added population in Formby would exacerbate this problem.

There is a lack of infrastructure for example both my husband and myself travel in and out of Formby to work. At times it can take my husband 20 to 30 minutes just to get out of Formby due to the congestion and the limited amount of exits from Formby. I myself use the train service to travel and at peak times they are packed and I often have to stand all the way. More houses means more people which will definitely impact on travelling to and from Formby

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 870	Response Ref 2	Representor Name JV Alderson
--------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I have lived in Formby for 15 years and came from choice for what Formby had to offer. Since then I have noted a few improvements but many more changes that have made Formby a less desirable place for me to live in.

Among the undesirable changes have been much increased traffic and congestion, with parking on pavements and great difficulty in crossing some roads. Walking around the Formby area used to be a pleasure - rarely so now. Litter has also increased, not just on the streets but in the waterways and in residents' front gardens where it has been thrown by passers-by. The number of 'For Sale' signs on houses and shops seems to have increased, but I know there are many younger people who feel they have no affordable future in the area. Closing of Formby police station on Church Road has been a retrograde step, and the introduction of a 20mph speed limit on local roads has been both expensive and unnecessary.

I have nothing against change - it can offer new opportunities for those with imagination, and an imaginative plan for Formby's future would be very welcome. Developments in Formby are constrained by its physical location on what is in effect a sandbar between the Irish Sea and the former Martin Mere, and also by the expected rise in sea level due to climate change, so the tired old plans of more housing and a larger industrial estate will not do. Technological developments are likely to produce changes in employment requirements and in working practices, which in turn will lead to changing housing and transport requirements.

Careful and considerate planning is essential, but above all we need a detailed and integrated plan based on an intelligent vision for the longer-term future.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 873	Response Ref 1	Representor Name N Armstrong
--------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The circumstances of Sefton's Local Plan are not "exceptional" therefore we should not build on the greenbelt (NPPF). We must protect our greenbelt at all cost; these arable fields are amongst the very best in England. We should not give up our high quality, high grade, and most versatile land so easily, we do have plenty of alternatives, build on the many brownfield sites that exist in Sefton, or we could ask near by areas to build some of our housing needs. I feel Sefton Council and the building companies are depriving us of our greenbelt for financial gain. Formby doesn't need any more new houses, there are hundreds of houses for sale ranging from over a million pounds down to one hundred and fifty nine thousand pounds, and there is lots of choice. The problem Sefton has is not the shortage of houses but the lack of well-paid jobs. We have brand new houses that were built several years ago, they still stand empty, its not that people don't wish to live in them, they are just out of ordinary peoples price range at over two hundred thousand pounds.

Sefton's Local Plan is to build lots of houses that ordinary local people cant afford, but does not address Roads, additional Schools, additional Doctors, and additional NHS Dentists.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**

Respondent No 879 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Deirdre Chesser

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

There are no justifiable or any special circumstances for building on Green Belt as put forward by Sefton Council. Formby's Green Belt is an important and essential flood plain which needs to be maintained in situ.

Sefton by this 20 year is motivated by commercial and financial gain to the detriment of its duty to its ordinary tax paying citizens and to the detriment of future generations to enjoy the amenities of a Green Belt zone.

Brownfield development should come first before taking the drastic alternative of greenfield development which is a limited resource. Commercial and profiteering considerations should not outweigh such brownfield development. The noise levels from Formby by pass traffic are already formidable and intrusive without adding to.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**

Respondent No 880 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Helena Randles

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I object to the proposed Local Plan to to the following concerns:

flooding; problem with parking; extra pollution with parking; taking over greenspace which is important to Formby.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**

Respondent No 881 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Brian Chesser

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Using up Green Belt at the Formby By Pass is a flood plain which needs to be carefully preserved and monitored. Unless that is done only as a last resort and/or in very small pockets rather than carte blanche. Green Belt at the Formby By Pass is a flood plain which needs to be carefully preserved and monitored. Unless that is done extensive flooding by the displacement theory [i.e. building on the Green Belt] will ensue. Developers will opt for larger residences to built on such green belts thereby making maximum profits but the loss to environment will be incalculable and irreversible.

Noise levels are already too high from traffic on Formby By Pass.

Brownfield development should be the first priority.

The taking out by 'sight of hand' of the Green Belt from the flood plain register without just cause or reason shows 'Males Fides' on the part of Sefton Council and reinforces the view that the Council are only interested in profiteering from said plan. Rather than genuine concerns for proper planning and development into the future.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 882 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Leslie James Baxter
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Formby is in an area in which fracking may take place and this is likely to reduce the demand for houses in the Formby area, this appears to be the case for housing in the Little Plumton area near Preston.

Much of the proposed building will be on land that is subject to surface water flooding; there is nowhere for the flood water to go except onto the existing properties as Formby is concreted over. The Liverpool Road site and the Brackenway site are two sites that are particularly prone to flooding. As climate change progresses we can expect flooding and particularly surface water flooding to increase in Formby, yet the council persist in marking out parcels of land in these areas. Parts of the present industrial estate can flood.

Sefton's own estimate states that the Grade 1 and Grade 2 agricultural land in the Sefton Green Belt is 30% and they try to play this down by stating that it is less than 1% of the National figure, The figure is still significant for the Grade 1, Grade 2 and Grade 3 areas in Sefton. The Liverpool Road site is Grade 1/Grade 2. The proposed southern extension of the Industrial estate is over Grade 1 agricultural Land.

Building 921 houses in Formby will put a serious strain on the infrastructure it is difficult now to get doctor's or dentist's appointments and more school places will be needed. Formby has problems with traffic congestion in the morning and evening rush hours and at school start and finish times and these will only get worse as the building up of Formby proceeds. The proposed Liverpool Road site would cause a major problem if it exits close to the Formby Bypass and would cause congestion at the exits of the Alt Road estate, even at present it can be difficult to exit this estate at the Altcar Road end.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 887 **Response Ref** 3 **Representor Name** LA Roberts
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Formby should have the infrastructure upgraded significantly before any further houses are considered.
Formby is stated as being a town. If so, where is a major medical centre, and if not why not?
If mistakes are made on the proposed housing developments and damage occurs to our dwellings as a result who do we sue? The builder or the Council?

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby

MN2 Formby sites

Respondent No 889

Response Ref 1

Representor Name P Gwyther

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to Sefton MBC's Local Plan, which, in my opinion, the council are trying to impose upon its residents, in spite of intense opposition.

I have lived in Formby for over 30 years and I feel that to build almost 1000 additional houses, increase the size of the Industrial/retail estate so substantially, apportion land for Fracking, plus, additional traveller's sites, is, quite frankly, outrageous. It would totally destroy this small town's distinctive and characteristic community.

I would also like to point out coastal erosion and receding coastline in Formby - (an extract from National Trust website) :-
The beach at Formby is the fastest eroding stretch of coastline we manage. It's predicted an average of 4m a year will be lost to the sea in the next century, but during recent winter storms over three years of erosion took place at once, with 13m lost! In view of the flooding in 2012, is it really viable to build here? If we suffer such flooding, who will pick up the bill? Developers will not be held responsible, nor those who gave planning permission to build.

Most of the proposed building would take place on our precious Green Belt land. I do not believe that the housing figures give "special circumstances" for building on same.

The loss of Green Belt here would produce more urban sprawl and the openness of our countryside would be lost. We are in danger of losing control of our borders, by building up to the border of our neighbouring local authorities. Formby is surrounded by good quality agricultural land. Building here is heavily constrained by the coast, areas of high risk flooding, and important nature conservation sites.

The best, most versatile agricultural land to be found anywhere in this country, is in this area.

Building on this land would erode farming communities and threaten food production for our future generations, plus, all service industry jobs and local employment associated with food production would be lost. With current world instability, global warming and ever increasing world population and hence its subsequent demand for food, why would we endanger our food supply by concreting over this valuable farmland?

There is clearly a lack of any credible infrastructure to be found in this plan in order to support the proposed increase in population. School places, doctors surgeries, dentists and our local hospital are already full to capacity. Our roads too are at capacity. Congestion here is horrendous, especially when trying to exit and later re-enter, during rush hours. The congestion around our schools during 'drop off/pick up time' is also a huge concern.

Formby has added pressure on our roads during the summer months. It is a tourist attraction. Visitors flock to our beaches and coastal paths, we experience 'grid lock' on most sunny weekends during summer, causing chaos to local residents and the added danger of emergency services, unable to gain access to some areas, due to traffic jams and inconsiderate parking.

Formby and Freshfield station car parks are at capacity during business hours Monday to Friday and at week-ends during the summer months. How would increased demand for parking at the station be addressed for additional households?

I believe, the additional traffic, plus the lack of infrastructure that the proposed housing/industrial /retail, pose, is unsustainable and would have a detrimental effect on the well being of the existing population, causing stress, increased pollution, increase of carbon footprint and a decrease in the quality of life here, for all concerned.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Extract from Formby Labour website re Parking/Driving outside schools

Extract from Formby Labour website and Formby Champion [1/6/2012] re congestion in Formby

Extract from Southport Visitor re Flooding in Formby [14/2/2014]

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 890 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** NL Gwyther
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to object to the local plan for the following reasons:-

Loss of the Green Belt Land. The housing figures do not give "special circumstances" to build on same. Building on Green Belt would encourage urban sprawl. This area has problems with flooding already. More houses will lead to more flooding.

The plan does not provide the infrastructure to support the increase in population. Roads already very congested here. Formby is a tourist attraction, roads often grid locked during summer months. Schools, Dr's surgeries, dentist, local healthcare already at capacity.

The loss of best most versatile arable land, threatening food supplies for future generations. The council should pursue a brownfield only policy first in the Local Plan, leading to much needed regeneration, south of the borough. Loss of wildlife habitat and important nature conservation sites. The huge amount of housing, industrial estates etc, would lead to a loss of the uniqueness of our town.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 891 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** H Lee
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com

Summary of Main Issues

I am hugely against development on the Greenbelt and development here would encourage urban sprawl in addition to causing the loss of an abundance of wildlife some of which are classed as protected species. The local plan should be adopting a Brownfield first policy.

In addition to the above points I do not believe that Formby has space for more housing. United Utilities have already stated that they can only cope with approximately thirty new homes per year. Our schools are completely full with children already attending from the surrounding areas of Ainsdale, Southport, Hightown and Crosby. Our roads are heavily congested as it is and it is virtually impossible to get a doctors appointment.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 892 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** PJ and JM Allen and Winrow
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We oppose the housing developments in the Formby area for many reasons, principally as follows:

In view of the proposed developments, in particular the large 'estate' type sites, we consider irreversible damage will be done to both social and ecological environment to the whole area. Not to mention what will become even more sprawl.

With the proposed developments will come a large number of additional cars [perhaps as many as 1500] on the roads never designed for such large amounts of traffic. Together with the fact that only having three suitable means of entering and leaving Formby, this will result in traffic jams at peak times and due to school runs. Furthermore, even now the car parks and the roads surrounding the village shopping area are full to capacity for most of the day, and with minimum public transport available, the effect of these proposals will become untenable. Also, such an increase in traffic could well lead to more accidents, and even possible loss of life, not to mention the additional associated pollution that will be created.

The developments on green field sites, in particular the land north of Liverpool Road leading to the bypass, is land that acts as flood plain during times of heavy rain. Therefore, building on such land could prove to be disastrous, as has been proved to be the case in other parts of the country. Furthermore, it could well be that existing combined drainage system that exists in the area will be unable to cope with the extra waste, resulting in possible flooding.

Doctors in the area are overloaded at present, it can take as long as week to ten days to get an appointment to see your doctor. The possible increase to the current population will simply make the already unacceptable situation even worse, and will affect the local hospital.

As most, if not all new houses will be occupied by families with young children, it could well prove that all the local schools, both primary and secondary, will not have sufficient places available to cope.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 894 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** KD Mowat
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

As a Formby resident I wish to register my objection to Sefton Council's Local Plan for the following reasons:

People like to visit Formby because it still feels like a village. If this plan is carried out that will be lost for all time as we will be joined with our neighbours. A number of wild life habitats will also be lost. There will be no open spaces left. There will be an increase in the volume of traffic leading to traffic congestion and pollution. Local Schools, Doctors and Dentists will be under pressure. Why can't we have a Brownfield first policy in the Local Plan?

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Formby Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites	
Respondent No 895	Response Ref 13	Representor Name Yvonne Irving
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

The proposed sites in Formby are all around the urban fringe and have no natural boundaries, it is quite possible that they are the beginning of the development of the land behind them that will gradually spread over the remaining green belt. Formby is also very low lying and is below sea level. Ground water levels are high and I live in a house that has two wells the water level of which is only about two feet below ground level. The government have issued new guidelines about the hazards of building on flood plains there should not be any more concreting over open ground in Formby as to do so will put all the houses in that area at risk.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Formby Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites	
Respondent No 896	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Bernard Prescott
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I object principally on the grounds of loss of Greenbelt. I do not believe that the special circumstances necessary for the release of Greenbelt currently exist.

I also object to the Local Plan on the grounds of drainage in Formby. I do not believe that sufficient attention has been paid to the issue of building on land which is susceptible to flooding on a regular basis and the resultant effects upon existing housing.

I also object on the grounds of the necessity to build such numbers of houses when there are large numbers of vacant houses already in Formby and throughout the district.

I also object to the wholesale changes which would inevitably be made to Formby, a town which I take some pride in. Many elderly people have retired here and now find that far from the semi rural idyll they had hoped for and invested their savings in they are faced with huge developments on their doorsteps exchanging views of green fields for building sites.

I object on the grounds of increased traffic in the Formby area. Anyone who lives here knows only too well the problems of access and egress. As well as parking both in the "village" area and beach.

Finally I object on the grounds that there is severe pressure on health and local government services already without adding several thousand more to the population. Formby already has a greater population than neighbouring Ormskirk but without a full time Fire Station or Police Station. Add to this the necessity for school places.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 897 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Alan Brett
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

All land around Formby is Coastline, woodland, golf courses, MOD land, RAF land, or High-grade arable land, all within the greenbelt, Formby cant absorb anymore housing, only under "exceptional circumstances" can Sefton build on our greenbelt land, there are plenty of brownfield sites in Sefton, and other nearby areas such as Liverpool and West Lancashire without changing our landscape to one of concrete and brick. We need our top quality farmland to provide food crops for our future generations. Greenbelt was put in place to prevent urban sprawl.

Flooding in and around Formby is, and always has been a problem, if Sefton Council allow the builders to raise up this, proposed land around Formby to enable new houses to be built on flood plains, then nearby housing such as my house on the Alt Road estate will flood all the more.

Parking in Formby Village is already very difficult, all the roads surrounding the Village are restricted or have cars parked all over them, getting a doctors appointment in Formby is difficult enough but parking for a doctors appointment (Also in the Village) is impossible most of the time.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 898 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Geraldine Brett
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Objection to Sefton's Local Plan. Sefton has very large quantities of falling down, derelict factories, warehouses, retail sites, and housing sites that could provide many, many years supply of brownfield land for Sefton's future needs without building on Formby's greenbelt. All the land around Formby is Coastline, woodland, golf courses, MOD land, RAF land, or High-grade arable land, all within the greenbelt, Formby cant absorb anymore housing, only under "exceptional circumstances" can Sefton build on our greenbelt land. We need our top quality farmland to provide food crops for our future generations. Greenbelt was put in place to prevent urban sprawl.

Flooding in and around Formby is, and always has been a problem, if Sefton Council allow the builders to raise up this, proposed land around Formby to enable new houses to be built on flood plains, then nearby housing such as my house on the Alt Road estate will flood all the more.

Parking in Formby Village is already very difficult, all the roads surrounding the Village are restricted or have cars parked all over them, getting a doctors appointment in Formby is difficult enough but parking for a doctors appointment (Also in the Village) is impossible most of the time.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Two photographs taken of Liverpool Road/ Alt Road farm field after heavy rainfall. Taken 2013.

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 899 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Fay Rooke
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Formby is like a little island with only three roads in and out. At commuter time the queues of traffic are horrendous. If we have more house, traffic will just come to a standstill.

Services in Formby [Doctors, Dentists, Schools etc] are stretched to their capacity, so any increase in population would be the strain that breaks said camals back.

We seek hellbent in this country on dessimating our wildlife. There is plenty of wildlife in the field mentioned - pheasants and grouse - to name but a few. Please do not rob us of our national heritage and leave our wildlife in peace.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 900 **Response Ref** 3 **Representor Name** David Shore
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

There are plenty of former industrial sites and empty houses that can be built on before there is any necessity to use the Greenbelt or the countryside.

I object to this proposal, as where I live in Formby there is a defined sense of community and belonging to the town. The plan suggests that housing is built to the north towards RAF Woodvale. Should the airfield ever close, then there is little to stop further development which ultimately joins Formby with Woodvale and Ainsdale, which would result in one long ribbon of urban sprawl from Crossens to Formby. This is not in the interests of the people who live in Formby.

I object to the fact that the Plan does not promote the use of Brownfield sites first, but prefers to use the Greenbelt. There are acres of former industrial buildings, particularly in Bootle, which would provide the land required for new housing for many years to come. In addition, there is plenty of older housing stock which could either be refurbished or knocked down and rebuilt.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Formby Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites	
Respondent No 902	Response Ref	Representor Name J Houghton
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Formby doesn't need any more houses, there are over 600 houses for sale at any time ranging from over a million pounds to one hundred and fifty thousand pounds, there are plenty of first time buyer's houses for sale in Formby. The demand for houses in Sefton is very low due to the lack of high paid jobs and lack of job security.

Formby's roads are already very congested, especially at peak times, hundreds more houses would lead to many hundreds more cars, causing greatly increased traffic problems. Queues in and out of Formby on and off the A565 at peak times is already a huge problem, if the Highways alter the traffic lights system to allow more "greentime" to get in and out of Formby the traffic builds up on the A565 would only make matters worse.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Formby Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites	
Respondent No 903	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Richard Houghton
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

We must protect the greenbelt; these high quality, high-grade farm fields are amongst the very best and most versatile in the UK. We can't afford to loose such good, productive, arable land, and our farming communities. Greenbelt was put in place to prevent, loss of control of our borders and prevent urban sprawl. The openness of our countryside will be eroded. Sefton's Plan could seriously cause loss of our wildlife habitats. Formby doesn't need any more houses, there are hundreds of houses for sale at any one time, there are plenty of first time buyer's houses for sale, the problem is not the lack of houses, but the lack of money.

Sefton's Local Plan if allowed will build on many of our best quality arable farmland before any brownfield sites are used. Many parts of Formby suffer from flooding due to water locking, if many more houses are allowed to be built on our green fields then our flooding issues will be exacerbated.

Sefton's Local Plan does not address additional Schools, additional Doctors, and additional NHS Dentists.

We want a brownfield first policy in our Local Plan. Please include my objection.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 905	Response Ref 1	Representor Name E Brownlee
--------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Formby doesn't need any more new houses, there are hundreds of houses for sale at any one time ranging from over a million pounds to one hundred and sixty thousand pounds, there is plenty of choice for first time buyer's houses for sale in Formby, the problem is not the lack of houses but the lack of high paid jobs. Most of the houses built on the old mushroom farm site, Cable Street; over three years ago still stand empty.

Greenbelt is essential in avoiding urban sprawl; there are no exceptional circumstances for building on the greenbelt! Sefton has hundreds of empty houses, which could be refurbished and brought up to modern standards; which would provide affordable homes, using local employment and local materials. I strongly disagree with building on prime arable farmland, Sefton has a very high proportion of brownfield sites, it is clear that Sefton Council and the building companies stand to make more money from building on greenbelt and farm land.

We must protect the greenbelt; Formby's high-grade fields are amongst the very best in England. We can't afford to loose such good, high quality farmland to building when there is an alternative, building on our brownfield sites.

Formby's drainage system is very old and will not take anymore water without the whole system failing and Formby flooding. Downholland Brook and The River Alt also will not take any more water other than existing Greenfield run off rates. I fear existing houses will suffer from increased flooding if Sefton's Local Plan is passed.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 906	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Suzanne Williams
--------------------------	-----------------------	--

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the Local proposed plan by Sefton Council on the following grounds. Flood plains are in place for a reason and building on them causes greater risk of flooding for existing properties. Greenbelt land should remain as that. There is plenty of Brownfield sites available. The various constraints should stay in play to preserve the area of outstanding beauty ie National Trust, coast line natural flood plains.

There is already the best versatile agricultural land and this will be lost and farming communities gone. There are plenty of houses (existing) which could be renovated. This would protect our open spaces and wildlife. The increase in traffic has not been thought out. If you live off Liverpool Rd, it is impossible to turn right at peak times of the day. The Formby residents do not wish for a large industrial estate to be built. The sewage plant cannot cope with the current volume for existing residents. This plan will tear the heart out of Formby village and cause more congestion.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby

MN2 Formby sites

Respondent No 907

Response Ref 1

Representor Name D Brodie

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to formally object to the local plan in its current form, and offer these comments for consideration by the inspector. It is very clear to anyone who lives in Formby and knows Formby that the sites proposed in this plan flood when it rains. Not only do they flood but the water will remain on the land for a considerable time, in some cases if it has been consistently raining for a period of time it will remain for weeks until it soaks away.

The school problems and places in the area are a major concern and I know of a couple of mums who actually have their children in separate schools as they are unable to get them in the same school as they have places in one year but not the other.

Getting out of Formby can be horrendous with long queues at peak hours. I work in Crosby which should have a journey time of no more than 20 mins. I start work at 8.45 am but have to leave at 7.45 in order to arrive in work on time. The same applies to coming home. When road works are added into the equation the time is even longer. On some occasions it has taken me more than 2 hours to travel back from work.

I object to building on the greenbelt and this will alter Formby and in particular the entrance to Formby and its surrounding areas forever, we are not a town like Liverpool we are a commuter area for other areas and we do not want to become a large town we want to remain as Formby Village.

Many people have made a lifestyle choice to live here and bring up their families yet this plan appears to want to extend Formby beyond all its boundaries with no concerns given to the issues of flooding or drains overflowing in the area. Who will be responsible if these houses are built and other properties then flood, will it be the developers or the Council who have carried on with this plan regardless of any major issues brought to their attention.

I would also like to point out that their so-called public consultations have been set up more to exclude people rather than include them. When they wanted to install 20mph zones they wrote to every household yet the local plan was advertised in a wraparound in the local plan, which many residents just throw in the bin due to its content. Why did they not write to individual households? Also if you wanted to discuss the plan you had to make an appointment and this was extremely difficult if you worked and had other family commitments.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 911 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** G Jackson
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am writing to strongly object to Sefton Local Plan.

My reasons are due to the overdevelopment of my home area Formby. There are only 3 roads out of Formby, all leading to the Formby by pass. Formby is already congested. We have the sea on one side and by pass on the other. We have a unique environment with our red squirrels, barn owls, bats and migrants to name just a few things. Although breeding sites are protected there is none for the areas where the animals feed and roost. Isolated pockets will lead to interbreeding . We must stop now all future development in Formby.

Formby is also up to maximum at its schools, doctors, dentists etc. A lot of Formby floods this will only increase with lack of vegetation and increase in concrete. Before anymore planning is done in Formby I would like an independent environmental survey done at the sewage works to see if that alone can cope with more waste. Furthermore, if houses are in so much demand and need, why then are developers not building flats/ maisonetts to save our land?

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 913 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Iris Cross
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I accept that there is a need for affordable housing in this country, but with regard to a place like Formby which was once a village and has now become a town, cannot cope with the proposed numbers of houses which you intend being built there. As it stands now, there is a shortage of Doctors, (waiting time 3 weeks for an appointment) and Dentists and schools will also be affected by the numbers of extra people moving to the area. When I moved back to Formby in the 50's there was a new housing estate being built park road, followed by the Harrington Rd estate, Garden Rd estates, plus Alt Rd estate, one following the other, therefore the population has increased massively over the last 50 years, but we have no extra Doctors or schools in the area.

One question I would like to ask is why is the Holy Trinity School being demolished when we are obviously going to need more places in schools when the extra housing is built.

I would like to add the quote that Mr Cameron made in Jan 2012 " I would no more put the countryside at risk, than I would risk my own family" and there would be no change to green belts and no large housing estates plonked down next to villages. Planning would revert to local commuities who would have the power to decide where buildings should go.

I know there are hundreds of more people in Formby who are already concerned about the future of Formby and how were going to cope with all the extra traffic, I hope that the council will re-consider the number of houses to be built and take note of the local communities concerns.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**

Respondent No 914 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** VA Hignett

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to object to the council's Local Plan. The rush hour traffic is already extremely bad and further residential buildings can only make this worse, especially as there is no infrastructure prepared or possible.

There are already many houses standing empty in Formby, which ought to be considered in the equation. Any new houses will tend to be well outside the financial capabilities of first time buyers which is what the government is concerned to cater for. Facilities for new residents such as medical centres and schools are already working to capacity. The whole scheme, taking into account all the points on the petition, is clearly going to cause untold problems and damage in the future. It lacks foresight and rides roughshod over the interests of the very people who pay taxes in this area. They have been ignored completely.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**

Respondent No 916 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** P Richardson

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

My husband and I both think that the above local council plans will change the Formby village and our way of life for the worst it would mean a lot of over crowding on doctors, dentists and schools and other services in the community.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**

Respondent No 918 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** J Parker

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I object to the Sefton Local Plan because it recommends building on green belt land. I also object on the grounds that there will be an increased risk of flooding to both my own and neighbouring properties. I am also extremely concerned about increased congestion on the roads and the added pressure on Formby schools and services caused by the lack of planning to current infrastructure.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 923 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** John Hankinson
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I feel that I have to write to you regarding the sell off of green belt land in Sefton central and in particular Formby, I live on the park road estate and objected to the housing being built at this present time known as orchid meadow. When you consider the number of houses on park road alone approx two hundred, plus the 72 houses on orchid meadows this alone increases traffic by 33%.

Formby between 7:30- 9:00 am is the most congested area in Sefton central, on top of this you plan to build up to 1000 more new houses, whether they are affordable for local people or not. On top of this you are not only proposing to build on green belt but also on flood plains, were after two to three hours of heavy rain a vast number of streets in Formby are under water, due to the poor drainage that already exists in Formby, on top of this you then have to provide places for children at our already overcrowded schools, doctors, dentists, extra houses will only compound the problem. Everything that effects our children, I sincerely hope you seriously consider your actions before anything is set in stone.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 926 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** JE Thompson
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The objections on the enclosed form cover most of my concerns about the local plan but I think the possible flooding of earmarked sites should be looked at very carefully. I would like to make the following objections.

There are many properties already unoccupied in Formby and surrounding areas, any future house building should be affordable for younger people so that we can start to reduce the older population in favour of the younger. This would reduce the strain on our services such as doctors and dentists.

More houses will mean more cars on the roads of Formby, this and the possible axeing of the local bus services and more cars parking on the pavements will impact on the older population.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 980	Response Ref 1	Representor Name V Houghton
--------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I have lived in Formby all of my life, I have always enjoyed the village life that Formby offers. Over the years there have been many changes, we are now a small town but still retains our village like feel. I love our beautiful coastline and very productive farm fields surround us. Sefton's Local Plan will build on large quantities of our best quality arable farmland, which is within the greenbelt. I feel that if allowed we could become joined up with other surrounding towns. I feel there is no need to build on our greenbelt as there are plenty of houses in Formby that are for sale. We should build on the brownfields first; this will regenerate Inner Cities and Towns, bringing employment, prosperity, and support our local supply and building companies. Sefton also has hundreds of empty 2 bed houses that lay empty; these could be refurbished and would be ideal as affordable homes

We must protect the greenbelt at all cost; these high-grade fields are amongst the very best in England. We can't afford to loose such good, productive, arable land, we have an alternative: Build and refurbish first time buyer's homes on brownfield sites and in inner towns. I feel Sefton Council and the building companies are depriving us of our greenbelt for financial gain.

Formby's roads are already very congested, especially at peak times, hundreds more houses would lead to many more cars, causing greatly increased traffic problems. Long queues in and out of Formby on and off the A565 at peak times is already a huge problem, if the Highways alter the traffic lights system to allow more "green-time" to get in and out of Formby the traffic builds up on the A565

would only make matters worse.

Please consider my objection.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 982	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Sylvia Smith
--------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the local plan proposed by Sefton Council on the following grounds:

What protection are you going to give to our wildlife if you allow unlimited building on green belt.

The green belt in Formby is Grade 1 arable land - we already have to import lots of our food - so by using prime arable land for bulding we will lose our home grown ability and therefore increase our imports which is infinitely more costly

Who is going to supply the extra infrastructure that will be needed for new building proposals - it certainly wont be the builders - who are in it purely for profit - not to meet the needs of the people AS a council you have already had to make drastic cuts to services

so how will you cope with the needs of so many more people - ie. Elderly, schools, docors, dentists, hospitals, these services are already stretched now - so what is the answer? There will be a tremendous increase in the volume of traffic in, out and around Formby - how will all these needs be met - there only 3 roads out of Formby so there will be a lot more congestion and frustration - approx 1000 cars per hour come into Formby at rush hour now, so what are your plans to cope with the increased flow of traffic?

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 989 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** George Brownlee
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I strongly object to Sefton's Local Plan. Greenbelt is essential in avoiding urban sprawl; there are no exceptional circumstances for building on the greenbelt!

Sefton has hundreds of empty houses, which could be refurbished and brought up to modern standards; which would provide affordable homes, using local employment and local materials.

I strongly disagree with building on prime arable farmland, Sefton has a very high proportion of brownfield sites, it is clear that Sefton Council and the building companies stand to make more money from building on greenbelt and farm land.

Formby's drainage system is very old and will not take anymore water without the whole system failing and Formby flooding. Downholland Brook and The River Alt also will not take anymore water other than existing greenfield run off rates.

The traffic in Formby already piles up causing pollution, increasing the number of cars by this amount will only make Formby one big traffic jam at peak times of the day, causing even more pollution. Parking in our shopping center (Formby Village) is already impossible most of the time, building out of town retail units with plenty of free parking will turn our Village into a ghost town. Please include my objection against Sefton's Local Plan.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 1001 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Blair Hilton
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Objection to Sefton Local Plan You will already be familiar with the objections raised by the action group Fragoff, all of which I agree with. The two with the highest impact in my view will be traffic and parking, and the problems with drainage and flooding. On the first count, the centre of Formby is small in comparison with the area it serves; on the second count, I have had building work done recently, and the water table is close to the surface and we are faced with a fast-eroding coast. An issue not listed is anti social behaviour in the village, and the use of drugs. The development is likely to attract younger families with the risk of increased drug use.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 1003 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** R Rodriguez
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the proposed plans for 'affordable housing' in Sefton with particular reference to the proposed sites in Formby.

I do not believe that Formby has space for more housing. The schools are completely full with children attending from the surrounding areas, our roads are heavily congested as it is and it is almost impossible to get a doctors appointment.

In closing, I hope that my concerns are going to heard and considered.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 1004	Response Ref 1	Representor Name M Belshaw
---------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Objection to Sefton Local Plan

Formby roads are already very congested. Try driving to the village on any day to realise how any increase in the number of cars would make it unworkable.

The greenbelt is absolutely essential for mental health. Formby residents comment on the relief they feel when driving through the fields and woods on their way home from work. In an age when stress and depression are on the increase and causing problems for the NHS this is a very important factor.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 1007	Response Ref 1	Representor Name D Armstrong
---------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The circumstances of Sefton's local Plan are not "exceptional" therefore we should not build on the greenbelt (NPPF) Formby is surrounded by floodplain, Flooding in and around Formby/ Altcar has always been a problem, if Sefton Council's Local Plan allow building on this land by raising up the land to enable the new houses to be built on flood free ground then nearby housing such as my house on Abbots Way will flood all the more, this would contravene the NPPF, therefore should not be allowed to happen. Instead Sefton's Local Plan should allocate land that would not adversely affect other properties such as well-established inner brownfield sites.

There are plenty of brownfield sites in Sefton that could easily provide ample land for new houses and retail. You only need to drive or jump the train into Liverpool, to realize just how much available brownfield sites that exist in Sefton. Our inner towns such as Bootle would benefit enormously from family houses and first time buyers homes instead of old, derelict, vandalized broken down buildings.

Formby doesn't need any more new houses, there are hundreds of houses for sale ranging from over a million pounds down to one hundred and fifty nine thousand pounds, and there is lots of choice. The problem Sefton has is not the shortage of houses but the lack of well-paid jobs. We have brand new houses that were built several years ago, they still stand empty, its not that people don't wish to live in them, they are just out of ordinary peoples price range at over two hundred thousand pounds.

Sefton's Local Plan is to build lots of houses that ordinary local people cant afford, but does not address additional Schools, additional Doctors, and additional NHS Dentists.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 1008	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Gregory Thomas
---------------------------	-----------------------	--

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the proposed developments in Formby. I feel that Greenbelt areas should remain as Greenbelt areas and we should be looking at developing on the Brownfield areas first. I do not want Formby to increase any more in size as there is already a problem with getting doctor's appointments, school places etc.

The traffic in Formby is also a problem, especially at peak times and I am particularly concerned about the possibility of another road exit off the Formby by-pass due to the amount of accidents that have happened around the Hightown exit. Developing on these Greenbelt areas may also cause flooding as some of these areas are currently used for drainage. Due to current Formby house prices and the price of land in Formby I do not believe that when these houses are actually built, that they will be "affordable" and feel that they will therefore not be helping any housing crisis.

There are many houses in and around Sefton that are boarded up, why should these houses not be sold cheaply to first time buyers? Would this not be preferable to greedy developers ruining our Greenbelt? I really hope these plans do not happen.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Formby	MN2 Formby sites
--------------------------	-------------------------

Respondent No 1009	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Alison Doran
---------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Whilst I appreciate the need to encourage sustainable development and economic growth I feel that the proposed development outlined in the Sefton Local Plan is not the answer to our housing crisis.

The price of land per square metre in Formby is far more expensive than in many other parts of the country and I do not believe that building here is conducive to creating 'affordable homes'. Sefton is full of boarded up unused houses and in my opinion would benefit far more by a 'facelift' where these properties are renovated and sold to first time buyers, which would not only help to move the property market but would serve to improve various areas within the borough.

I am hugely against any development on the Greenbelt in Formby and I think we need to implement a Brownfield policy first.

In general I do not think that Formby can cope with the demands caused by any large scale developments. Our doctors, dentists and certainly our schools are already operating at full capacity. I feel that many of our councillors have opted for a plan that favours the large developers rather than existing communities, if this was not the case then how do they explain the fact that Formby Parish, along with the 9 other Parishes in Sefton, was not consulted on the final draft and additional sites that were included in the draft Surely this goes against the recently updated Parish Charter for Sefton.

I appreciate you taking the time to read this letter and hope that you will take my comments on board

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 1031 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Janet Roberts
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to object to Sefton Council's Local Plan in its current form.
My objections are based on sites in Formby.

The loss of Green Belt on these sites will create urban sprawl. As refer to NPPF, para 83 which states 'once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances,through the preparation or review of the Local Plan' The proposed development on these sites amounts to inappropriate development within the Green Belt & is 'by definition.

Harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very exceptional circumstances' Lack of a 5 year plan is not a very exceptional circumstance.

Any significant increase in traffic will result in havoc & hazard. Infrastructure:- This important issue has not really been tackled within the Local Plan. Formby schools have few vacancies especially the high schools which are oversubscribed. It is so difficult to get an appointment with doctors & dentists. In fact, I have to travel to Crosby for an NHS dentist & I have lived here for 36 years.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 1302 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Gillian & Leslie Street
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

SOS Petition+
Too much traffic at present leaving Formby each morning.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Formby Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Formby **MN2 Formby sites**
Respondent No 1304 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** A&A Blanchard
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

SOS Petition+
Increased risk of flooding to existing properties. "especially the Alt road estate"

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.12	Other Documents
Policy MN2.12	Land north of Brackenway, Formby	
Respondent No 13	Response Ref 2	Representor Name John Medley
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

It is hard to see how development could be described as sustainable. Existing infrastructure is completely inadequate to cope with the large number of houses proposed, and there is nothing in the plan to suggest that this problem would, or could, be given any serious attention. The roads in the area, particularly Deansgate Lane North and Paradise Lane, are inadequate to cope with such a large increase in traffic. They are narrow and often congested, particularly in the vicinity of Trinity St Peter's School, and Deansgate Lane North is regularly used as a 'rat run' to avoid the worst congestion, thereby causing difficulties at peak hours to gain access onto Southport Road. There are no shops in the area, no medical facilities and existing schools would be totally unable to cope with additional children from any new housing development. Every journey away from this site would necessarily be by car, and in such a remote corner would almost certainly involve at least two cars per household. An environmental disaster. Parking in the centre of Formby, already fraught with difficulty, would become particularly difficult

The Council has received many objections from the users of Kenton Wood stables which would be closed down if development takes place. This would not only throw all the employees out of work but would also remove a popular recreational facility for many young people. Re-stabling the horses would be extremely difficult and could well result in many of the animals having to needlessly be put down. It would be impossible to find alternative stabling to the west of the by-pass, necessary for access to the bridleways and beach, and even if stabling were available to the east of the by-pass this would cause acute road safety problems with additional horses needing to be brought over the busy by-pass.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Site should be withdrawn entirely from the local plan. The green belt should be protected against unnecessary development, and only by withdrawing these proposals can the plan be made compliant and sound.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.12	Other Documents
Policy MN2.12	Land north of Brackenway, Formby	
Respondent No 13	Response Ref 1	Representor Name John Medley
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Current Government policy with regard to development of green belt specifies that such land should be used for housing development only when it is absolutely essential, and not for the purposes of meeting targets. There is no evidence that additional housing on the scale envisaged is necessary, and indeed it is known that recently built housing is not selling. The Parish Council [Formby] has expressed its objections to these developments in the strongest terms and the election of independent councillors to both Sefton and local councils is evidence of desire to retain Green Belt land. Development will irreversibly damage the Green Belt and for this reason I believe that the plan is not consistent with national policy and cannot be justified.

It is the responsibility of Councillors to protect the interests of their constituents in the first instance, and democracy surely means that decisions of this nature should be made by local people who understand properly the area affected. It is entirely wrong for Councillors who know little about Formby, and probably care even less, to have a decisive say on matters that will not have any direct impact on their own daily lives. Formby councillors should have the final say.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Sites [in the Green Belt] should be withdrawn entirely from the local plan. The green belt should be protected against unnecessary development, and only by withdrawing these proposals can the plan be made compliant and sound.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.12 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.12 **Land north of Brackenway, Formby**
Respondent No 22 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Florence Smith
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

It is a nightmare trying to get out of Paradise Lane/Deansgate Lane. They are lanes, not roads, as Formby was a 'village' and Freshfield as 'hamlet'. It was never meant to take this traffic. Are the buyers of the new homes going to be informed they are sitting on a flood plain? A piped brook passes under homes and opens up a large hole every 3 years. The ditches are already full of water from recent heavy rain. There is also a large run-off of surface water from Woodvale Airfield. If the pumping station packed up the area would be in trouble. The area has been flooded every winter in the past. Formby is already over developed since the 'garden grab' and building over all the former schools land and playing field [Bishops Court, Barkfield Lane etc] This in turn greatly decreased the song bird population which was in abundance here, including owls. Gardens are being covered over to accommodate 2 to 3 cars which seems to be common for every house. Trees and bushes felled and pulled out which is again affecting the bird life and disclosing a very built up area.

There are many homes for sale in Formby at the moment and they are not selling as it is. 'Buy to Let' should be curtailed, or the landlords heavily taxed, so the young, at least, could get a step on to the property ladder. The population is falling on Merseyside so where are all these people coming from? With closing and building on schools where are all these extra children going to go? You may use the counter argument that there is not enough children to use the existing schools. If that is so, why do you need to build more homes? The swallows come in large numbers and nest at the stables where the proposed building is to take place. This would greatly affect them and the geese come in their thousands to feed on the fields [some of the best agricultural land in the country] as well as the marshes.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.12 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.12 **Land north of Brackenway, Formby**
Respondent No 33 **Response Ref** 3 **Representor Name** Maureen Costello
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The proposed building by me on the land owned by Rimmers livery Yard with up to 200 hundred houses means at least 200cars if not more trying to get on to Southport Road ,or passing past Spar to get on to Church road, madness, the area will end up as a large car park (no one moving).

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.12 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.12 **Land north of Brackenway, Formby**
Respondent No 33 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Maureen Costello
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I see the greatest number of houses are set to be built on Green land [at Brackenway]. I noticed that it is over a public footpath, sixteen acre lane, also there are lots of drainage ditches there. If they are to be filled in I would be very concerned about future flooding.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.12 **Land north of Brackenway, Formby**

Respondent No 35 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Carol Duty

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Formby residents do not want to become part of an urban sprawl up to Woodvale and Ainsdale. After a weekend of rain I would invite any inspector to come along view the amount of water that is flooding the ditch at Hawksworth Drive and lying in the adjacent fields. If the homes were built on the land behind Brackenway then the traffic on Deansgate Lane North would be horrendous and dangerous. This would also apply to Paradise Lane due to Trinity St Peter's school which stands on the site and is unpassable when the school is open. This has been the case for a number of years.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.12 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.12 **Land north of Brackenway, Formby**
Respondent No 175 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Anthony Horne
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Sites MN2.16 and MN2.12 are used by Pinkfooted Geese for grazing during the winter months, when they migrate from Iceland. The local plan indicates climate change is a major issue and they will direct building away from areas at flood risk and yet two of the largest areas for building development MN2.12 and MN2.16 in Formby, flood during the winter months in years of heavy rainfall. If this local plan is approved Sefton Council will be responsible for more wetlands, swales, ditches and verges on the new sites which they will have to adopt. This will have financial implications and could cause a rise in council tax in the future at a time of financial restraint. New housing developments on a large scale on land that has a tendency to flood increases the risk of flooding to existing housing in the area.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.12 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.12 **Land north of Brackenway, Formby**
Respondent No 182 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** M Pollard
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to register most strongly my objections to this land this green belt land being built on. The land has very poor drainage and every time we have a heavy rainfall it becomes very boggy. I see from my kitchen window lots of wild life including red squirrels, bats, natterjack toads, pheasants, foxes, swallows, hedgehogs, herons, southern marsh orchids etc

My second point is the amount of traffic now causes big problems in Paradise Lane which is a very narrow road which has a day nursery on one side and a primary school opposite. In my opinion it would be an accident waiting to happen. I feel Formby and Freshfield is already over built and we should protect what Green fields we have left.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.12 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.12 **Land north of Brackenway, Formby**
Respondent No 241 **Response Ref** 14 **Representor Name** Claire Jenkins
Organisation Name Formby Parish Council
Obj/Sup/Com

Summary of Main Issues

Duty to Consult:

[Affordable housing]:

Any new properties must be affordable in the full sense of the word, they must be well built, well designed and fuel efficient. A more detailed study of MN2.12 and MN 2.13 must be carried out as insufficient investigation has been made to determine the full impact of them on resources. (Can that be sufficient in Sefton when it has been established by the assessment by Keppie Massie, a Liverpool based Consultant, that unless a developer can make a profit of 15%, affordable housing may not be provided?)

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.12 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.12 **Land north of Brackenway, Formby**
Respondent No 241 **Response Ref** 6 **Representor Name** Claire Jenkins
Organisation Name Formby Parish Council
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We are also concerned with the extra housing development at Brackenway, Formby, especially as this area is already subject to flooding and surface water problems.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.12 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.12 **Land north of Brackenway, Formby**
Respondent No 267 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Keith Fell
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Specifically development of the site identified as MN2:12 should not be allowed to safeguard the present natural boundary. Residential development on this site would also be detrimental to existing residents as access in particular would be via local roads (Paradise Lane & Deansgate Lane North, Formby) already carrying traffic beyond expectation for their original design. This could only be mitigated if new vehicular access were available from the Formby by-pass (A565), with only pedestrian links to existing residential areas. As the A565 is a major dual carriageway trunk road, such access would therefore be unlikely to be permitted on highway grounds. However if such an access were to be permitted, it would make further development of 'green belt' land north of Formby an inevitable consequence and even more difficult to control. Furthermore the area in the vicinity of Eight Acre Lane/Hawksworth Drive Formby has been subject to recent flooding requiring emergency work by the Environment Agency; such problems would only be exacerbated by further development.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.12 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.12 **Land north of Brackenway, Formby**
Respondent No 272 **Response Ref** **Representor Name** A Hockey
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The Plan clearly states that climate change is a major issues for all local authorities and it is directing development away from areas of flood risk. Yet this site lies within a flood plain. I know the relevent protests have already been made to the council but I suggest they log on the the Environment Agency website. When I moved into the area it showed a clear warning that this area is a flood plain. It is still giving the same information. I hope full disclosure will be given to the 286 new home owners who will find it either impossible or extremely costly to insure their homes.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.12

Land north of Brackenway, Formby

Respondent No 306

Response Ref 1

Representor Name Jane Newby

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to lodge an objection to the building of over two hundred and eighty nine houses on green belt land to the north of Brackenway. This land is subject to severe flooding and sits on a flood plain. The building of these houses will also result in the loss too of wildlife habitats of flora and fauna of which there are many in the area. It will also result in urban sprawl, whereby Formby will be joined to Southport and eventually Crosby. The building of all these houses will put even more pressure on local services. It is already very difficult to get a doctor's appointment and there are few NHS dental services to cope with Formby's population. Though some hospital services are based in Southport, many require travel to Ormskirk by public transport. Contrary to public opinion, not everyone has a car!

Where would children go to school in this area? There are two schools (primary) Freshfield and St Peter's. Trinity/St Peter's is oversubscribed and yet Holy Trinity School in the village was closed down and I believe is now earmarked for further housing development. Another school would have to be built.

Traffic is another problem! The road by Trinity/St Peter's School is virtually a single track road at certain times of day and parents dropping off and collecting children park in the surrounding roads, e.g, Heatherways and Heathfield Close. It is very dangerous to cross Paradise Lane here, as vehicles restrict your view. Brackenway and Deansgate Lane North roads have now become main roads because Paradise Lane is inaccessible. Nobody bothers to stick by 20mph speed limit. More cars , more houses, more traffic - Formby just will not be able to cope! Parking in the village from all those extra households is just not possible. Formby is already FULL and relies on the goodwill of Waitrose for free public parking and toilet facilities. No public toilet facilities in Formby are a disgrace, yet more numbers in the population.

Leisure facilities are also few and far between, unless you pay for Formby Hall or Sports Direct.com. At present Formby has a pool and small gym. Older residents like me have to do aerobics/pilates in the café screened off from the public! No prospect of a studio for those activities even though consultations and petitions have been filled in. Where in 10 years' time are all the children of those households going to congregate - on street corners? They WILL because there are no leisure facilities in this village. At this end fo Formby there is a small swing area off Deansgate Lane North - not good enough for children of 289 houses - that'll be next in line for the house building though!

Brownfield sites must be used up before any Green Belt Land. Affordable houses for Formby young families. Any houses built will be between £200,000 - £300,000 or more, which puts them out of the reach of first time buyers or young families. Access to this new estate would be a problem. Formby is a one horse town - one road in and out. Formby bypass and the area by Ince Woods is regularly a scene of accidents.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove allocation MN2.12 from the Local Plan.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.12	Other Documents
Policy MN2.12	Land north of Brackenway, Formby	
Respondent No 307	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Edmond Samuel / Elsie Lowe
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Against development (land north of Brackenway, Formby). Increased traffic volume onto Southport Road, Formby. Primarily we object to any development on "Green Belt or agricultural land" (however we are in favour of "brownfield sites" where suitable). Furthermore we consider that existing flooding, traffic and amenity problems in Formby will be overwhelmed under this ill-considered plan. With regard to traffic in and out of Formby, the three existing routes are always busy, at full stretch during peak hours and seasonal weekends. With the additional burden of cars from the proposed development properties, the situation would become impossible.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Primarily we object to any development on "Green Belt or agricultural land" (however we are in favour of "brownfield sites" where suitable). Furthermore we consider that existing flooding, traffic and amenity problems in Formby will be overwhelmed under this ill-considered plan. With regard to traffic in and out of Formby, the three existing routes are always busy, at full stretch during peak hours and seasonal weekends. With the additional burden of cars from the proposed development properties, the situation would become impossible.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.12	Other Documents
Policy MN2.12	Land north of Brackenway, Formby	
Respondent No 329	Response Ref 7	Representor Name Michael Collier
Organisation Name Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester & North Merseyside		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

LWT objects to the allocation of this site for housing. The proposed allocation has increased hugely since the publication of the draft plan and now implies the destruction of around 70% of the existing Local Wildlife Site. This would entail the largest loss in terms of area to Sefton's Local Wildlife series and would represent a significant loss of semi-natural grassland within the borough. The provisions set out in MN6 talk of 'major ecological benefits', implying that the proposed mitigation would more than offset loss of existing value. LWT concedes that this is theoretically possible but it is very far from being guaranteed. It is our view that it would be extremely difficult and probably impossible to achieve anything like this without somehow preventing recreational access by the very large influx of new residents and their pets to a site which would literally be on their doorstep. It is certainly the case that this objective could not be achieved without putting in place the funding for management of the site in perpetuity and without appointing a suitable agency to implement this management. Furthermore, the potential adverse impacts of significantly increased recreational usage upon the fragile heathland of nearby Freshfield Dune Heath, which is part of the Sefton Coast SAC, would need to be addressed in a site-specific HRA.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.12	Other Documents
Policy MN2.12	Land north of Brackenway, Formby	
Respondent No 359	Response Ref 3	Representor Name Catherine Fraser
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Development MN2.12 (Brackenway Formby) has been extended from 169 homes to 286. And now includes flood zone 3 land! I was originally told by the planning officer that the flood risk was too great to extend the site and the council would oppose an extension to the site. The land is a saturated water meadow bounded by two main rivers Eight Acre Brook and Wham Dyke. These rivers along with many others drain into Downholland Brook using culverts and hence to the River Alt. The councils drainage report suggested that with climate change there would be a growing risk of further floods. As with all the culverts that drain into Downholland Brook during periods of prolonged rain Downholland Brook is too high to allow drainage to take place. The development will increase flood risk if the culvert cannot cope with the existing run off plus displaced water from the new development. In Wimpey's Ruthin development the culvert and the SUDs provision became overwhelmed with catastrophic results. There are just too many developments in Sefton and West Lancashire draining into Downholland Brook, Fine Jane Brook, Three Pools, and the river Alt etc. It seems that responsibility for flood safety is split between the councils, United Utilities and the Environment Agency. There needs to be some form of overall body taking an overview clearly out in the plan. Having seen major flooding events at first hand I know that the communication process is too slow between the different bodies and SUDs is just not adequate. At the very least the extension to this site should be prevented. This development's main access is on a bend in the bypass with poor visibility. The section of the bypass around Woodvale has been the scene of a number of serious accidents. Moreover, I think the link to Formby village will be tenuous as most resident are likely to shop elsewhere adding to traffic congestion adding nothing to the economic viability of Formby Village. In any case Formby Village just doesn't have enough parking. The local plan makes no provision for extra parking in the village which clearly indicates a preference for new out of town retail provision.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove site as an allocation.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.12	Other Documents
Policy MN2.12	Land north of Brackenway, Formby	
Respondent No 361	Response Ref 11	Representor Name A D Fraser
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Development MN2.12 (Brackenway Formby) has been extended from 169 homes to 286. And now includes flood zone 3 land! I was originally told by the planning officer that the flood risk was too great to extend the site and the council would oppose an extension to the site. The land is a saturated water meadow bounded by two main rivers Eight Acre Brook and Wham Dyke. These rivers along with many others drain into Downholland Brook using culverts and hence to the River Alt. The councils drainage report suggested that with climate change there would be a growing risk of further floods. As with all the culverts that drain into Downholland Brook during periods of prolonged rain Downholland Brook is too high to allow drainage to take place. The development will increase flood risk if the culvert cannot cope with the existing run off plus displaced water from the new development. In Wimpey's Ruthin development the culvert and the SUDs provision became overwhelmed with catastrophic results. There are just too many developments in Sefton and West Lancashire draining into Downholland Brook, Fine Jane Brook, Three Pools, and the river Alt etc. It seems that responsibility for flood safety is split between the councils, United Utilities and the Environment Agency. There needs to be some form of overall body taking an overview clearly out in the plan. Having seen major flooding events at first hand I know that the communication process is too slow between the different bodies and SUDs is just not adequate. At the very least the extension to this site should be prevented. This development's main access is on a bend in the bypass with poor visibility. The section of the bypass around Woodvale has been the scene of a number of serious accidents. Moreover, I think the link to Formby village will be tenuous as most resident are likely to shop elsewhere adding to traffic congestion adding nothing to the economic viability of Formby Village. In any case Formby Village just doesn't have enough parking. The local plan makes no provision for extra parking in the village which clearly indicates a preference for new out of town retail provision.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove Green Belt sites as allocations.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.12	Other Documents
Policy MN2.12	Land north of Brackenway, Formby	
Respondent No 434	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Val Ormrod
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to object to the local plan for housing on green belt land in Sefton We have little enough green belt in our area and to reduce any is just not right. There are plenty of brown belt sites in the area which should be utilised prior to green belt. The house builders seem to prefer green belt on a cost basis as brown belt land has to be cleared prior to their building on it - which costs money. This should of course not be a consideration as our green belt land is precious

I particularly object to the use of the green belt land in Formby which is north of Deans gate Lane and just south of Woodvale Aerodrome. This land is currently a livery yard and houses some 60 livery horses The green belt is used for grazing If this area is allowed to be sold for housing purposes then a huge social asset will be lost to the area The horses are all individually owed and all the families and children will have to find other suitable homes for their animals There is simply not enough alternative stabling in the area to cater for the numbers involved This yard is in an ideal spot from a safety aspect as it is at the edge of Formby and not on the other side of the very busy Formby by pass - which obviously poses a danger to both children and horses when trying to cross it. Formby's infer structure cannot cope with the huge numbers of houses proposed. There are only 3 routes in and out of the town and these are already very congested The schools, doctors and dentists are also already over subscribed. I therefore very strongly object to the local plan especially in my area of Formby where I have most knowledge of the chaos the proposal will cause.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.12	Other Documents
Policy MN2.12	Land north of Brackenway, Formby	
Respondent No 435	Response Ref 1	Representor Name James Crawford
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I object to the proposal to allow building on land in and around Formby, specifically MN2.12; MN2.16 and MN2.19. My reasons are the sites are low lying and have been subject to flooding many times in recent years, particularly MN2.1. The existing infrastructure will require significant investment to cope with developments of this size including areas such as drainage, water supply, traffic flow, available parking in the village centre, additional school places, doctors and dentists practices, hospital capacity, gas and electricity services. The council will be responsible for more wetlands, swale ditches and verges on the new sites which they will have to adopt. This will have financial implications on services that are already being cut. There will be an increased risk of flooding to existing properties in the vicinity of these developments. Loss of green belt

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.12 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.12 **Land north of Brackenway, Formby**
Respondent No 450 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** William Kirkham
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to register my objections to the proposed development of the land at the end of Deansgate Lane North, Formby. I am concerned about the impact the proposed development will bring. I'm specifically concerned on the grounds of: Increased risk of flooding to existing properties since the drainage for the new site will add to the existing load from current properties. The road directly outside has pooled up under rainfall and the fields hold large expanses of water for weeks on end. The additional traffic flow in and around the immediate area on already narrow roads. (Namely Deansgate Lane North, Hawksworth Drive and surrounding area) Added pressure on services I.e. Insufficient school places in the local area which I know of first hand as my child has to travel to the other side of Formby for School. Loss of wildlife habitats - we have red squirrels.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.12 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.12 **Land north of Brackenway, Formby**
Respondent No 455 **Response Ref** **Representor Name** Jane Rigby
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I object to the allocation to the north of Brackenway which is currently used as a livery yard for 70 plus horses. This are is used daily by families from tiny tots to pensioners. In the days when all children are bring encouraged to get into the open and away from the tv I can't believe you are proposing to remove a facility used by Formby residents more frequently than the local football field! There is no other site in formby that can accommodate these horses and I urge you to reconsider this proposal.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.12 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.12 **Land north of Brackenway, Formby**
Respondent No 457 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Peter Sheridan
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to register my objections to the proposed development of the land at the end of Deansgate Lane North, Formby. I am concerned about the impact the proposed development will bring. I'm specifically concerned on the grounds of: Increased risk of flooding to existing properties since the drainage for the new site will add to the existing load from current properties. The road directly outside has pooled up under rainfall and the fields hold large expanses of water for weeks on end. The additional traffic flow in and around the immediate area on already narrow roads. (Namely Deansgate Lane North, Hawksworth Drive and surrounding area) Added pressure on services I.e. Insufficient school places in the local area which I know of first hand as my child has to travel to the other side of Formby for School. Loss of wildlife habitats - we have red squirrels.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.12 **Land north of Brackenway, Formby**

Respondent No 458 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Emma Sheridan

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to register my objections to the proposed development of the land at the end of Deansgate Lane North, Formby. I am concerned about the impact the proposed development will bring. I'm specifically concerned on the grounds of: Increased risk of flooding to existing properties since the drainage for the new site will add to the existing load from current properties. The road directly outside has pooled up under rainfall and the fields hold large expanses of water for weeks on end. The additional traffic flow in and around the immediate area on already narrow roads. (Namely Deansgate Lane North, Hawksworth Drive and surrounding area) Added pressure on services I.e. Insufficient school places in the local area which I know of first hand as my child has to travel to the other side of Formby for School. Loss of wildlife habitats - we have red squirrels.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am astounded that Sefton is considering that this site should be taken out of the green belt and used for housing. These fields act as a reservoir for excess water especially after heavy rain. Essentially, they constitute a flood defence for the adjacent properties on Hawksworth Drive. The fields regularly become a lake that stretches right across this proposed site. If the site becomes part of the 'concrete jungle', this excess water will inevitably flood Hawksworth Drive and its houses. This has happened in the last few years without any buildings on the fields. Such building would render the properties more vulnerable to flooding and they would then become uninsurable and unsaleable. Possible subsidence in the event of flooding must also be taken into account.

I note that in the original assessment of this site, it failed the Sequential Test on the grounds of flood risk. Yet, in the latest version of the plan, this has been ignored and compelling reasons for building invoked. This appears to contradict Sefton's claim in their publicity material (The Champion, Wed 4th Feb 2015): "Climate change is a major issue for all local authorities. The Local Plan responds to this in a number of ways e.g. directing development away from areas of flood risk." The flood mitigation proposal presented in the Local Plan (Chapter Six: Meeting Sefton's Needs: MN6 Land At Brackenway, Formby) appears to consist largely of a pond that will fill up with the excess water. However, this whole site already acts as a large pond. Will a smaller one do the job? Similarly, scooping out larger ditches would add very little extra capacity.

Other issues to take account of include: Road access to and from the proposed estate. Internal roads in Formby would not be able to take the extra traffic. Just try driving down Paradise Lane when the primary school children are arriving or leaving and you will see what I mean. The only access point would be via the Formby Bypass. The proposed traffic lights would cause jams in both directions. It would appear from TW's Representation Report that they would like to rewrite the rules regarding access roads (section 8.4). The plan's claim (Local Plan Chapter 6: MN6 6.64) that rat running should be avoided looks somewhat hollow in this light. Traffic Density. Employment prospects within the local area are very limited. Most people living on the proposed site would inevitably have to drive long distances to work, thus increasing traffic density on already crowded commuter routes. This point is amply illustrated by Local Plan "Figure 2.2 Key commuter flows into and out of Sefton". More houses mean more families and more children. Local schools are oversubscribed. Where would these extra children go to school and bearing in mind the lack of road access, how would they get there? Would this lead to even more road congestion around school entrances? Medical facilities. Are there enough GPs to look after the extra people? Bearing in mind that many GPs are retiring early and recruitment to general practice is problematical, it seems unlikely that local practices could cope with an influx of people. I also note that no local GPs have been consulted on this point and that all estimates have made been via NHS England. This would seem to be a gross oversight in planning. Citing long term trends and hoping it will all come out right in the end is not a plan. Local Transport. It cannot be assumed that everybody moving in will have access to a car. Bearing in mind that many older people use buses, how many of them will be able to hobble as far as the nearest bus stop approximately half a mile away? Would prospective buyers be subject to a fitness test and prevented from buying a house if they failed?

Safety. The flood mitigation proposal of a pond adjacent to the housing estate looks like a disaster in the making as far as children are concerned. They would be bound to be attracted by such a body of water. Young children can drown in a few inches of water. Is anybody from Sefton prepared to take the flak if such an accident were to happen? Amenity. This may seem to be a frivolous item but should be taken seriously. Many people enjoy walking along 8 Acre Lane with and without dogs. Part of that pleasure is the view across green fields. Having to view a bunch of houses and their back fences would detract from this and spoil the enjoyment of being outdoors. In a broader context, this is a health issue. See: <http://www.kingsfund.org.uk/projects/improving-publics-health/access-green-and-open-spaces-and-role-leisure-services>. Ecology. The proposed site is inhabited by all sorts of wildlife. If there is no good reason for building there but for a builder to please its shareholders, these creatures should take priority. They cannot be transplanted. Destroying this habitat unnecessarily would be immoral and demonstrate a complete lack of ethical principles. In summary, site MN6 is a poor choice for building extra houses in the area. The Local Plan fails to address many of the difficulties in concrete terms and depends too much on vague statements and generalities.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name**Obj/Sup/Com** Objection**Summary of Main Issues**

I am writing to express my objection to the plan, in particular to applications for additional building on the flood plain green belt fields to the rear of Hawksworth Drive.

In my opinion the reasons given for supporting this development are not sound, as outlined below.

Flood Risk:

MN6 Land at Brackenway / Hawksworth Drive, Formby (extension to the first proposed Local Plan allocation SR4.11).

With particular reference to the two flood plain fields adjacent to Eight Acre Lane Brook behind Hawksworth Drive (Additional Site AS06)

The first Local Plan excluded these zone 2 and 3 flood plain fields because of the flood risk.

Hawksworth Drive: Recent flood history

Photographs provided. These make it clear that we are not talking about a few puddles, but substantial volumes of water causing damage (Ref 1 photographs). -

The fields at the back of Hawksworth Drive are identified as a flood plain by Sefton and various authorities.

- Sefton Local Plan : "6.61 Just under half of the site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3" (Ref 2).

- The Independent Report commissioned by Sefton states "there are hotspots of flooding at Eight Acre Lane Brook and along Hawksworth Drive, Formby(Ref 3).

The severe flood in September 2012 caused flooded homes and garages and the road was under water (Ref 1). The two fields formed one lake; the dividing ditch between them leading up to Wham Dyke was invisible and totally submerged. Water spread as far as the Formby Bypass cycle track and its verges (see photograph). This necessitated a round-the-clock exercise of pumping water into bowlers to transport it away.

The photographs show that both fields are susceptible to severe flooding when conditions are right, regardless of zone classification.

A severe flood on October 31st 2000 affected homes, garages and the road. The Fire Service fought round the clock to pump the water away. A Leading Fireman said "When we were pumping the water away, we were really only pumping it in a circle, there was just nowhere for it to go. But we had to keep on going just to stop it from getting into people's houses".

This illustrates the difficulty in dealing with floods here, once they have happened. (Ref 4, scans of local papers, enclosed).

That there was nowhere for water to go, confirms that the flood problem was not just generated by factors on the flood plain/Hawksworth Drive site. Other major contributing factors were the wider Formby drainage system and River Alt outflow to sea. Thus, no amount of tinkering with the flood plain/Hawksworth Drive site will solve the whole problem.

Sequential Test

Chapter 10, 10.55 of the Local Plan, states:

"The Sequential Test aims to steer new development to Flood Zone 1 areas — areas with a low probability of river or sea flooding".

There is a major conflict between the original and final Local Plans.

Site Assessment form for Original Plan (Ref 5):

This is the small site without the flood plains, which passed the sequential test:

"Constraints to Development:

Flood Risk: Minor Constraint:

97% of the site is in Flood Zone I. Some surface water flood risk to the north east of the site, and susceptibility to ground water flooding.

Sequential Test: Pass.

97% in Flood Zone 1. Development within the site should avoid land in Flood Zones 2 and 3."

Site Assessment form for Final Plan with extension (Ref 6):

"Constraints to Development:

Flood Risk: Significant Constraint:

12% of the site is in Flood Zone 3, and a further 33% is in Flood Zone 2.

The northern and eastern parts of the site have high surface water flood risk. Susceptible to ground water flooding.

Sequential Test: Fail:

A significant proportion of the site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and there are sufficient reasonable alternatives in Flood Zone 1. However, there are compelling reasons why this site should be allocated for development.

When drawing up the first Local Plan, the legal mechanism always existed for Sefton to override the Sequential Test. That they didn't pursue this option indicates that they had faith in the validity of their decision to protect the flood plain; that the evidence did not support invoking a "compelling reason" for "essential housing need" to justify overturning it. They accepted that in their own best judgement, there was a significant flood risk.

There has been no change in housing need since that decision, so there are no new "compelling reasons" to justify a change in judgement. The Sequential Test override does not reflect a point of principle or genuine need.

Furthermore, Chapter 10, 10.57 of the Local Plan, states:

"Flood resistance and/or flood resilience design measures alone should not be used to justify development in areas at greater risk of flooding."

The so-called "habitat /ecological enhancements" are essentially a renaming of the flood plain and related habitat. They are of marginal benefit and do not provide functions that the flood plains are not already providing themselves. Their object appears to be a cosmetic attempt to enhance the "flood mitigation case", in order totick boxes that will override the Sequential Test. It is a trumped up public relations exercise.

Sefton's Publicity Claim

The Sefton Council supplement attached to The Champion, Wed 4th Feb 2015, claimed: "Climate change is a major issue for all local authorities. The Local Plan responds to this in a number of ways e.g directing development away from areas of flood risk." (Ref 7).

It has not done so in this case, so is in breach of its own promotional literature.

Hawksworth Drive: Specific Risk Factors

Formby is low lying, so during the autumn and winter months it is not uncommon to see large lakes of water on these fields, with the ditches filled to the brim. Hawksworth Drive is lower than sea level and waterlocked: i.e. surface water drainage sewers cannot discharge into the watercourse (Eight Acre Brook) if it is already full. Thus we are particularly vulnerable to flooding. Even as I write, in March, there is lying surface water on the second field in from the bypass, even though rain has not been heavy. The effects of climate change increase flood risk to British coastal areas such as this.

The Independent Report shows that flooding is often multifactorial; anything that adds to it can only worsen the situation. Climate change and other influences are fluid, so there may yet be unknown factors.

Additional Risk and Consequences of Proposed Building on Additional Site AS06

If houses are built on the flood plain, even the use of permeable paving that allows water to seep away will not compensate for the "footprint" of the non- permeable buildings themselves, from which water will simply run off. After a burst of heavy rain, there will not be time for it to be soaked up and it will head our way.

I understand the developers propose to raise the residential footprint by 0.3m above existing ground levels. This will protect them from flood water but at our expense - we will be the ones where the run-off will be heading. A cynical proposal. They also propose to put non return valves on the estate drainage system. When I first heard about this (informally), I was told that computer modelling would be carried out, since it was uncertain whether the valves would improve or worsen things. Because of this concern, I feel it would be unwise to rely solely on modelling. I feel strongly that this should be trialled in real life, before any development is considered.

Chapter 10, Local Plan: EQ8 Managing Flood Risk And Surface Water:

"Flood risk generally.

- Development must not increase flood risk from any sources within the site or elsewhere, and where possible should reduce flood risk"

The proposal to raise the embankment of Eight Acre Brook is an indication that the developers anticipate higher levels of water in Eight Acre Brook from the new development, so it breaches EQ8 (see Hawksworth Drive / Brackenway Flood mitigation plans, below).

Hawksworth Drive / Brackenway Flood mitigation plans

That flood mitigation plans are needed at all is an indication that the development is increasing flood potential, so its concept is in breach of EQ8:

Chapter 10, Local Plan: EQ8 Managing Flood Risk And Surface Water:

"Flood risk generally:

- Development must be located in areas at lowest risk of flooding from all sources.

Within the site, buildings must be located in the areas at lowest risk of flooding.

- Development must not increase flood risk from any sources within the site or elsewhere, and where possible should reduce flood risk"

We do not know if the flood risk mitigation scheme will work. Computer modelling has been carried out for TaylorWimpey by two companies: Betts and Capita (Ref 8).

The Capita statement says that the 2012 flooding "was concluded to be due to blocked trash screens on culverts and general poor maintenance".

This statement is flawed and misleading, since this was only part of the problem (see Hawksworth Drive: Recent flood history).

It was demonstrable that water from the Hawksworth Drive flood was unable to flow out to the sea through normal channels. There was nowhere for the water to go, including problems at the Alt Mouth outflow. The bowyers had difficulty finding somewhere to discharge. My husband saw them emptying bowyers onto farmers' fields on the other side of the Formby Bypass.

Since their basic premise is flawed, so are the proposed means of resolution.

Modelling is not the same as real life; it can only be a best guess, which is not an acceptable basis considering the possible impact on people's lives.

If Sefton think that a mitigation scheme is essential, they should have considered one independently of any Local Plan, and implemented it themselves to see if it worked, or be planning to do so. That they have not, speaks volumes.

Wetland Water Storage Areas

Taken from Sefton Local Plan January 2015: Chapter Six: Meeting Sefton's Needs:

MN6 Land At Brackenway, Formby

"1. a) Include a flood risk mitigation scheme that:

iii) significantly reduces the existing surface water flood risk to properties on Hawksworth Drive by directing flood flows away from Eight Acre Brook to new flood storage areas adjacent to the Formby Bypass. 6.62: The requirements set out above will ensure that the existing surface water flood risk to properties on Hawksworth Drive is significantly reduced. This will be secured by the creation of new flood water storage areas adjacent to the Formby Bypass".

I asked the Planning Dept about the nature of the new storage areas. "These are likely to be 'wetland areas' adjacent to the bypass into which flood water would be directed. They would be dry most of the time but be used when needed. The exact nature of these would be determined at a planning application stage."

These so-called "new flood water storage areas" sound in essence like another name for the existing flood plain, since in reality it often functions as a wetland area. So the water storage areas are not new.

Renaming the field as a wetland area does not increase capacity. In the past, these flood plain fields were demonstrated to be incapable of absorbing the huge volumes of severe flood water (Ref 1, photograph from 2012).

The proposal to redirect water to the wetland storage areas is indefensible: it is where it is coming from in the first place.

The water table is very high in Formby. This means that the land below the pasture is often saturated. Calling it a wetland area, or digging a pond or underground tanks no matter how deep, cannot physically provide much additional storage, since the water is already "stored" below ground to capacity, by natural processes of a flood plain. As such they are not new storage areas, as claimed in MN6. Prolonged rain will, in any case, fill a tank, as it does the fields. Scooping out a pond or wetland area for compensatory drainage and using the existing ditches as storage will not add materially to the storage capacity of the site and will have implications for adjacent sites. If a pond in the wetland site is a possibility, is it to be lined or just a dug hole? The decision will have a critical impact on its role in flood risk mitigation. A lowered-land unlined pond can continuously absorb water from its surroundings, so would be little different from the flood plain in capacity. A lowered-land storage area would have to be lined to preserve it for surface water storage and prevent it from filling up with ground water. The lining will limit its function to that of a tank, which could fill up but not seep away naturally. This could be a liability: a full tank overflowing round the lined depressions, especially if there were a rapid water influx from any source. This would be worse than a natural flood plain.

How can anyone predict that an area would remain dry most of the time? A dry wetland pond is an oxymoron. In any case, the pasture is often saturated.

The Planning Dept replied to "what does used when needed" mean: "The development would be engineered so that water would be directed (via gravity) to the flood storage areas in a flood event."

Redirecting flood water into the wetland areas is no different from what happens naturally on the flood plain at present and it is ineffectual when there is overwhelming flooding. The evidence for this is when Hawksworth Drive was flooded in 2012; both fields, brooks and ditches were completely under water, including onto the Formby Bypass cycle track and its verges (see section Hawksworth Drive: Recent flood history, above). Any new "pond or wetland area" would have been submerged, invisible and useless. Any attempt to redirect water would simply have recycled it from one flooded area to another.

Another consideration is one of safety: children are attracted to ponds like a magnet. This issue should have a high priority if such a scheme is implemented.

Formby Drainage System / Network

The Formby drainage system does not cope well and is in urgent need of an upgrade. Anyone who lives in Formby is familiar with the readiness with which minor floods occur in various local roads situated away from the fields, even after a couple of hours of moderate rain, let alone the overflow from local serious floods. Any increase in coastal flooding or run-off from new housing would further challenge this system since, as quoted above, there is "nowhere for it to go". There is potential for this to lead to increased flood frequency and severity in Hawksworth Drive. This in itself could increase the risk to homes peripheral to it, where flooding may not have been a problem before, again a breach of the Local Plan objectives EQ8: "Development must not increase flood risk from any sources within the site or elsewhere".

If this development is approved, work on the Hawksworth Drive/Brackenway Flood mitigation plans and wider drainage infrastructure systems in Formby must begin before house building. It should be completed to a deadline, not delayed indefinitely by masterly inaction. If not completed before house building begins, there will be a period of increased flood risk due to the strain on the system from the new houses & foundations. There should be a proviso that homes cannot be built and sold until full infrastructure is in place & functional, out of decency to those whose homes will be at risk. If the builders start before mitigation steps are in place, and they find that they are digging into waterlogged ground, where will they pump the water to?

Another point to note: If floods occur more often or are more severe, many houses would become unsaleable and uninsurable.

Associated Issues

Empty Properties In Sefton

While suitable brownfield sites and empty properties exist, there is no justification for building on Green Belt. This should be the priority before destroying Green Belt, particularly flood plains.

I have been informed under an FOI request that there are 5,023 empty "non-derelict" properties in Sefton, recorded as privately owned (Personal communication, Freedom of Information request, Fri 6th March 2015). This is a substantial figure. Surely these should be targeted first.

This would destroy the case for "compelling reasons for development" on Green Belt and flood plain building (see section: Sequential Test) .

Cost and Legal Implications

Prevention of flood risk arising from the development and risk factors beyond, will require measures to be taken, with associated cost. I'm not sure how it would be apportioned between the responsible authorities, agencies and developers, but an element of the cost is likely to fall to Sefton. Water flow away from Hawksworth Drive is heavily dependent on the capacity of the Formby drainage network, which would need a costly upgrade. If even some of this fell to already cash-strapped Sefton with its many other priorities, I would be surprised if adequate funding could be found, even if there were a will to do it.

- Where are the details from all stakeholders, of projected plans & costings?
- Where is the analysis of who has agreed to pay for what?
- Is it within budget for all of them?

If this underpinning is not addressed and in the public domain, there can be no confidence in the plan. I do not see how the Plan can be implemented safely, so it should not go ahead.

The folly of building on known flood plains is recognised nationally and is currently a high profile issue. To introduce deliberately an avoidable flood risk would be perverse. Nobody can claim that they didn't know about it. I'm not sure of the legal consequences or where liability would fall. However, I think there would be a public outcry in the future, if a preventable situation were to lead to precious Sefton funds destined for public services, being diverted to repair emergency flood damage or pay legal costs. This is not the sort of publicity Sefton needs.

Transport Issues

New Traffic Lights Onto The Formby Bypass: With specific reference to Additional Site AS06

The Planning Dept say that these will be located somewhere along the new development site edge where it meets the bypass (Ref 9).

Many of the 286 houses may have more than one car, especially since the scarcity of employment in Formby means that many residents work outside Formby. This will generate hundreds of extra cars on the bypass.

There are already rush hour traffic lights delays on the approaches to and from Southport Coastal Road. There will be bottlenecks in the rush hour for those exiting the development, and those approaching from both directions on the bypass. (See next Section: Routes to Other Parts of Formby.)

In the rush hour it is likely that many motorists will choose to avoid an extra queue by "rat running" along the Old Southport Road from both directions. This is a narrow unlit country lane with blind bends and no pavements, not designed to take busy traffic. It is used by pedestrians, dog walkers, horse riders and cyclists. These would be at risk and accidents would be inevitable. Rat running is supposedly discouraged in the Plan (see next Section: Routes to Other Parts Of Formby: Rat Running).

Extra cars on the bypass will create another bottleneck at the roundabout junction between the Bypass, Southport Road and Southport Old Road.

Routes to Other Parts of Formby: Rat Running With specific reference to Additional Site AS06

The express aim of discouraging conditions that increase the risk of "rat running" is specifically highlighted in Local Plan Chapter 6: MN6 6.64: "The site layout should ensure that a direct through route to other parts of Formby is not created, to discourage "rat running".

There will be bottlenecks in the rush hour as described above (See: New Traffic Lights Onto The Formby Bypass, above) for those exiting & entering the development. Human nature being what it is, no matter what the site layout, drivers will be likely to use the "rat runs" to escape these.

Even out of the rush hour, what driver is going to drive a mile or so out of their way down the bypass if they are going to Formby Village? To think that they won't is wishful thinking that is out of place in a Local Plan.

Site Assessment forms AS06 and SR4.11, under 7. Site Access and 8. Network Capacity, cite access via Paradise Lane and Deansgate North as moderate constraints.

Suggestions include junction improvements and a link road between the two. These would be a godsend to rat runners — a rat runners' charter.

Thus, the aim of discouraging "rat running" cannot be "ensured", so the Plan is in breach of itself. This conflict does not seem to have been considered.

Formby as a Whole: Impact on Road Congestion, Safety, Parking and Business

The Local Plan proposes building hundreds of houses in Formby, which in turn will add hundreds of extra vehicles to the roads.

Local roads already have "hot spots" where there is considerable congestion and there is no spare capacity. Using existing minor roads to access the additional builds would make these roads dangerous.

Parking in the village is difficult. An increase in demand will drive custom away from businesses already hit by the recession, since both new and existing residents will be deterred. We don't want to see the village die. Empty shops mean less money going into the Sefton Exchequer.

Formby as a Whole: GPs

Personal experience indicates that it can take 3 weeks for a GP appointment, or 10 days for a telephone consultation. It is recognised nationally that there are insufficient GPs at present. General Practice does not attract young trainee doctors; even if it did, it takes time to train doctors for the GP speciality. There is already increasing pressure on the NHS from an ageing population. This begs the question as to how our local GPs will cope with extra numbers from the hundreds of new houses.

Sefton's supplement to the Champion, Wed 4th Feb 2015 claimed:

"Taking Account of Previous Comments we have had discussions with those who provide services including United Utilities, National Health England and with the Council Departments responsible for planning school places, our highways network and

drainage. All are satisfied that the necessary infrastructure can be provided at the right time to accommodate the level of development proposed throughout this Plan."

Under the Freedom of Information Act I asked what the specific plans were, regarding "provided at the right time".

Reply: "There are no specific plans, [such as would be received with a planning application] so discussions ... relate to principles.

Regarding GP practices, I was advised that "No specific meetings have been held with GPs. Contact has been with NHS England"

On this basis, I don't see how anyone can make predictions, or give bland assurances on behalf of local health professionals who haven't been consulted. Where are these GPs going to come from, given the national shortage?

The Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan refers to "the 15 year period of the plan", and "... a long lead in to respond to the implications of specific proposals on some services like health & schools".

If increased health service provision does not precede house building, a dangerous void will be created during which healthcare will fail to support the larger population, with inevitable serious clinical incidents.

Bats and their Habitat

With specific reference to Additional Site AS06 as described above under Section: Flood Risk.

Bats only appear twice in the local plan:

Chapter 11: NATURAL AND HERITAGE ASSETS

11.21 In Sefton priority species include... Legally protected species include... bats ..."

11.29 "The Plan encourages opportunities to enhance habitat e.g. bat boxes".

This weak statement does not even say "must", so is liable to be ignored.

It is pointless building bats boxes if they have been starved to death as a result of the chain of events during development i.e. disruption of fields / fewer flowers to sustain the moths they eat (see below).

The lack of a statement about bats around Brackenway is a surprising omission, since we have seen bats every night in summer for nearly forty years at the back of Hawksworth Drive. At the very least I would expect to have seen evidence that Brackenway and Hawksworth Drive had been surveyed at dusk/dawn when bats fly. Lack of dusk/dawn surveys is a significant constraint to gathering information on how bats use a site, and will lead to a claim that there are no bats, or that no action is needed.

Pipistrelles and Brown Long-eared bats are known to roost in the immediate locality. They use these fields for foraging and potential commuting. Brown Long-eared bats have more specific foraging requirements than Pipistrelles, so are more affected by habitat destruction.

Reduction in field size means fewer flowers, so less nectar for moths to eat. Habitat loss is the main cause of the decline of butterflies and moths.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Photographs of flooding events

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.12	Other Documents
Policy MN2.12	Land north of Brackenway, Formby	
Respondent No 486	Response Ref 1	Representor Name D Parr
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

We write in response to the recent notices in the Press regarding the Sefton Local Plan and the proposed additional sites for development in Sefton. Our own concerns are the building in Formby and particularly the land at Hawksworth Drive. We need Green Belt land for the future to sustain agriculture and too many open space areas are being lost to building. We understand the need for new and affordable housing for all but surely Brown Belt land should be the first option. There is also the matter of traffic, schools, doctors etc which needs to be addressed. The land at the back of Hawksworth Drive, has been mentioned and this is where our concerns are. When we get heavy rain the field can become water logged and has flooded in the past as have parts of Hawksworth Drive. If houses were built on this land what would happen to the surface water and drainage and how would this affect properties in Hawksworth Drive. We ask, therefore, that you please keep us informed of any plans regarding the possible building at the land at Hawksworth Drive as we may need to take advice with regard to our property and what effect it would have now and in the future.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.12	Other Documents
Policy MN2.12	Land north of Brackenway, Formby	
Respondent No 492	Response Ref 10	Representor Name
Organisation Name Craig Seddon SIPP		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Land north of Brackenway (Site MN2.12) is a 13.7ha site identified for 286 dwellings. The site is allocated in the UDP as falling within the Green Belt, within the Coastal Planning Zone and as a designated Local Wildlife Site. The site's allocation as a Local Wildlife Site is assessed in the Site Assessment Form (references SR4.11 & AS06) as a moderate constraint because there is scope for on-site mitigation. The Assessment Form does not however advise what mitigation and compensatory measures will be necessary because an ecological assessment does not appear to have been undertaken. Without this assessment the impact of the on protected habitats, species and trees cannot be determined, therefore this must be assessed as a Tier 1 constraint.

Two access points are proposed at Paradise Lane and Deansgate. It is therefore questionable whether there is the network capacity to accommodate the private vehicles associated with an additional 286 dwellings. The Assessment Form states that these roads are narrow and constrained by congestion. Given the above it is questionable whether access is feasible from here.

The Assessment Form considers that access could be taken directly off the Formby Bypass, though it is suggested that significant highway infrastructure changes will be necessary to accommodate this. Without undertaking a Transport Assessment it is unclear whether the proposed access is suitable or whether the surrounding network has the capacity to accommodate the development. The Assessment Form identifies the site as partially falling within Flood Zones 2 and 3 but specifically states that there are sufficient reasonable alternatives in Flood Zone 1. It advises that this is a significant constraint. Given Planning Practise Guidance and the Council's statement, our client questions why the site been brought forward.

In seeking to justify the site's inclusion, the Assessment Form states that there are compelling reasons why the site should be allocated for residential development, listing these as flood risk improvements to the existing residential area, ecological and highways improvement. A flood risk assessment has not been undertaken. Without having undertaken this our client questions how the Council have come to this conclusion. Similarly, no ecological or transport assessments have been undertaken to demonstrate that these benefits mitigate the development of land in Flood Zones 2 and 3.

Given the uncertainty over ecology, highways and particularly flood risk, it is questioned how this site has been allowed to progress to the Draft Publication stage of the Local Plan.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to register my very strong objections to land north of sixteen and eight acre lane land being considered as suitable for residential development. As far back as 1975 there is evidence this land was within a proposed Green Belt area. Development proposals were refused at the time, in 1981 the land was left white for Sefton to determine future land uses. Some 250 residents made written representations some 150 local residents had a public meeting such was the concern of people in the area.

In 1981 Merseyside County Council was requested to include all land north of Sixteen Acre and Eight Acre lane in the Green Belt the boundary being Sixteen Acre and Eight Acre Lanes which with the land is a natural boundary separating Freshfield from Woodvale. This resolution was confirmed in 1982, the land was put back into Green Belt. This whole area of Sixteen Acre and Eight Acre Lane does regularly flood at times of heavy rainfall which will cause many problems. Extensive drainage would be required for land to surface water, pumping facilities would have to be provided for foul drainage.

The development of many homes on this site will cause great problems in the area, Paradise Lane is already congested with local school Trinity St Peters and a pre school across the road. Increased traffic would make it dangerous for young people using the facilities. Deansgate Lane North narrows considerably on the approach to Sixteen Acre Lane which would make this very congested, with a possible two cars per house the congestion would be considerable in the area and add pollution to this beautiful natural wild life habitat.

There is also the problem of increased population to this small already widely populated area. Our schools are full at present and would not be able to absorb pupils from a large number of new homes. Doctors and Dentists will have problems absorbing so many new patients.

This parcel of land is of natural beauty and is home to many varieties of wild life, Herons are often seen in the ditches and fields Pheasants, Swallows, Owls, and other Birds of Prey, Shrews, Mice, Voles, Foxes and many more. This is one of the few remaining localities where Snipe breed, also the Natterjack Toad has been seen an endangered species in Britain and recognised as a priority for conservation action, it is protected under British and European Law it is illegal to disturb the home of this toad or to damage or destroy its habitat. The Skylark has also been seen the population is in decline putting the Skylark on the endangered list. Hedgehogs are also present there is evidence of a declining Hedgehog population, preliminary data from two surveys run by People's Trust for Endangered Species (PTES) over the past decade indicated an alarming fall in numbers of Hedgehogs in urban and rural areas. A report by the British Trust for Ornithology (BTO) commissioned by PTES and the British Hedgehog Preservation Society (BHPS) to determine the state of British Hedgehogs, indicates that at a conservative estimate a quarter of the population has been lost in the last ten years. The preliminary data from the surveys was sufficiently alarming for Hedgehogs to be declared a priority conservation species in 2007, the evidence is now very strong that Hedgehogs are in trouble. There are also many Bats all are protected by law as their numbers have also decreased dramatically. We should be ensuring such wonderful mammals are around for future generations to enjoy and not considering destroying their habitat. Among the flora is a large population of the Southern Marsh Orchid a wild orchid unique within this area.

There are a large number of houses of all types for sale in Formby and Freshfield at present and have been for some considerable time this would indicate there is no need to use Green Belt land, any need could be met by in-fill and "brownfield" development. There is, however, a definite shortage of open spaces for recreation. The temptation for creeping development on the Green Belt should be strongly resisted.

I hope that these comments will convince the Council that the previous decision to include this parcel of land within the Green Belt and not allow development are still valid.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.12	Other Documents
Policy MN2.12	Land north of Brackenway, Formby	
Respondent No 546	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Linda Speck
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I am somewhat puzzled as to how far this proposed building site will stretch as at present Rimmers Stables in on the site and am anxious to know if this is being sold and again how many houses will be built there and the effect the added traffic will have on Paradise Lane and the entrance to Kenton Close. These proposals do concern us as residents since 1988 as it is a peaceful area that is accessed by those who live here and go to the stables but certainly is not built for heavy traffic. I fear we are going to have another residential mistake made by planners years go in the areas adjacent to St. Lukes School and Range High as the amount of added traffic there is horrendous and although a school is down the bottom of Paradise Lane already traffic can be at a premium and can cause major problems so further houses being built will only cause more problems. I urge planners to think these problems through as if you look at the situation surrounding the area of Cambridge Road etc no thought was given to the extreme problems this causes and I do not think this is fair to the people who are already living in this area and who enjoy the peace and tranquillity of being close to a green belt area free from the injection of heavy traffic.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.12	Other Documents
Policy MN2.12	Land north of Brackenway, Formby	
Respondent No 551	Response Ref	Representor Name Stephen Sayce
Organisation Name Environment Agency		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

We have received site specific Flood Risk Assessments for Land North of Brackenway, however, we have advised Sefton Council that additional information including modelling is required to demonstrate that this site is acceptable in flood risk terms In light of the above we consider that the Council have not been able to satisfactorily apply the exception test as required by the NPPF. Sefton Council are aware of our requirements on the above points and we are working very closely with them to ensure the correct information is submitted.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.12	Other Documents
Policy MN2.12	Land north of Brackenway, Formby	
Respondent No 559	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Christopher Summers
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Ecological and Environmental Considerations. The land at the rear of Brackenway (site ref MN2.12) forms a natural boundary for the Green belt. It is popular with walkers and horse riders. Sefton supports and encourages all forms of exercise and sport with a view to a healthier population. So why remove or infringe upon valuable assets like this land? The parcel of land has been identified as a designated local Wildlife Site and Sefton's own literature states it would not normally be considered for development. I have seen all manner of wildlife on the land; Bats, Frogs, Toads, Newts and many species of birds such as Heron and Pheasants. Wild flowers are commonplace, in particular the Southern Marsh Orchid, a wild Orchid unique to this area. Greenbelt provides a vital break between areas, preventing urban sprawl which would ruin the character of this part of Britain.

Land Drainage Issues. The proposed development on the land at the rear of Brackenway (site ref MN2.12) is on land that floods regularly. I've lived in a house overlooking the land for over twenty years and in most winters there are prolong periods of time when there is standing water on the fields. In about 2000, the fields overflowed into houses on Hawksworth Drive. A similar situation occurs on the proposed Liverpool Road site. The land plays a vital part in Formby's flood water management by holding water that would otherwise flow onto adjacent land. Building on the land will mean water flows onto other land. I believe the issue has led to Sefton Council's former Senior Drainage Engineer joining the campaign to stop this development.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.12 Land north of Brackenway, Formby

Respondent No 585 Response Ref 1 Representor Name D Marsden

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

As I stated in my correspondence of the 25 September 2013 the land in question (Site Ref: MN 2.12 (which is now double in area to that of the previous consultation document)) is located within defined Green Belt and as such cannot be automatically regarded as a potentially re-developable brownfield site. The Local Authority's record shows that that the Planning Inspectorate recommended that the land north of Sixteen Acre Lane (track) & Eight Acre Lane (a clear and definable boundary and Bridleway/By-Way) should remain within the Green Belt as per the adopted 'Subject Plan' and was considered to be an important breathing space between conurbations of Formby and Woodvale.

It is also recorded that the Merseyside County Council supported this view and subsequently this parcel of land was classified as Green Belt in June 1983. Subsequent Planning Policy adopted by Sefton MBC (Unitary Development Plan, June 2006) clearly shows the 2013 consultation site SR4.11 (2011 Draft Core Strategy Site 5038) as being within the adopted Green Belt (Fig 1) and that in 2011 assessment this area of land is acknowledged by the Local Authority as being part of a larger Local Nature Site and a National and International Nature Site.

Legal precedence within previously adopted planning policy, tested through public examination (public inquiry), clearly indicated that there are issues with developing this part of Formby. In 1982 Sefton MBC placed a great deal of weight to the long term future of Formby, including the shortage of public open space making particular reference to horse grazing and its associated activities, traffic issues, drainage problems and past commitments. It is understood that these criteria were influential in the decision to retain these areas as open land for a combination of both public and private recreational purposes.

The published Local Plan for consultation recognises that much of this part of the Borough is flat and low-lying, which makes it potentially vulnerable to flooding from a variety of sources. It is also recognises the risk of flooding which is likely to increase with climate change.

It is considered that the site conditions have not changed since the aforementioned Public Inquiries. There is no apparent evidence in the current consultation documents to suggest otherwise other than in relation to Draft Local Plan policy; EQ8 - MANAGING FLOOD RISK AND SURFACE WATER it is noted that for 'Flood risk generally': Development must be located in areas at lowest risk of flooding from all sources. Within the site, buildings must be located in the areas at lowest risk of flooding. Development must not increase flood risk from any sources within the site or elsewhere, and where possible should reduce flood risk.

Section 10 of the NPPF 2012 'Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change' clearly sets out the parameters that local authorities must address in regard must be given to Paragraphs 100 & 103. "...local planning authorities should ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere and only consider development appropriate in areas at risk of flooding where, informed by a sitespecific flood risk assessment..." (Para 103)

The Local Authority has recognised that there is a need to protect Sefton's natural assets including its high quality environment and its rich heritage and that it has a responsibility to cater for development and growth to improve and maintain the living conditions and opportunities for our residents in a planned way. By allowing this site to be allocated for housing is considered to be contrary to the Government's National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

It was noted during the previous consultation the Local Authority must have regard to Section 12 Paragraphs 126 to 141 of the NPPF 2012 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) which advises that Local Planning Authorities and Developers to have regard to sites and areas that may have future historic importance.

A substantial area north of Formby is designated as protected Dune Heath which is managed by The Lancashire Wildlife Trust and RAF Woodvale², which is an operational military airfield that recently celebrated its 70th Anniversary and has important and significant historic links to WWII. The impact of developing the larger site MN 2.12 will need to be fully assessed under the provisions of the NPPF 2012, the retained English Heritage³ PPS 5 Planning for the Historic Environment - Practice Guide Document (March 2010) and English Heritage's 'Understanding Significance' also retained to provide supplementary guidance to the NPPF.

The surrounding open land to the site in question also provides a natural habitat for the wildlife that is attracted to the adjacent protected Dune Heath and Airfield. The land immediately to the west of Site MN 2.12 (Bowler's Riding School) was defined in the previous consultation documents as an important equine education and leisure facility but to operate, as such it will require appropriate level of grazing consequently policies need to be developed to allow for the possible expansion of this important facility. There is no mention of such facilities in the January 2015 version of the Local Plan published for consultation.

Should Sefton MBC be mindful to proceed with zoning this site to be developed for residential use then this area of equine education, leisure facility and associated grazing land will be lost. It is acknowledged that there is a need to provide affordable homes in Formby to meet the Government's current advice, but Site MN 2.12 will require substantial infrastructure to mitigate the serious issue of flooding. As such these additional costs will likely be transferred to the purchasers resulting in the new properties not being classed as 'affordable'. In addition, the wider implications of introducing a method reducing the potential of flooding to the new properties the local authority in conjunction with the Environment Agency will need to establish fairly early on in the process that the existing neighbouring residences to the south of Site MN2.12 will not be affected by the displaced flood water.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Photographs taken in September 2012 show the proposed development site flooded.

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.12	Other Documents
Policy MN2.12	Land north of Brackenway, Formby	
Respondent No 626	Response Ref 3	Representor Name S Wilson
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I object to building on a floodplain, even if the classification has been altered. Whatever its classification land that floods should not be granted building consent. It affects the surrounding existing housing. In particular I am referring to the land off Liverpool Road in Formby (S048) and the land between the bypass and rear of Hawkesworth Drive in Formby (S038) as both these areas flood badly, with existing drains unable to cope to the point raw sewage is coming up the grids on particularly bad days around the Savon Hook area.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.12 Land north of Brackenway, Formby

Respondent No 685 Response Ref 4 Representor Name

Organisation Name Taylor Wimpey

Obj/Sup/Com Support

Summary of Main Issues

TWUK strongly supports the release of the site from the Green Belt and its allocation for housing and consider that it would make a positive contribution to the Borough's and Formby's market and affordable housing requirements. However, it is important to note that the capacity identified is reflected as indicative and that flexibility will need to be applied by the Council to enable the sites' capacity to be maximised taking into account flood risk and other constraints.

The allocation would make a positive contribution to the Borough's and Formby's market and affordable housing requirements. A series of benefits would be secured through housing development at the site as set out in the accompanying Development Statement. These include: The allocation of the entire site will contribute to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy. The proposals will result in a number of significant economic benefits to Formby including: Approximately £30 million investment into the local area through the construction process. Approximately £2.1 million through the Government's New Homes Bonus Scheme to be spent by Sefton Council in the area at their discretion. £2.3 million net additional spending annually in the local economy from the sites new residents, which could support 21 additional jobs in the local economy. 295 person years of employment which equates to 59 annual construction jobs over the course of the development assuming it will take 5 years to build out the site. The potential to provide apprenticeships and training opportunities with TWUK and its suppliers for residents in the local area which will help meet the Council's economic development aspirations.

The allocation of the entire and comprehensively designed site will support the creation of a strong, vibrant and healthy community by: Increasing the supply of housing of a type and tenure to help meet the needs of Sefton in a sustainable location. In particular, the scheme will deliver high quality family housing as well as affordable housing. Facilitating the delivery of much needed affordable housing to address local requirements. Adding to the overall quality of the area in the long term by creating an attractive place to live. Securing a high quality built environment which is accessible to local services; and supporting sustainable patterns of development and is accessible by sustainable modes of transport.

In accordance with the provision of the National Planning Policy Framework the supply of new homes can be best achieved by planning for larger scale development. The release of the site from the Green Belt and its allocation for housing is considered to be the most appropriate way to deliver a sustainable development to meet Formby's current and future housing needs.

The allocation of the entire site will not result in an unacceptable harm or loss to important natural, built or historic environmental assets. The Development Statement demonstrates that there are no environmental constraints to development and where required appropriate mitigation can be delivered at the site. The proposals will result in significant environmental benefits to Formby including: A unique opportunity to create a biodiversity asset on the northern portion of the site which could potentially form an extension to the adjoining Lancashire Wildlife Trust reserve. The potential to provide ecological mitigation at 'The Acres' for other more constrained sites in Formby which are allocated for development in the emerging Local Plan; and flood risk mitigation measures which reduce surface water flood risk on site and to existing properties in the surrounding area.

Summary of Suggested Changes

None suggested.

Evidence Submitted

- Appendix 1: Preferred Options Reps
- Appendix 2: Development Statement dated September 2013
- Appendix 3: Supplementary Information Letter dated January 2014
- Appendix 4: Flood Risk Assessment dated September 2013
- Appendix 5: Landscape Appraisal dated September 2013
- Appendix 6: Supplementary Information Letter dated May 2014
- Appendix 7: QC's Written Opinion
- Appendix 9: Flood Risk Statement dated November 2014

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.12	Other Documents
Policy MN2.12	Land north of Brackenway, Formby	
Respondent No 703	Response Ref 13	Representor Name Jackie Copley
Organisation Name CPRE Lancashire		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

We prefer to see SR4.11 serve its Green Belt purpose, and continue to afford ecological value as a Local Wildlife Site, but should the Council redesignate the site we recommend an enforceable planning condition relating to adequate mitigation. The proximity of the larger Local Wildlife Site nearby could support this biodiversity off-setting.

The site has a known flood risk and suffers noise due to the proximity of the Formby By-pass. There are known highways and accessibility constraints.

CPRE supports the officer view that the bridleway along the south side of the site would need to be improved to include provision for cyclists.

Site ref. AS06:

We are strongly opposed to the redesignation of this larger green belt site for residential development. We do not believe that the significant reduction in this Local Wildlife Site could be adequately mitigated. Were the site to be developed, and ecological survey would be required.

A significant proportion of the site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3; we believe that residential development of the eastern part of the site so affected would be contrary to paragraph 100 of the NPPF, especially taking into account the need to consider the long-term impact of climate change.

Access to the site would be very problematic. We regard the officer recommendation of a new signal controlled junction onto the Formby Bypass at less than 400 m from the Freshfield Roundabout would be an unacceptable impediment to the flow of traffic on the bypass. In our opinion, access would have to be via Deansgate Lane North, exacerbating the already existing difficulties at its junction with Southport Road (B5424).

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.12	Other Documents
Policy MN2.12	Land north of Brackenway, Formby	
Respondent No 716	Response Ref 18	Representor Name Robert Swift
Organisation Name Robert Swift and family		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Land north of Brackenway, Formby (Site MN2.12) is a designated local wildlife site and both the Sustainability Appraisal and Green Belt Study Assessment sets out that there will be an impact on the landscape and ecology, habitats and protected species on the site, particularly as the site is relatively open and not contained. There are also significant flooding risks associated with the eastern part of the site (surface flooding) and is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3.

The Council's Proforma identifies the site should only be considered if no other land is available and the benefits of the development of the site outweigh any negative impact in terms of the sequential test. We disagree with the inclusion of this site within the proposed allocations and consider the flood risk to be significant. There are also accessibility and access concerns associated with the site. The site should be discounted.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Site MN2.12- Land north of Brackenway, Formby - should not be allocated in policy MN2.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.12	Other Documents
Policy MN2.12	Land north of Brackenway, Formby	
Respondent No 740	Response Ref 18	Representor Name
Organisation Name Formby Residents Action Group		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

Detailed assessment of flood risk issues on this site [pages 91-93 of the rep]. We also wish to rely on the representation of Mr John Williams [Rep No. 1026] for flood risk issue on this site.

Assessment of the site in meeting the Green Belt purposes and its assessibility and sustainability impact [pages 117-119 of the rep]

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.12	Other Documents
Policy MN2.12	Land north of Brackenway, Formby	
Respondent No 741	Response Ref 11	Representor Name
Organisation Name Priory Asset Management LLP		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

Land north of Bracken Way, Formby (MN2.12) is allocated for housing within the Local Plan. The 13.7ha site is proposed to deliver 286 properties at a density of 20.9 dwellings per hectare.

The land is designated as a Site of Local Wildlife Interest. It is clear that in order to develop this site, a significant level of on-site mitigation, to accommodate and improve the wildlife habitat would be required. This would reduce the developable area considerably, and could be a considerable cost for the site. Despite the Site Assessment suggesting that the development could occur on site, the wider area is significantly constrained by risk of flooding, which could affect its ability to act as suitable area for ecological mitigation. Further assessment should be encouraged to explore whether this land is able to deliver the type of mitigation required.

The site has the potential to provide two access points. Both would be on to narrow roads, which may require widening. These are also very congested roads due to the existing school traffic in this location. It has not been demonstrated whether the roads could be widened without requiring third party land. The Local Authority have suggested an alternative potential access on to the bypass, in order to reduce congestion. However, a junction of this scale and size would be a considerable cost to the development and could reduce the sites ability to deliver other benefits such as affordable housing. This is in addition to mitigation for wildlife habitats referred to above.

The site has a 'significant' risk of flooding, with 12% of the site in Flood Zone 3 and a further 33% in Flood Zone 2. This has resulted in the site failing its sequential flood risk test.

This site has been allocated within the Local Plan when a number of other sites have been excluded purely on the basis of flood risk. In some circumstances this level of flood risk has then been downgraded as a result of the Environment Agency's re-modelling. All sites should be given an equal assessment and guidelines adhered to, and the inclusion of this site at this stage raises questions about whether other sites should be reconsidered as they may cause less harm to the Green Belt, or offer an opportunity for development.

The full parcel is assessed within the Green Belt Study, and concludes that a section of the site could be developed. This area identified of the site corresponds with the smaller site of 6.43ha assessed within the site selection assessments. These show that both sites would have a 'moderate' impact on three of the five purposes of the green belt.

The site has several serious constraints; the most concerning of these is the risk of flooding. The fact that a site which has failed a sequential test has been advanced to this stage of the Local Plan raises serious concerns about Sefton's approach to their site selection. In order for the allocations to be fully transparent it is suggested that a further assessment is undertaken to assess other sites whose flood risk has been reduced.

There are likely to be considerable abnormal costs associated with developing this site, and these have not been included within the viability section of the Site Assessment. The requirement for significant highway improvement works, ecological mitigation and flood risk improvements, as well as the need for a significant section of the development to be on piled foundations should trigger questions about the sites viability.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.12 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.12 **Land north of Brackenway, Formby**
Respondent No 774 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** A Hockey
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The report clearly states that climate change is a major issue for all local authorities and the Local Plan is directing development away from areas of flood risk. Yet one proposal is to build 286 houses on land north of Brackenway in Formby. I know the relevant protests have already been made to the Council but I suggest they log on to the Environment Agency website. It is still giving the same information. I hope full disclosure will be given to the 286 new homeowners who will find it either impossible or extremely costly to insure their homes.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.12 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.12 **Land north of Brackenway, Formby**
Respondent No 782 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Karen Stevens
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The road I live on is already a very busy road with a 20 mile an hour in force. If the development of houses goes ahead on the field at the back of Brackenway Road then traffic will become extremely congested as well as potentially dangerous leading to traffic accidents. Liverpool Road in Formby has always been a natural flood plain but appears to have been moved out of the flood plain when the plan was being proposed, how can this just not be shown. Sefton has on one side its coast line, but the water runs inland as lower than the coast line.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.12 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.12 **Land north of Brackenway, Formby**
Respondent No 792 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** PJ Morley
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to strongly object to the plan proposed by Sefton Council with particular reference to the land North of Brackenway (my neighbourhood). This is important countryside adjacent to nature reserves and sites of Special Scientific Interest resulting in: Visual beauty. This enhances the character of Formby and Ainsdale, a reason why many people choose to live here. Natural habitat for endangered species egg skylark, lapwing, bats and barn owls. A natural break or gap between Formby and Woodvale Airfield. Drainage for excess rainfall. I think it would be a disaster if this area were to be built on with particular reference to the presence of skylarks. These wonderful birds are rapidly disappearing from the UK.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am writing in order to make my views known on the Local Plan for Sefton and in particular the proposed development MN2.12 of 286 new houses. As you know, this was proposed as a site for development some eighteen months ago but this scheme met with such vehement opposition (with several thousand signatures from local residents opposing the plan) that the plans were shelved. It is distressing to see that not only have you tried to rekindle these plans by making them part of the larger scheme of development but also you propose an expansion upon the original scheme. Comments made at an earlier stage are not forwarded to the inspector and because of this you are able side-step the original protests and brush residents concerns under the carpet. I find this to be done in poor faith. The plan as it stands will turn some roads around the development into major thoroughfares and cause considerable problems outside the local primary school St Peter's on Paradise Lane. The drainage in that area is poor and I would argue that you are in fact not moving development away from areas of flood risk at all but increasing the risk of flooding for all in the area. The land is green belt land and you claim that a loss of 4.4% of green belt is necessary to meet needs and make the plan sound and yet you also claim that there over 5822 empty homes in Sefton.

It is clearly unsound management to meet demand by simply abandoning homes that you cannot fill in order to eat into the green belt for new development. Your claims to be concerned for climate change and for 11,000 affordable new homes become absurd when there are over half that number of properties that are already in existence that you have simply failed to manage or maintain.

I believe that this terrible contradiction at the heart of this plan makes your claim that "the policies in the plan protect the environment" seem to be at best empty. I oppose the development at MN2.12 in the strongest possible terms and urge the inspector to ask why the recycling of empty houses is not at the very heart of your proposal.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Policy MN2.12

Land north of Brackenway, Formby

Respondent No 888

Response Ref 1

Representor Name HL Moore

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The area MN2.12 on the Local Plan Policy Map ear marked for future housing no doubt will be accessed via Paradise lane when the stables there are pulled down this will lead to an increase in traffic along paradise lane to get to the bypass and into Formby At present Paradise lane gets gridlocked at school time also with problems of people parking across drive ways so more housing built in this area will only compound this problem

As the council have closed down Holy Trinity School and amalgamated it with St Peters this will mean more parents wanting their children to go to St Peters from other parts of Formby's new housing schemes increasing the traffic problem even more for the residents of Paradise Lane.

When we moved here 30 years ago and put an extension on our house the building inspector told us that the surface water could not be run into the drains we had to use a soak away because the sewage pipes for the area were under capacity and could not take the load

We have a flood at the entrance to our property every time it rains heavy or there is continues rain fall for hours on end due to the rain not being able to run away down the grids into the sewers. I notice that there are lots of flooded areas around other roads in the area also during the same weather conditions due to the back up in the sewage system This will only get worse with more housing being built all the extra toilets, showers, baths wash basins & washing machines that will disposed of their waste into the system

This will only help create even more flooding due to backups in the system all over Formby when we have continuous or heavy rain falls which we are told is happening more often with Global Warming!

I don't think most sensible Formby residents will deny that there is need for some additional housing but not to the extent of the numbers quoted in Sefton Council Executive Report and provided they are built in the right locations and the infrastructure in the area is up graded to cope with any additional demand to prevent flooding, traffic congestion etc

These should be built on Brown Belt land not Green Belt as there is suppose to be so much open green space per head of population which I believe Formby is lacking in already due to the houses that have been built here over the past 30 years

The plan is to allow for 30% affordable housing this I think is to low there is no mention of Flats we need more 1 & 2 bedroom flats for the youngsters who were born and bred in Formby who want to stay in the area but can't get onto the housing ladder to get them started due to the sky high prises being asked

More Flats also for Pensioners who want to down size and stay in the area which then will releases there house's back on the market for the younger buyers as they move up the housing chain. also agree with the 18 bullet points on the Save Our Sefton Petition sheet.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.12	Other Documents
Policy MN2.12	Land north of Brackenway, Formby	
Respondent No 889	Response Ref 3	Representor Name P Gwyther
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

These sites are subject to severe flooding. They are also home to between 50/60 horses, it is a livery stables. To lose this facility would be a huge loss of amenity to Formby residents, both young and not so young, who own and love their horses, have stabled them here for many, many years. It would also mean a loss of income to the producers and suppliers. Farriers, vets, saddlery establishments would suffer a loss of earning too. Employees at the stables may lose their jobs. Where would the owners of so many horses find new livery and riding out facilities in this area?

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Extract from Formby Labour website re Parking/Driving outside schools
Extract from Formby Labour website and Formby Champion [1/6/2012] re congestion in Formby
Extract from Southport Visitor re Flooding in Formby [14/2/2014]

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.12	Other Documents
Policy MN2.12	Land north of Brackenway, Formby	
Respondent No 891	Response Ref 1	Representor Name H Lee
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to object to the proposed plans for Affordable Housing in Sefton with particular reference to the site north of the Brackenway area of Formby and to the east of Bowlers Riding School. This land is a critical drainage area and ducks have been observed swimming across the fields at various times of year including the summer.

This site currently hosts a leisure centre in the form of a DIY livery stable yard which provides stabling, grazing and facilities for about 60 individually privately owned horses. In a safe and healthy environment, children and teenagers are disciplined and committed in the care of their horses and learn responsibility from an early age. Finding alternative stabling for this amount of horses in the Formby area would be impossible.

For those people who are lucky enough to find stabling in the Formby area, access to the bridleways and safe hacking would involve crossing the extremely busy Formby bypass on horseback. If this were any other type of leisure centre such as a football club, a cricket club or a golf club, it is unlikely that it would be used for development, however, it is a leisure centre and so should remain as one. Any company that develops on this land should be obliged from an ethical perspective to make alternative provisions for a comparative leisure facility.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.12 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.12 **Land north of Brackenway, Formby**
Respondent No 1003 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** R Rodriguez
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am hugely against development on the Greenbelt and development, especially on the site North of Brackenway (site SR4.11, currently an equestrian centre / horse livery yard) would encourage urban sprawl in addition to causing the loss of an abundance of wildlife. This area is also a flood plain. In my opinion the local plan should be adopting a Brownfield first policy. The horse riding/ horse livery yard I have mentioned above provides stabling, grazing and facilities for many privately owned horses. If this were any other type of leisure centre such as a cricket, rugby, golf or football club it would be very unlikely to be used for development. Development here would cause the loss of an amenity and a lot of people would be affected. I feel that anyone responsible for developing on this land should make provisions for a comparable facility for all those affected.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.12 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.12 **Land north of Brackenway, Formby**
Respondent No 1009 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Alison Doran
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Any development to the area north of Brackenway would certainly cause devastation to a plethora of wildlife including natterjack toads, swallows and bats. Development here would create further implications caused by the loss of an amenity as this land currently hosts an equestrian centre which provides enjoyment to many people and where children are occupied in a safe and healthy environment at the same time as being taught responsibility and discipline. If this facility were to cease to exist provisions would need to be made to provide alternative stabling in Formby for approximately sixty privately owned horses. The area north of Brackenway is also a critical drainage site and development here will most certainly have a negative impact on other properties in the area.

I am also deeply concerned about worsening our traffic congestion problem. During peak times Paradise Lane, around St Peters School is practically at a stand still I feel that more homes in this area will intensify this problem and may even endanger the children who attend here. Furthermore, I am not happy about the prospect of another exit off the Formby by-pass as I feel that this will also increase the risk of traffic accidents; bear in mind the closure of the Watchyard Lane exit (between the Southport Road and Altcar Road exits) for motorists turning right in to Formby due to the high level of incidents, also the high level of incidents (including fatalities) at the Hightown exit.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.12 Land north of Brackenway, Formby

Respondent No 1026 Response Ref 3 Representor Name John Williams

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

These sites flood. They flood to such an extent that certain properties in Hawksworth Drive (immediately adjacent to the site) have flooded three times in the thirteen year period of 2000 to 2012, from the water in Eight Acre/Sixteen Acre Lane Ditch. The problem for Sefton is that in protecting the properties in the new development, it will put the existing adjacent properties at greater risk of flooding. Raising land levels only pushes water aside from its natural flow through the ground and prevents the land draining in the way it has done for hundreds of years. Storing water on the site removes the existing storage facility within the ground

You may be interested to see photographs of this site [provided].

You will notice that this ground is not just “saturated” but really “flooded” – should you wish to dispute this fact, there are several residents of Hawksworth Drive who will happily (or very unhappily) explain to you that this water has entered their houses and caused significant damage, and at considerable cost. This flooding has not been caused by some 1 in 1000 year massive storm, but happens on a regular basis. Once the flooding reaches a certain level, it starts to enter low lying adjacent properties. The last time internal property flooding occurred was during a 1 in 30 year storm in 2012, but two flooding incidents in 2000 and the mid 2000s were at even more frequent storm return periods. This is not acceptable. So far, the combined might of Sefton Council, the Environment Agency and the Water Company (United Utilities) along with the adjacent riparian owner have failed to solve this problem. The solution to the flooding in this location is not within the site at all, but external to the site. No matter how much level changing is proposed (raising and lowering), of diverting water on a longer route to the same outfall (as has been proposed) the water is not going to go away for this site unless the cause of the flooding problem is solved.

The Planning Department has been in negotiation with a developer for this site since 2012. So far, it appears that no real appreciation of the flooding problems existing adjacent owners has been demonstrated. The only preventative measure suggested and apparently agreed by the Planning Department, is to install a non-return on the surface water outlets from Hawksworth Drive/Brackenway etc. All that will do is close when the water in Eight Acre/Sixteen Acre lane ditch rises above the non-return valve, thus preventing the existing estate from discharging at all (see photo at the industrial estate proposed site to see the effects of a closed non-return valve. Installing a non-return valve is only “half a job” – the other half is to install a pump (see photo of the development site south of Tesco to see why a pump is required), unfortunately installing a pump is against Environment Agency policy and neither Sefton Council or United Utilities would want to adopt a pump either.

Sefton Council have emailed a resident of Hawksworth Drive telling them that the properties in the new development will be built so that they will not flood until a 1 in 1000 year storm (judging by the photographs of the site, that is more than a little over optimistic) but then they have said the development will not make the flooding of existing properties “any worse”. This is surely a shameful and abhorrently immoral statement to tell a resident that they are likely to flood 3 times in the next thirteen years (no worse than at present) when Sefton Council should be protecting its current residents rather than promoting new developments. As there are no proposals to improve the capacity of the watercourses and culverts in the vicinity and enable a free discharge into Downholland Brook, the development of this flooded site WILL cause additional problems to the residents of Hawksworth Drive. (copy of emails can be provided upon request).

It is obvious that the scale of accommodation works proposed by the developer who has already been in negotiation with Sefton’s Planning Department since 2012 (this includes raising and lowering areas of the site, installing ponds and creating natural areas and setting up a method of funding the maintenance of the site etc.) will simply mean that there will be no affordable housing built on this site at all. It should be made clear that the requirement in Formby is for affordable housing for people who have grown up in Formby, people who work in Formby (mostly in retail) and people who have lived in Formby and are now retired and need suitable accommodation to retire into. Shared ownership properties and ones with high annual maintenance charges are not at all suitable for the categories of people listed above.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Photographs of site

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.12 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.12 **Land north of Brackenway, Formby**
Respondent No 1037 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Marilyn Griffiths
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Comment

Summary of Main Issues

The junction of Paradise Lane and WrigleysLane is already hazardous added to this the congestion at the school makes the site access for the vehicles from 286 houses a non starter. Brackenway already adjoins Paradise lane with Deansgate Lane. AS06 - As this part of the site proposes a new junction to the bypass access via Paradise lane at SR411 seems redundant.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.13 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.13 **Land at West Lane, Formby**
Respondent No 33 **Response Ref** 4 **Representor Name** Maureen Costello
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I'd also like to object the building proposed on the land owned by Clarence House ,once again on the grounds of life becoming unbearable due to traffic .

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.13

Land at West Lane, Formby

Respondent No 173

Response Ref 1

Representor Name MR Duty

Organisation Name**Obj/Sup/Com** Objection**Summary of Main Issues**

This letter express my views relating to the proposed development known as Sefon Local Plan. In particular, it refers to the proposed housing development in Formby and is centred principally around the specific area to the north of Brewery Lane. Whilst fully supporting the campaign which opposes any building on land currently designated Green Belt, the reasons listed focus on problems which are specific to the Brewery Lane site.

Principal objections to the development are: Infrastructure, lack of future places in local schools , danger of the proximity of the main runway of Royal Air Force Woodvale, local drainage. These points are explained below in greater detail.

The current infrastructure in the surrounding area will not support the development of 200 plus homes. There are only two access roads to the proposed development. The first is along Deansgate Lane North. This road is already close to capacity during peak times, and is full of cars parked along it. Access to Southport Road from Deansgate Lane is already a problem, especially in the morning rush hour, as the school crossing patrol at this busy junction has to cope with heavy traffic along Southport Road, and traffic leaving deansgate Lane. This leads to a very hazardous crossing for children attending both Freshfield and Trinity St Peters Primary Schools. Traffic is compounded at this time as the main local bus stops are also used by school buses to Range High and Merchant Taylore schools.

The other route is along Paradise Lane, which suffers the same traffic flow as above but is also a through route to other parts of Formby such as Victoria Road or the Harrington Road estate. The traffic already has to go past the very busy Trinity ST Peter's School with the influx of parental cars at 8:30 and 3pm making it virtually impassable.

Mention of the above two schools also highlights the problems of infrastructure, as both schools are full to capacity. Trinity St Peter's school was formed recently from the amalgamation of Holy Trinity with St Peter's which has led to the school moving to a two form entry school of over 200 pupils. The site of Holy Trinity is land earmarked for housing development but figures from the Department of Education show that nationally some half million children are currently approaching school age. Formby will obviously be part of this surge, albeit on a smaller scale. Therefore, rather than using the land on Holy Trinity for housing, it is more likely that the school will need to reopen as all the other schools are full.

Perhaps the most significant, but possibly overlooked factor opposing the development of the Brewery Lane sight is its proximity to the main runway of RAF Woodvale. The main south westerly runway, faces the prevailing wind and is thus the most used of Woodvale's three runways. It is used mainly for aircraft taking off into the prevailing wind. Aircraft taking off on this runway would be very close to the proposed site, making the idea very dangerous.

The last objection is probably the most reported, as the site forms part of the local flood plain. The land adjacent to Brewery Lane and Hawkesworth Drive is drained by a series of deep ditches flowing inland. The ditches converge into a storm drain at the eastern end of Hawkesworth Drive, which carries the water under the main A565 road. In periods of heavy rain, this storm drain often floods and the houses at this end of Hawkesworth Drive are frequently at risk of flooding. The Environment Agency has, on many occasions, needed to clear flood water from the road and house gardens, they also regularly need to clear the storm drain to avoid it flooding the A565, the principal link road between Southport and Liverpool.

I hope that the points raised in this piece will help to inform an impartial view of the proposed Sefton Plan. The objections are on the grounds of flooding and safety. It shows that the existing infrastructure cannot support the development of any new homes on land adjacent to Brewery Lane.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Policy MN2.13

Land at West Lane, Formby

Respondent No 217

Response Ref 1

Representor Name Mel Duty

Organisation Name**Obj/Sup/Com** Objection**Summary of Main Issues**

This letter express my views relating to the proposed development known as Sefon Local Plan. In particular, it refers to the proposed housing development in Formby and is centred principally around the specific area to the north of Brewery Lane. Whilst fully supporting the campaign which opposes any building on land currently designated Green Belt, the reasons listed focus on problems which are specific to the Brewery Lane site.

Principal objections to the development are: Infrastructure, lack of future places in local schools , danger of the proximity of the main runway of Royal Air Force Woodvale, local drainage. These points are explained below in greater detail.

The current infrastructure in the surrounding area will not support the development of 200 plus homes. There are only two access roads to the proposed development. The first is along Deansgate Lane North. This road is already close to capacity during peak times, and is full of cars parked along it. Access to Southport Road from Deansgate Lane is already a problem, especially in the morning rush hour, as the school crossing patrol at this busy junction has to cope with heavy traffic along Southport Road, and traffic leaving deansgate Lane. This leads to a very hazardous crossing for children attending both Freshfield and Trinity St Peters Primary Schools. Traffic is compounded at this time as the main local bus stops are also used by school buses to Range High and Merchant Taylore schools.

The other route is along Paradise Lane, which suffers the same traffic flow as above but is also a through route to other parts of Formby such as Victoria Road or the Harrington Road estate. The traffic already has to go past the very busy Trinity ST Peter's School with the influx of parental cars at 8:30 and 3pm making it virtually impassable.

Mention of the above two schools also highlights the problems of infrastructure, as both schools are full to capacity. Trinity St Peter's school was formed recently from the amalgamation of Holy Trinity with St Peter's which has led to the school moving to a two form entry school of over 200 pupils. The site of Holy Trinity is land earmarked for housing development but figures from the Department of Education show that nationally some half million children are currently approaching school age. Formby will obviously be part of this surge, albeit on a smaller scale. Therefore, rather than using the land on Holy Trinity for housing, it is more likely that the school will need to reopen as all the other schools are full.

Perhaps the most significant, but possibly overlooked factor opposing the development of the Brewery Lane sight is its proximity to the main runway of RAF Woodvale. The main south westerly runway, faces the prevailing wind and is thus the most used of Woodvale's three runways. It is used mainly for aircraft taking off into the prevailing wind. Aircraft taking off on this runway would be very close to the proposed site, making the idea very dangerous.

The last objection is probably the most reported, as the site forms part of the local flood plain. The land adjacent to Brewery Lane and Hawkesworth Drive is drained by a series of deep ditches flowing inland. The ditches converge into a storm drain at the eastern end of Hawkesworth Drive, which carries the water under the main A565 road. In periods of heavy rain, this storm drain often floods and the houses at this end of Hawkesworth Drive are frequently at risk of flooding. The Environment Agency has, on many occasions, needed to clear flood water from the road and house gardens, they also regularly need to clear the storm drain to avoid it flooding the A565, the principal link road between Southport and Liverpool.

I hope that the points raised in this piece will help to inform an impartial view of the proposed Sefton Plan. The objections are on the grounds of flooding and safety. It shows that the existing infrastructure cannot support the development of any new homes on land adjacent to Brewery Lane.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.13 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.13 **Land at West Lane, Formby**
Respondent No 241 **Response Ref** 12 **Representor Name** Claire Jenkins
Organisation Name Formby Parish Council
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Duty to Consult:

[Affordable housing]:

Any new properties must be affordable in the full sense of the word, they must be well built, well designed and fuel efficient. A more detailed study of MN2.12 and MN 2.13 must be carried out as insufficient investigation has been made to determine the full impact of them on resources. (Can that be sufficient in Sefton when it has been established by the assessment by Keppie Massie, a Liverpool based Consultant, that unless a developer can make a profit of 15%, affordable housing may not be provided?)

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.13 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.13 **Land at West Lane, Formby**
Respondent No 307 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Edmond Samuel / Elsie Lowe
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Against development (land at West Lane, Formby). Increased traffic volume onto Southport Road, Formby.

Primarily we object to any development on "Green Belt or agricultural land" (however we are in favour of "brownfield sites" where suitable). Furthermore we consider that existing flooding, seage traffic and amenity problems in Formby will be overwhelmed under this ill-considered plan.

With regard to traffic in and out of Formby, the three existing routes are always busy, at full stretch during peak hours and seasonal weekends. With the additional burden of cars from the proposed development properties, the situation would become impossible.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Primarily we object to any development on "Green Belt or agricultural land" (however we are in favour of "brownfield sites" where suitable). Furthermore we consider that existing flooding, seage traffic and amenity problems in Formby will be overwhelmed under this ill-considered plan.

With regard to traffic in and out of Formby, the three existing routes are always busy, at full stretch during peak hours and seasonal weekends. With the additional burden of cars from the proposed development properties, the situation would become impossible.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.13 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.13 **Land at West Lane, Formby**
Respondent No 546 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Linda Speck
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We object to the increased traffic activity to the back of our property and to the entrance of the close. We also are concerned as to how far the new homes will penetrate to the boundary and how much this will encroach on the back of our house and near to the trees at the boundaries.

The specific plan we are concerned with is MN2.13 West Lane as we are at the back of this land. We are anxious to know what the approximate number of houses are going to be built there and how this will impact on the peaceful, green belt area that we have here especially as we live in a close and Brewery Lane is a narrow road which has a cul-de-sac at the end. You have two stables farming the area and a very high level of horses being rode which can further add to traffic chaos.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.13 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.13 **Land at West Lane, Formby**
Respondent No 703 **Response Ref** 14 **Representor Name** Jackie Copley
Organisation Name CPRE Lancashire
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Objection

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.13 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.13 **Land at West Lane, Formby**
Respondent No 716 **Response Ref** 50 **Representor Name** Robert Swift
Organisation Name Robert Swift and family
Obj/Sup/Com Support

Summary of Main Issues

Land at West Lane, Formby (MN2.13) - the site has an indicative capacity of fewer than 50 dwellings. We agree with the Council's indicative capacity on this site.

Summary of Suggested Changes

None requested

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.13	Other Documents
Policy MN2.13	Land at West Lane, Formby	
Respondent No 740	Response Ref 19	Representor Name
Organisation Name Formby Residents Action Group		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

Assessment of flood risk issues on this site [page 94 of the rep].

We also wish to rely on the representation of Mr John Williams [Rep No. 1026] for flood risk issue on this site.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.13	Other Documents
Policy MN2.13	Land at West Lane, Formby	
Respondent No 895	Response Ref 7	Representor Name Yvonne Irving
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

Brackenway is in the Green Belt and also a Local wildlife site. It is in a flood plain and has no easy access for the 268 houses it will hold. There will have to be an access road onto the busy A565 which carries traffic constantly all day. At weekends the traffic is bumper to bumper and another road onto it will create enormous problems and hold ups. West Lane is adjacent to Brackenway and has the same problems.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.13	Other Documents
Policy MN2.13	Land at West Lane, Formby	
Respondent No 1026	Response Ref 4	Representor Name John Williams
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

This site should be treated with great care as it is at the upstream end of watercourses that already cause flooding to existing properties. This site has several problems relating to development:- The ground itself is frequently saturated to a very high level due to its very close proximity to existing watercourses. There are already flooding problems in adjacent roads caused by the highway drains being unable to discharge freely to the existing watercourses. Any development within this site will take away the natural storage that is within the ground and is therefore likely to cause additional land drainage (flooding) problems to existing adjacent properties. The site is within 250m of a potential source of flooding, and a current real world flooding problem, so may have difficulty getting flood insurance. It would therefore be deemed as logical that this site should be discounted on grounds of NPPF Ch10 Para.100

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.13 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.13 **Land at West Lane, Formby**
Respondent No 1037 **Response Ref** 3 **Representor Name** Marilyn Griffiths
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Comment

Summary of Main Issues

Retention of protected tress only proviso

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.14 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.14 **Former Holy Trinity School, Lonsdale Road, Formby**
Respondent No 31 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Roger Pontefract
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

This site has been identified in the Local Plan for housing. I believe it is in Council ownership and appears to be ideally located for older citizens' accommodation i.e. proximity to shops,leisure facilities, GP surgeries,luncheon club etc. Surely this site should therefore be reserved to help meet the needs of an ageing population as identified since, once they are lost to other forms of housing (or other) development, the opportunity is lost for at least a generation.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Identify this site specifically for older people's homes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.14 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.14 **Former Holy Trinity School, Lonsdale Road, Formby**
Respondent No 52 **Response Ref** 10 **Representor Name** Ian Cowell
Organisation Name Ince Blundell Parish Council
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Though not part of the Township of Formby, Ince Blundell is part of Ravenmeols Ward which also covers Formby. Moreover, the residents of Ince Blundell use the facilities of Formby for shopping doctors, dentist etc. As a consequence the Parish Council feels it appropriate to make some observations on the proposal to build 999 houses in Formby. For it is evident to the Council, that if 999 houses are to be built in Formby there will be a requirement for schools. The Council is, therefore, amazed and disappointed to learn that MN2.14 Former Holy Trinity School, Lonsdale Road, Formby, is to be designated as a site on which to build 50 houses. The NPPF paragraph 7.4 states "Existing open space, sports and recreation and land, including playing fields, should not be built on: unless an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, building of land to be surplus to requirements, or the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity or quality in a suitable location or the development is for alternative sports and recreation provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss. The Parish Council contends that both these sites will be needed in future to cater for the children from the houses that are to be built in Formby. Moreover, if both these sites are to be sacrificed to development, then more land will be needed (not so far designated) to provide sites for new schools for the children living in the new housing estates. Furthermore, Formby schools do not just cater for children from Formby but also cater for children from Hightown who are bussed to schools in Formby on a daily basis. Despite there being no schools in Hightown it is noteworthy that under the Local Plan a further 130 houses are to developed in Hightown Village.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.14	Other Documents
Policy MN2.14	Former Holy Trinity School, Lonsdale Road, Formby	
Respondent No 208	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Ian Cowell
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I drafted with the agreement and support of Tim Asbury, Chairman of Hightown Parish Council, which after vetting, Tim signed and delivered to Sefton Planning a submission on behalf of Hightown Parish Council in response to Sefton's Local Plan. In essence Sefton have designated two sites at the rear of Elmcroft Lane for the development of 130 houses. As part of that submission Hightown Council expressed concern at the proposed residential development of Holy Trinity School (MN 2.14 – 50 houses) and the Former Ravenmeols School (currently use as the Formby Professional development centre MN2.15 – 15 houses). You may not be aware that because of the lack of a primary schools in Hightown (the land designated at Alton Close for the purpose of a Primary School in Hightown has now been developed for housing) the majority of our children are bussed to Formby schools for their education. According to the Infrastructure Development Plan "the number of primary school places required for 100 new homes equates to 17.5. The number of homes proposed in Formby is likely to require a 0.5 form entry". The Plan continues: "Redgate Primary has been reduced to a single form intake school, whilst the accommodation is currently occupied by community uses, there may be the scope to reinstate the capacity to make it a 1.5. form entry if required. The number of homes in Hightown is likely to generate a small increase in primary school pupils who will be able to access places in Formby schools." On the basis that Formby is to have 999 homes and Hightown 130 homes = $1129 \times 17.5 = 197$ primary school children! I am told by primary school teachers there should not be more than 30 children in a class (though on occasion it has risen to 33) so the rationale behind these figures does not just add up and it is evident the school sites mentioned above will be needed for educational purposes or more land will need to be made available for the development of a school.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove site MN2.14 from the plan or provide a new site for a school.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.14	Other Documents
Policy MN2.14	Former Holy Trinity School, Lonsdale Road, Formby	
Respondent No 289	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Alan & Barbara Hodges
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

There are no plans for extra infrastructure. The development on the former Holy Trinity school in Lonsdale Road will take this provision for primary education out of the equation. There is no provision for increased parking near the village shops which will act as a deterrent. Does the community want more retail units across the Bypass?

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove the site MN2.14 as a housing allocation.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.14	Other Documents
Policy MN2.14	Former Holy Trinity School, Lonsdale Road, Formby	
Respondent No 354	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Ngaio Bell
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I am writing to protest against the "Local Plan" for Formby. I have lived here for more than 48 years and have watched the lovely green spaces, that are part of our community, being eroded. Our roads are more congested already, our Doctors and Dentists and Clinic struggle with the amount of patients, and to get an appointment on the same day is almost impossible. Our Schools are full, and yet you are proposing to remove Holy Trinity an Ravenmeols for more houses. I do not know about Holy Trinity, but Ravenmeols is well subscribed. The Council is making many cut-backs, due to financial restrictions, so where will the money come from to make provision for the occupants of these new homes.

Formby is surrounded by lovely countryside, so what will happen to these beautiful areas? What will happen to the farming and wild life?

There is plenty of houses already for sale in Formby, the only housing that is really needed is starter homes, to get on the home owning ladder. Many of my friends have children who wish to live in Formby, near to them, but there are no inexpensive properties.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove MN2.14 and MN2.15 as allocations.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.14	Other Documents
Policy MN2.14	Former Holy Trinity School, Lonsdale Road, Formby	
Respondent No 359	Response Ref 7	Representor Name Catherine Fraser
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Formby has only 700 parking places and building over a 1000 houses is going to make parking impossible. Like most retail centres Formby is under considerable pressure from structural change. Site MN2.14 which is adjacent to the furnness avenue car park should have been used to provide some additional parking. The recent PWC survey highlights the importance of parking spaces to the High Street. Sefton have failed to produce an effective neighbourhood plan for Formby. Many people think that Sefton have given up on Formby as a retail centre and more out of town retail will kill it off completely. Under the Local Plan Formby should be promoted as the focus of the community.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove site as an allocation.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.14	Other Documents
Policy MN2.14	Former Holy Trinity School, Lonsdale Road, Formby	
Respondent No 725	Response Ref 8	Representor Name Paul Daly
Organisation Name Sport England		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

Paragraph 74 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Sport England's playing field policy seek to protect playing fields (and other land and buildings used for sport) from development unless specific criteria are met. In brief, Sport England would oppose the allocation of any site that would result in the loss or redevelopment of existing buildings and/or land used for sport unless it could be demonstrated that they are genuinely surplus to requirements or they would be replaced to an equivalent quantity and quality in a suitable location in line with the requirements of paragraph 74 of the NPPF and Sport England's planning policy objectives.

In the case of playing fields, Sport England would look to an up to date, robust playing pitch strategy to demonstrate that a specific site was not required to meet current and future needs. Whilst it is positive that Sefton has commenced production of a playing pitch strategy, the findings of the assessment and the strategy for addressing the issues it identifies have not yet been produced. It is therefore premature to assume that sites last used for sport will not be required to meet current or future need. The fact that a playing field or sports facility is not in current use is not a demonstration that the site is genuinely surplus to requirements. If this was the case, any landowner that wanted to develop a sports facility for a different use would simply have to stop people from using the facility to bypass the protection offered by planning policy.

In the case of sites with other types of sports facilities, Sport England would expect an assessment that complies with our guidance ('Assessing needs and opportunities guide for indoor and outdoor sports facilities - How to undertake and apply needs assessments for sports facilities') to demonstrate that they were surplus to requirement. The said guidance was produced to support paragraphs 73 and 74 of the NPPF and is referenced by National Planning Practice Guidance.

No evidence has been provided that any of the proposed allocations above meet any of the exceptions set out in Sport England's playing field policy, or those set out in paragraph 74 of the NPPF, Sport England therefore opposes the allocation of the sites. The loss of the sites is not justified by evidence to showing them to be surplus to requirements, and is therefore considered contrary to paragraph 74 of the NPPF. It is also considered contrary to the objectives of proposed policy NH5 of the Local Plan which seeks to protect playing fields.

Summary of Suggested Changes

The site should be deleted as an allocation. The alternative is to make clear that if the playing pitch strategy does not identify the playing fields to be surplus to requirements based on current and future need that the playing fields would need to be replaced. However, given the number of sites and area covered, there would be no certainty that such land would be available to allow for replacement provision.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.14	Other Documents
Policy MN2.14	Former Holy Trinity School, Lonsdale Road, Formby	
Respondent No 740	Response Ref 20	Representor Name
Organisation Name Formby Residents Action Group		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

Assessment of flood risk issues on this site [page 95 of the rep].

We also wish to rely on the representation of Mr John Williams [Rep No. 1026] for flood risk issue on this site.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.14	Other Documents
Policy MN2.14	Former Holy Trinity School, Lonsdale Road, Formby	
Respondent No 741	Response Ref 19	Representor Name
Organisation Name Priory Asset Management LLP		
Obj/Sup/Com	Comment	

Summary of Main Issues

Several former school sites anticipate a higher density than the market may wish to deliver. The former Holy Trinity School in Formby site allows for over 40dph, which is extremely dense and potentially unrealistic.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.14	Other Documents
Policy MN2.14	Former Holy Trinity School, Lonsdale Road, Formby	
Respondent No 895	Response Ref 7	Representor Name Yvonne Irving
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

This site is allocated for far too many houses. It is within the village of Formby and is intrusive right next to the village setting. Access is a real problem and the loss of this green field site is regrettable.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.14	Other Documents
Policy MN2.14	Former Holy Trinity School, Lonsdale Road, Formby	
Respondent No 1026	Response Ref 5	Representor Name John Williams
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

This site has several problems relating to development:- The ground itself is frequently saturated to a very high level due to its very close proximity to the major watercourse Dobbs Gutter. There are already flooding problems in Lonsdale Road and Rosemary Lane related to a watercourse that runs through from Rosemary Lane to Lonsdale Road and to Dobbs Gutter. There are already flooding problems in Halsall Lane, again caused by a backup from Dobbs Gutter. Any development within this site will take away the natural storage that is within the ground and is therefore likely to cause additional land drainage (flooding) problems to existing adjacent properties. The site is within 250m of a potential source of flooding, and a current real world flooding problem, so may have difficulty getting flood insurance. It would therefore be deemed as logical that this site should be discounted on grounds of NPPF Ch10 Para.100

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.14 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.14 **Former Holy Trinity School, Lonsdale Road, Formby**
Respondent No 1037 **Response Ref** 4 **Representor Name** Marilyn Griffiths
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Comment

Summary of Main Issues

Any part of Liverpool Road affording access to this site would pose dangers, particularly turning right as traffic comes past off the bypass and hardly slows even for the bend. 300 plus properties could have in excess of 400 vehicles and as this is a commuter town will be heading to and from the bypass or trying to turn right in the stations at which site parking's already oversubscribed. The Bypass was built to take congestion and pollution away from the small and already congested town, this is a retrograde step, 15000 registered vehicles in Formby and 1000 parking spaces.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.15 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.15 **Formby Professional Development Centre, Park Road, Formby**
Respondent No 17 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Marc Bourhill
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The development on Windsor Road (Professional Development Centre) will take away the only bit of greens space around the Park Road estate and is unnecessary.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.15 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.15 **Formby Professional Development Centre, Park Road, Formby**
Respondent No 31 **Response Ref** 3 **Representor Name** Roger Pontefract
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

This site has been identified in the Local Plan for housing. I believe it is in Council ownership and appears to be ideally located for older citizens' accommodation i.e. proximity to shops,leisure facilities, GP surgeries,luncheon club etc. Surely this site should therefore be reserved to help meet the needs of an ageing population as identified since, once they are lost to other forms of housing (or other) development, the opportunity is lost for at least a generation.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Identify this site specifically for older people's homes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.15	Other Documents
Policy MN2.15	Formby Professional Development Centre, Park Road, Formby	
Respondent No 52	Response Ref 11	Representor Name Ian Cowell
Organisation Name Ince Blundell Parish Council		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

Though not part of the Township of Formby, Ince Blundell is part of Ravenmeols Ward which also covers Formby. Moreover, the residents of Ince Blundell use the facilities of Formby for shopping doctors, dentist etc. As a consequence the Parish Council feels it appropriate to make some observations on the proposal to build 999 houses in Formby. For it is evident to the Council, that if 999 houses are to be built in Formby there will be a requirement for schools. The Council is, therefore, amazed and disappointed to learn that MN2.14 Former Holy Trinity School, Lonsdale Road, Formby, is to be designated as a site on which to build 50 houses. The NPPF paragraph 7.4 states "Existing open space, sports and recreation and land, including playing fields, should not be built on: unless an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, building of land to be surplus to requirements, or the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity or quality in a suitable location or the development is for alternative sports and recreation provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss. The Parish Council contends that both these sites will be needed in future to cater for the children from the houses that are to be built in Formby. Moreover, if both these sites are to be sacrificed to development, then more land will be needed (not so far designated) to provide sites for new schools for the children living in the new housing estates. Furthermore, Formby schools do not just cater for children from Formby but also cater for children from Hightown who are bussed to schools in Formby on a daily basis. Despite there being no schools in Hightown it is noteworthy that under the Local Plan a further 130 houses are to developed in Hightown Village.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.15	Other Documents
Policy MN2.15	Formby Professional Development Centre, Park Road, Formby	
Respondent No 66	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Amanda Mercer
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed development of the Community Centre, Park Rd, Formby. The land surrounding the community centre is only large remaining green area on the Park Rd estate and is used by the local children for football and playing out in the woods like young children should be able to do. Local dog owners exercise their dogs on the green and in the woodland which is full of wildlife and flowers. It is also an important area for local wildlife. I regularly see/hear a variety of tits and finches and a plethora of other bird species in the woodland area. It is also home to hedgehogs and used by the red squirrels who chirp at me from the trees if I should happen to disturb them while walking the dog. The green and woodland are part of the old primary school that is now a community centre that is used by a variety of clubs including the fencing club and the Red Cross Society. If the area is redeveloped I pray that the woodland can be kept intact and a large green area preserved for the use of the local children and dog walkers, rather than houses squeezed together with no thought of how the loss of this valuable green space will lower the quality of life for the children who live near by.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter General **Plan Order** Site MN2.15 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.15 **Formby Professional Development Centre, Park Road, Formby**
Respondent No 740 **Response Ref** 21 **Representor Name**
Organisation Name Formby Residents Action Group
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Assessment of flood risk issues on this site [page 96 of the rep].

We also wish to rely on the representation of Mr John Williams [Rep No. 1026] for flood risk issue on this site.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.15 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.15 **Formby Professional Development Centre, Park Road, Formby**
Respondent No 895 **Response Ref** 9 **Representor Name** Yvonne Irving
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Unnecessary loss of a valuable centre that is used by many local groups. No such similar centre is nearby. The site is also a local green field site that hosts a number of very beautiful mature trees.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.15 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.15 **Formby Professional Development Centre, Park Road, Formby**
Respondent No 1026 **Response Ref** 6 **Representor Name** John Williams
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

This site has several problems relating to development:- The ground itself is frequently saturated to a very high level due to its very close proximity to the watercourses in Ravenmeols Lane, the Park Rd estate and the trackside drain of the railway line. There are already flooding problems in Park Road related to a watercourse that runs along the side of the railway line. This causes flooding to the back gardens of properties that back on to the railway line. Any development within this site will take away the natural storage that is within the ground and is therefore likely to cause additional land drainage (flooding) problems to existing adjacent properties. The site is within 250m of a potential source of flooding, and a current real world flooding problem, so may have difficulty getting flood insurance. It would therefore be deemed as logical that this site should be discounted on grounds of NPPF Ch10 Para.100

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 13 **Response Ref** 3 **Representor Name** John Medley
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Infrastructure is completely inadequate to cope with the large number of houses proposed, and there is nothing in the plan to suggest that this problem would, or could, be given any serious attention. The roads in the area are woefully inadequate to cope with such a large increase in traffic. There are no shops in the area, no medical facilities and existing schools would be totally unable to cope with additional children from any new housing development. Every journey away from this site would necessarily be by car, and in such a remote corner would almost certainly involve at least two cars per household, causing further parking difficulties.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Site should be withdrawn entirely from the local plan. The green belt should be protected against unnecessary development, and only by withdrawing these proposals can the plan be made compliant and sound.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 21 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Ian Robertson
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Comment

Summary of Main Issues

This site is a farmers field, which regularly floods. How will this be addressed?

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 51 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Stan Hughes
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

My concerns are drainage problems particularly with regards to the number of houses you propose for the Liverpool Road/Bypass site. Far too many of the roads in and out of Formby are all single carriageways and will clog up far too frequent. Also at present we have to wait over 10 days to get a doctors appointment. This will get worse. There are no dentists available, I waited 2 years to get into my dentist. I understand you have to build more houses but 999 for the small town of Formby is far too many and I think you need to look further out of the village this all seems to be driven by the Labour councillors

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 52 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Ian Cowell
Organisation Name Ince Blundell Parish Council
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Approximately 30% of the site has Grade 2 Agricultural Land with the rest being 3(b)(319 houses) so only part of the site should be developed.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 102 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Irene Fox
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am disgusted at the decision to agree to include the Liverpool Road/Monks Drive as an allocated site for housing. This will inevitably cause problems with flooding which has been an issue for years. The increased traffic caused by those accessing the site is a recipe for disaster, at peak times especially. The problem is bad enough now, the hold ups will be horrendous to get to the bypass and through to Formby, let alone the heavy traffic using Monks Drive, causing damages to road surfaces.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 158 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Elizabeth Fitzpatrick
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

My objection to the Local Plan relates specifically to the proposed building on the Liverpool Road Formby site. This land is designated Greenbelt and a flood plain. It is consistently flooded throughout the winter months and is both unsuitable and unsafe to build on. At the present time the field manages to contain much of the water, but if built upon the surplus water would present a serious threat of flooding to the existing adjoining properties. This local Plan does not take into account the local geography of Formby or the wishes of its residents.

Summary of Suggested Changes

The Liverpool road ,Formby site should not be used for housing, it is totally unsuitable for the reasons stated earlier.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.16	Other Documents
Policy MN2.16	Land at Liverpool Road, Formby	
Respondent No 165	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Peter Hughes
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Liverpool Road site has always been a natural flood plain but appears to have been moved out of the flood plain when the plan was being proposed. The lack of drainage will cause flooding to existing properties.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.16	Other Documents
Policy MN2.16	Land at Liverpool Road, Formby	
Respondent No 171	Response Ref	Representor Name John A McLean
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Site MN2.16 is below the surrounding road levels is frequently flooded over a significant area during the winter months.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.16	Other Documents
Policy MN2.16	Land at Liverpool Road, Formby	
Respondent No 175	Response Ref 3	Representor Name Anthony Horne
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Sites MN2.16 and MN2.12 are used by Pinkfooted Geese for grazing during the winter months, when they migrate from Iceland. The local plan indicates climate change is a major issue and they will direct building away from areas at flood risk and yet two of the largest areas for building development MN2.12 and MN2.16 in Formby, flood during the winter months in years of heavy rainfall. If this local plan is approved Sefton Council will be responsible for more wetlands, swales, ditches and verges on the new sites which they will have to adopt. This will have financial implications and could cause a rise in council tax in the future at a time of financial restraint. New housing developments on a large scale on land that has a tendency to flood increases the risk of flooding to existing housing in the area.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 252 **Response Ref** **Representor Name** Helen Gannon
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Liverpool Road site has always been a natural flood plain, but appears to have been moved out of the flood plain when the plan was being proposed. It is very clear that by building up this land, and the lack of drainage, that the water will inevitably drain off at a quicker rate, towards the existing properties, which are lower than the new ones, thus causing flooding to existing properties.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 253 **Response Ref** **Representor Name** Peter Gannon
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Liverpool Road site has always been a natural flood plain, but appears to have been moved out of the flood plain when the plan was being proposed. It is very clear that by building up this land, and the lack of drainage, that the water will inevitably drain off at a quicker rate, towards the existing properties, which are lower than the new ones, thus causing flooding to existing properties.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 254 **Response Ref** **Representor Name** Matt Gannon
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Liverpool Road site has always been a natural flood plain, but appears to have been moved out of the flood plain when the plan was being proposed. It is very clear that by building up this land, and the lack of drainage, that the water will inevitably drain off at a quicker rate, towards the existing properties, which are lower than the new ones, thus causing flooding to existing properties.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.16	Other Documents
Policy MN2.16	Land at Liverpool Road, Formby	
Respondent No 359	Response Ref 6	Representor Name Catherine Fraser
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Development MN2.16 involves sacrificing productive agricultural land that has been farmed for generations. Parts of this land have a tendency to flood during periods of prolonged heavy rain and consequently I think the housing allocation for this site is far too high. In any case Formby has not got the necessary infrastructure in terms GP's, parking, roads, transport and drainage etc. The proposed access route will cause absolute chaos during peak periods. I was shocked by the inadequate scrutiny by Sefton's planning department when the developers submitted their plans for this site. The council did not pick up any of the drainage plan's inaccuracies. The plan had the incorrect number of houses thus the surface water runoff calculation was obviously incorrect. They suggested a ground water figure for a particular day which could not possibly have been correct as the site was under water at the time. A development on this scale will require considerable surface water 'run off' either into the river Alt or Downholland Brook. There is a genuine risk that adjacent properties will be flooded as result of this and other developments.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove site as an allocation.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.16	Other Documents
Policy MN2.16	Land at Liverpool Road, Formby	
Respondent No 361	Response Ref 14	Representor Name A D Fraser
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I object to the decision to agree to include the Liverpool Road/Monks Drive as an allocated site for housing. This will inevitably cause problems with flooding which has been an issue for years. The increased traffic caused by those accessing the site is a recipe for disaster, at peak times especially. The problem is bad enough now, the hold ups will be horrendous to get to the bypass and through to Formby, let alone the heavy traffic using Monks Drive, causing damages to road surfaces. The plan envisages raising the level of the land in order to build the new houses. This will involves constructing an impermeable surface higher than the existing ground level. This will increase the rate of surface water run - off and flood existing properties. In order to mitigate the flood risk the developers want to build a whole series of drainage channels and open spaces but they have no maintenance strategy as they expect the rate payers to foot the bill. There should be a requirement that the developers pay for the maintenance and it is included in the viability study.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove Green Belt sites as allocations.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.16	Other Documents
Policy MN2.16	Land at Liverpool Road, Formby	
Respondent No 370	Response Ref	Representor Name Frances Horne
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

The area proposed for housing off Liverpool Road is very prone to flooding, the given plans to overcome this problem are not satisfactory. Alt Road itself suffers already from the surface breaking up. Who will be responsible if houses become flooded because of poor drainage facilities? The building company? Sefton? Also this is a very busy road at times, with cars breaking the speed limit, further traffic is not acceptable.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 419 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** A Rowland
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The Liverpool Road site was rejected as being unsuitable due to flooding etc. Why is the same site now being considered for 274 homes?

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 435 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** James Crawford
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I object to the proposal to allow building on land in and around Formby, specifically MN2.12; MN2.16 and MN2.19. My reasons are the sites are low lying and have been subject to flooding many times in recent years, particularly MN2.1. The existing infrastructure will require significant investment to cope with developments of this size including areas such as drainage, water supply, traffic flow, available parking in the village centre, additional school places, doctors and dentists practices, hospital capacity, gas and electricity services. The council will be responsible for more wetlands, swale ditches and verges on the new sites which they will have to adopt. This will have financial implications on services that are already being cut. There will be an increased risk of flooding to existing properties in the vicinity of these developments. Loss of green belt

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 589 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Edward O'Connor
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

This area regularly floods during heavy rain thus causing sewerage or drainage problems. Flooding does occur at Monks Drive and Savon Hook.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.16

Land at Liverpool Road, Formby

Respondent No 631

Response Ref 1

Representor Name Tony Roberts

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to object to Sefton's proposed Local Plan based on proposals in Formby which will affect me personally and my immediate environment. My home overlooks this site which is Green Belt. NPPF, para 83 states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The land has been farmed, and still is, for at least 50 years that I know of. It is high grade agricultural land which produces at least 2 annual crops. The field acts as a flood plane protecting the existing surrounding properties. It is already difficult to get out of Formby from this area in the mornings, especially during term time.

My justification for these objections are:- Inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt. The proposed 319 new homes will be executive 3/4 bed roomed houses. There are currently plenty of existing, vacant properties on the market within Formby which could certainly be considered more affordable than the proposed new builds. High grade agricultural land should never be concreted over. It should be preserved at all costs to enable future generations to benefit from locally grown produce. I believe any development on this site is likely to cause flooding on my property. It would be necessary to raise the farmers field by 2 metres to ensure any new development was not subject to flooding. Presently, this field is the lowest point and is why water collects on it. However, if this field is built up, the surrounding, existing properties then become the lowest point and our protection will have been removed. The proposed 319 dwellings will probably produce another 600 cars, all trying to exit Formby in the morning. This would obviously create a backlog of vehicles with queues forming along the extremely busy Formby by pass which, in my opinion, would be hazardous.

I believe the proposed development for this site amounts to inappropriate development within the Green Belt and as such is harmful to the Green Belt. The Green Belt is the 'lungs' of Sefton. Brown field sites must be used and our council must ensure this is happening. There are many existing brown field sites in Sefton and our council should be enforcing their use for development of affordable homes and not allowing developers to pick and choose Green Belt so they can make more money. Building on brown field sites makes sense. The infrastructure is already there. Many of these sites are lying waste and creating unsafe areas for children. As we know, children will play near derelict buildings. Investment in these areas should be the way forward. Clearing these sites and building new, affordable homes for our young people to buy or rent would help to make the plan more 'sound' and acceptable to Sefton residents across the borough.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Chapter	Appendix 1	Plan Order	Site MN2.16	Other Documents
Policy	MN2.16	Land at Liverpool Road, Formby		
Respondent No	668	Response Ref	3	Representor Name Andrew Thompson
Organisation Name	Morris Homes and Ballygorryveg Ltd			
Obj/Sup/Com	Comment			

Summary of Main Issues

Morris Homes Northern Ltd and Ballygoryveg Development Ltd support the release of Green Belt in order to accommodate the proposed level of growth, which they believe has been underestimated. This includes the two sites they are promoting (MN2.16 and MN17) in Formby. The site constraints identified in the Council's Site Assessments can largely be dealt with at the planning application stage. However the key restraints relating to heritage assets and vehicular access are set out under the representation for each site. The site area of MN2.16 could be increased in size which would increase the indicative capacity from 319 dwellings to approximately 426 dwellings (see detailed site representation).

Site MN2.16 is enclosed by tall hedgerows along the length of Liverpool Road. The Heritage Assessment recommends that this enclosure should be maintained to avoid adversely impacting the setting of Loveladys Farm. Soft landscaping to entrances into the site along Liverpool Road should be incorporated to maintain the predominance of Loveladys Farm as the 'entry point' into Little Altcar. Setting development back from the edge of the site boundary, and any entrances into the site, will maintain the linear views along Liverpool Road and retain the prominence of Loveladys Farm as the 'entry point' into Little Altcar. Morris Homes and Ballygoryveg Development Ltd conclude that the requirement preventing development on the western part of this site suggested in Appendix 1 is unjustified and should be removed.

In addition, the area of land between Liverpool Road and the site boundary should be taken out of the Green Belt as it would no longer function as Green Belt, not fulfil the purposes of Green Belt once the site is developed. Appendix One also restricts access to site MN2.16 from one point on Liverpool Road. The requirement for one access onto Liverpool Road is considered to be inappropriate in this context for the following reasons: There are no highway safety reasons to restrict vehicular access to Liverpool Road to only 1 access point; a briefing note undertaken by Aecom on behalf of Morris Homes has identified two possible locations along Liverpool Road that could serve the site subject of these representations which would operate safely, and without detrimentally impacting existing highway infrastructure, including the bus stop on Liverpool Road. As there are two land ownerships subject to one allocation, requirement for only one access has high potential to sterilise one of the sites, putting the remaining site in a ransom position, with access having to be provided through the adjacent land holding; and requiring one vehicular access into land held under two ownerships also has the potential to significantly delay the delivery of the entire allocation whilst a suitable access point is agreed in terms of location, design and delivery. Given the Council have under delivered housing significantly since 2003 as outlined in the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2014 Update any delay to bringing housing sites forward to meet the backlog is not considered to be appropriate. Therefore the current site specific requirement restricting access to a single point on Liverpool Road is considered to be unjustified and should be removed.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Heritage Assessment; Aecom briefing note; Response to the comments made during the Preferred Options consultation

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.16	Other Documents
Policy MN2.16	Land at Liverpool Road, Formby	
Respondent No 703	Response Ref 15	Representor Name Jackie Copley
Organisation Name CPRE Lancashire		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

We prefer to see SR4.14 serve its Green Belt purpose, but recognise the planned extension here is better than speculative and sporadic development of countryside. But if redesignated, residential development should be confined to the area north of Lunts Lane. Whereas, the area between Lunts Lane and Southport Road should not be developed in order to preserve the openness of the southern approach to Formby; openness is the essential landscape quality of the land that surrounds the Formby settlement. We recommend that accumulating surface water in the area north of Lunts Lane should be channelled to the area south of Lunts Lane, the whole of which should be devoted to a SUDS. This arrangement would allow a greater density of development north of Lunts Lane.

We envisage the area south of Lunts Lane being retained as parkland for high quality residential amenity to be enjoyed by both the occupiers of the new dwellings on the site and residents living in adjacent established areas. An attractive possibility would be a small lake in the area as a part of the SUDS (see earlier paragraph). We would like to see the Council owned land contiguous with the North end of the site, which is currently a neighbourhood park/children's play area, incorporated in the residential part of the site north of Lunts Lane and, in compensation, a play area could be incorporated in the parkland to the south of the site. Access to the site would be problematic; there is already considerable congestion on Liverpool Road at rush-hours and queuing to get onto the bypass, especially in the morning; vehicles travelling south on the bypass also face long queues at the south Formby roundabout. A Transport Statement or Transport Assessment would necessary (as specified by NPPF paragraph 32).

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.16	Other Documents
Policy MN2.16	Land at Liverpool Road, Formby	
Respondent No 716	Response Ref 28	Representor Name Robert Swift
Organisation Name Robert Swift and family		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Development of Grade 2 agricultural land would result in a negative impact on the rural economy. Whilst the site is contained, there will be an impact on the wider landscape, ecology and habitats. The site is also at risk of flooding, with the large area of surface water flood risk within the south east corridor restricting development. The proforma sets out that only between 40-75% of the site is developable on this basis. The site was subject to a planning application in 2013 by David Wilson Homes for 274 dwellings, which was withdrawn. The figure cited in this application has been applied.

Summary of Suggested Changes

The indicative capacity of Site MN2.16 should be reduced from 319 to 274 dwellings.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 777 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Mike and Shirley Goffey
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Our worries regarding the Liverpool Road site are mainly flooding and access with the number of houses being planned. We have read the plans which show the builders aim to raise the level of the the land quite a lot next to Savon Hook which would mean our Hook would be at a lower level and therefore be the only area for any excess water. Up to now, neither the Builders or the Council Planners can assure us that this won't happen or promise us they will protect our properties in the event of flooding. We also worry about the amount of extra traffic. Accessing Liverpool Road from Alt Road is already a nightmare so, if so many more cars are exiting the new junction upto the Island how will drivers get out of the new estate when people from Formby will have the right of way?

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 787 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Elizabeth Hogan
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The land to be built on in Liverpool Road has, until recently, been marked as a flood plain. It is confusing as to why the flood plain has reduced at a time when we are suffering heavier and more concentrated rainfall, the water table is rising, and global warming is expected to make this problem worse.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 789 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** JD and M-A Campbell
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com

Summary of Main Issues

A large housing development is scheduled for the agricultural fields to the South of Formby, along Liverpool Road. This is highly undesirable. It will degrade existing properties by removing the perception of closeness of open areas, and will very much increase the likelihood of flooding in the vicinity (a major concern, confirmed by Sefton's own ex-senior drainage engineer). It will, in addition, cause a massive increase in traffic congestion along Liverpool Road and Formby Bypass and will result in much degradation of air quality by the excess slow moving traffic.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.16	Other Documents
Policy MN2.16	Land at Liverpool Road, Formby	
Respondent No 803	Response Ref 1	Representor Name P Larsen
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

Liverpool Road site has always been a natural flood plain but appears to have been moved out of the flood plain when the plan was being proposed. It is very clear that by building up this land and the lack of drainage that the water will inevitably drain off, at a quicker rate, towards the existing properties which are lower than the new ones, thus causing flooding to existing properties. Are the council prepared to cover any costs caused by flooding in the future, as they appear to think there is no problem?

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.16	Other Documents
Policy MN2.16	Land at Liverpool Road, Formby	
Respondent No 814	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Paul Edge
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

Alt Road, River Close, Monks Drive, and Savon Hook all back onto the Liverpool road site, they all suffer from water pooling and flooding through most winters.

Taylor Wimpy in the 1960's left this land un-built upon due to its drainage difficulties, it has always been a natural floodplain, and I believe it was the original site for Down Holland Brook many years ago. Unlike Formby's existing land, which is pure sand, the fore mentioned field is made up of mainly river silt and clay. Several of the end houses in Savon Hook and River Close closest to the field collapsed shortly after being built due to land and flooding problems!

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.16	Other Documents
Policy MN2.16	Land at Liverpool Road, Formby	
Respondent No 829	Response Ref 2	Representor Name R Thompson
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com		

Summary of Main Issues

The main issue on the Liverpool Road site is the flooding. Wimpey Homes would not build on this site for that very reason.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 831 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Kay Thompson
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I live near the Liverpool Road site and we have flooding already happening in our garage if the weather is wet. My house lies 6" lower than any other in our road. The Liverpool Road site has always been a natural flood plain but appears to have been moved out of the flood plain when the plan was being proposed.

Wimpy built our portion of the estate in 1964/65. Why did they leave this section of Liverpool Road unbuilt on - because they knew that this was not fit to be built on.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 834 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Raymond Wix
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Liverpool Road site has always flooded, it is a floodplain, and is the lowest point in Formby, as such it protects my house from flooding, if this field was to be raised and built upon I fear my house may flood.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 836 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Gwyneth O'Hara
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The proposed Liverpool Road site does not seem to have been thought out very well. Why have Sefton completely ignored FRAG OFF report on flooding on the Liverpool Road site?

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 837 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Colleen Bold
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

At present there exists a sizable 'soak away' area adjacent to the River Alt. Building housing estates on a substantial part of that area would clearly be detrimental to natural drainage and also take away much of the capacity of the land to cope in the event of the river bursting its banks. In addition to the large number of new houses there would of course be new roadways and driveways — cumulatively requiring new drainage capacity.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 846 **Response Ref** 3 **Representor Name** J Williams
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The Liverpool Road site, in Formby, has always been a natural floodplain and as such was always shown to be so. However, it would appear that this parcel of land has been removed from being a floodplain when the local plan was being formulated. I feel that should this parcel of land be built on, the raising of this land and the subsequent compacting of the ground would be detrimental to the natural drainage of the area, especially to the surrounding existing housing which would be at a lower level. Which would only add to the already flooding problems of this area

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 848 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** E Williams
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the Local Plan proposed by Sefton Council on the following grounds: As a residents of Monks Drive which is adjacent to the proposed site at Liverpool Road my main concern would be drainage. In my deeds it clearly says that this area is a flood plain. I am amazed that in 3 years it has gone from being a flood plain to a proposed site for development. We only have a soakaway drain which are not 100%. When it rains our bungalow is completely surrounded by water, which takes hours to drain. I would be extremely anxious if building on this area was given the green light.

We moved to Formby 3 years ago because of the Green Belt. We appreciate the Green Belt and want to protect it for ourselves and for future generations. When the greenbelt is gone it has gone forever. It is also clear to me that the infrastructure is not in place and Sefton Council are dependent on the developers to deal with this. When the developers and the Council talk about affordable homes they are way off course. The price will not be the normal range because building on the Green Belt will put a premium on the housing which will clearly make them unaffordable.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.16	Other Documents
Policy MN2.16	Land at Liverpool Road, Formby	
Respondent No 856	Response Ref	Representor Name David Hogan
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

The land to be built on in Liverpool Road has, until recently, been marked as a flood plain. It is, at best, fanciful to suggest that the flood plain has reduced at a time when we are suffering heavier and more concentrated rainfall, the water table is rising, and global warming is expected to make this problem worse.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.16	Other Documents
Policy MN2.16	Land at Liverpool Road, Formby	
Respondent No 869	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Leanne McKee
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

The Liverpool Road site has always been a flood plain which has been proven in recent years when it has flooded. Formby in general has a problem with drainage and often roadworks are carried to repair and renew drains. This can be observed on a regular basis

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.16	Other Documents
Policy MN2.16	Land at Liverpool Road, Formby	
Respondent No 871	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Earl O'Keefe
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

The land around Formby is mostly low-lying and prone to flooding. The Liverpool Road site is part of the flood plain of the River Alt and floods regularly each winter. Reeds grow around the edge of it, so that it is not a site on which most people would pitch a tent! I understand that it is proposed to raise the level of the site to drain the water away from it. This water would then flow to the lower ground on which existing houses lie. The Liverpool Road site is also locally iconic. The road into Formby from the by-pass is carried at present on a causeway between open fields. To lose this would be to lose an area of important local character.

I am also concerned that the area under discussion is rich in wildlife. I have seen both curlews and whimbrels, both barn owls and tawny owls, kestrels, herons and, on two occasions [each], a raven and a marsh harrier on or over this particular field.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 872 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Pauline O'Keefe
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The land around Formby is mostly low-lying and prone to flooding. The Liverpool Road site is part of the flood plain of the River Alt and floods regularly each winter. Reeds grow around the edge of it, so that it is not a site on which most people would pitch a tent! I understand that it is proposed to raise the level of the site to drain the water away from it. This water would then flow to the lower ground on which existing houses lie.

The Liverpool Road site is also locally iconic. The road into Formby from the bypass is carried at present on a causeway between open fields. To lose this would be to lose an area of important local character.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 875 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** TE Roberts
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the local plan proposed by Sefton council on the following grounds:- The land chosen to the east and south of Formby is totally unsuitable for building because of the following:- The datum of the River Alt is approximately 5 meters higher than the existing fields and house datums. This land is subject to saturation during the winter period approximately 6 months because of equinoctial tides. Seepage takes place during this period into the surrounding ground (fields) etc. Digging down 0.4 metre achieves water during this period. Rushes grow 66 metres from my house. A new development is being built which is metres above the River Alt. In winter this will put extra water into the Alt causing more problems to the housing development proposed at Liverpool Road and to the East of Formby. This land chosen is prime Green Belt farming land There have been no problems for the farmers over the past. Crops have always been taken. Formby has only achieved one thing, a swimming baths in 40 years. No other infrastructure upgrading has been forthcoming. The building of houses at the cost intended does not answer the request for affordable dwellings. It merely turns the area into a money catchment for Sefton Council which we do not benefit from.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 893 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Elaine Roberts
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Both of these sites are green belt land, MN2.16 is high grade agricultural land and MN2.17 is currently used as a paddock, having been used as agricultural land in the past.

MN2.16 is in flood zone 1, with a medium to high flood risk and MN2.17 is 91% flood zone 1, with the remainder of the site being flood zone 3. In addition to this, the site has a main river to the boundary at the south. The western part of this site is next to Sewerage works, raising additional concerns about pollution for this development.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 895 **Response Ref** 10 **Representor Name** Yvonne Irving
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

This site has potential to flood, it is in the green belt and is valuable farmland. Access for 319 houses onto busy Liverpool Road will cause huge traffic problems.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 899 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Fay Rooke
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to strongly object to the local plan proposed on the following grounds: The field involved in the Liverpool Road plan is is a natural flood plain. There is a layer underneath the soil which rain cannot pass through and therefore remains on the surface. The builders say they can get around this but however clever they are they cannot stop the rain falling. So if it cannot be accomodated on the field it will run out to the surrounding roads and houses causing devastating floods. We have all learned from the media of such floods up and down the coutry, very often due to bad planning. This is a disaster waiting to happen - please don't let it happen. The field is good agricultural land, being sown regularly twice a year. Surely to grow our crops and not import from other countries helps our countrys economy. This makes sense.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.16	Other Documents
Policy MN2.16	Land at Liverpool Road, Formby	
Respondent No 900	Response Ref 1	Representor Name David Shore
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I object to this proposal, as the Greenbelt is essential in avoiding urban sprawl and maintaining agricultural land and open spaces. The building of houses would affect me directly as we would have the disruption of living opposite a building site for many years. Once finished, we would then have the permanent inconvenience of increased traffic noise. Most of all, we appreciate the wonderful views we enjoy from our house and any development would mean we would lose this permanently.

I object to this proposal, as the field opposite our house is reportedly prime agricultural land which is in constant use by the farm for growing crops. This obviously provides an income for the farmer, employment to people and on a wider scale goes towards ensuring sufficient food for the the country. By building on this land you would puts farms out of business and put further pressure on those remaining farms to provide for a growing population in this country.

I object to this proposal due to the increased risk of flooding to my house and those of my neighbours. We have lived on Alt Road for 20 years and it is clear that the flooding on the field is getting worse every year. After any heavy rainfall there are large areas of standing water which can remain for a long while. The land is not suitable for housing at present and would require extensive drainage to be incorporated. When there was a planning application the other year (reference S/2013/0905) I noted with alarm that one of the proposals was for the houses opposite us being built at a higher level, to enable the water to drain downhill towards where our house is, which is completely unacceptable.

I object to this proposal, on the grounds that no allowance is made for the increased pressure on our local doctors, schools, chemists and other local services. The building development for Liverpool Road referred to above was for 300 houses, which would mean an estimated additional 1000 people in the community with no increase in services to meet this extra demand.

I object to this proposal on the grounds of the large increase in vehicle traffic that will happen. It is estimated that the development would take roughly five years to complete, which would mean increased traffic bring deliveries and workers. After completion, there will then be hundreds more cars to add to the congestion and pollution, particularly in our road and the whole town in general.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.16	Other Documents
Policy MN2.16	Land at Liverpool Road, Formby	
Respondent No 901	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Linda Shore
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I object to the building of houses on the Greenbelt, in particular opposite my house marked as Land off Liverpool Road, due the increased pollution and carbon emissions this will bring. The development is proposing 300 houses which will increase the number of vehicles by hundreds. This will lead to an increase in pollution, which is bad for the area in general, but for my family in particular.

The building development for Liverpool Road referred to above was for 300 houses, which would mean an estimated additional 1000 people in the community with no increase in services to meet this extra demand.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 902 **Response Ref** **Representor Name** J Houghton
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Liverpool Road, Monks Drive, Savon Hook, River Close Alt Road, all back onto the Liverpool road site, the original Alt Road estate building company, Taylor Wimpy left this site inbuilt due to its flooding problems, it has always been a natural floodplain, it was the original site for Downholland Brook hundreds of years ago. Formby's existing land is pure sand; Liverpool Road field is made up of mainly river silt and clay.

I enclose a very nice photograph of newly seeded Liverpool Road/ Alt Road farm field, showing new shoots after germination. (This is one of the best quality arable sites under threat from Sefton's Plan)! Please consider my objection.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Photograph

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 949 **Response Ref** **Representor Name** Maureen Brady
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Liverpool Road site is on a natural flood plain and living opposite this site, I fear my home will be flooded should this land be built on.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 950 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** DJ Simpson
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Having lived in Alt Road for 44 years I strongly object to the Local Plan for the following reasons. The Local Plan is to take a large amount of green belt land in Sefton at Liverpool road. Agricultural land, open countryside and wild life, the area proposed for houses off liverpool Road is prone to flooding. The plan to overcome this problem is not satisfactory. Houses on the Alt Road Estate already suffer flooding because of poor drainage. Who will be responsible if our houses become flooded? Liverpool Road is a very busy road, Further traffic is not acceptable. There are many brownfield sites that should be considered before using green belt land.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 951 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** S Mutch
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the Local Plan proposed by Sefton Council on the following grounds: The site on Liverpool Road has always flooded and feel that if housing goes ahead the land needs better drainage. The water will then drain onto existing properties causing flooding and damage. I believe the water will go into existing sewers and road drainage causing problems on the Alt Road estate. The top of my road that joins Alt road has already flooded several times over the years requiring sandbags to be delivered to homes to protect from flooding. I feel that there are not enough doctors, schools, dentists in the Formby area. It is also difficult to get to Southport and Ormskirk hospitals which will need to be addressed if the population is to increase. From plans that I have seen from the Liverpool Road site, there is only one entry and exit onto the development. This exit and entry is onto Liverpool Road which is already congested during rush hours as it is only a single lane road. Sefton has lots of Brownfield sites in the area. Several are being built on at present but there a lot of sites which would be better to be built on instead of Green Belt land.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 980 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** V Houghton
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Liverpool Road, Monks Drive, Savon Hook, River Close Alt Road, all back onto the Liverpool road site, the original Alt Road estate building company, Taylor Wimpy left this site inbuilt due to its flooding problems, it has always been a natural floodplain, it was the original site for Downholland Brook hundreds of years ago. Formby's existing land is pure sand; Liverpool Road field is made up of mainly river silt and clay. I enclose a photograph of Liverpool Road/ Alt Road farm field. This is one of the best quality arable sites under threat from Sefton's Plan!

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Photograph

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.16 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.16 **Land at Liverpool Road, Formby**
Respondent No 982 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Sylvia Smith
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The proposed building on the Liverpool Road site causes me great concern. This site was designated a flood plain for many many years and suddenly it was changed to surface water. Liverpool Road was built on a dyke, WHY?, because of potential flooding - proposed site is approx 10/12 feet lower than Liverpool Road at the bypass end - how will they build - by pile driving? - and what happens to all the water because at the other end of the field, houses are level with the field, so what protection will we have. Also, why, when Redgate was built did Wimpeys stop at the field instead of going to the bypass - it was because the land was deemed unsuitable by Wimpeys surveyors.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.16	Other Documents
Policy MN2.16	Land at Liverpool Road, Formby	
Respondent No 988	Response Ref 2	Representor Name P Jones
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Liverpool Road site has always been a natural flood plain but appears to have been moved out of the flood plain when the plan was being proposed. It is very clear that by building up this land and the lack of drainage that the water will drain off at a fast rate towards existing properties that are lower than the new area causing flooding to existing properties.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.16	Other Documents
Policy MN2.16	Land at Liverpool Road, Formby	
Respondent No 1010	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Michael Weild
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I have lived opposite Formby's Liverpool Road/ Alt Road site for over 40 years; it is a beautiful high-grade farm field that has been intensely farmed every year. This field is part of the lowest land in Formby, as such spends many months under water during most winters. Until recently this farmland was within the official, natural, floodplain but has now been removed for no reason other than to make way for building. All houses on the "Alt Road estate" use soak-away drainage systems which can be full to overflowing during winter months and periods of heavy rain, our houses already suffer badly from very deep pooling during heavy rainfall (at any time of year), this is not helped by the negative angle of our driveways, (Driveways and gardens slope steeply backwards from the road towards our front doors) some houses have even set up make-shift electric pumping systems to try keep the water away from there houses.

If the proposed Liverpool Road site is raised up one to two meters so as to prevent the new proposed houses from flooding then I fear our existing houses will become Formby's lowest point, water run-off and seepage will flood our estate. NPPF says you should not build on land if it should adversely affects existing homes.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Photographs of brownfield sites

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

This site floods – as does the adjacent park, existing gardens of properties near the site and the adjacent road flood as well. This site has several problems relating to development:- The ground itself is frequently saturated to a very high level due to its very close proximity to the River Alt and Downholland Brook. The site is partly situated on the Redgate Clay Lake. This covers a significant area of the south –east corner of Formby. Rainwater therefore lands on this large area soaks through to the clay layer and travels towards Downholland Brook/River Alt. Therefore this means that water will be flowing through the soil towards the river, even when it is not raining on this site. The south-east bottom corner of this site is over 2m below high tide and a similar level below the level of the river embankment. There are already flooding problems in Monks Drive and Alt Rd related to the inability of the land drainage systems to drain through this site and successfully discharge to Downholland Brook/River Alt. The site floods every year – not as per claims by the Planning Department that the majority of this site is only at risk of flooding on a 1 in 1000 year storm. There seems to be a slight discrepancy between the theoretical flood map and the reality of real world flooding.

Any development within this site will take away the natural storage that is within the ground and is therefore likely to cause additional land drainage (flooding) problems to existing adjacent properties. In the previous Planning Application s/2013/0905 in paragraph 3.29 of the Flood Risk Assessment, the consultant acknowledges flooding in the adjacent roads and states that this will be prevented from entering the proposed site, therefore they are admitting the new development will cause additional flooding problems to existing properties. Nowhere in the description of this site in the Local Plan does it mention the previous comments from Sefton Council's Drainage Section that were in support of my objection to Planning Application s/2013/0905, which seems very strange as those comments are still relevant and current to this site. Has Sefton's Planning Department overruled the Drainage Section's advice with regard to this site? The site is within 250m of a potential source of flooding, and a current real world flooding problem, so may have difficulty getting flood insurance. (see the insurance assessment at the beginning of this document that shows properties near this site already have problems getting flood insurance). It would therefore be deemed as logical that this site should be discounted on grounds of NPPF Ch10 Para.100. Apparently this site is not at risk of flooding!? All of the water that can be seen here would be prevented from getting to this point

It has flooded every year in living memory and beyond. Unfortunately, both developers and Sefton's Planning Department count real world evidence such as photographs of the site as "anecdotal evidence" and therefore dismiss these factual pictures and prefer the theoretical flood maps that seem to bear no relation to the reality of the situation. The park at the northern end of site also floods every year. Gardens of adjacent properties flood every year and road adjacent to the site (above picture shows the public highway of Savon Hook flooding). The developer for this proposed site clearly stated in their Flood Risk Assessment that they knew that these problems existed but they that would ensure none of this water would enter their site (which is lower than these gardens and roads) as they would be raising their site. Bear in mind that water travels through farmland very easily as there is a high content of "air voids" in ploughed land. This land is ploughed at least twice a year and planted with thirsty crops, and yet it can be seen that this site is unable to cope with the quantity of water that is trying to get through it to get to the river. It is therefore obvious that in raising their site by an average of 900mm (up to 2m high in front of properties on Alt Rd) and compacting that earth you will remove nearly all of the air voids in the soil and prevent water flowing through it to get to the river. Therefore, all the water that can be seen in the photograph of the site above, will not be able to get through the site and WILL accumulate around the site and makes the flooding of the park, roads and gardens worse. You will notice in the photographs of the gardens above that the properties are lower than the gardens, which are lower than the road, therefore in making this external flooding worse you are actually making internal flooding of the properties more likely. That is most definitely against NPPF Ch10 para.100. Unless this, and other, sites are drained properly before development (with a fully maintainable and free draining land drainage system), developing such sites will cause an increase in the likelihood of flooding to the existing properties.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.16	Other Documents
Policy MN2.16	Land at Liverpool Road, Formby	
Respondent No 1031	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Janet Roberts
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

My home faces the land at Liverpool Road Formby MN2.16 which acts as a flood plane protecting existing, surrounding properties from flooding. I believe any development on this land is likely to cause flooding on my property. Raising the farmer's field by 3ft,(which the developers must do in order to avoid flooding their new builds)will increase the likelihood of land drainage flooding. Instead of water collecting in this field, which is the lowest point at the moment, all existing, surrounding land & houses will become the lowest area. Who will be responsible when our homes flood?
Certainly not the developers- they will be long gone.
United Utilities?-they have already confirmed they wouldn't.
Insurance companies?-unlikely to get home insurance.
Sefton Council? Maybe those that allow development on any land susceptible to flooding?

There are only 3 entrance/exits to & from Formby from the by pass. It is already extremely difficult to get out of Formby in the morning at peak hour, especially during term time. Housing development on sites MN2.16, 17 & 18 means a possible 600 more cars especially in view of the types of houses to be built- 3/4 bedroomed executive homes.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.16	Other Documents
Policy MN2.16	Land at Liverpool Road, Formby	
Respondent No 1050	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Francis Roberts
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to Sefton Council's Local Plan for several reasons which will, if implemented, have an impact on me and where I live:- Sites MN2.16, 17 & 18. NPPF para 83 states that 'Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances' I consider any development on these sites to be inappropriate:- The fields act as flood plains and act as protection to all the existing, surrounding properties. Formby is low lying & as such, I already have gardens & patios that flood. If the field are raised for development, my home is at serious risk of flooding. The building of 3 and 4 bedroomed detached homes in Formby is unnecessary. The council's assessment that 999 new homes are required in this area is not justified based on unrealistic assumptions of employment growth & inward migration. I believe the current annual figure for inward migration to Formby is approximately 100. The infrastructure cannot cope with an increase in development and the Local Plan in its current form does not appear to address this important matter. The school have very few vacancies. In fact,the high schools are oversubscribed. It is difficult to get a doctors or dentists appointment. The roads in and out of Formby are already congested, especially at peak hour and term time. Another possible 1500/2000 cars, in view of type of properties to be built, will create chaos. Not only on our small country lanes but also escalate to the already extremely busy Formby by pass.

Summary of Suggested Changes

I believe it is necessary for Sefton Council to include a policy to build on brownfield first & foremost. This will ensure that the Plan is more compliant with the NPPF. Any Green Belt land should not be developed, especially if prone to flooding or high grade agricultural land. This makes sense. Each separate area within Sefton should be looked at individually & figures, eg population, housing, migration, employment, infrastructure, for that specific area should be assessed and planned to suit each area. Local resident & business consultations should be held to find out what each specific area needs and wants. It is not constructive for a Formby resident, for example, to comment on the requirements of a Bootle resident. Same goes for councillors. I don't believe that many Sefton residents agree with the Local Plan in its current form & it can only become 'sound' if the public are listened to and amendments made.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.17 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.17 **Land at Altcar Lane, Formby**
Respondent No 52 **Response Ref** 3 **Representor Name** Ian Cowell
Organisation Name Ince Blundell Parish Council
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Ince Blundell Parish Council would urge the Planning Inspector to avoid housing development, wherever possible, on the sites with best and most versatile agricultural land. Part of site is Grade 2 land.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter Appendix 1 **Plan Order** Site MN2.17 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.17 **Land at Altcar Lane, Formby**
Respondent No 668 **Response Ref** 4 **Representor Name** Andrew Thompson
Organisation Name Morris Homes and Ballygorryveg Ltd
Obj/Sup/Com Support

Summary of Main Issues

Morris Homes Northern Ltd and Ballygoryveg Development Ltd support the release of Green Belt in order to accommodate the proposed level of growth, which they believe has been underestimated. This includes the two sites they are promoting (MN2.16 and MN17) in Formby. The site constraints identified in the Council's Site Assessments can largely be dealt with at the planning application stage. However the key restraints relating to heritage assets and vehicular access are set out under the representation for each site. The site area of MN2.16 could be increased in size which would increase the indicative capacity from 319 dwellings to approximately 426 dwellings (see detailed site representation).

Appendix One of the Local Plan does not apply any development restriction to site MN2.17. The heritage assets are located directly between MN2.16 and MN2.17. Our heritage assessment concludes that Site MN2.17 is largely aligned with Altcar Lane and the continuation of existing development along the south side of the road. Avoiding development hard up against the south-east boundary line will provide a 'buffer' to the immediate setting of Lovelady's Farm and avoid adverse impacts on its setting. The primary access to the site should be from Altcar Lane, rather than Lighthouse Lane, to maintain the current urban setting to the farm. There are no site specific requirements preventing development on any part of MN2.17.

The site area should also be slightly extended to the SE to reflect the field boundary, as shown at the Local Plan Preferred Options stage plans. There are no heritage reasons why this part of the site should be excluded from the allocation.

The need for a site specific assessment under the Habitats Regulations is considered appropriate.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Heritage Assessment; Response to the comments made during the Preferred Options consultation

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.17 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.17 **Land at Altcar Lane, Formby**
Respondent No 703 **Response Ref** 16 **Representor Name** Jackie Copley
Organisation Name CPRE Lancashire
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We are opposed to the redesignation of this Green Belt site for residential development on the grounds that redesignation would breach the strong physical boundary of Altcar Lane; the site's boundaries to the east and southeast would be uncharacterised by any geographic feature and so would be susceptible further erosion of the neighbouring green belt by future residential development.

The presence of the sewage works on the western boundary of the site would make a substantial area of the site unsuitable for residential development. We also attribute significant weight to the fact that part of the site would be in Flood Zone 3, contrary to the Sequential Test (NPPF paragraph 100), and that the redesignation would involve the sacrifice of the best and most versatile agricultural land. There are significant problems of access and for the wider road network; a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment would necessary, as specified by NPPF paragraph 32.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.17 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.17 **Land at Altcar Lane, Formby**
Respondent No 716 **Response Ref** 52 **Representor Name** Robert Swift
Organisation Name Robert Swift and family
Obj/Sup/Com Support

Summary of Main Issues

Land at Altcar Lane, Formby (Site MN2.17) - the site has an indicative capacity of fewer than 50 dwellings. We agree with the Council's indicative capacity on this site.

Summary of Suggested Changes

None requested

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.17 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.17 **Land at Altcar Lane, Formby**
Respondent No 740 **Response Ref** 23 **Representor Name**
Organisation Name Formby Residents Action Group
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Assessment of flood risk issues on this site [page 99 of the rep].

We also wish to rely on the representation of Mr John Williams [Rep No. 1026] for flood risk issue on this site.

Assessment of the site in meeting the Green Belt purposes and its assessibility and sustainability impact [pages 122-124 of the rep]

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.17 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.17 **Land at Altcar Lane, Formby**
Respondent No 893 **Response Ref** 3 **Representor Name** Elaine Roberts
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Both of these sites are green belt land, MN2.16 is high grade agricultural land and MN2.17 is currently used as a paddock, having been used as agricultural land in the past.

MN2.16 is in flood zone 1, with a medium to high flood risk and MN2.17 is 91% flood zone 1, with the remainder of the site being flood zone 3. In addition to this, the site has a main river to the boundary at the south. The western part of this site is next to Sewerage works, raising additional concerns about pollution for this development.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.17 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.17 **Land at Altcar Lane, Formby**
Respondent No 895 **Response Ref** 11 **Representor Name** Yvonne Irving
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

This small site is vital to the openness of the green belt. It is often flooded as is Altcar Lane. It is adjacent to the sewage farm and has a problem with access. To move out of Altcar Lane onto Liverpool Road is almost impossible. The site has a hedge running its full length and is of ancient origin. Many species of birds and bees use the hedge for food and habitat. It is mainly Hawthorn, a very valuable tree for providing habitats and regulating soil erosion. Thousands of Pink footed geese land on the site for food before they fly south. This site should not be built on.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.17 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.17 **Land at Altcar Lane, Formby**
Respondent No 1026 **Response Ref** 8 **Representor Name** John Williams
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

This site has several problems relating to development:- The ground itself is frequently saturated to a very high level due to its very close proximity to the River Alt. There are already flooding problems in the adjacent roads, Hoggs Hill Lane and Altcar Lane, caused by the highway drains being unable to discharge freely to the existing watercourses. Any development within this site will take away the natural storage that is within the ground and is therefore likely to cause additional land drainage (flooding) problems to existing adjacent properties. The site is within 250m of a potential source of flooding, and current real world flooding problems, so may have difficulty getting flood insurance. Building this close to the River Alt is seriously unwise, both from a ground stability problem and potential flood risk. This land is adjacent to the sewage treatment works and as such is at a very low point (most of Formby's foul drainage comes to this point, therefore it is logical that development here will be at significantly greater risk of flooding than other parts of Formby. It would therefore be deemed as logical that this site should be discounted on grounds of NPPF Ch10 Para.100

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.17	Other Documents
Policy MN2.17	Land at Altcar Lane, Formby	
Respondent No 1031	Response Ref 3	Representor Name Janet Roberts
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

MN2.17 & MN2.18 are sites that border the River Alt. The water level has been so high in the past (I have photos) that it is almost touching the soffit underneath the bridge. This is without any additional flow from any new developments.

There are only 3 entrance/exits to & from Formby from the by pass. It is already extremely difficult to get out of Formby in the morning at peak hour, especially during term time. Housing development on sites MN2.16, 17 & 18 means a possible 600 more cars especially in view of the types of houses to be built- 3/4 bedroomed executive homes.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.17	Other Documents
Policy MN2.17	Land at Altcar Lane, Formby	
Respondent No 1050	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Francis Roberts
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to Sefton Council's Local Plan for several reasons which will, if implemented, have an impact on me and where I live:- Sites MN2.16, 17 & 18. NPPF para 83 states that 'Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances' I consider any development on these sites to be inappropriate:- The fields act as flood plains and act as protection to all the existing, surrounding properties. Formby is low lying & as such, I already have gardens & patios that flood. If the fields are raised for development, my home is at serious risk of flooding. The building of 3 and 4 bedroomed detached homes in Formby is unnecessary. The council's assessment that 999 new homes are required in this area is not justified based on unrealistic assumptions of employment growth & inward migration. I believe the current annual figure for inward migration to Formby is approximately 100. The infrastructure cannot cope with an increase in development and the Local Plan in its current form does not appear to address this important matter. The schools have very few vacancies. In fact, the high schools are oversubscribed. It is difficult to get a doctors or dentists appointment. The roads in and out of Formby are already congested, especially at peak hour and term time. Another possible 1500/2000 cars, in view of type of properties to be built, will create chaos. Not only on our small country lanes but also escalate to the already extremely busy Formby by pass.

Summary of Suggested Changes

I believe it is necessary for Sefton Council to include a policy to build on brownfield first & foremost. This will ensure that the Plan is more compliant with the NPPF. Any Green Belt land should not be developed, especially if prone to flooding or high grade agricultural land. This makes sense. Each separate area within Sefton should be looked at individually & figures, eg population, housing, migration, employment, infrastructure, for that specific area should be assessed and planned to suit each area. Local resident & business consultations should be held to find out what each specific area needs and wants. It is not constructive for a Formby resident, for example, to comment on the requirements of a Bootle resident. Same goes for councillors. I don't believe that many Sefton residents agree with the Local Plan in its current form & it can only become 'sound' if the public are listened to and amendments made.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order Site MN2.18** **Other Documents**

Policy MN2.18 **Power House phase 2, Hoggs Hill Lane, Formby**

Respondent No 419 **Response Ref** 3 **Representor Name** A Rowland

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Permission was given to build 57 homes on the former Powerhouse site. Now an application to build an extra 20 homes is planned. It would seem that the technique is to apply for a small number then come back for additional numbers.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order Site MN2.18** **Other Documents**

Policy MN2.18 **Power House phase 2, Hoggs Hill Lane, Formby**

Respondent No 488 **Response Ref** 12 **Representor Name** Ian Brodie Browne

Organisation Name Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group

Obj/Sup/Com Support

Summary of Main Issues

For context and background information we attach our previous submission [dated 7 Aug 2014] because much of what we said in it still applies. Some small Green Belt compromises are possible: We do realise that some land that technically falls within Green Belt can sensibly be developed because it is often not high quality agricultural land. The Power House in Formby is an example of a site where a reasonable compromise can be made. The Power House is an example of a site which has previously been built upon to some extent and therefore lends itself to being developed. This approach can take the pressure off building on high grade agricultural land. However, such reasonably developable sites within the Green Belt are few.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order Site MN2.18** **Other Documents**

Policy MN2.18 **Power House phase 2, Hoggs Hill Lane, Formby**

Respondent No 703 **Response Ref** 17 **Representor Name** Jackie Copley

Organisation Name CPRE Lancashire

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

CPRE is opposed to the redesignation of this site for residential development. We do not agree that a continuous row of rear gardens constitutes a week boundary; this proposal would breach that boundary. The new southern boundary would not be defined by any physical feature and would be susceptible to subsequent residential development, even as far as the River Alt. The landscape character of the approach to Formby is characterised by flatness and openness and we do not accept that a residential development on the delineated site could be made congruent with the landscape character of the southern approach to Formby as it would be perceived by people approaching on the footpath from Hightown to Hoggs Hill Road (Footpath 35). The site is liable to surface water flooding and would require a high standard of SUDS which would reduce the housing density were the site to be developed as proposed.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.18	Other Documents
Policy MN2.18	Power House phase 2, Hoggs Hill Lane, Formby	
Respondent No 706	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Mike McComb
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Support	

Summary of Main Issues

We support the removal of the site from the Green Belt and the extension of the settlement boundary as proposed. However we consider the policy needs to be revised as follows. The capacity could be increased to 40 dwellings. The boundary is arbitrarily drawn and does not take account of the ability of the site to provide non-residential uses within the flood plain area (i.e. open space) or for technical solutions to allow for potential further development within this area. The site is adjacent to the urban area. It is accessible and comprises a sustainable location for development. A good range of services are within walking distance, including local schools with capacity to accommodate new students. There is a regular bus service to the centre of Formby 40m away from the site. The site would also benefit from the accessibility enhancements being undertaken in conjunction with the development of phase 1 the Powerhouse site.

The new access road created to serve phase 1 of the development has been designed to accommodate the additional traffic generated by this site. Initial investigations undertaken indicate that a larger area than that identified by the Council could be allocated for development. The Council's Green Belt site assessment indicated that between 40% and 75% of the site is developable, but the allocated site only comprises 34% of the area available. It is important to note that although a large proportion of the site is within Flood Zone 3a, residential development can take place within this zone provided the Sequential and Exception Tests are successfully applied. Development should be steered towards areas considered to be at lower risk and suitable mitigation measures applied where they are considered necessary, identified during a full Flood Risk Assessment. Mitigation measures such as the setting of a minimum Finished Floor Level can be employed. Subject to a detailed flood risk assessment being undertaken to establish the developable area of the site and appropriate mitigation measures a minimum of 40 dwellings could easily and safely delivered on this site.

The adjacent Powerhouse site can deliver a full range of utility services to the area. There is the opportunity and capacity for this site to join into these services. The Ground Conditions of the site were fully assessed by Sutcliffe Investigations in 2009 in association with the proposed redevelopment of the Powerhouse. This part of the former Powerhouse site was not in commercial use and it is not considered that this would present any barrier to further development of the site. Appropriate further investigations would be undertaken prior to submission of any application. The proposed allocation is controlled by our client who is in discussions with developers active in the North West to take on the site. Our clear instructions are that they will bring the site forward as soon as possible. The whole site could be built out within two years. Therefore the council and the Inspector can be assured that this is an allocation that will be delivered.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Policy MN2.18 should be amended accordingly to increase the indicative capacity to 40 dwellings.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.18	Other Documents
Policy MN2.18	Power House phase 2, Hoggs Hill Lane, Formby	
Respondent No 716	Response Ref 53	Representor Name Robert Swift
Organisation Name Robert Swift and family		
Obj/Sup/Com	Support	

Summary of Main Issues

Power House phase 2, Hoggs Hill Lane, Formby (Site MN2.18) - the site has an indicative capacity of fewer than 50 dwellings. We agree with the Council's indicative capacity on this site.

Summary of Suggested Changes

None requested.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter General	Plan Order Site MN2.18	Other Documents
Policy MN2.18	Power House phase 2, Hoggs Hill Lane, Formby	
Respondent No 740	Response Ref 24	Representor Name
Organisation Name Formby Residents Action Group		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

Assessment of flood risk issues on this site [page 100 of the rep].

We also wish to rely on the representation of Mr John Williams [Rep No. 1026] for flood risk issue on this site.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.18	Other Documents
Policy MN2.18	Power House phase 2, Hoggs Hill Lane, Formby	
Respondent No 882	Response Ref 4	Representor Name Leslie James Baxter
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

Formby Power House and Green Belt.

Green Belt is established to stop urban sprawl, the construction on the Power House site starts the move towards Hightown even though part of this site was brownfield within the Green Belt. This site is at risk of flooding and stands close to the River Alt hence building has been permitted in an area that may flood. Seventy five houses are being built on this site with a further 20 later.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.18	Other Documents
Policy MN2.18	Power House phase 2, Hoggs Hill Lane, Formby	
Respondent No 895	Response Ref 12	Representor Name Yvonne Irving
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

This site will presently have nearly 100 houses built on it. The proposed houses will be facing Hoggs Hill Lane which is a dedicated footpath. The home owners will not be able to drive along this Lane.

The site is in the green belt and is very near to the sewage farm. The area has barn owls and bats and offers wild life habitat to a variety of creatures. The River Alt is running close by and has water voles there which are a protected species. Local people were promised that the construction of the power house estate would be the last of the build on that site.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.18	Other Documents
Policy MN2.18	Power House phase 2, Hoggs Hill Lane, Formby	
Respondent No 1026	Response Ref 9	Representor Name John Williams
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

This site has several problems relating to development:- The ground itself is frequently saturated to a very high level due to its very close proximity to existing watercourses. There are already flooding problems in Hoggs Hill Lane caused by the existing watercourse having difficulty in discharging under the railway line. Any development within this site will take away the natural storage that is within the ground and is therefore likely to cause additional land drainage (flooding) problems to existing adjacent properties. This land is adjacent to the sewage treatment works and as such is at a very low point (most of Formby's foul drainage comes to this point, therefore it is logical that development here will be at significantly greater risk of flooding than other parts of Formby. The site is within 250m of a potential source of flooding, and current real world flooding problems, so may have difficulty getting flood insurance. It would therefore be deemed as logical that this site should be discounted on grounds of NPPF Ch10 Para.100

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.18	Other Documents
Policy MN2.18	Power House phase 2, Hoggs Hill Lane, Formby	
Respondent No 1031	Response Ref 4	Representor Name Janet Roberts
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

MN2.17 & MN2.18 are sites that border the River Alt. The water level has been so high in the past (I have photos) that it is almost touching the soffit underneath the bridge. This is without any additional flow from any new developments.

There are only 3 entrance/exits to & from Formby from the by pass. It is already extremely difficult to get out of Formby in the morning at peak hour, especially during term time. Housing development on sites MN2.16, 17 & 18 means a possible 600 more cars especially in view of the types of houses to be built- 3/4 bed roomed executive homes.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.18	Other Documents
Policy MN2.18	Power House phase 2, Hoggs Hill Lane, Formby	
Respondent No 1050	Response Ref 3	Representor Name Francis Roberts
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to Sefton Council's Local Plan for several reasons which will, if implemented, have an impact on me and where I live:- Sites MN2.16, 17 & 18. NPPF para 83 states that 'Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances' I consider any development on these sites to be inappropriate:- The fields act as flood plains and act as protection to all the existing, surrounding properties. Formby is low lying & as such, I already have gardens & patios that flood. If the fields are raised for development, my home is at serious risk of flooding. The building of 3 and 4 bedroomed detached homes in Formby is unnecessary. The council's assessment that 999 new homes are required in this area is not justified based on unrealistic assumptions of employment growth & inward migration. I believe the current annual figure for inward migration to Formby is approximately 100. The infrastructure cannot cope with an increase in development and the Local Plan in its current form does not appear to address this important matter. The school have very few vacancies. In fact, the high schools are oversubscribed. It is difficult to get a doctors or dentists appointment. The roads in and out of Formby are already congested, especially at peak hour and term time. Another possible 1500/2000 cars, in view of type of properties to be built, will create chaos. Not only on our small country lanes but also escalate to the already extremely busy Formby by pass.

Summary of Suggested Changes

I believe it is necessary for Sefton Council to include a policy to build on brownfield first & foremost. This will ensure that the Plan is more compliant with the NPPF. Any Green Belt land should not be developed, especially if prone to flooding or high grade agricultural land. This makes sense. Each separate area within Sefton should be looked at individually & figures, eg population, housing, migration, employment, infrastructure, for that specific area should be assessed and planned to suit each area. Local resident & business consultations should be held to find out what each specific area needs and wants. It is not constructive for a Formby resident, for example, to comment on the requirements of a Bootle resident. Same goes for councillors. I don't believe that many Sefton residents agree with the Local Plan in its current form & it can only become 'sound' if the public are listened to and amendments made.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.19	Other Documents
Policy MN2.19	Land at Andrew's Close, Formby	
Respondent No 86	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Alison Moody
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I am strongly objecting the the development of new housing off Andrews Close in Formby. Andrews Close is a narrow road which would be virtually impossible to pass. I am also concerned as to how building and plant machinery would fit down the road should construction commence. Andrews Lane which it leads on to is incredibly busy during school run times, particularly in the mornings. The junction at the top of Andrew Lane whereby traffic coming over the level crossing turns left into one junction currently causes massive traffic issues at this time with people unable to exit Andrews Lane. The barriers close, I believe, at least twice per 15 minutes, causing massive tailbacks and congestion. The additional proposed housing and subsequent traffic would further add to this morning chaos and I believe increase the danger to the many school children cycling and walking to Range High School and St Lukes Primary School. Additionally, the recent improvement of the path to Hightown which emerges at the junction of Barton Heys Road and Andrews Lane (right by Andrews Close) has resulted in a huge increase in leisure cycling. Many of these cyclists do not realise they are coming up to a road and simply continue at speed along the road. Cars exiting from Andrews Close already have limited vision of the track but due to the small number of cars at present exiting there, it is not a considerable danger. However, if the development goes ahead, the increased traffic could easily result in serious accidents from the path

Summary of Suggested Changes

I would strongly urge this site to be removed from the list of proposed developments

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.19 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.19 **Land at Andrew's Close, Formby**
Respondent No 224 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Mike McGibbon
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Access via Andrews lane will cause major congestion at Eccles crossing which is already congested. No traffic feasibility study has been completed.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.19 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.19 **Land at Andrew's Close, Formby**
Respondent No 307 **Response Ref** 4 **Representor Name** Edmond Samuel / Elsie Lowe
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Land at Andrew's Close Formby. From a safety angle this would jeopardise the approach to a much used footpath and cycle route from Formby to Hightown. In addition this proposed development could put extreme pressure on the Ravenmeols Road Railway crossing. Primarily we object to any development on "Green Belt or agricultural land" (however we are in favour of "brownfield sites" where suitable). Furthermore we consider that existing flooding, seage traffic and amenity problems in Formby will be overwhelmed under this ill-considered plan. With regard to traffic in and out of Formby, the three existing routes are always busy, at full stretch during peak hours and seasonal weekends. With the additional burden of cars from the proposed development properties, the situation would become impossible.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Primarily we object to any development on "Green Belt or agricultural land" (however we are in favour of "brownfield sites" where suitable). Furthermore we consider that existing flooding, seage traffic and amenity problems in Formby will be overwhelmed under this ill-considered plan. With regard to traffic in and out of Formby, the three existing routes are always busy, at full stretch during peak hours and seasonal weekends. With the additional burden of cars from the proposed development properties, the situation would become impossible.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.19	Other Documents
Policy MN2.19	Land at Andrew's Close, Formby	
Respondent No 311	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Shirley Potter
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

My objections to the development of the site are: The land is located entirely within Flood Zone 1 and as such is and regularly subject to ground water flooding. The current sewer and drainage infrastructure is presently operating to full capacity and development of this open area of floodplain is likely to increase risk of flooding to surrounding properties and the new homes to be built on it. Located at the southern end of Formby, access to the site is limited via Andrews Lane and the junction of Ravenmeols Lane and the rail crossing. At the public consultations meeting held by Sefton Borough Council the concern regarding the capacity of the existing road infrastructure to support the number of additional properties was not able to be assured. There is a serious issue relating to the traffic management arrangements and the congestion at the junction of Andrews Lane and Ravenmeols Lane that can reasonably be foreseen as a result of the increase in housing. In addition, Andrews Close was not intended to be used as a through access road and as such does not have the capacity needed to support any additional traffic. This development will further risk damage to the character of Formby and the environment drawing the existing residents to the area. I also object to this development on the grounds that: Housing figures do not give "special circumstances" for building on greenbelt. Lack of consultation and the ability to answer questions raised by the public. The Council will be responsible for more wetlands, swale ditches and verges on the new sites which they have to adopt. This will have a financial implication on services that are already been cut. The loss of green belt to Sefton, creating urban sprawl which has already occurred in the borough. The openness of the countryside will be eroded. Increased risk of flooding to existing properties. Lack of infrastructure planning for additional housing. Added pressure on services to include Doctors, Dentists, Schools and Hospitals. Increased volume of traffic on roads which are already congested. Increase in pollution and carbon emissions. We want a Brownfield first policy in the Local Plan. I would also raise with you the policy against which additional housing is intended to be provided ie to address a shortage of available housing. It is not my opinion that there is such a shortage of property within Formby and the town enjoys an active housing market with considerable properties of all values available at any one time. I would, therefore, contest that this development is in support of Central Government home building policy and as more to do with profit for the developers.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove MN2.19 as an allocation. Include a brownfield first policy in the Local Plan.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.19	Other Documents
Policy MN2.19	Land at Andrew's Close, Formby	
Respondent No 393	Response Ref 1	Representor Name David Davidson
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I fully understand the need to develop further housing stock and in principle support this. My main concern is around the proposed development south of Andrews Lane in Formby SR4.16 applies. My concern is around road access to this proposed site during development. The plan suggests that this can be dealt with by "extending and realigning" Andrews lane. This fails to deal with the traffic congestion and narrow roadway before the junction with Elson Rd. This is a narrow lane already used by school traffic to Range High and is often gridlocked at the upper end particularly when the level crossing gates are closed and at school times. Alternative access to Range High School can be via Jubilee Rd but this passes St Lukes school which is also an extremely narrow road with considerable congestion at peak school times. Network is a major issue and one which I recognise having lived in Andrews Lane for nearly 40 years. This prompted my suggestion in my initial letter about the plan. SUGGESTION> The developers of SR4.16 should be obliged to construct an access road to connect with Liverpool Rd south of the development which could link with the other proposed developments to the south of Formby namely SR4.46,SR4.15 and SR4.45 I know that his would involve difficult planning decisions as the link would need to cross railway property but given the long term nature of this plan and the virtual certainty of increase in traffic with time, now is the time for serious thought to be given to this proposal.

Summary of Suggested Changes

The developers of SR4.16 should be obliged to construct an access road to connect with Liverpool Rd south of the development which could link with the other proposed developments to the south of Formby namely SR4.46,SR4.15 and SR4.45 I know that his would involve difficult planning decisions as the link would need to cross railway property but given the long term nature of this plan and the virtual certainty of increase in traffic with time, now is the time for serious thought to be given to this proposal

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.19	Land at Andrew's Close, Formby
----------------------	---------------------------------------

Respondent No 432	Response Ref 1	Representor Name George Simpson
--------------------------	-----------------------	--

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I write with regard to the plan to build houses at Andrews Close, Formby. Whilst it might be taken at first sight that I am objecting to the building per se, I am more concerned that my property will be subject again to sewage flooding. I have suffered three episodes of sewage flooding in 2013 following rainfall. On one occasion there was exceptional rainfall but on the other two there was nothing out of the ordinary. Sewers in the vicinity of my property were spurting foul water and toilet paper into Andrews Close. On each occasion I have also had foul water and toilet paper spurting from an inspection hatch in my garden flooding my lawns, paths and garage. This was water backing up from the main sewer. On one occasion I had to sand-bag my gateways in a vain attempt to stop foul water from the street pouring into my garden. The sewage was so deep that it ran over my garden, up a passageway at the side of my house and into the rear garden and garage. The rear garden flooded to a depth of about 6 inches and it rose over my patio area. I contacted United Utilities on each occasion and they sent out engineers to check the sewers. On each occasion they have said that the sewers are clear but are just not adequate to deal with the water. Consequently all the sewage from the local area is forced to come up through the inspection hatches into the street when water volume is high.

United Utilities men have told us that the Formby sewage works has regularly had to dump large volumes of untreated sewage into the River Alt, as the works cannot cope during heavy rainfall. There is an intention to build a large number of houses behind Andrews Close which will share the same sewage system. Some of the foul water outside my home is draining into the street surface water drains and this ends up in a ditch at the side of my house, alongside a public footpath which crosses a field, and then it also drains, untreated, into the River Alt. United Utilities have not offered a solution to this problem so far and seem content to just hose the street down after each foul flood. This is polluting the street, domestic premises and a local watercourse with sewage. United Utilities cannot reassure me that they have any plans to resolve the situation more permanently as it is bound to happen again if it rains heavily.

I have written to the Environment Agency and Consumer Council for Water / Ofwat for advice as there is an urgency to this issue on public health grounds. The total inadequacy of the drains to deal with the existing volume of sewage is apparent but what concerns me now is that a large number of new houses and the attendant paving over of a large area of the fields behind Andrews Close will just exacerbate the problem. The fields act as a natural soakaway in this already low-lying part of Formby. Flooding will become more frequent and sewage flooding will blight the whole area if house building is allowed to happen here. It is not a matter of "not in my back yard" but one of common sense not to push the risks of flooding any higher when it is already evidenced that the drainage system is already beyond its capacity in this documented Flood Zone.

I hope you will consider this when debating how to go forward with the Local Plan. I note that your Site Assessment states that the site is "entirely within Flood Zone 1" yet assesses this as only a "minor constraint". My experience of having Sewage pouring across my property and that of my neighbours would suggest otherwise.

Summary of Suggested Changes

I am pointing out the already high incidence of Sewage Flooding in my vicinity and feel further development on site Reference SR4.16 (Andrews Close) will create a nightmare for existing and new residents. The site has been assessed by Sefton Council to be "entirely in a Flood Zone" and it is not therefore reasonable to select this site for building on as this will push the drains beyond their capacity and create even more flooding.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.19	Other Documents
Policy MN2.19	Land at Andrew's Close, Formby	
Respondent No 435	Response Ref 3	Representor Name James Crawford
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I object to the proposal to allow building on land in and around Formby, specifically MN2.12; MN2.16 and MN2.19. My reasons are the sites are low lying and have been subject to flooding many times in recent years, particularly MN2.1. The existing infrastructure will require significant investment to cope with developments of this size including areas such as drainage, water supply, traffic flow, available parking in the village centre and provision of amenities and services. The council will be responsible for more wetlands, swale ditches and verges on the new sites which they will have to adopt. This will have financial implications on services that are already being cut. There will be an increased risk of flooding to existing properties in the vicinity of these developments. Loss of green belt

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.19	Other Documents
Policy MN2.19	Land at Andrew's Close, Formby	
Respondent No 492	Response Ref 11	Representor Name
Organisation Name Craig Seddon SIPP		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Land at Andrew's Close (Site MN2.19) comprises 3.3ha of land, identified for 87 dwellings. The site is allocated in the UDP as falling within the Green Belt. The site is located adjacent to Raven Meols Farm, which is a grade II listed building. The Site Assessment Form (SR4.16) suggests that excluding land to the west of the footpath would reduce the harm. This is an arbitrary approach to addressing this issue and, it is questionable whether this actually reduces the harm. It is argued that the impact upon the listed building is still a significant constraint. Our client therefore questions why this site has been brought forward without a Heritage Impact Assessment.

The site is only accessible via Andrew's Close, which is turn is only accessible through an existing large residential area. Andrew's Close is a narrow residential street with vehicles parked along either side of the road. Given no Transport Assessment has been undertaken, it is questioned whether the existing highways network has the capacity to accommodate the additional vehicles associated with 87 new dwellings or whether only one access point off Andrew's Close is suitable. Until a Transport Assessment has been undertaken to demonstrate otherwise, these should be regarded as Tier 1 constraints.

The Site Assessment argues that the existing Green Belt boundary is weak but goes on to suggest that the proposed boundary would not correspond with a strong geographical feature to the south. Our client agrees with this statement and question, therefore, why the site has been brought forward.

There are significant heritage and highways constraints which need to be addressed to demonstrate that this site is suitable for residential development. Without these assessments, these must be considered as Tier 1 constraints.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.19	Other Documents
Policy MN2.19	Land at Andrew's Close, Formby	
Respondent No 527	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Graham Bell
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Comment	

Summary of Main Issues

I do not believe that affordable housing should be built. The Plan fails to address that Andrews Close is the primary access point for traffic to Range High School. The new junction intended at Andrews Lane/Close and Barton Heyes Road is already a problem with parked cars etc and is a blind junction. The waste water/sewage outflow from Andrews Close is already known to overflow after heavy rain for prolonged periods. Network upgrading will be required unless any new build has an entirely separate flow to the sewage works.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Must clearly set out how affordable housing will be provided. It must be made clear that Andrews Lane is the primary access road for traffic arriving [not necessarily departing] Range High School and that this must be part of the Traffic Assessment. A full and proper assessment of wastewater capacity must be undertaken and upgrade will be undertaken if found to be necessary.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.19	Other Documents
Policy MN2.19	Land at Andrew's Close, Formby	
Respondent No 696	Response Ref 3	Representor Name Robin Buckley
Organisation Name	Redrow Homes Ltd	
Obj/Sup/Com	Comment	

Summary of Main Issues

The inclusion of the site at Andrew's Close, Formby (MN2.19) as a housing allocation is fully supported. It has emerged as an allocation following the Sefton Green Belt Study and the Methodology for Selecting Green Belt Sites. Development on this site is vital if Sefton is to meet its objectively assessed need for housing. Development on this site will add significantly to the stock of affordable housing for which there is a distinct need in the town.

Part 4 of Policy MN2 relates to Proposed Open Space next to the housing allocation. The precise division between housing and open space should be determined by a specific study of all constraints. The policy wording should be changed to allow further consideration of the balance between housing and open space following the completion of further relevant assessment. Because of this the Local Plan Policy Map for Formby should show a less well defined division between the housing allocation and the Proposed Open Space. This argument is developed further in our representations relating to Policy EQ9.

As is noted in Appendix One of the Publication Draft Local Plans the development will provide the opportunity for sustainable urban drainage and habitat creation and will help to facilitate the connection of Formby footpath no. 35 through the development onto Andrew's Lane.

Summary of Suggested Changes

The policy wording should be changed to allow further consideration of the balance between housing and open space following the completion of further relevant assessment. Because of this the Local Plan Policy Map for Formby should show a less well defined division between the housing allocation and the Proposed Open Space.

Evidence Submitted

Appendix 1 - Indicative site access; Appendix 2 - Ecological Survey and Assessment; Appendix 3 - FRA; Appendix 4 - Appraisal of Landscape Context and Site Masterplan; Appendix 5 - Preliminary Geo-environmental Risk Assessment; Appendix 6 - Raven Meols Farmhouse

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.19 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.19 **Land at Andrew's Close, Formby**
Respondent No 703 **Response Ref** 18 **Representor Name** Jackie Copley
Organisation Name CPRE Lancashire
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We are opposed to the redesignation of this Green Belt site for housing. We reassert that that a row of contiguous rear gardens does not constitute a weak green belt boundary; by contrast, the southern boundary of the proposed site would lack any distinguishing physical feature. The proposed site would not only be an encroachment into the Green Belt, it would also be an encroachment into a countryside recreational area (Policy NH5). The weak southern boundary would make it vulnerable to further encroachment due to additional residential development. The flatness and openness of the site is intrinsic to the setting of Kew Farmhouse which is Grade II listed. Furthermore, CPRE believes that residential development on the delineated site would significantly diminish the landscape character of the southern approach to Formby as it would be perceived by people approaching on the footpath from Hightown to Hogs Hill Road (Footpath 35). The site is liable to surface water flooding and would require a high standard of SUDS. There are significant problems of access; a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment would be necessary as specified by NPPF paragraph 32. An Ecological Assessment would be necessary.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.19 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.19 **Land at Andrew's Close, Formby**
Respondent No 716 **Response Ref** 29 **Representor Name** Robert Swift
Organisation Name Robert Swift and family
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Land at Andrew's Close, Formby (Site MN2.19) is relatively contained, and the constraints associated with the site are limited. Whilst it is accepted that there will be some listed building impact and access difficulties these should be able to be overcome, and a density of 30 dph has been applied.

Summary of Suggested Changes

The indicative capacity of Site MN2.29 should be reduced from 87 to 74 dwellings.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter General **Plan Order** Site MN2.19 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.19 **Land at Andrew's Close, Formby**
Respondent No 740 **Response Ref** 25 **Representor Name**
Organisation Name Formby Residents Action Group
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Assessment of flood risk issues on this site [page 101 of the rep].

We also wish to rely on the representation of Mr John Williams [Rep No. 1026] for flood risk issue on this site.

Assessment of the site in meeting the Green Belt purposes and its assessibility and sustainability impact [pages 120-121 of the rep]

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.19	Other Documents
Policy MN2.19	Land at Andrew's Close, Formby	
Respondent No 789	Response Ref 1	Representor Name JD and M-A Campbell
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Another large housing development is scheduled for fields West of the railway line and just North-West of the extended development now in progress on the site of the old power plant. This proposed development is much too close to the existing nature reserve area in the coastal dunes. This important natural area will be severely degraded as a result of this development, with loss of habitat, much increased pollution, and resultant loss of biodiversity. Siting any new housing developments West of the railway line at Formby is completely at variance with the Plan's stated concern for preserving natural areas (and it bears repeating here that this will compromise dune systems that are of international importance).

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.19	Other Documents
Policy MN2.19	Land at Andrew's Close, Formby	
Respondent No 882	Response Ref 5	Representor Name Leslie James Baxter
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Green Belt is established to stop urban sprawl. The Andrews Close package also fills in an area that is on the boundary of Formby and on the Hightown side.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.19	Other Documents
Policy MN2.19	Land at Andrew's Close, Formby	
Respondent No 1005	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Paul Radcliffe
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

There are many reasons stated, which you will no doubt be informed of, as to why this plan must be rejected. Of greatest concern to me are the effects on wildlife, increased environmental pollution, overcrowding of local services and loss of utility in the environment. I live, as you will see from my address, in Andrews Close. One of the major developments is proposed for the agricultural land to the south of our road. This land is home to a variety of wildlife. We have owls, red squirrels, bats - which I believe are pipistrelle, water voles and hedgehogs. Prior to any planning permission being given to develop this land I feel it is imperative to have a comprehensive, current wildlife survey as well as an independent bat survey carried out.

As I said above, our road backs onto agricultural land which floods in heavy rain. This will provide a significant environmental challenge to future development. However, more important to us in Andrews Close is that, at present heavy rain already causes our road to flood to a depth of several inches since the drains here are so shallow. This is an ongoing problem which will only get worse if the rear field is concreted over. It is not unusual, following flooding, to have the United Utilities crew come to the road and "clean" the road. Residents fear that any development will just make matters worse affecting our properties (and possibly our health).

I believe the proposed development will lead to a great increase in local traffic volumes. I am not convinced that the site can be accessed without serious disruption. Should the proposed development proceed, being bounded as it is by Andrews Close, where currently there is hardly enough room for 2 cars to pass safely, and by the Hightown footpath which again is very narrow and would present the same problem.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.19	Other Documents
Policy MN2.19	Land at Andrew's Close, Formby	
Respondent No 1026	Response Ref 10	Representor Name John Williams
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

This site has several problems relating to development:- The ground itself is frequently saturated to a very high level due to its very close proximity to existing watercourses known as Andrews Lane ditch and Ravenmeols Farm ditch (these watercourses are already on Sefton Council's list of ditches that cleaned on a four/five yearly basis and are regularly inspected due to the problems they cause adjacent properties and roads. There are already flooding problems in Andrews Lane, Andrews Close and Barton Heys Road caused by the existing highway drains having difficulty in discharging to the watercourses crossing this site. Any development within this site will take away the natural storage that is within the ground and is therefore likely to cause additional land drainage (flooding) problems to existing adjacent properties that already have problems. This land is adjacent to the railway line in a location where the trackside drain (culverted) has problems. The site is within 250m of a potential source of flooding, and current real world flooding problems, so may have difficulty getting flood insurance. It would therefore be deemed as logical that this site should be discounted on grounds of NPPF Ch10 Para.100

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Hightown Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Hightown **MN2 Hightown sites**

Respondent No 191 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name**

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The HM Government wants to devolve more power to local councils and they are expected to listen to the people. Not all council members live and represent Hightown. They should not force the issue on HIGHTOWN with out taking full account of the people living here. This village does not have any amenities. It is already a dome[sic] village.

If this goes ahead there will be more carbon foot print because people have to travel in and out to reach amenities, put more pressure on emergency services miles away from Hightown. Roads leading in to Hightown are pretty bad already and congested at times.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Hightown Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Hightown **MN2 Hightown sites**

Respondent No 194 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** P Robinson

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Over a period I have been attending various meetings concerning the above mentioned Plan. I am deeply concerned at what I have heard as it relates to Hightown and the next close to Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane and of road structures leading into Hightown and through the village into the development area. The roads concerned are very narrow and will clearly struggle to accommodate any construction traffic. I think this alone will be very serious for Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane. I cannot see the justification for more housing in Hightown for I seem to remember that populations in the area scheduled to fall here, is there a need for the plan relating Hightown. I have lived in the area since 1984. I feel very sad at what is proposed for the village and the lack of schools to service increased population and the village will be very adversely affected by increased traffic. I conclude by saying that I would hope the planning team would seriously reconsider the plan for the reasons outlined here and decide that a wiser course would be to terminate matters now.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Hightown Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Hightown **MN2 Hightown sites**

Respondent No 447 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Audrey Irons

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Talks of a building programme of five years duration in Hightown will cause constant flow of lorries through narrow roads. Cars and vans are driving into Hightown all the time now. Many houses have 2 or 3 cars on their drive. Another 200+ houses and cars will cause congestion in the area. In the village [Hightown] people park around the station, sometimes from Formby.

As there is a need for catholic and Council Schools, more buses will be needed to get children to a school and that's problem already.

Lots of wildlife and green fields going is worrying. Sometime in the future with population going up we will need fields to grow food.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Hightown Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Hightown **MN2 Hightown sites**
Respondent No 448 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** S Kennedy
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Comment

Summary of Main Issues

Has any thought been given to the problem of parked cars? School Road and Alt Road could already be re-named 'Park and Ride'. These roads are dangerous to pedestrians and cyclists, both of whom have increased in number since the new path was opened, making Hightown attractive to even more visitors.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Hightown Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Hightown **MN2 Hightown sites**
Respondent No 587 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Mark Holmes
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I do not understand the need for the level of development in this area. Sefton's population is in decline and has been for a number of years. Perhaps the south east of England is in urgent need of extra housing but we are not. There are a number of houses for sale or for rent in Hightown and a new development of 13 available. Who are we building these houses for?

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.20 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.20 **Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 99 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Jim O'Gorman
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I live in the Hightown area and am particularly concerned about the lack of any infrastructure plans to support an additional proposed 130 new homes, which probably means there are no plans for any infrastructure changes ? For a small village with no schools and limited services this is surely not a practical proposal

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 126	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Peter Walker
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I believe that the infrastructure in Hightown is unsuitable to support this development, on the following grounds. The road in and out of Hightown is already at peak time very busy, and the bends coming into the village are so tight that large vehicles can not go around them without the trailer part of the vehicle crossing onto the opposite carriage way. We have already had a big increase in heavy vehicles and buses with the increased use of the rifle range, up about 25%. This is now running at approx 240000 people in and out of a single access road. The area of the proposed development, also has a football club, which already causes traffic gridlock on Saturdays, without the proposed site traffic, children and heavy plant are not a good mix. There are other problems, school children are already having to be bused in and out as we do not have a school. Minimal facilities and services exist in Hightown.

The road going into the proposed site Elmcroft Lane is narrow, and the houses have been subject to subsidence. I do not know if the lane is capable of withstanding heavy vehicles and if not could damage the existing houses with vibration. Current housing developments and existing properties are not selling. The population of Sefton has decreased over the last ten years from 300000 plus to 278000, why do we need more houses, our unemployment levels are increasing, where are these people who need all these houses.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove site MN2.20 from the plan.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 127	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Jane Wilson
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

My main complaint is the utter disruption that would happen particularly whilst building was taking place and afterwards when over 100 homes are built. Anyone who resides in the vicinity will know it is bad enough on a Saturday and Sunday when football is on. I believe the roads are just not wide enough to cope with the extra traffic, particularly Elmcroft. The chaos that has been caused whilst building is taking place on the Range Site for only 15 houses I dread to think what it will be like in Elmcroft and the roads leading to it. There is no doubt in my mind that the value of the houses in Elmcroft and Sandy Lane will decrease as a result. I also believe that there is a variety of wild life in the Paddock area, red squirrels and more importantly bats which I believe are protected. Will a survey be done to look into the bat situation? Also, where are all the children from families buying these houses go to school. I know from experience that many primary schools in Sefton are oversubscribed.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove site MN2.20 from the plan.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.20 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.20 **Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 128 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** John Armstrong
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

My major concern is that the infrastructure in Hightown is not fit for purpose for anymore developments. The impact this would have to the only road leading into and out of this site would be significant. Elmcroft itself is not wide enough for the proposed building traffic, we already experience problems with the current development taking place on the Altcar training camp for a mere 13 properties. In addition, I am concerned by the amount of trees that would be removed as a result of this work. This area is an area of natural beauty that has remained in a natural state for a number of years as such it is a breeding ground for bats, red squirrels and probably natterjack toads and other wildlife. I am not convinced nor accept that a proper due diligent nature survey has been carried out on this site. Has consideration also been given to the peat/boggy content on this land and the potential impact any work would have on the water table - my concern is for flooding and impact on the railway track to the local rail services to Liverpool and Southport.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove site MN2.20 from the plan.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.20 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.20 **Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 143 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Peter Smith
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We do not agree to the building of 120 Houses in Hightown. The roads alone are not up to taking any more cars. Consider it has just one small road in and out. There is a complete lack of services and many more points to consider also.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.20 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.20 **Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 148 **Response Ref** 10 **Representor Name** Tim Astbury
Organisation Name Hightown Parish Council
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

It is noted that URS in its Habitats Regulations Assessment of January 2015 (Sefton Local Plan HRA/AA) prepared for Sefton Council make the following observations re S068 (covering the MN2.20 & 2.21 sites) 'Located in an area of sensitivity for pink-footed goose and where records of the species exist according to the Lancashire Bird survey, aerial photographs indicate current land-use is grassland with some scrub. Nonbreeding season bird surveys would be required to confirm their presence' It continues, 'If this site is selected it will need to be covered by a site specific HRA accompanying the planning application to provide appropriate protection to the integrity of the SPA/Ramsar site bird population.'

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 148	Response Ref 7	Representor Name Tim Astbury
Organisation Name	Hightown Parish Council	
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Whilst it is accepted the site MN 2.20 9 (6.5 hectares) is in Flood Zone 1 there is, nonetheless, a problem with ditches on this site with frequent surface flooding. There is already a problem with drainage. Drains/sewers are already at full capacity with foul sewer flooding following heavy rain. It is noted that in a footnote to paragraph 103 of the NPPF that 'A site specific flood risk assessment is required for proposals of 1 hectare or greater in Flood Zone 1(site MN2.20 is 6.5 hectares). The footnote continues: 'All proposals for new development (including minor development and change of use) in Flood Zones 2 and 3, or in an area within Flood Zone 1 which has critical drainage problems (as notified by the local planning authority by the Environment Agency) and where proposed development or a change of use to a more vulnerable class may be subject to other sources of flooding. It is noteworthy that despite the coastal protection works carried out by Sefton Council at the Blundellsands Sailing Club following the storm conditions in 2013 they were overtopped and the Blundellsands Sailing Clubhouse at Hightown damaged. Indeed the coastal area from the West Lancashire Golf Course to Hightown is vulnerable to tidal flooding.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 148	Response Ref 8	Representor Name Tim Astbury
Organisation Name	Hightown Parish Council	
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

At the bottom of Elmcroft Lane which, at present, is a cul-de-sac there is a small Coppice. It is intended to cut a road through this Coppice in order to access the 120 houses that comprise development MN 2.20.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 148	Response Ref 3	Representor Name Tim Astbury
Organisation Name	Hightown Parish Council	
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Regarding Network capacity Sefton contends the issue is only a minor constraint. To quote: 'It is not considered that there will be an issue in terms of capacity given the level of housing proposed however, this would be subject to a satisfactory Transport Statement. With the building of 120 houses of course there is going to be an issue! With, perhaps, 2/3 cars per household, and other service vehicles, it is inevitable there will be an issue with Elmcroft Lane transformed by the numbers of vehicles coming to and from the new estate. Indeed, there is an implied acceptance of the problems likely to face the residents of Elmcroft Lane with the suggestion 'There is likely to be a need for a potential parking scheme(waiting restrictions) on Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane required to ensure safe access

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 148	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Tim Astbury
Organisation Name	Hightown Parish Council	
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane comprise good class properties on the east side of the Northern Railway Line that runs through Hightown Village. At present the south side of Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane fall within Sefton's Green Belt which provides an essential buffer between the North of Crosby and Blundellsands (see NPPF Paragraph 80). According to the Local Plan there are proposals to build a total of 120 houses on land designated as MN2.20 parallel to the Railway line and to the south of Elmcroft Lane.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 148	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Tim Astbury
Organisation Name	Hightown Parish Council	
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

At the bottom of Elmcroft Lane which, at present, is a cul-de-sac there is a small Coppice. It is intended to cut a road through this Coppice in order to access the 120 houses that comprise development MN 2.20. This quiet tree lined residential neighbourhood would then be transformed into a traffic and pedestrian route to the new Estate, not only for residents, but by developers'. At present Elmcroft Lane is only 6 metres wide and should it be used as a bus route [for school buses] (see later) it would also have to be widened to at least 6.75 metres if used by buses, and other heavy goods vehicles.

Again, access to Elmcroft Lane via Sandy Lane is likewise limited as a feeder route to the proposed new estate. The Sefton Local Plan contends that regarding site access to the land at Elmcroft Lane the issue is of only moderate constraint and that 'vehicular and pedestrian access will need to be taken from Elmcroft Lane. Slight modifications would be needed to the highway layout. There is little scope to provide any alternative/additional points of access for either vehicles or pedestrians. Hightown Parish Council profoundly disagrees with this statement that only 'slight modifications will be needed' as it considers any changes will be significant and that Elmcroft Lane should not be used as a through route to any new estate but that an alternative means of access should be sought. Moreover, if Sefton cannot come up with any alternative/additional points of access then the new estate should not be built.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.20 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.20 **Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 148 **Response Ref** 5 **Representor Name** Tim Astbury
Organisation Name Hightown Parish Council
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Again, it is inevitable that children who need schooling will live on the new estate (with 30% affordable housing). At present children from the Village are bussed to schools, mainly in Formby, and elsewhere. This will mean a bus route via Elmcroft Lane will be involved in picking up the children to transport them to school. Originally, during the earlier development of the Village land had been set aside at Alton Close for a Primary School. More housing and a Children's Play area was built on this land with the consequence that Hightown children had to be bussed for schooling elsewhere! With the prospect of the two school sites of Holy Trinity (MN2.14 — 50 houses) and the former Ravenmeols School (currently used as the Formby Professional Development Centre MN 2.15 — 15 houses) being used for housing what is Sefton going to do about land for a school for Hightown children? If a primary school is to be built at Hightown this will involve the designation of yet more land and there is no indication that such land has been specified under the Local Plan. Furthermore how is such a primary school to be funded? It is highly unlikely that developers would wish to pay towards a school development.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.20 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.20 **Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 148 **Response Ref** 4 **Representor Name** Tim Astbury
Organisation Name Hightown Parish Council
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Furthermore, there is a history of the houses in Elmcroft Lane suffering from subsidence and needing underpinning. Without doubt using Elmcroft Lane as a main route in and out of the new estate would almost certainly cause damage to the existing properties in the Lane so who will be responsible for the damage to these properties? For example one owner paid in excess of £35,000.00 to have his property underpinned.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.20 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.20 **Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 148 **Response Ref** 6 **Representor Name** Tim Astbury
Organisation Name Hightown Parish Council
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Whilst it is accepted the site MN 2.20 9 (6.5 hectares) is in Flood Zone 1 there is, nonetheless, a problem with ditches on this site with frequent surface flooding. There is already a problem with drainage. Drains/sewers and foul sewers are already at full capacity with foul sewer flooding and a back flow of raw sewage into ditches with sewers blocked following heavy rain. It is noted that in a footnote to paragraph 103 of the NPPF that 'A site specific flood risk assessment is required for proposals of 1 hectare or greater in Flood Zone 1 (site MN2.20 is 6.5 hectares). The footnote continues: 'All proposals for new development (including minor development and change of use) in Flood Zones 2 and 3, or in an area within Flood Zone 1 which has critical drainage problems (as notified by the local planning authority by the Environment Agency) and where proposed development or a change of use to a more vulnerable class may be subject to other sources of flooding. It is noteworthy that despite the coastal protection works carried out by Sefton Council at the Blundellsands Sailing Club following the storm conditions on 5th December 2013 they were overtopped and the Blundellsands Sailing Clubhouse at Hightown damaged. Indeed the coastal area from the West Lancashire Golf Course to Hightown is vulnerable to tidal flooding.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 148	Response Ref 9	Representor Name Tim Astbury
Organisation Name Hightown Parish Council		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

The Sefton Council Local Plan 11.21 states 'Priority habitats sit outside the designated site hierarchy and may be of national (Ancient woodlands) or local importance. Legally protected species include badgers, bats and water voles. Section 119 of the NPPF states 'The presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 14) does not apply where development requiring appropriate assessment under the Birds or habitats Directives is being considered, planned or determined. There is evidence of bats and bat roosts in the Coppice at the bottom of Elmcroft Lane. All bat species and their roosts are legally protected in the United Kingdom. All bats are listed as European protected species of animals in the European Unions' Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992. This Directive is implemented in the UK by the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c) Regulations 1994. In England & Wales it is an offence under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981(as amended) to: intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat at roost or intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to a roost. To seek to build a road through this Coppice would almost certainly risk breaching this law. Moreover, there are bats and bat roosts in the trees surrounding Rose Cottage (Grade 11 Listed) and trees abutting on to Sandy Lane.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 148	Response Ref 11	Representor Name Tim Astbury
Organisation Name Hightown Parish Council		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

In the Council's opinion both MN2.20 and MN 2.21 are unsuitable for development as proposed in the Local Plan owing to network capacity and accessibility. In addition there will be a need for a site specific flood risk assessment of both sites, a satisfactory Transport Statement, and an assessment under the Habitats Directive. The Council is also concerned about the schooling of Hightown children as it is considered this aspect of the Sefton Council Local Plan has not been thought through carefully enough. Finally the question of drainage and sewage in this low lying area of Hightown is of particular concern.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 162	Response Ref 1	Representor Name John McCall
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

All, please consider this email as full endorsement of Hightown Parish Council's response to you. This is my personal, as a resident, objection to the development, which in my opinion offers little benefit in numbers to the council's wider strategy, whilst devastating a local, rural and coastal community. It is short sighted and the references in the Parish Council's response relating to land drainage, village access, schooling, wider infra-structure, property and access on Elmcroft and the very serious wildlife matter of sustainable bat populations are all valid. I doubt the development is a valid financial proposition for a developer and if started, like on the Range Road, evolving, it could end up ruining the environment whilst not delivering the end product. I would therefore in summary wish for the proposals on both designated sites be withdrawn as viable options. Whilst a member of the Parish Council, this is a residential opposition.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 180	Response Ref 1	Representor Name M&J Fleet
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Regarding the 150 houses to be built near Elcroft Lane, Highton, we both strongly object on the following grounds. The infrastructure of Hightown will be under strain. The village surgery struggles to cope efficiently at the moment. There are no parking facilities. There is no school. The whole infrastructure, roads, drains etc will be under strain, please think again.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 181	Response Ref 1	Representor Name
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I strongly support the need for more affordable housing. However my main worry about the proposed development in Hightown is the inadequate infrastructure. The very narrow lanes and bends giving access to Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane are quite dangerous for existing traffic ie residents and football crowds- an accident waiting to happen! The lack of a school and no regular doctor.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 188	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Debra and Clive Harris
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to raise our objections to the proposed plan to build 120 houses in Hightown. I object on the grounds that the roads into and out of the village will not cope with the volume of lorries and the weight of them –have you seen the state of the tarmac already? Or waited to turn into the village at night- with the Formby commuters using the Hightown bends as rat runs. I object on the grounds that already we do not have our own schools and our children do not get their first choice of school and have to travel to attend school. We are currently short of Doctors. The area around the village shops is very congested already with the commuter parking for Liverpool (and I note a great deal of these cars are not Hightown residents but travel in to park before catching a train.) You have already made this problem worse by allowing the current housing development access to the road by the Hightown railway station- have you ever been there during the morning rush –presumably not as you wouldn't have given planning permission. Why can't these houses be sited on brown field sites. If we had room for expansion in our schools and Doctors surgeries I would agree we could absorb more but we don't. Will these houses be for first time owners. If there is such a shortage of houses in sefton why aren't the current ones selling.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 189	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Thomas Hanlon
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I have just discovered to my dismay and frustration that planning has been submitted to build 120 houses in Hightown. Hightown is possibly one of the last villages in Sefton if not Merseyside that over the past 30 years had gone through a number of phases of expansion with houses being built resulting in the expansion of the village to what it is today. We are at our limit. We have one road in and out which is sufficient for the village as it is now. We are currently going through a building phase at the moment with a small development adjacent to the service road from the rail station to the Army Camp. This development was strongly opposed, but went ahead anyway. This small development has already caused disruption to the village with the re routing of the start of the service road and the repositioning of the bus stop. The current location of the bus stop has still not been finalised as there is not enough natural space around the village green other than its original position which is now the new entrance to the service road to the Army Camp. We do not want or need 120 new houses in Hightown, being built in phased developments lasting a proposed 5 years plus. 5 years of lorries digging equipment disruption to the village. 120 houses would mean another 200 cars and the loss of a nice small village. The objections from the village were just ignored in response to the plans to the development on the service road to the Army Camp. Please don't let these objections go unheard.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 190	Response Ref 1	Representor Name P Inskip
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Regarding the planning of 120 new houses in Hightown. Enough is enough, there is not the infrastructure to take any more houses in the area, the roads are inadequate plus there is not enough schooling for any younger children, plus the area could not take any more cars, it's too small a village for any more houses. I strongly object to any more building of houses whatsoever.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 202	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Marjorie Walker
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I write with concern about the proposed development in Hightown. I realise that homes will be needed for the future. Amongst a lot of issues this development will cause, I mention just a few. The infrastructure will not cope with the extra traffic, as the development is a distance from the village, people will drive to the centre of the village. As there is limited parking, it is going to cause a greater problem, as it does now with residents using cars on the other side of Hightown, a distance from the village. Also with no schools in Hightown, this will cause another problem, as our own children already living in here have difficulty acquiring places in schools in Formby. These are a few of many problems we have and I would like to register my concern.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove site MN2.20 from the plan.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 205	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Jane Young
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the building of 120 additional houses in Hightown, my reasons are as follows: Loss of wildlife and green spaces. Potentially 200+ cars travelling in and out of the village causing extra congestion on access roa. Additional school buses. Constant disruption with lorries in and out of the village during approximately 5 year build programme

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove site MN.2.20 from the plan.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 209	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Nicholas Deering
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

We object strongly,parking and driving is difficult on already crowded congested roads.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove MN2.20 from the plan.

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown
----------------------	--

Respondent No 213	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Dorothy Walsh
--------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane comprise good class properties on the East side of the Northern Railway Line that runs through Hightown Village. At present the South side of Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane fall within Sefton Green Belt which provides an essential buffer between the North of Crosby and Blundellsands (see NPPF Paragraph 80). According to the Local Plan there are proposals to build a total of 120 houses on land designated as MN2.20 parallel to the Railway line and to the south of Elmcroft Lane. At the bottom of Elmcroft Lane which, at present, is a cul-de-sac there is a small Coppice. It is intended to cut a road through this Coppice in order to access the 120 houses that comprise development MN 2.20. This quiet tree lined residential neighbourhood would then be transformed into a traffic and pedestrian route to the new Estate, not only for residents, but by developers'. At present Elmcroft Lane is only 6 metres wide and should it be used as a bus route (see later) it would also have to be widened to at least 6.75 metres if used by buses, and other heavy goods vehicles. Furthermore, there is a history of the houses in Elmcroft Lane suffering from settlement and needing underpinning. Without doubt using Elmcroft Lane as a main route in and out of the new estate would almost certainly cause damage to the existing properties in the Lane so who will be responsible for the damage to these properties? For example one owner paid in excess of £35,000.00 to have his property underpinned. Again, access to Elmcroft Lane via Sandy Lane is likewise limited as a feeder route to the proposed new estate. The Sefton Local Plan contends that regarding site access to the land at Elmcroft Lane the issue is of only moderate constraint and that 'vehicular and pedestrian access will need to be taken from Elmcroft Lane. Slight modifications would be needed to the highway layout. There is little scope to provide any alternative/additional points of access for either vehicles or pedestrians. The Council profoundly disagrees with this statement that only 'slight modifications will be needed' as it considers any changes will be significant and that Elmcroft Lane should not be used as a through route to any new estate but that an alternative means of access should be sought. Moreover, if Sefton cannot come up with any alternative/additional points of access then the new estate should not be built.

Regarding Network capacity Sefton contends the issue is only a minor constraint. To quote: 'It is not considered that there will be an issue in terms of capacity given the level of housing proposed however, this would be subject to a satisfactory Transport Statement. With the building of 120 houses of course there is going to be an issue! With, perhaps, 2/3 cars per household, a necessary bus route, delivery vans, postal services, ambulances, fire brigade tenders, police vehicles, health visitors visiting the elderly, it is inevitable there will be an issue with Elmcroft Lane transformed by the numbers of vehicles coming to and from the new estate. Indeed, there is an implied acceptance of the problems likely to face the residents of Elmcroft Lane with the suggestion 'There is likely to be a need for a potential parking scheme(waiting restrictions) on Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane required to ensure safe access.....' Again, it is inevitable that children who need schooling will live on the new estate (with 30% affordable housing). At present children from the Village are bussed to schools, mainly in Formby, and elsewhere. This will mean a bus route via Elmcroft Lane will be involved in picking up the children to transport them to school. Originally, during the earlier development of the Village land had been set aside at Alton Close for a Primary School. More housing and a Children's Play area was built on this land with the consequence that Hightown children had to be bussed for schooling elsewhere! With the prospect of the two school sites of Holy Trinity (MN2.14 – 50 houses)and the former Ravenmeols School (currently used as the Formby Professional Development Centre MN 2.15 – 15 houses)) being used for housing what is Sefton going to do about land for a school for Hightown children? If a Primary School is to be built at Hightown this will involve the designation of yet more land and there is no indication that such land has been specified under the Local Plan. Furthermore, how is such a Primary School to be funded? It is highly unlikely that developers would wish to pay towards a school development.

Whilst it is accepted the site MN2.20 9 (6.5 hectares) is in Flood Zone 1 there is, nonetheless, a problem with ditches on this site with frequent surface flooding. There is already a problem with drainage. Drains/sewers and foul sewers are already at full capacity with foul sewer flooding and a back flow of raw sewage into ditches with sewers blocked following heavy rain. It is noted that in a footnote to paragraph 103 of the NPPF that 'A site specific flood risk assessment is required for proposals of 1 hectare or greater in Flood Zone 1(site MN2.20 is 6.5 hectares). The footnote continues: 'All proposals for new development (including minor development and change of use) in Flood Zones 2 and 3, or in an area within Flood Zone 1 which has critical drainage problems (as notified by the local planning authority by the Environment Agency) and where proposed development or a change of use to a more vulnerable class may be subject to other sources of flooding. It is noteworthy that despite the coastal protection works carried out by Sefton Council at the Blundellsands Sailing Club following the storm conditions on 5th December 2013 they were over topped and the Blundellsands Sailing Clubhouse at Hightown damaged. Indeed the coastal area from the West Lancashire Golf Course to Hightown is vulnerable to tidal flooding.

The Sefton Council Local Plan 11.21 states 'Priority habitats sit outside the designated site hierarchy and may be of national (Ancient woodlands) or local importance. Legally protected species include badgers, bats and water voles. Section 119 of the NPPF states 'The presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 14) does not apply where development requiring appropriate assessment under the Birds or habitats Directives is being considered, planned or determined. There is evidence of bats and bat roosts in the Coppice at the bottom of Elmcroft Lane. All bat species and their roosts are legally protected in the

United Kingdom. All bats are listed as European protected species of animals in the European Unions' Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992. This Directive is implemented in the UK by the Conservation (Natural Habitats,&c) Regulations 1994. In England & Wales it is an offence under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981(as amended) to: intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat at roost or intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to a roost. To seek to build a road through this Coppice would almost certainly risk breaching this law. Moreover, there are bats and bat roosts in the trees surrounding Rose Cottage (Grade II Listed) and trees abutting on to Sandy Lane. It is noted that URS in its Habitats Regulations Assessment of January 2015 (Sefton Local Plan HRA/AA) prepared for Sefton Council make the following observations re SO68 (covering the MN2.20 & 2.21 sites) 'Located in an area of sensitivity for pink-footed goose and where records of the species exist according to the Lancashire Bird survey, aerial photographs indicate current land-use is grassland with some scrub. Non-breeding season bird surveys would be required to confirm their presence' It continues, 'If this site is selected it will need to be covered by a site specific HRA accompanying the planning application to provide appropriate protection to the integrity of the SPA/Ramsar site bird population.'

In my opinion both MN2.20 and MN 2.21 are unsuitable for development as proposed in the Local Plan owing to network capacity and accessibility. In addition there will be a need for a site specific flood risk assessment of both sites, a satisfactory Transport Statement, and an assessment under the Habitats Directive. I am also concerned about the schooling of Hightown children as it is considered this aspect of the Sefton Council Local Plan has not been thought through carefully enough. Finally the question of drainage and sewage in this low lying area of Hightown is of particular concern.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.20

Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown

Respondent No 216

Response Ref 1

Representor Name Janeann & David Fealey

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

After consulting the Sefton Local Plan I write to once again express my concerns about the plans to build 130 houses on the two proposed sites on Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane in Hightown. Whilst I was aware that there were proposals to build on sites in Hightown I was astonished to learn of the number of houses proposed which to me seemed to increase ? I was at first told the number was to be around 40 so to find out it was 130 was a great shock. As a resident of Elmcroft Lane and a resident of Hightown for 38 years I feel that I know the area and village very well having relied on the facilities and amenities it has to offer. It is this point which I would wish to raise with you now - I do not believe the infrastructure of Hightown could cope with such a large development and the amount of extra people that these houses would bring.

The village is very small with one shop and one post office and it is very far from the proposed sites, especially the larger site at the end of Elmcroft. How would new residents access the village especially elderly residents? I live here and use the roads that you plan to use for the developments and they will not be able to withstand the traffic. Elmcroft Lane itself is not wide enough for public transport vehicles to drive down and I would assume that with such a large development planned that public transport would be required to access the site ?

Access to the houses is a massive concern for myself and my neighbours. Already the main and only access road to Elmcroft Lane, Sandy Lane, has constant pot holes in it and is always in need of repair. When the football provision on the sports field began some years back the increase in traffic resulted in more potholes and damage to the road and now you have to swerve to miss the potholes or damage your car. So I am of the opinion if it struggles with that traffic now it most certainly will not be able to withstand heavy duty traffic during the build and in the future when accessing the houses. We constantly get trucks stuck in the road trying to get out of our street - due to the narrow width they have no option but to reverse and once they are approaching Sandy Lane end there is a very small amount of room to reverse so I have often seen it take more than half an hour trying to get a truck out successfully ! How would this work with large work vehicles trying to get in and out of the site when building starts ? Currently when this happens if you are trying to get into the road there is no option but to sit and wait for the truck to get out.

I mentioned infrastructure earlier and unlike the other areas proposed in the plan we do not have a school in Hightown and have to access schools in Formby and Crosby. We already experience problems in getting Hightown children into schools in Formby so with no plans for a school here how would we have any chance at all with a larger demand for them ?

I am very concerned at what this proposal means for this lovely quaint village and whilst I fully understand the need to build more homes in Sefton I think that building in an area such as Hightown without adequate roads, amenities, access to education would be a mistake when there are clearly other areas being proposed that would provide this.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 223	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Roger Walsh
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to object to that part of the plan which refers to MN2.20 and MN2.21, the building of houses on Sandy Lane, Hightown and land at the back of Elmcroft Lane, Hightown. The building of these properties will greatly damage the quality of the rural setting. More importantly, the infrastructure to support more dwellings in the village does not exist. The fields identified as potential building sites have a history of subsidence. The drainage ditch running through the 6.5 hectare field has been filled in by the current landowner. There is a high Peat level in this field which results in a high water content in the winter months. This dries out in the summer months making the ground unstable. It is doubtful whether piling, which would need to be to a considerable depth, would remove the risk of instability to any structures built. There is also an unconfirmed rumour that, at some time in the past, tobacco waste was dumped on this land. There is only one road into the village. This is a narrow carriageway with deep sided ditches on either side and a 90 degree bend on the approach to the village.

Vehicles veer off the road and into the ditches even in good weather. In snowy and icy conditions, it has been known for the village to have been cut off totally for considerable periods due to accidents on the lanes. In the winter of 1981, blizzard conditions also closed the railway for a number of days which meant that the whole village was cut off. This caused problems for the parents of very young babies and for the elderly. Such events also greatly hinder access to Police, Ambulance and Fire services to the village. Trying to enter the village via North End Lane on a weekend when junior football is played on the playing fields adjacent to the proposed building sites is almost impossible due to the constant stream of parents' cars entering or leaving the village. An extra 130 homes would not only exacerbate the situation at weekends but would bring about the same problems every day of the week. Within the village there is a Post Office, a newsagent which also sells a few basic supplies, a hairdresser and a pharmacy. There are no other shops. At times, it is virtually impossible to park a car any where near the shops or the station. When the new road for the Chelmere houses being built near the army camp was being created, there was absolute chaos on the village roads. Water pressure to houses in the village has reduced considerably over the last 20 years or so. One assumes that this would be further reduced by the demands of more users. Conversely, the pressure on the existing sewer system would be increased by the extra waste created by the occupants of any new properties. Access to any new site is said to be via Elmcroft Lane. This is a very narrow lane and would not be wide enough to accommodate contractors' plant. Such access would also necessitate the destruction of the small wood at the back of Elmcroft lane.

Has a full independent survey been made of the bat colony which roosts within this wood? When new houses were built on Blundell Road and Elvington Road in 1976, a village school was promised and land set aside. When the next phase of houses were built in the 1980's, part of this land was built on and the remainder became a play area. Children were bussed to school in Formby and Crosby. Formby schools are oversubscribed and it seems obvious that with the level of construction proposed within this plan for both Hightown and Formby, there will not be adequate provision for education within the area.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 229	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Angela Laffler
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I strongly object to 120 new houses for Hightown. The road leading to the village cannot take more traffic. Think of possibly 240 extra children being ferried to schools. Such a shame to ruin a lovely rural aspect for many residents too.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.20 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.20 **Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 230 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** C Scrine
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am writing to register my strong objection to any proposed further housing developments within Hightown, and in particular the current proposal for 120 houses to be built in our area.

There are many reasons for my objection which I am sure you will be made aware of via the relevant bodies, but as a Hightown resident I at this stage purely wish to register my objection to any housing developments.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.20 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.20 **Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 233 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** LJ Jenkins
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I strongly object, for all of the reasons stated for the proposal of 120, houses to be built in Hightown. I've noticed already the problems caused, with large vehicles, coming into Hightown, with just a small amount of houses being built, by the railway, some are going over into, oncoming traffic lanes, as the roads aren't wide enough, very dangerous. I also don't want to see any green belt areas going, as wild life will suffer, and is very precious, also Sand Dunes, which Hightown has lost in past years, due to houses getting built. We pride ourselves on a lovely village and community. People who love these walks, in peace, not feeling threatened. The danger aspect, buses, more traffic on an already dangerous Hightown bends doesn't bare thinking about. That then brings in policing. So I and many others say no thank you to these proposals.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.20 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.20 **Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 238 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** D Higham
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to voice my concern for the building of an additional 200 homes in the Hightown area. Apart from the devasation to wildlife and our green belt area. The increase in road traffic and insufficient facilities to cater for the extra people that will occupy these homes will have a huge detriment to our village and community. There are no schools for any children to attend here, there are no old peoples facilities ie day centres or other facilities to cater for as the owners get older. The addition traffic, noise, pollution and general refuse caused by the addition of that many occupiers is un imaginable. This must also effect the farmers locally have their concerns been listened too. The council is all ready strapped for cash providing limited services. Just where do you expect the children to play from these homes as there is nothing for them here. I'm sure there are other concerns I've missed but please rethink the effects this will have on what is a good community and a lovely place to live. Please reconsider and reject this proposal. We are currently experiencing terrible problems with the houses being built by the train station and that's a much smaller holding. So to times this up x 190 just doesn't bear thinking about. So in conclusion that's a no from us.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 244	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Kim and Barbara Bryan
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

We are opposed to plans for yet more unnecessary and inappropriate house building in our home village of Hightown. The plan to build 120 houses, with its contingent problems of intrusion into areas of wildlife and traffic congestion, is a further example of the bad planning decisions that are made when local authorities are influenced by private developers. A number of existing social problems in urban areas have been created or exacerbated by past planning disasters. In the late sixties and early seventies settled communities were broken up and their inhabitants sent away to wholly unsuitable new 'estates' lacking the components - jobs, amenities, family connections - that enable healthy living spaces to evolve. Nothing has been learned. The municipal housing we need to address shortages and provide economic homes for families in need is gone while homes most of us cannot afford to buy are being built on the greenbelt. Hightown is not an urban community, but it is a community with a well established culture that suits its inhabitants and with enough existing property to accommodate people wanting to move here. Furthermore it is the only genuine village community left on the Sefton coast. We believe it is the duty of council officials to reflect in their governance the interests and needs of the wider community.

Please listen to the people of the village. Do not build these houses.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 249	Response Ref 1	Representor Name David Bosworth
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

The site does not currently meet the economic role due to the lack of network capacity. The proposed exit point for motor traffic from 130 houses down Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane will cause problems at both Our Lady of Victories Church when events are being undertaken due to on street parking and when football is occurring at the pitches off Sandy Lane when 200 plus cars use Sandy Lane as sole access. The increase of traffic exiting on the sole exit route from the village at the bend on the bottom the bridge over the railway line will be subject to severe delays. The site does not meet the social role due to the lack of a contiguous footpath, from the proposed developments to the Railway Station. This is of importance since access to the local Bus (hourly service), school buses or railway and the route to the local park have to go by this route to cross the railway line. Currently the nearest Bus stop is by the Hightown Hotel which would mean that the suggested High Accessibility in the technical assessment (84.2%) is incorrect and should be similar to that of the Railway station (medium 54.2% and low 45.8%). Similarly accessibility to the Neighbourhood Park is low due to the presence of the Railway line necessitating crossing by the Railway Station and then a further > 800m travel to the park. Thus the proposed developments at Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane would pose safety concerns for pedestrians

Summary of Suggested Changes

The economic role problem could be mitigated by making a requirement that the development off Elmcroft lane (m2.20) for 120 houses is abandoned and the original proposal SR4.17 for a smaller development of circa 40 houses is included with commensurate lesser increase in traffic flow. The social role could be mitigated by requiring a play area to be constructed in the development and by zebra crossings being placed in Sandy lane to facilitate safe crossing for pedestrians

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 250	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Akshay Bhatnagar
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

My wife and I own 4 Sandy Lane and we are very concerned about the plans for building new houses in Hightown. I do not object to new houses in principle but I cannot support the proposals as they currently stand. My objections are: Elmcroft Road is a pleasant residential street where kids ride bikes. Safety will be hugely compromised by construction traffic coming through - even if it is widened Sandy Lane and Elmcroft cannot cope with the volume of traffic needed. The bollards at the entrance to Sandy Lane are often knocked over even now. Hightown's amenities are still woefully inadequate - no school, awful provision of GP facilities and just 1 local shop. Access to Hightown will be insufficient to cope with the increased traffic - there is just one way in and out - Sandy Lane and on to the bends. Wildlife and ecology - we have rare moths and bats in the paddock - why disrupt nature when there are other options. I can support the proposal if another access road for the construction traffic and new residents is built. If an alternative access road from Gorsey Lane on the bends which accessed the proposed area directly around the perimeter of the playing fields so there is zero additional traffic coming down Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane during the construction period, and the lack of school, medical services provision is addressed. The ecological issues are appropriately addressed.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 259	Response Ref 1	Representor Name D Howard
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

From the point of view of most of the present residents of the village, there are absolutely no positive reasons for building 120 new houses in Hightown. There are, however a number of probable negative outcomes. If "affordable homes" are built, undoubtedly property values will be adversely affected and grid-lock will surely result if more vehicles are parked in the narrow roads close to the shops and the station. Hightown has changed slowly over the years, but, at present, it still is a very pleasant and friendly place to live. Families from the proposed 120 new homes would certainly put a severe strain on the limited services available and they could not fail to have a significant affect on the character of the community.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 275	Response Ref 1	Representor Name G Rowe
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

According to the local plan there are proposals to build 120 houses on a site via elmcroft lane, Hightown (MN210) and 10 houses in Sandy Lane Hightown MN2.23. There are plans to use elmcroft lane, a quiet cul de sac, as a through way to the proposed building site. This would cause many problems for the residents, the most serious being structural problems and damage to the present propoerties. In this event who is responsible for repairs? The small wood at the end of Elmcroft Lane is home to red squirrels and bats and other species icnluding woodpeckers and herons. There are also many red squirrels in the gardens in Elmcroft lane which are regularly seen crossing the road. The prospect of seeing squashed squirrels on the road is not a happy one. All the land in this part of Hightown is low lying and subject to flooding. In the winter thousands of pink foot geese frequent the area using the fields for feeding and roosting.

What provisions are there for schools for the children of Hightown? At the moment children are bussed to schools in Formby. Will there be room for Hightown children in the future? It is proposed to build many more houses in Formby but some schools have been closed + there are proposals to build on the sites.The roads leading out of hightown are already heavily loaded. North End lane leading to the bypass is an accident black spot. Moss lane leading to crobey and the by pass have tail backs every morning and evening. In conclusion it is my opinion that Hightown is not a sutailable place for any further development.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 277	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Judy Glynn-Jones
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to make the strongest objection to the building of 120 houses in Hightown. With basically only one road into Hightown the volume of traffic will be horrific.

Is there any plan to build a primary school?

If this plan did go ahead what about a road from Gorsey Lane to divert some of the traffic!

There are no facilities to accommodate this building.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.20 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.20 **Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 279 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Anne Fletcher
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Comment

Summary of Main Issues

My reservations are based on several factors:- loss of wildlife and open spaces. Increase of traffic into and out of the village which has only one access road causing extra congestion. The need for extra school buses to get children to schools in Crosby and Formby (provided of course that there are enough places available in those schools). The disruption which will be caused during the 5-year building period from lorries travelling in and out of the village. Though it is understandable that more houses are needed in the country it doesn't make much sense to build on green-field sites when there are so many brown-field sites available as well as many empty properties. Hightown is at capacity as it is for the amenities available. The planned build would push that situation to an unacceptable level.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.20 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.20 **Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 280 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name**
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I think it will be madness to build 120 houses in Hightown. For a start we cannot sell the houses already on the market and I have a list of houses both big and small houses. There are no facilities for children in the village except for one youth club meeting a week and one small playground. Also the roads around the suggested area are in a very bad state and would have to be completely relaid before any traffic could use them. 13 houses are already under construction and if these are 4,5 or 6 bedroom houses that must mean children, again what is there for them to do. I have lived in this village for 57 years and I am dead against any more houses for all the reasons stated on your leaflet.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.20 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.20 **Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 293 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** AW & EA Triggs
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am writing to strongly object to the proposed erection of a large housing estate on nearby Green Belt land. The main access off Sandy Lane is already congested, especially on Saturdays with traffic from the football pitches. This little unspoilt village cannot take such a bottleneck around the station area. Please note our strong objection.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove site MN2.20 from the plan as an allocation.

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object in the strongest way to the plans for the building of 120 new houses at the end of Elmcroft Lane. This scheme does not take into consideration the situation in Hightown — children having to be taken by bus to school, insufficient places available for any new children, inevitable congestion with added traffic, lack of suitable infrastructure in the village to name a few. The land proposed is, I understand, peat and pile-driving any building will add so much to costs that affordable housing will be impossible. Why consider Elmcroft Lane as an access road? Any new houses built behind, and parallel to Elmcroft Lane, will require access and any such road could be extended to have entry from Sandy Lane. This would be much more suitable than Elmcroft which is already a busy and, at times, congested road. I trust that you will have second thoughts on the advisability of the current plan and will find the necessary land for new housing in a much more suitable position.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove site MN2.20 from the plan as an allocation.

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown
----------------------	--

Respondent No 298	Response Ref 1	Representor Name David Taylor
--------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

As far as we are aware the current proposal is to erect 10 new properties in 0.7 hectares on the East side of Elmcroft Lane behind the existing properties and with entrance to the site via Sandy Lane. The current proposal is also to erect 120 new properties in 6.5 hectares (16.06 acres) at the South end of Elmcroft Lane which is currently a quiet cul-de-sac. The land at the South end of Elmcroft Lane comprises a wooded area currently used for equestrian purposes and thence to the South, farmland. We understand the wooded area will be left as is but provide access to the proposed new housing area via an extension to Elmcroft Lane through the wooded area. We are assured the developments will be in keeping with the current properties in Elmcroft Lane and will be spaced at 8 —10 properties per acre. The affordable requirement is 30% but we are assured the affordable units will be indistinguishable from the market units albeit smaller types. Whilst we are very much against the development of Green Belt land in Hightown for the reasons set out in this document we understand the thinking behind the choice of Green Belt land. The land in question will always be available for sale as there is no other practical use for the land apart from farming.

In addition to our objection to the development of the Green Belt land we are very much against the use of Elmcroft Lane for access to so many houses. The proposal we consider is unsafe in many ways set out below and has a serious effect on the value of existing properties in Elmcroft Lane. The writer estimates that this proposed development has stopped the sale of houses in Elmcroft Lane and has reduced the values of those properties by some 100— 150K. As far as the writer is aware there is no compensation offered for these losses from any source.

As residents in Elmcroft Lane we are extremely concerned about the effect of extra traffic in the lane and indeed Sandy Lane. Elmcroft Lane is a narrow lane (6M wide) and whilst the road surface in Elmcroft Lane is acceptable the surface in Sandy Lane is not and already shows signs of significant settlement (see photo). Assuming 2 vehicles per property that increases the use of Elmcroft Lane's 23 houses (46 vehicles) to 143 houses (286 vehicles) approximately a 500% + increase. It is hard to imagine how this narrow lane will cope with that volume of traffic in rush hour and Sandy Lane will have that traffic plus an increase of 20 vehicles from the new properties on the East side of Elmcroft Lane and the significant road usage associated with the sporting activities undertaken at the playing fields on the South side of Sandy Lane. It should also be noted there are no schools for any age group in Hightown so all the children and teenagers of Hightown have to attend schools in Formby and Crosby or further away. The school run problem and the fact that, in this day and age, it is very common for both parents to work further accentuates the traffic problems.

The previous point assumes the proposed properties have already been built but in addition to those problems we have the insurmountable problems of volumes of heavy vehicles during the building process. On road parking is already a significant problem due to the very many vehicles using the sporting activities on Sandy Lane and often that parking problem spills into Elmcroft Lane. In addition to the above every vehicle wishing to travel North to Formby or South to Liverpool has to use the same single route in and out of Hightown (Kerslake Way / Moss Lane see photo) which is also a narrow road in itself. The considerable traffic from the West side of Hightown has right of way on Kerslake Way / Moss Lane and a 'T' junction at the end of Alt Road / Sandy Lane (see photo) is the only exit from the East side of Hightown (Elmcroft Lane side). If the planning proposal is approved in its current form the 'T' junction at the end of Sandy Lane will have to be completely redesigned to prevent serious accidents. A further concern is for access by emergency vehicles as they try to attend the new 120 additional houses having to travel down the narrow roads of Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane. The Local Plan points out the convenience of the railway station in Hightown. This provides electric train services to Southport and Liverpool and many stops in between and the trains are good and regular. It should be noted there is no parking facility at all at Hightown station and no room to develop any. This is presumably because Hightown was initially a village and the development of that village has continued at an unstoppable rate. We estimate some 250 houses have been built in Hightown since we have been residents and save for the railway road bridge connecting the West side of Hightown to the East there has been no improvement or development of Moss Lane. In asking questions about the local plan we are informed a Transport Statement/ Assessment has not been undertaken as yet even though we think this document should be produced at the earliest possible opportunity. As the Transport Statement /Assessment is not available to view it is impossible for anyone wishing to comment on the Local Plan to do so with accuracy.

In trying to continue the development of Hightown serious thought has to be given to traffic management and the general facilities in the area. Hightown has one small news agent, one small post office and a Chemist. It also has a doctor's surgery with, as far as we are aware, no permanent doctors and a small dentist's surgery which is full and cannot accept further patients. Hightown was a small village set in pleasant countryside. The development of these sites will have a significant effect on the community. The writer also considers the developments in question will devalue both the quality of life in the community and certainly the value of property in Elmcroft Lane substantially. In the most recent census the population of Hightown was 3,247. With this development of 130 houses plus a further 13 already being built and the U.K. average household of 2.4 people the population growth will be more than 10% which we consider is excessive. The local amenities are suitable for a small village and

residents already have to travel to Formby for any varied and reasonable sized facilities. We are told that the majority of the wooded area at the end of Elmcroft Lane will be retained and that access only will be provided for the 120 new houses through that wooded area and into the existing Elmcroft Lane. It has been mentioned on many occasions in the past that the wooded area at the end of Elmcroft Lane provides for the wellbeing of many red squirrels and bats which are protected species. It is hard to believe that either of these species will remain whilst a two lane road is constructed, old and established trees are removed and the heavy traffic involved in the construction of the road and the 120 new houses passes through the wooded area. After the construction is finished the heavy level of traffic through the woods will undoubtedly deter any significant animal life in the area. Whilst there are few official records of bats in the wooded area at the end of Elmcroft Lane most of the residents of Elmcroft Lane are aware of their presence and it is strongly suggested an official survey is conducted.

Local Plan 7. Site Access — Moderate Constraint — "There is little scope to provide any alternative / additional points of access for either vehicles or pedestrians". Photos Sandy Lane 4 and 5 show from the site development area into Hightown down Sandy Lane and it is not the intention of the writer that the roads in these areas be improved. These photos are for clarity only. It can be seen from the enclosed marked map that Sandy Lane continues past the Northern end of Elmcroft Lane to a right hand bend by cottages on the bend and thence to a left hand bend (approx. 234M) immediately adjacent to the site earmarked for development (photo Sandy Lane Sandy Lane then continues to a 'T' junction with Gorsey Lane (approx. 367M) (photos Sandy Lane 2 and 3). A left turn onto Gorsey Lane (photo Gorsey Lane 1) continues to a 'T' junction at Moss Lane (approx. 935M) (photos Gorsey Lane 2 and 3). Turning right onto Moss Lane (B5193) which is a main route to Liverpool from Hightown through Little Crosby and Crosby. Turning left onto Moss Lane is a route through to Hightown, Formby and Southport.

The site earmarked for development has direct access to Sandy Lane where a right hand turn would lead to Moss Lane and thence Liverpool as described above. Whilst about 50% of Sandy Lane is not made up road it is the opinion of the writer that this unmade track from the development site to Gorsey Lane could easily be widened and surfaced to present an acceptable approach road to the new development. Equally well Gorsey Lane which is made up and narrow but again it is the opinion of the writer that this could easily be widened to present an acceptable approach road for the new development. There is plenty of available land on either side of both roads and the drainage ditches at the side of the roads could be moved to allow for the development. There could also be a walkway provided around and to the East of the wooded area providing walking/cycle access to Elmcroft Lane, the local station and other small services provided in Hightown. This would allow for the minimum of disturbance to the wooded area and avoid to a great extent disturbance to the resident protected species.

Summary of Suggested Changes

The representation indicates that the site MN2.20 should not be allocated. However it is implied that if it is allocated: The site earmarked for development has direct access to Sandy Lane where a right hand turn would lead to Moss Lane and thence Liverpool as described above. Whilst about 50% of Sandy Lane is not made up road it is the opinion of the writer that this unmade track from the development site to Gorsey Lane could easily be widened and surfaced to present an acceptable approach road to the new development. Equally well Gorsey Lane which is made up and narrow but again it is the opinion of the writer that this could easily be widened to present an acceptable approach road for the new development. There is plenty of available land on either side of both roads and the drainage ditches at the side of the roads could be moved to allow for the development. There could also be a walkway provided around and to the East of the wooded area providing walking/cycle access to Elmcroft Lane, the local station and other small services provided in Hightown. This would allow for the minimum of disturbance to the wooded area and avoid to a great extent disturbance to the resident protected species.

Evidence Submitted

Photographs and maps supplied to support the text.

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 300	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Carole & Grenville Evans
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I am sending this e-mail to you to let you know that we are opposed to this development for the following reasons: Living on Sandy Lane which would provide access to the development we are very concerned about the volume of construction traffic passing our residence, as well as the number of vehicles for the builders themselves. The plan suggests this could go on for 5 years and we do not find this acceptable. We bought our house in Hightown knowing that potential for building projects of this nature were extremely limited, hence we decided to buy. If this development does go ahead the volume of traffic passing us in Sandy Lane could be as high as 200 plus car journeys, especially as Hightown does not have its own school, so the number of school runs morning and night will be very high. This would also cause additional congestion on access roads, as you well know Hightown is a village with one road in and one road out. The likelihood is that the new houses would have children, and if the average of 2.2 per family is the case then there will be an extra 250+ children requiring school places, places which currently do not exist we believe. This also means additional school buses. Not the least is the removal of green land and therefore the loss of wildlife in the area. We were also concerned that there was a suggestion of creating dedicated on road parking spaces in Sandy Lane, but who for and where would they be? I am sure many other residents here in Hightown will be writing to you to object and will be citing similar reasons as outlined above by my wife and I.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove MN2.20 as an allocation.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 305	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Hanorah B Noonan
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I strongly object to the plan to build 120 houses in Hightown, the village itself is only small and 120 houses is out of all proportion to the rest of the properties and will swamp the village and access road. It will also have a negative impact on wildlife and green spaces. I also see it as a Health and Safety issue, the one road actually going into the village consist of a very narrow lane as well as an extremely sharp bend. Lorries required to go in and out of village tend to actually traverse nearly 2 lanes, can't understand why this has not been addressed before. If this road gets blocked it will cause major problems, one road in and one road out, will there be another wider road built to aid extra traffic? We already have new houses being built "Blundell Hamlet" these are in proportion to the rest of the properties and will have little effect in the life of the village but 120 Houses just far too much.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove site MN2.20 as an allocation.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 312	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Kevin Kewn
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Please accept this email as an objection to the proposed building of more houses in Hightown. In my opinion, we are already at saturation point. The traffic load has significantly increased year on year and the proposal of another 120 houses and the further increase in traffic that would follow would impact negatively on already over parked roads, increasing the risk of an accident to motorist, pedestrian and more importantly children. The building traffic would also cause considerable disruption to the village, as is the case with the present building work alongside the station. The council did a magnificent job in creating and walk/cycle path from Hightown to Formby, and this has been virtually unusable since the present builders have been in situ. We have one road in and out of the village, and an increase of traffic which would accompany any further build, could lead to more road traffic accidents. The downgrading of Formby fire station should also be taken into consideration when deciding whether to increase homes in Hightown, as with reduced cover and increased homes the risk would be far greater.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove MN2.20 from the plan as an allocation.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 319	Response Ref 1	Representor Name
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Please find the enclosed list of our objections in this letter on the following grounds for the proposed 120 housing development to be built on our valuable green space which we know will have a detrimental and devastating effect on our wildlife also possibly nother 200+ cars in and out of the village causing such extra disruption and congestion on our already small access roads. We have no local school within Hightown and extra buses would be required (if there where any available places in local schools) and approximately there would be a build programme of 5+ years bringing in a heavy and constant flow of lorries etc, creating more pollution; noise and disruption to our quite village life health and well being and we feel this is unfair that as residents we should suffer this total inconvenience and disruption to our health and well being. We are just a small village that already has limited parking facilities for our own residents and visitors and due to the increasing population here we do on occasions already have to park 2 to 3 roads away from the bus stop and train station making it difficult in bad weather and taking into account the safety aspect in winter months when it is dark etc. We have resided here for over 35 years and our reason for living here was because it was a small village providing a good community life and a healthy place to live also its small population and very low crime rate. We strongly object to this proposal and hope you will take on board our strong objection due to the size and nature of its location that will bring in significant effects and change in terms of visual intrusion and the potential noise impact and severe disruption to existing traffic and the possibility of increased future volume of traffic resulting in chaos because we already have the new upgraded coastal footpath which brings in more people to the area which in turn brings in more litter, noise and general disruption to our small village.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove site MN2.20 as an allocation.

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.20

Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown

Respondent No 322

Response Ref 1

Representor Name R, JJ, C & V Wolfe

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Me and all my family strongly object to all the proposed building of new houses in Hightown, and our objections are as follows. There is no need for affordable housing in Hightown, as the price of houses is already affordable, and in your proposal there is no mention of the price for this affordable housing or how you intend to manage the sale of them. In your proposal there are no benefits for any or all of these houses, to any one in Hightown, or any were else. No more shops, no more bus stops, only less green belt land and less sports area, so who is going to benefit? Not the people of Hightown. The building of these houses will be of great upset, to everyone in Hightown, and to people visiting the area.

On a Sunday and Saturday, the traffic is very busy at times with people coming and going from the sports fields, on that side of Hightown, and this is only going to add to that much more traffic, and congestion, as well as the pollution from these lorries, and trucks. The noise level in Hightown can sometimes be very loud, due to the Rifle range, but that will be nothing to the noise over the next 5 years due to the building traffic, which is highly unacceptable.

At the moment my grandson plays at the sports field on that side of Hightown and it is good that we can walk him there, and are not adding to the traffic, but with these fields that being a great source of keeping sport alive and keeping fit, were are they going to go? There seems to be less green area than ever before. The loss of Green belt land is also unacceptable, where is all the local wild life going to go? We have peacock's that walk all around Hightown, at the moment they have the freedom to do this, all the residents that live here know to look out for them, we would not like to see anything happen to these birds. Would we be getting more buses to pick up more children that will need to go to local schools, if they can get in? Where would this money come from for these buses if we did get them?

Please save our village, and keep it the nice place that it is at the moment to live, a very concerned resident of Hightown.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove site MN2.20 as an allocation.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 329	Response Ref 9	Representor Name Michael Collier
Organisation Name Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester & North Merseyside		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

LWT objects to the allocation of this site for housing. Compared with the original draft plan, this proposal represents a large extension southwards to include the northern half of an ecologically rich site known as "Hightown Meadows" as well as part of an adjacent playing field. The map shows intrusion into the north-west corner of the meadow and adjacent area of playing field, affecting about 30% of the former directly. However, indirect effects, such as disturbance and drainage are also likely to be highly damaging, especially as the site's interest depends, in part, on a high water-table.

The nature conservation interest of Hightown Meadows has been known since 1980. It covers about 2.5ha immediately east of the railway line and is underlain by waterlogged blown-sand over peat. The most recent of several ecological reports describes an unusual acidic plant group quite different from that found to the west of the railway line and unique on the Sefton Coast. A total of 93 vascular plants was identified, of which several are notable species. They include Marsh Pennywort and Mat-grass, both being upgraded in the 2014 Vascular Plant Red List for England to "Near Threatened" status. Also present was much of the regionally notable Narrow Buckler-fern, as well as 22 individuals of Royal Fern. Although not listed as notable, this spectacular fern is rare in Merseyside. The meadows were also found to be rich in invertebrates, including several species of butterflies, the "local" Silver Hook moth and abundant Common Green Grasshopper. The adjacent playing field supports Slender Trefoil and Knotted Clover, both being "Species of Conservation Importance in North West England".

The site has long been proposed for designation as a Local Wildlife Site and clearly meets the relevant guidelines for selection. The proposed development would make major inroads into the Meadows and threaten the viability of the rest of the site. It would involve the partial destruction of an area of Local Wildlife Site value supporting a habitat and species assemblage of unique importance on the Sefton Coast, the loss of which could not be compensated for elsewhere. These adverse impacts could be mitigated if the proposed development site was reduced in area and its boundary was set back at least 100m to the north, with the aim of reducing both direct and indirect effects on the area of major conservation value.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 338	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Phyllis Gunner
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

My objections are: - Village surgery has difficulties with the numbr of residents in 2015, to give an efficient service. Would require extra school buses (if there were available places in local schools). May affect property values. Many more cars travelling in and out of the village causing extra congestion on access roads. Loss of wildlife and greenspaces. Approximate build programme of 5 years duration causing constant flow of lorries in and out of the village.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove sites MN2.20 and MN2.21 as allocations.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 339	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Edward & Blanche Arch
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Our village does not have the infrastructure to support that number of new houses e.g no school. We are trying to maintain a village community. We do not wish to become a dormitory town, there is already building of unnecessary executive housing in progress. More importantly, in the early 1970's Elmcroft Road was improved from an ash road and reconstructed up minimum local authority adoption standards, (i.e. cul-de-sac road) not a through road or spine road. As a retired chartered civil engineer involved in the construction of this work, I know that the thick layer of peat under this road and under the houses was not removed. The road has just survived without much deformation but any increase in traffic, especially heavy goods vehicles, will be beyond capability and cause settlement to the houses. An alternative route would have to be found if the proposed development went ahead.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove sites MN2.20 and MN2.21 as allocations.

An alternative route would have to be found if the proposed development went ahead.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 341	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Malcolm Walker
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

We only have a small village centre and government cutshave resulted in less funding for maintenance of roundabouts and public spaces and volunteers are having to ensure standards are maintained. To build more houses in Hightown would necessitate a monumental alteration to the infrastructure of the area which would prove the development impracticable.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove sites MN2.20 and MN2.21 as allocations.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 342	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Barbara Hope
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Only access would be down Elmcroft Lane, which is too narrow and unsuitable for heavy traffic or buses - which would be needed for this estate. Ground liable to flooding/houses would need under-pinning, putting up the price to build. In paddock adjacent to field we have bats, red squirrels, wood peckers, as well as many wild flowers. Approach road in and out of Hightown cannot take anymore traffic, especially at weekends when we have we have a gridlock of football traffic. Amenities inadequate - no school, limited shops far from new houses. You may or may not know the houses in Elmcroft Lane are liable to subsidence. Any increase in traffic could increase the problem. Believe me, the residents of this road will monitor their houses carefully for any sign of damage and will be quick to demand a decrease in Council tax for any inconvenience or signs of disturbance. The value of our houses will drop dramatically if these plans go ahead. I wonder if Sefton planning have thought this through as well as my my objections stated. I feel the houses will have to be underpinned or placed on rafts due to flooding/increased cost of building. Who would want to buy them , elderly people would feel totally isolated out there - no school for the young families and limited access for all. Hightown would lose its "village" atmosphere turning it into sprawl with Crosby. The people who live here choose to do without shops our individuality. Red squirrel alert and tree conservation have been informed. A bat survey must be done before further development.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove MN2.20 as a proposed allocation.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 353	Response Ref 1	Representor Name
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I and my wife are opposed to the further development for housing in Hightown. Having been a family resident of 39 years in Hightown the scope for development has been limited to individual infill or sale of side garden plots. Only extension into the green belt can further houses be built given the borders of either the railway line, sea/dunes or coastal path. The character of the village is established with the old housing and farm houses/ agricultural land, new housing within the green belt at the road access into Hightown would be a huge 'blot' on the landscape and village setting. The population of Hightown has slowly increased over the years with later developments south to Crosby, there is no primary school yet a much smaller village of Little Crosby has one? A new primary school would have to be built and where would that go, you cannot keep "bussing in" more and more children to Formby which also has proposed increase in developments which will take up more pupil requirements for high and primary schools.

This development is unsuitable and not sustainable for a village such as Hightown. There are hundreds of brown filed sites in litherland/Bootle and Southport where old, redundant empty factories are no longer required and have remained so, being more suitable factory space on proper industrial estates. There is no need for these green belt developments in Formby or Hightown we are losing more and more 'green spaces' on land known for the wildlife such as pheasants and barn owls but most importantly the migrating geese that first land in these fields after crossing the coast. Hightown is right under the migration flight path the geese drop down into this field, rest and feed before onward flight to Martin Mere, they also feed out on the estuary, it is their first landfall for thousands of geese. This green belt development must not be allowed and we object.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove sites MN2.20 and MN2.21 as proposed allocations.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 359	Response Ref 8	Representor Name Catherine Fraser
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

MN2.20 & MN2.21 in Hightown consists of 130 houses. Originally the council proposed building 58 homes in Hightown because I quote "Only a limited amount of development is proposed in the Greenbelt around Hightown. This reflects the limited number of services and facilities in the village" (A Local Plan for Sefton Document) . Sefton now need to explain whether they are going to provide the extra services required. Currently there is a major problem in terms of a lack of GP services. If I remember right there is a pub and a shop. This development cannot possibly be sustainable. The Local Plan needs to say what extra services Sefton are going to provide. This is an increase in the housing allocation of 124%. In any case such a development is going to have a major impact upon a small community. This "about turn" in policy illustrates a certain element of cynicism.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove site as an allocation.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 361	Response Ref 16	Representor Name A D Fraser
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

MN2.20 & MN2.21 in Hightown consists of 130 houses. Originally the council proposed building 58 homes in Hightown because I quote "Only a limited amount of development is proposed in the Greenbelt around Hightown. This reflects the limited number of services and facilities in the village" (A Local Plan for Sefton Document) . Sefton now need to explain whether they are going to provide the extra services required. Currently there is a major problem in terms of a lack of GP services. If I remember right there is a pub and a shop. This development cannot possibly be sustainable. The Local Plan needs to say what extra services Sefton are going to provide. This is an increase in the housing allocation of 124%. In any case such a development is going to have a major impact upon a small community. This "about turn" in policy illustrates a certain element of cynicism.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove Green Belt sites as allocations.

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.20

Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown

Respondent No 385

Response Ref 1

Representor Name Shirley Roberts

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I object on the grounds that there is only one narrow road into and out of Hightown, which is extremely congested during rush hour already and is, therefore not suitable for any increase in traffic which would result from lorries transporting building materials to and from the site during construction of the proposed development and, in the long term, additional vehicles belonging to residents of the houses. The Hightown access road is bounded on both sides by extremely deep drainage ditches and there have been numerous accidents, with cars ending up in the ditches, particularly in winter when the road is icy.

There is no school in Hightown, so children have to be bussed into either Formby or Crosby, although schools in both areas have, in the past, been unable to accommodate Hightown children on several occasions. There is, consequently a glut of school buses and coaches using the access route on school holidays. This development will not provide new or improved road/rail infrastructure and would require substantial improvements and alterations to the existing infrastructure. I fail to see why, with the reduction in Sefton's population, so many more houses are required, particularly on Green Belt land. Should any more be needed there are sufficient brownfield sites on which to build.

Summary of Suggested Changes

No development should take place until the road infrastructure is dramatically improved e.g by widening the access roads. A primary school should be built in Hightown to accommodate the extra influx of children into the village. All brownfield sites and empty houses should be used before any encroachment on the Green Belt.

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.20

Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown

Respondent No 389

Response Ref 1

Representor Name Stephen Smith

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We have major concerns about the effect that this will have upon us. We understand that the only access to this proposed site will be via Elmcroft Lane with no exit road from any part of the site. Traffic visiting the site during its construction and after its completion will have to drive down the small roads of Alt Road, Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane. These roads already show signs of settlement and increased heavy traffic will only add to the problem. The residents of these roads will find that their environment and the character of their dwellings will change significantly. Major factors when we bought the house were its quiet location and minimal traffic. The proposed site will change these aspects completely and one can only imagine will have a dramatic effect on the value of the property.

There are other concerns that we have about the overall impact on Hightown which we now detail. Proposed growth of Hightown One concern is the size of the proposed growth of Hightown which is out of keeping with its character and socio-economic function in the borough. Hightown is a much smaller settlement to neighboring Formby on which most Hightown residents are dependent for local amenities. In the 2011 census the population of Hightown was 3,247. In addition to the proposed development of 120 houses at the end of Elmcroft Lane there is another proposed development of 10 houses in a nearby location. Based upon the UK average household size of 2.4 people the two proposed development sites could result in a population growth of nearly 10%.

Another concern is Hightown lacks local amenities for its population of 3,247 and with a proposed population growth of 10% this lack of amenity will be further exasperated. A small newsagents and a small post office store do not meet the needs of Hightown residents who have to travel to Formby and other shopping centres for shopping facilities. This is also no school in Hightown which means that Hightown school children have to travel to other schools in the borough for their education. Most residents of Hightown have no option but to use the one road to drive in and out of Hightown. This leads to a convergence of traffic where the vehicles from the west side of Hightown meet the traffic from the east side of Hightown. This is the 'T' junction where Alt Road joins Kerslake Way.

The cars of the residents of the proposed extra 130 houses in Hightown will add to this busy 'T' junction which will need to be better controlled by the introduction of a roundabout or traffic lights if the risk of increased road traffic accidents is to be avoided. Should there be a need for emergency vehicles to access the two proposed sites then there could be delays as the emergency vehicles go down the narrow roads of Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane.

The peat substrate within the soil causes concern about the risk of further subsidence in Hightown which represents danger to life and property. Hightown is a small settlement, pleasantly situated in a rural location and there are many types of wildlife including bats in the vicinity of the proposed sites. The development of the two sites will have a significant effect on the character of the area. They will have the effect of urbanising the settlement with negative impacts on the amenity for the residents of Hightown and in particular those that live on Alt Road, Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane. They will also impact on the setting of Rose Farm Cottage which is a Grade II Listed Building. I trust that the planning team will give due consideration to these major concerns and recognise that the proposed developments are not acceptable.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove MN2.20 and MN2.21 as allocations in the plan.

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The following are 5 major concerns that I have about the proposed development of up to 130 houses referred to as sites MN2.20 and MN2.21 in the Sefton Plan.

Firstly, high level of housing growth in Hightown The plan gives cause for concern about the size of the proposed growth of Hightown which is out of keeping with its character and socio-economic function in the borough. Hightown is a much smaller settlement to neighboring Formby on which most Hightown residents are dependent for local amenities. In the 2011 census the population of Hightown was 3,247 while in Formby the population was 24,996. Based upon the UK average household size of 2.4 people the two proposed development sites in Hightown could result in a population growth of nearly 10%.

Secondly, lack of amenities in Hightown Hightown lacks local amenities for its population of 3,247 and with a proposed population growth of 10% this lack of amenity will be further exasperated. A small newsagents and a small post office store do not meet the needs of Hightown residents who have to travel to Formby and other shopping centres for shopping facilities. This is also no school in Hightown which means that Hightown school children have to travel to other schools in the borough for their education.

Thirdly, road infrastructure in Hightown Most residents of Hightown have no option but to use the one road to drive in and out of Hightown. This leads to a convergence of traffic where the vehicles from the west side of Hightown meet the traffic from the east side of Hightown. This is the IT' junction where traffic using Sandy Lane and Alt Road joins the traffic using Kerslake Way. The cars of the residents of the proposed extra 130 houses in Hightown will add to the busy IT' junction which will need to be better controlled by the introduction of a roundabout or traffic lights if the risk of increased number of road traffic accidents is to be avoided. The only access to 120 of the proposed 130 houses will be via the small roads of Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane. These roads already show signs of settlement and increased heavy traffic will only add to the problem. The residents of both of these roads will find that that their environment and the character of their dwellings will change significantly. It is hard to imagine that it will be considered adequate, from a health and safety point of view, for Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane to provide access to 120 additional houses with no other road providing an exit from the proposed new development. Should there be a need for emergency vehicles to access one of 120 additional houses at the end of Elmcroft Lane then there could be delays as the emergency vehicles go down the narrow roads of Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane.

Fourthly, deliverability and viability of the site The peat substrate within the soil raises questions about the deliverability and viability of the site as there is a high cost associated with its removal. There is also the risk that potential subsidence could take place, representing danger to life and property.

Finally, changing the character of Hightown Hightown is a small settlement, pleasantly situated in a rural location and there are many types of wildlife including bats in the vicinity of the proposed sites. The development of the two sites will have a significant effect on the character of the area. They will have the effect of urbanising the settlement with negative impacts on the amenity for the residents of Hightown and in particular those that live on Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane. They will also impact on the setting of Rose Farm Cottage which is a Grade II Listed Building.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.20 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.20 **Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 422 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Tony Handley
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The village is current underserved in terms of infrastructure and any further residential dwellings will put further drain on stretched resources. Coupled with this, it is my firm belief that if this proposal goes ahead, members of the public will be put at risk due to the increased traffic on the limited and narrow access to the village.

I would like to support the points above with some very specific examples:- During snow fall on Friday 19th December 2008, the village was effectively cut off for 12 hours, with very little traffic being able to enter or leave the village – it was a miracle that casualties were suffered. The heavy haulage lorry that brings loads to the railway yard on Sandy Lane, has collided with the bollard outside our house on at least 4 occasions, the lorry regularly has to leave the village on the wrong side of the road as it cannot manoeuvre around the junction. The roads leading to Elmcroft Lane are woefully inadequate to accommodate heavy haulage vehicles. The traffic on a Saturday and Sunday is already crippling the approach to the fields on Sandy Lane, more residences will make this route unbearable. On 3 occasions, traffic accidents on the bends have caused havoc with the residents trying to enter the village, just today (March 19th), there was another RTA on Orrell Hill Lane, which effective shut any route towards The Pheasant for 2 hours, forcing cars onto the Bypass. During the recent bus replacement service for the railway, I witnessed cars having to mount the grass verge just to let the bus passed, on one occasion when 2 buses were trying to pass each other, it took 3 mins and caused mass confusion, the traffic was backed right up to the by-pass, again how no one was injured was a miracle. I am sure others will object to this project, with more expertise than I, about the environmental impact the proposals will have, but for myself and my family (and those in the village), the sheer volume and density of traffic that will result from these proposals, will put our village at a safety risk; and I expect you and your colleagues to hold the safety of your community at the top of your moral list.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.20 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.20 **Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 425 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Richard and Marilyn Kinch
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to register my objection to the proposed building of 120 houses in Hightown, my objections being. The effect of some 200 plus cars into the village causing risk and congestion on our only access road. More school busses, and would there be local placements for the children? The loss of more wild life. The danger of builders lorries for the 5 year build programme on our very narrow access road in and out of the village. We must have infrastructure first.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 426	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Joan Fieldsend
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to make the following points in my objection to the building of 120 houses in Hightown: The increase in traffic in and out of Hightown, which has only one road in and out. Parked cars in the village will increase and this is already an issue. The effect on wildlife and green spaces within the Hightown area. There is no school in Hightown and the extra buses required to take the children to school would cause extra traffic problems

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 430	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Craig Stobie
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

The following are major concerns that I have about the proposed development of up to 130 houses referred to as sites MN2.20 and MN2.21 in the Sefton Plan.

Hightown is a small settlement, pleasantly situated in a rural location and there are many types of wildlife including bats in the vicinity of the proposed sites. The development of the two sites will have a significant effect on the character of the area. They will have the effect of urbanising the settlement with negative impacts on the amenity for the residents of Hightown and in particular those that live on Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane. They will also impact on the setting of Rose Farm Cottage which is a Grade II Listed Building.

The plan gives cause for concern about the size of the proposed growth of Hightown which is out of keeping with its character and socio-economic function in the borough. In the 2011 census the population of Hightown was 3,247 and based upon the UK average household size of 2.4 people the two proposed development sites in Hightown could result in a population growth of nearly 10%.

Hightown lacks local amenities already for its population of 3,247 and with a proposed population growth of 10% this lack of amenity will be further exasperated. A small newsagents and a small post office store do not meet the needs of Hightown residents who have to travel to Formby and other shopping centres for shopping facilities. This is also no school in Hightown which means that Hightown school children have to travel to other schools in the borough for their education.

Residents of Hightown have no option but to use the one road in and out of the village. The only access to 120 of the proposed 130 houses will be via the small roads of Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane. The roads around Sandy Lane already show significant signs of settlement and increased heavy traffic will only add to the problem impacting road quality but also the drains and sewers in Hightown. It will also have a significant impact for the residents of both of these roads who will find that that their environment and the character of their dwellings will change significantly.

The peat substrate within the soil raises questions about the deliverability and viability of the site as there is a high cost associated with its removal. There is also the risk that potential subsidence could take place, representing danger to life and property. I trust that the planning team will give due consideration to these major concerns and recognise that the proposed developments are not justifiable in size and scope, not feasible and certainly not acceptable to myself or other Hightown residents.

Summary of Suggested Changes

The redevelopment of existing sites and development of land accessible by the new link road from switch island.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 436	Response Ref 1	Representor Name David Griffiths
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I strongly object to the proposed building of 120 house for the following reasons: Possibly another 200+ cars travelling in and out of the village causing extra congestion on access roads. Vehicle parking in the village is horrendous at the moment with vehicles parking on double yellow lines and not policed. Extra school buses would be required (If there were available places in local schools). Approximate build programme of 5 years duration, causing a constant flow of lorries in and out of the village which cannot cope with the current level of traffic. Loss of wildlife and green spaces. May well affect property values

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 451	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Peter R Williams
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I have many reasons to object but I am concentrating on the most serious aspect should the plans proceed as outlined, namely the overwhelming of the Hightown coastal frontage by the sea and/or internal flooding. Thirty years ago, after the last spate of housebuilding in Hightown, the planning authority stated that no more house building would be permitted in Hightown until secure sea defences had been built. Twenty years ago the closet building to the sea, namely the clubhouse of the Blundellsands Sailing Club was in danger of being inundated by the rising sea and so the club at their own expense built a perimeter wall around the club house and grounds comprising surplus building blocks, each weighing approx 10 tones, concentrated together and infilled to the rear with rubble and grassed over.

This work, although not very pretty, maintained the integrity of the club grounds even though to the north and south of the barrier the sea demolished the natural dune system and the club house protruded like a salient on the flat beach. In 2012, Sefton Council, after numerous surveys decided to move a vast quantity of blown and accreted sand from Waterloo to appease the complaint from the inhabitants thereof to Hightown, the cost being borne by the £1000 house premium from the last building programme in Hightown. They of course did not like the aesthetics of the bsc sea wall which they removed and substituted a sloping ramp in its place. A surge in 2014 led to the defences being overwhelmed and the club house flooded to a depth of approx 2 foot [photograph provided].

Further to the north of the BSc, the tidal River Alt runs through the top of the main road of the village [lower Alt Road] the waterlevel is 1ft vertical height of flooding the village [photograph provided]. After the storm and subsequently the sand that moved away from Waterloo has been washed away to leave the coastline more or less as it was losing approx 1 metre of sand per annum. Only recently Sefton announced that no more money will be spent on sea defences in Hightown. As we are frequently informed global warming will increase the possibility of high winds and rising seas so building more homes will only put more homes at risk. In view of the above I feel it would be unwise to sanction further housing development in Hightown unless substantial coast protection is instituted and this means concrete and rock armour along the whole Hightown coast.

In addition to the danger presented by the coast we have a north land drain which is sited on the beach which has been condemned and in danger of collapsing and a southern drain which has been blocked by a northward drift of house bricks and is now hidden from sight. These two drains remove the surface water from the Hightown streets and houses. Yet another contribution to the possibility of flooding should more urban roads and 120 houses be added to the drainage system

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Photographs of storm damage.

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 462	Response Ref 1	Representor Name David Raw
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

The access to the proposed building site at the bottom of Elmcroft Lane is insufficient to meet the demands of a large building site. Elmcroft Lane is a narrow road intended to service a small cul-de-sac with limited numbers of traffic. Heavy goods vehicles and long vehicles could not safely be accommodated down Elmcroft Lane. There are many families with small children which live on Elmcroft Lane, and I believe allowing multiple lorries access to a construction site via Elmcroft would be a significant risk to pedestrian safety. Sandy Lane which serves Elmcroft Lane is also too narrow with arching trees to accommodate HGVs which would be required for a building site on Elmcroft. During the recent rail replacement service, I observed cars mounting the grass verge on the way in and out of the village to allow buses to pass. This situation would be repeated much more frequently with heavy goods vehicles were building works to be permitted in Elmcroft Lane.

Sandy Lane road traffic volume is already at an unsafe level on Saturday and Sundays such that it is impossible to negotiate some sections of Sandy Lane. The organisers of the local football tournaments on each weekend employ an untrained, unauthorized person to direct traffic using a "stop/go" sign in and out of Sandy Lane. This is, I understand, an illegal practice, but one which has arisen because Sandy Lane cannot cope with the current volumes of traffic. Elmcroft Lane sewerage drainage systems frequently block. Adding to the demand on these aged systems would be a public health risk. There is insufficient infrastructure in Hightown at the moment without further burdening the single access road into Hightown. Apart from rail links there is little public transport access to and from Hightown. This is similarly the case for schools, and local amenities such as the village shop. Elmcroft Lane is also still not served by BT infinity broadband.

This is one of the few remaining green belt areas in the borough, and is the main reason many residents, including myself, chose to live in Hightown. The green belt is a haven for wildlife such as owls, woodpeckers, and mammals such as foxes and hedgehogs etc. By building in these green belt areas, the individual identity of urban areas would be lost and the urban landscape would become one large sprawling site emanating from Liverpool as suburbs which would stretch unbroken as far north from the city centre as Formby 10 miles away.

Much of the land to the east of the Railway is prone to subsidence; indeed inspection of houses on Elmcroft Lane confirms this is the case. Building work would be costly and involve pile-driving or building on concrete rafts. Secondly, much of the land is flooded in the autumn and winter with a high water table. Although I have several objections to this proposal as specified above, it is the risk to public safety which I am most concerned about: in particular, the high volumes of construction traffic including HGVs and Long Vehicles accessing narrow, residential roads not designed for these vehicles where children also play. Should the proposed developments be permitted, the safety of children and other pedestrians will be compromised.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 465	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Maureen Garrett
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

My objections are:- The significant increase in traffic along a narrow lane. Traffic from building contractors over a sustained period. Lack of school places. Reduction in property values. Destruction of green space which provides a habitat for endangered red squirrels and bats.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 466	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Sarah and Darin Harrison
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I have lived in Hightown my whole life. We chose to live here, as this is such a quiet village, and a peaceful place to raise our family. We have paid a premium to purchase a house here - we could have bought a larger house for less in another area of Sefton, but decided this is where we wanted to set up our family home. If we wanted to live in a busy town or city, we would have done, but we don't, which is why we chose Hightown. We are extremely lucky here to have walking paths to Formby and Hall Road, as well as the green belt area at the end of Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane. The addition of 120+ homes would cause significant detriment to Hightown, not only those on Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane, but all of its residents.

If granted, the proposal will: Turn Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane into 'main roads' - these roads are not suitable for heavy traffic. Increase the number of people in the village with school age Children - where are my children going to go to school if others move into the area? Increase the number of people/youths loitering around Hightown - there are no facilities here for large numbers of older teenagers. Could cause an increase in crime in the area. Put significant pressure on the roads leading into Hightown from the Formby by-pass A565, and the route from Little Crosby Village- these roads are already extremely busy, especially during peak times. Having an increase in traffic on these routes could cause safety issues/an increase in accidents. Put significant pressure on the utilities and services in the area - the sewer system in Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane is probably as old as the houses on it; these houses are in excess of 80 years old. This may lead to flooding at either end of the development - or on the railway line. Decrease the value of the houses along Sandy Lane, and Elmcroft Lane. Ultimately change Hightown - it will not longer be the small, quiet village for young families and retired people looking for a quiet peaceful life - it will be turned more towards a small town - thus making Hightown less desirable to live, and hence reducing all house prices across the village. Cause a significant impact during construction - noise, dust, pollution, vibration, a significant increase in HGVs/vehicle movements - all which will be detrimental to the local population - especially given the lack of access (only one access road).

Although I appreciate the need for housing in Sefton, I would have considered it be more appropriate to regenerate brownfield sites, not only to generate new housing, but also reduce these derelict areas. Hightown has already recently succumbed to a development which is currently underway, adjacent to the Railway Line and Altcar Rifle Range - the addition of these houses is proportionally significant, considering how small the village is. I feel that Hightown has already contributed to the need for housing in Sefton. The proposal for 120 + houses will absolutely devastate the village. Please consider other areas in Sefton for new housing. Do not destroy our lovely quiet village.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 467	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Yvonne West
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to voice my objection to the building being proposed on the land South-East of Hightown. This land is at the back of my home, this would mean that I would be living in a building-site for the five years of construction. The land is on the green belt, which should be left for the health and well-being of the population. It also sustains abundant wild-life, were many animals and birds feed. Hightown is a pleasant "Village", that would lose it's identity by being built up into a large estate. It would bring extra congestion on the narrow lanes in and out of Hightown. I can not see how this amount of building can enhance the life of the village - I want to say how devastated I would be, to see this beautiful landscape be replaced by concrete; and street lights flooding out the night sky!

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 484	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Barbara A Macy
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

If Elmcroft Lane is opened up as a through road, I am extremely concerned at the damage which will inevitably be caused to the existing properties. My own property is already subject to subsidence due to the unstable nature of the land. What guarantee do residents have that any damage will be made good? The drainage in this area also gives cause for serious concern - the system is barely adequate to sustain the existing properties. Also, all the roads in the area would need to be completely relaid, neither Sandy Lane nor Elmcroft Lane is robust enough to sustain the increased volume of traffic which would inevitably follow any development. We have an abundance of wildlife in this area. I feel that disturbance of their habitat should not be permitted.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 485	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Philip Roberts
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I object to the plans on the grounds of road infrastructure, appertaining to Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane , Hightown. These roads are less than 6 metres wide and therefore lorries and future buses and coaches, including school transport, which are each standard 2.5 metres wide, not including wing mirrors and would have to mount the kerbs. The surrounding lanes around Hightown and are already overcrowded and therefore another possible 200 cars a day enetering Hightown would exacerbate the situation. I must also point out that the area of Hightwon is still open to flooding because the amount of £1.7 million from the Broseley Trust spent by Sefton Council, originally designated for sea defences has been completely wasted by moving sand from Crosby to Hightown for coastal erosion, which washed away in the first storm of the year. To reduce the risk of flooding a sea wall along the whole stretch of Hightown would have to be built. Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane would have to be widened and yellow lines included [which would need policing]. Also to avoid buses a new school would have to be built to accommodate the large increase of children from another 130 family homes. All access roads in and out of Hightwon, in the interests of Hightown would have to be widened to accommodate large wagons.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 492	Response Ref 12	Representor Name
Organisation Name Craig Seddon SIPP		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

Land at Elmcroft Lane (Site MN2.20) comprises 6.5ha of land for 120 dwellings. The site is identified in the UDP as falling within the Green Belt.

The Site Assessment Form (reference S068) identifies that access would need to be taken from Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane. Elmcroft Lane is a narrow residential street with vehicles parked on either side of the road. Sandy Lane is a single track which would require significant widening and upgrading in order to be able to accommodate vehicles associated with 120 new dwellings. The deliverability of this site is therefore questioned. Our client does not agree with the Council's assessment that this is only a moderate constraint.

Access onto Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane is only available via the Hightown residential area to the north. A Transport Assessment has not been undertaken to demonstrate that the highways network has the capacity to accommodate this development. Indeed the Assessment Form assesses the network capacity to be a severe constraints and identifies that there are significant concerns regarding the North End Lane / Alternative Road / Moss Lane highway junction. Given the above, this must be assessed as a Tier 1 constraint and it is questioned why the site has been included within the Draft Publication document.

Our client agrees with the Site Assessment that the existing Green Belt boundary is strong and that the proposed boundary would not correspond with a strong geographical feature. It is considered the site to be segregated from the existing residential development and agree that it would not be well contained by strong physical boundaries.

There are severe network capacity constraints on Land at Elmcroft Lane. Whilst a smaller site has come forward to that which was previously assessed, the site is still identified for the delivery of 120 new dwellings. Without a Transport Assessment it is questioned how the Council can come to the conclusion that the highways impacts would be acceptable. The site is also poorly contained and segregated from the existing residential area, as well as any local convenience and services. Our client does not agree that this site should be allocated for housing in the Local Plan.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove Site MN2.20 from the Local Plan.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 494	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Derek Jones
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

Another proposal is for many more houses to be built on a suggested development at the bottom of Elmcroft Lane, which would mean removing a coppice and extending onto farm land. Hightown, as a village, would become spoilt beyond belief and the one road in and out would be severely congested at peak times, but no doubt better informed people than me have already made that point.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown
----------------------	--

Respondent No 499	Response Ref 1	Representor Name John Foley
--------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I believe that this proposal will cause major environmental problems to the existing village community. Access to the village is by one narrow two lane road, Alt Road, with the village split by the Liverpool -Southport Railway line. Hightown is connected to the Formby By- Pass (A565) either via North End Lane, if driving towards Southport, or via Moss Lane , if travelling towards Crosby/Liverpool and the Motorway Network. Both these roads, (North End Lane and Moss Lane) are narrow, twisting with numerous bends, two lane roads which are, already known to be subjected to traffic incidents that have in some cases involved serious injuries and fatalities.

Hightown is located within the coastal boundary sandhills, the River Alt flowing into the sea and the Altcar Rifle Range to the west and agricultural fields on the otherside to the north, east and to the south towards Little Crosby. Any further development will lead to the further loss of green spaces on the edge of the village. This will cause a loss of wildlife which does include Bats roosting off Elmcroft Lane and Red Squirrels that are known to inhabit this area and around Hightown.

Hightown also has numerous other wildlife visitors in the shape of wild ducks and geese that use the surrounding fields to feed/graze as they migrate to and from their breeding grounds.

The fields around Hightown are subjected to periodic flooding following heavy and persistent rain with the local drainage system struggling to cope. The proposal of the additional 120 houses off Elmcroft Lane and a further 10 houses off Sandy Lane will mean the destruction of a wooded area off Elmcroft Lane. Access to this proposed site would be via Alt Road, Sandy Lane and on to Elmcroft Lane. Alt Road /Sandy Lane are both very narrow tree lined roads, heavily used as access to the local Hightown Cricket Sports Club grounds and, especially at weekends, when there are numerous junior football teams playing on the surrounding sports fields causing a large number of cars to visit and park in the area whilst transporting the young players.

The local infrastructure will struggle to cope with an additional 130 houses. There are already many "two car plus households" in Hightown and possibly another 200+ cars travelling in and out of the village will cause extra congestion on the already busy roads. The proposed development would have to be supported on piles because of the underlying ground structure. The new properties would of course need to be connected to the existing electric, gas, water and sewage systems that are currently under pressure from the existing residents in the village. Hightown residents also have sporadic mobile telephone coverage.

Any Hightown residents who do not possess their own vehicle have to rely on the Merseyrail services or the local 206 bus service which links Hightown to Crosby. This service only operates Monday to Saturday between 08.00 and 17.00 with no service on Sundays and Bank Holidays. If the Merseyrail service is subject to engineering work on Sundays the 30 minute service is replaced by buses that only operate into Hightown once an hour.

Hightown does not possess any schools and all pupils have to be taken either by car, train or by extra school buses. The local provision for education does mean that there are few places available within the existing education establishments. There are already problems as regards medical provision in Hightown, the local doctors surgery is often staffed purely by locums and even in the surrounding locations of Formby and Crosby it is difficult to obtain appointments with doctors.

The proposed build programme of 5 years duration will cause a constant flow of heavy lorries in and out of the village using the narrow twisting access routes. The Altcar Rifle Ranges is one of the Army's major training centres for both Regular and Territorial soldiers. With the rise of terror threats in the world there is a noticeable rise in the traffic on to the Ranges. It is further likely that the Ranges use will grow even more due to other training establishments reducing their size and capacity. There are also numerous times when Army Helicopters are involved in the training. The Ranges are also used to train Army Cadets from England, Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland. Merseyside Police also utilise the Ranges for firearm training.

There are already in Hightown numerous empty new properties and houses for sale/rent so why build even more large expensive unwanted homes. I therefore object to the implementation of the plan to expand the village of Hightown by this proposal and any further future housing development. I have been a Hightown resident since 1976 and I do not want to see the unique village that is Hightown destroyed by these unnecessary houses. The Green Belt must be protected from this urban spread. There are numerous "brown field " sites across Sefton Borough that would be more suitable for housing.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 500	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Dawn and Gerard Collins
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

We have lived in Hightown for almost 30 years and specifically chose to live here and have remained due to its true village feeling. It always feels safe, our crime rate is very low and yet still we sometimes struggle to get out of Hightown at school collection or drop off times. At those times the road is often extremely chaotic and it is difficult to see past the buses in order to overtake and continue our journey. We cannot imagine how many more buses will be needed to bus the additional children to school or extra vehicles with parents dropping them off, waiting to collect them etc.

Potentially you are going to bring approximately another 500 people in to Hightown and it will no longer be a village. All the things we love about our homes will be gone and I suspect a mass exodus by some people who will look for their quiet life elsewhere. Why should we have to do this, why should we be disrupted. Why do you need to build so many additional homes in Hightown. I am sure there are numerous other places they could be built where they could enhance the areas. They offer nothing good for us, only disruption and loss.

Would there be sufficient places for these additional children in local schools. Our properties will reduce in value. 200-300 additional cars. Possibly 500 extra people. Too much additional traffic on the roads. How many more school buses. What about the people who have all these parked outside their homes. Disruption with drop off and pick up times and chaos and potential accidents. Would we need a zebra crossing for so many more children, what about a crossing patrol. Damage to roads with additional traffic and increased council costs. Loss of wildlife by taking what little green space we have left as we have just lost more green space near the railway. How long for the build and what major disruption, noise and potential damage could be caused by the numerous lorries and major building vehicles. We say no to these new houses.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 501	Response Ref 1	Representor Name
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I have lived in Hightown for 22 years. I chose to live here because of the quiet location. It always feels safe and the crime rate is very low. The infrastructure of Hightown, I feel, could not cope with the number of new houses proposed. The school buses that come into the village cause considerable difficulty at the best of times, this surely will be made much worse. Potentially you are going to bring approximately another 500 people in to Hightown and the feel of village life will change dramatically. All the things we love about our homes and village will be gone causing, I would suggest, lots of people to re think their future in Hightown, me included. Why should we have to do this, why should we be disrupted.

Would there be sufficient places for these additional children in local schools. Our properties will reduce in value. 200-300 additional cars. Possibly 500 extra people. Too much additional traffic on the roads. How many more school buses. What about the people who have all these parked outside their homes. Disruption with drop off and pick up times and chaos and potential accidents. Would we need a zebra crossing for so many more children, what about a crossing patrol. Damage to roads with additional traffic and increased council costs. Loss of wildlife by taking what little green space we have left as we have just lost more green space near the railway. How long for the build and what major disruption, noise and potential damage could be caused by the numerous lorries and major building vehicles. We say no to these new houses.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 503	Response Ref 1	Representor Name David Llewellyn
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I am a resident of Hightown and write with respect to my observations on the local proposals, particularly concerning water and drainage issues. As you correctly point out under "Infrastructure" issues, water to this area is supplied from River Dee and Lake Vyrnwy and comes to the area via Prescott Treatment Works. The pressure for the whole area is therefore limited by the elevation of those works. Hightown is at the northern extremity of the Liverpool area and already suffers somewhat low pressure as a direct result of its location and the demand which takes place ahead of it through the system.

Because pressure cannot be increased in a system governed by gravity alone (as it is entirely from Norton Tower onwards), my concern is that to allow further development in the village (areas MN2 20 & 21) and areas beyond, in the south of the borough, will further reduce water pressure to an unacceptable level for both domestic usage and firefighting. I believe these proposals should therefore be opposed.

Over a number of years I have watched with concern the effect of rainfall on the River Alt and its local tributaries. On a number of occasions they have all overtopped their banks. I accept that your requirement will be for all new development to drain to soakaway. However there must also be a considerable hard-surfaced area, namely driveways and roads which will still drain to local watercourses, even through oversized sewers/tanks. This will, I believe, inevitably impact on the already strained drainage capacity of watercourses and lead to flooding. My view therefore is that on this ground too the proposals in areas MN2 20 & 21 should be opposed.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 511	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Carol Sharman
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the proposed plan to build more than 200 houses in Hightown: It will ruin the countryside around the village which is so important for birds and mammals. It is the home for buzzards, owls, foxes, geese, rabbits. These will disappear which is a disaster. People love walking around here and spending time in the outdoors.

It will ruin a quiet and peaceful village which is the first choice of many retired people and young families. The extra traffic from the planned houses which could take more than 5 years to complete will be a danger. The small development near the station is already causing congestion in the centre. The proposed answer to this is to restrict parking which will cause great hardship to people who have difficulty walking as they will not be able to get to the shops. 400 extra cars will cause more accidents and congestion on the one road that provides access. People will never be able to get in and out of the village. There are adequate facilities for the present population but to add another 800 people is just totally unacceptable. There are no schools and probably not places in nearby villages and towns. Doctors and dentists cannot cope with present numbers.

Property prices may be affected by a great increase in the number of houses. This always happens when rural areas are built over and ruined. The houses on Elmcroft Lane are already suffering from this. Numbers of them are already up for sale as people are trying to get a decent price for their property before it is too late. It seems a travesty that residents who have lived in this area for many years by choice are feeling that they are being forced out just to develop housing in an area which is not suitable and offers little to people who are not actively looking for a village existence. There are numbers of houses for sale here which have been available for a long time - Hightown is quiet and not for everyone. What is the point of building more housing. It's a rural area and should be left as such.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Please can these points be considered and this proposal abandoned

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.20

Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown

Respondent No 514

Response Ref 1

Representor Name D&L Larkey

Organisation Name**Obj/Sup/Com** Objection**Summary of Main Issues**

I am opposed to the destruction of green belt land situated to the south of Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane which also provided an essential space between Hightown and Crosby/Blundellsands. I am also opposed to the destruction of small coppice at the end of Elmcroft Lane and the subsequent detrimental effect that will have on local wildlife.

Elmcroft Lane is currently only six metres wide and would need to be widened initially to provide adequate access for vehicles associated with the building process and then to provide access to the new homes. Such action would cause tangible damage to properties in Elmcroft Lane, adversely affect property values and severely diminish the quality of life of long term residents. Given the inevitability of such damage, contingency plans for compensation should be made known. The introduction of a bus route would also require the road to be widened to the detriment of local residents.

The Sefton Local Plan suggests only slight modifications would be required to road layout. However, it is clear that major modifications would be required and that consideration should be given to the provision of alternative access. If no alternative plans are available, the proposed development should not be built. Sefton Council appear to consider the building of 120 additional homes would cause no issues in terms of capacity despite the plans being subject to a satisfactory transport statement. Given the number of personal, public and private service vehicles likely to be associated with that number of dwellings, there quite clearly will be issues. Furthermore, the likely introduction of parking restrictions would also adversely affect local residents.

The building of a further 120 homes in Hightown will place additional pressure on local school provision. Demand for places will increase and if no suitable provision is available within Hightown, an increased number of children will have to be bussed or driven elsewhere. This will add to congestion, pollution and carbon emissions. It is unlikely that developers would contribute towards the building of a school in Hightown, that suitable land would be available and that any progress would ever be made.

Development of a further 120 properties would add to the existing problems with drainage which are already well documented. Ditches in the area regularly overflow causing surface flooding and, after heavy rain, sewers/drains also overflow. Despite the coastal protection work already carried out, it has proved inadequate and the coastal area from Blundellsands to Hightown also remains at risk of tidal flooding.

Development in the area planned would adversely affect legally protected species including badgers, bats, water voles and pink footed geese. There is evidence of bats roosting in the coppice at the end of Elmcroft Lane and in the area around Rose Cottage (a grade 2 listed building). To destroy such habitat would surely be in breach of UK legislation and EU directive. Adverse effect on property prices. Possible damage to properties in Elmcroft Road. Protracted building programme with associated noise and disruption.

In conclusion, I believe the areas suggested for development are unsuitable due to network capacity and accessibility. There is a danger of flooding which requires risk assessment and assessments will also be needed in respect of a satisfactory Transport Statement and to ensure compliance with the Habitats Directive. I have further concerns over drainage and sewerage arrangements and the provision of school places for children resident in Hightown.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 520	Response Ref 1	Representor Name L and J Tynon
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I write to express my concerns about plans to build 130 homes in Elmcroft and Sandy Lane, Hightown. My biggest worry is about the road itself. I do not think the road is wide enough to withstand large works vehicles. We already have many problems with access. Sandy Lane is the only road currently used to gain access to Elmcroft and already can't hold the amount of cars that drive on it. There are many potholes and it is always in need of repair. Elmcroft Lane itself is a narrow road and large vehicles struggle to get down the road even if one car is parked up. Hightown is a small village and I do not think that it has the infrastructure to cope with an increase in population that these developments will bring. I would urge you to reconsider plans to develop homes here.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 522	Response Ref 1	Representor Name George Copeland
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Adverse effect on property prices. Possible damage to properties in Elmcroft Road. Loss of wildlife and green spaces. Additional private, public and personal vehicles associated with 120 extra properties. Increased congestion, pollution and carbon emissions Requirement for extra access roads. Protracted building programme with associated noise and disruption. Insufficient provision of school places and subsequent increased transport needs. Increased pressure on local services.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.20 Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown

Respondent No 523 Response Ref 1 Representor Name Jane Larkey

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am opposed to the destruction of green belt land situated to the south of Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane which also provided an essential space between Hightown and Crosby/Blundellsands.

I am also opposed to the destruction of small coppice at the end of Elmcroft Lane and the subsequent detrimental effect that will have on local wildlife.

Elmcroft Lane is currently only six metres wide and would need to be widened initially to provide adequate access for vehicles associated with the building process and then to provide access to the new homes. Such action would cause tangible damage to properties in Elmcroft Lane, adversely affect property values and severely diminish the quality of life of long term residents. Given the inevitability of such damage, contingency plans for compensation should be made known.

The introduction of a bus route would also require the road to be widened to the detriment of local residents.

The Sefton Local Plan suggests only slight modifications would be required to road layout. However, it is clear that major modifications would be required and that consideration should be given to the provision of alternative access. If no alternative plans are available, the proposed development should not be built.

Sefton Council appear to consider the building of 120 additional homes would cause no issues in terms of capacity despite the plans being subject to a satisfactory transport statement. Given the number of personal, public and private service vehicles likely to be associated with that number of dwellings, there quite clearly will be issues. Furthermore, the likely introduction of parking restrictions would also adversely affect local residents.

The building of a further 120 homes in Hightown will place additional pressure on local school provision. Demand for places will increase and if no suitable provision is available within Hightown, an increased number of children will have to be bussed or driven elsewhere. This will add to congestion, pollution and carbon emissions. It is unlikely that developers would contribute towards the building of a school in Hightown, that suitable land would be available and that any progress would ever be made.

Development of a further 120 properties would add to the existing problems with drainage which are already well documented. Ditches in the area regularly overflow causing surface flooding and, after heavy rain, sewers/drains also overflow. Despite the coastal protection work already carried out, it has proved inadequate and the coastal area from Blundellsands to Hightown also remains at risk of tidal flooding.

Development in the area planned would adversely affect legally protected species including badgers, bats, water voles and pink footed geese. There is evidence of bats roosting in the coppice at the end of Elmcroft Lane and in the area around Rose Cottage (a grade 2 listed building).To destroy such habitat would surely be in breach of UK legislation and EU directive.

In conclusion, I believe the areas suggested for development are unsuitable due to network capacity and accessibility. There is a danger of flooding which requires risk assessment and assessments will also be needed in respect of a satisfactory Transport Statement and to ensure compliance with the Habitats Directive. I have further concerns over drainage and sewerage arrangements and the provision of school places for children resident in Hightown.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name**Obj/Sup/Com** Objection**Summary of Main Issues**

I am writing in regards to the proposed development in Hightown. Old Hightown is such a beautiful place, a rarity in such a built-up area, It is proposterouse to even contemplate building houses opposite Rose Cottage or having a busy road running past it. This is a listed building - does this count for nothing? To have a road running through woodland is unacceptable. This is the home to so much wildlife. Car fumes - a dangerous road - noise - destroyed countryside - unhappy children - losing the charm of the area, just a few reasons to say don't do this. The residents of Hightown get by with one pub, one chemist, one shop, one post office and one hairdressers. We are happy, we are small and beautiful. We are just asking to be allowed to stay that way.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Policy MN2.20

Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown

Respondent No 525

Response Ref 1

Representor Name J Wain

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

High level of housing growth in Hightown The plan gives cause for concern about the size of the proposed growth of Hightown which is out of keeping with its character and socio-economic function in the borough. Hightown is a much smaller settlement to neighboring Formby on which most Hightown residents are dependent for local amenities. In the 2011 census the population of Hightown was 3,247 while in Formby the population was 24,996. Based upon the UK average household size of 2.4 people the two proposed development sites in Hightown could result in a population growth of nearly 10%.

Lack of amenities in Hightown Hightown lacks local amenities for its population of 3,247 and with a proposed population growth of 10% this lack of amenity will be further exasperated. A small newsagents and a small post office store do not meet the needs of Hightown residents who have to travel to Formby and other shopping centres for shopping facilities. This is also no school in Hightown which meansthat Hightown school children have to travel to other schools in the borough for their education.

Road infrastructure in Hightown Most residents of Hightown have no option but to use the one road to drive in and out of Hightown. This leads to a convergence of traffic where the vehicles from the west side of Hightown meet the traffic from the east side of Hightown. This is the "V junction where traffic using Sandy Lane and Alt Road joins the traffic using Kerlake Way. The cars of the residents of the proposed extra 130 houses in Hightown will add to the busy 'T' junction which will need to be better controlled by the introduction of a roundabout or traffic lights if the risk of increased number of road traffic accidents is to be avoided. The only access to 120 of the proposed 130 houses will be via the small roads of Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane. These roads already show signs of settlement and increased heavy traffic will only add to the problem. The residents of both of these roads will find that that their environment and the character of their dwellings will change significantly. It is hard to imagine that it will be considered adequate, from a health and safety point of view, for Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane to provide access to 120 additional houses with no other road providing an exit from the proposed new development. Should there be a need for emergency vehicles to access one of 120 additional houses at the end of Elmcroft Lane then there could be delays as the emergency vehicles go down the narrow roads of Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane.

Deliverability and viability of the site the peat substrate within the soil raises questions about the deliverability and viability of the site as there is a high cost associated with its removal. There is also the risk that potential subsidence could take place, representing danger to life and property.

Changing the character of Hightown Hightown is a small settlement, pleasantly situated in a rural location and there are many types of wildlife including bats in the vicinity of the proposed sites. The development of the two sites will have a significant effect on the character of the area. They will have the effect of urbanising the settlement with negative impacts on the amenity for the residents of Hightown and in particular those that live on Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane. They will also impact on the setting of Rose Farm Cottage which is a Grade II Listed Building.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 544	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Peter Costello
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to address the proposed plans to build new houses in Hightown. The locations proposed are not well thought through. Elmcroft Lane is a cul de sac and to build behind the existing houses on odd side of the lane is rather ridiculous. The land is very unstable and would require a great of labour to pile driving to put satisfactory foundations in to enable safe house building. This with the heavy lorries delivering materials. Up and down the lane would surely cause damage to the road surface and great discomfort and inconvenience to the residents. There would be a surge in heavy vehicles in and out of the village causing extra congestion on the one access road which comes into Hightown. If the time span is 5 years for the building of the properties then the constant flow of heavy wagons in and out would be considerable and unfair for the population of the village. Also, and I consider this to be of major importance, at the end of the lane there colonies of bats, a protected species, and red squirrels which should not be disturbed.

There are many brown sites in the Sefton area which could be used. Indeed not all that long ago at the junction if Buckley Lane and the North Perimeter Road there were maisonettes and flats owned by Sefton which were demolished and turned into green land. Perhaps the powers that be could sit down and reconsider what discomfort, inconvenience and uneasiness the proposed building work would cause the residents and because of the expensive preparations, pile driving, the properties will be out of reach of the customers that the house building plan is supposed to help.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 547	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Diane Short
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I am writing to lodge my objection to the 120 new houses you plan to build in Hightown. Firstly, I would urge you to visit Hightown and see how many houses are for sale that Hightowners are having difficulty selling. Most of these are affordable houses. There is absolutely no need for more affordable housing to be built in this location. Secondly, I am thinking of all the extra cars that would be using the road in and out of Hightown - 120 extra houses could mean in excess of 200 more cars, a number which the present road system cannot support. There would be even more congestion on the access roads. There is also the question of schooling. "Affordable housing" would, one must presume, be aimed at first-time buyers, newly-marrieds or those with young families. There is no school in Hightown. So where will there be available places in local schools for the children? This will inevitably mean laying on more school buses, too - more congestion on the Hightown roads at the busiest of times. The infastucture of what was once a small village cannot support this big a development. I urge you to rethink your plans for the future of Hightown. You are taking away our green spaces, our wildlife and our village.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 554	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Philip Dillon
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to register my objections to the proposed development of 140 new houses off Elmcroft Lane in Hightown. This is due to the detrimental impact on the village in terms of long term traffic management, the lack of facilities an infrastructure to support 140 new families and the disturbance to wildlife including bats that inhabit the proposed building site.

Hightown has one access road which would initially struggle to cope with construction vehicles and longer term vehicles from new residents that would have to access via Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane. The roads struggle with present traffic volume on Saturdays with the football on the pitches around Hightown Sports club. There is regular subsidence of the road surface and additional vehicles will only exacerbate this.

The village has limited facilities - one shop, a Post Office and a doctor's surgery. With no school and Hightown children now struggling to access schools in Formby so many more properties can only exacerbate this situation. What play facilities will be built? What traffic management will be put in place?

One can only imagine the direct impact for residents in Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane and roads accessed via them.what thoughts have been given to these people and their quality of life during the five year development with construction vehicles ploughing past their doors everyday.

Finally the disruption and disturbance to wildlife needs full consideration. Bats roost in this area are protected. The land being proposed as the build site is subject to poor drainage and will again cause more issues with protracted build times and higher costs which would effectively exclude any social housing.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 556	Response Ref 1	Representor Name
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to register my objection to the proposal . The village is already under considerable stress with regard to traffic, (one small road In and out). We have already a serious amount of extra traffic Saturday and Sunday with football taking place. The facilities in the village would not cope with the increase. School buses and available places in local schools. The extra congestion alone would be unsuitable the constant flow of lorries destroying village life .

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 557	Response Ref 1	Representor Name David and Bridget Jacks
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Hightown is a small village effectively split into two parts by the Liverpool – Southport railway. The western part is already fully developed with Thornbeck Avenue providing a good newer access road between the old and newer properties. This part contains the only shops in the entire village – a Post Office, one small newsagent/general store, a pharmacy and ladies hairdressers. There are no schools in the village. There is a small doctor’s surgery in St Georges Road on the eastern side of the village. This eastern part is where MN2.20 (120 houses) and MN2.21 (10 houses) are proposed with sole access through the existing roads of Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane. These are lined by established trees and substantial good class detached properties which give, particularly this part of Hightown, its distinctive character. A Google search on “Rightmove, Elmcroft Lane (or Sandy Lane) and then street view” will illustrate the point.

Access to MN2.20 is through Sandy Lane and then Elmcroft Lane which is currently a cul-de-sac with the top end closed off by a long-established copse of mature trees, which provide a habitat for bats (a protected species), red squirrels, barn owls and wild peacocks, which frequently walk along Elmcroft Lane. This copse would be largely destroyed by the new road to provide access to MN2.20. Hightown, especially Elmcroft Lane, is an area of known subsidence. Some houses have required underpinning at significant cost to their owners.

The proposed access roads (Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane) to MN2.20 and MN2.21 are totally inadequate for developments of this size. In respect of Sandy Lane, this has already been openly acknowledged by Sefton Council in its exchange of letters (provided) which talks of the need to widen Sandy Lane to accommodate the extra traffic caused if the proposed 10 additional junior football teams (see later) were allowed. Elmcroft Lane (6 metres), which was not directly affected by this proposal is much narrower than Sandy Lane which because of its geography is of varying widths;

Any widening of both Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane would entail the removal of approximately 78 fully mature trees (32 in Elmcroft Lane and 46 in Sandy Lane). This would destroy the essential character of the area as a whole;

In the case of Elmcroft Lane in particular, this is an area especially prone to subsidence as evidenced by the number of houses which have required underpinning. The significant increase in traffic, including the heavy construction vehicles, would render the adjacent properties at greater risk of further subsidence damage.

In the case of Sandy Lane, traffic problems are already at a critical point (all the following points are well-known to the Council). These problems are caused by the following:- Our Lady of Victories RC church and adjoining church hall are situated here and details are attached of the extensive use each day of these facilities, provided by the Parish Priest, Fr. David Gamble. There are no designated parking facilities and the existing parking takes place outside the church/hall, often on both sides of Sandy Lane. Sometimes use of the church/church hall coincides with the junior football. Adjacent to the church is a British Rail repair depot which is often serviced by heavy vehicles, often parking on Sandy Lane to pick up heavy equipment. Sandy Lane is also used by approximately 800-1000 vehicles at weekends and occasionally on weekday evenings to facilitate the junior football which takes place on the sports field off the unadopted portion at the top of Sandy Lane and on the southerly side of Elmcroft Lane. This is the largest junior football league on Merseyside. There is designated parking for these vehicles on the sports field but inevitably some parents park in Elmcroft Lane. In addition, Sandy Lane is the feeder road to Thirlmere Road for access to the Hightown Sports & Social Club where there are rugby (two pitches), tennis (six courts), and veteran’s football (one pitch) and in the summer cricket. There is also a modern clubhouse with two bars to provide facilities for the players and social events in the evenings. All facilities are in regular use. Some vehicles also use the gate along the unadopted portion of Sandy Lane, opposite the junior football, to park on the edge of the cricket field to picnic in good weather. Opposite the entrance to Elmcroft Lane lies the Hightown Bowling Club and in summer months in particular some bowls players park on Sandy lane near the Elmcroft Lane junction. Rail commuters, many from outside Hightown, use the railway station here to travel to Liverpool/Southport stations. There is no designated parking and users utilise Alt Road up to the junction of Sandy Lane for this purpose.

Sefton, concerning network capacity, contends that there is no “...issue in terms of capacity given the level of housing proposed, however, this will be subject to a satisfactory Transport Statement”. With respect, on the basis of the information set out, there are already issues and these will be exacerbated beyond breaking point if these developments are allowed to proceed. There would be a need to accommodate, approximately, an extra 250 vehicles along Elmcroft Lane/Sandy Lane plus school buses as there is currently no school planned to be built on the new developments.

The present infrastructure within Hightown village is insufficient to sustain the proposed additional housing. Currently, there are problems over sewage disposal, particularly during rainy weather. As already indicated, there are no schools at all in the village and a shortage of shops and other facilities.

There is also a suggestion that yellow lines may be used in Sandy Lane/Elmcroft Lane. This is wholly impracticable. Where are visitors then going to park, including service vehicles such as postal delivery vans (daily), repairers, ambulances/health workers, gardeners and decorators? There are no parking spaces available elsewhere and no places where they could be built. It would again destroy the essential character of this area.

The presumption in favour of sustainable development is not absolute and has to be weighed in the balance with The obligation to preserve and protect the rare wildlife detailed above. The bats, in particular, have statutory protection. The obligations set out in paragraph 10 and EQ9 of the Local Plan that developments must not result “result in unacceptable loss of, or damage, to existing trees of woodlands or significant landscaping” and the obligation to “preserve and/or enhance” the character of this area. The destruction of 78 mature trees in Elmcroft Lane/Sandy Lane plus the trees in the coppice at the top of Elmcroft Lane is unacceptable and would destroy the essential and distinctive character of this part of Hightown. A viewing of the street view the Rightmove site would demonstrate this.

Summary of Suggested Changes

The obligation to maintain a safe and secure environment for the existing residents of this part of Hightown; The following alternatives are proposed:- To build an alternative access road to MN2.20. This proposal also faces great problems; if this is not acceptable, to avoid building the developments on MN2.20 and MN2.21 entirely.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 564	Response Ref 1	Representor Name K Bradshaw

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We are writing with strong objection to the proposed residential development of housing in Hightown. We ask that you consider the following. The quiet tree lined residential neighbourhood of Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane would be transformed into a traffic and pedestrian route to the new estate, not only for residents but by developers with heavy goods vehicles. Great increase of traffic with perhaps 2 cars per household, bus route, delivery vans, postal services, emergency service vehicles etc. Possibility of potential parking scheme (waiting restrictions) on Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane having detrimental affect on the value of property. Children living on the new estate will have to be bussed to school outside of Hightown. This would require a bus route through Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane. If the village is developed are there plans for a school? Where would it be built? How would it be funded? Further problems with drainage. Drains/sewers and foul sewers are already at full capacity with foul sewer flooding and a back flow of raw sewage into ditches with sewers blocked following heavy rain. There is evidence of bats and bats roosts in the coppice at the bottom of Elmcroft Lane and in the trees surrounding Rose Cottage on Sandy Lane. To seek to build a road through the coppice would disturb the bats which is illegal. Significant pressure will be put on the road leading into Hightown from Formby and Little Crosby. We feel the infrastructure of the village would not readily support the building of 120 new dwellings.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown
----------------------	--

Respondent No 579	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Rob and Sue Lees
--------------------------	-----------------------	--

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

This objection relates specifically to the portion of land marked for housing allocation on the Formby Policy map marked MN2.20, adjacent to Sandy Lane in Hightown. Given all the available land in the area, I do not consider that use of this particular portion of greenbelt land is justified for housing development. There are a number of reasons why:

Firstly, this portion of land is important to local wildlife. The small wooded area at the end of Elmcroft Lane is full of birdlife, including tawny owl, greater-spotted woodpecker and large flocks of migratory birds in winter such as fieldfare and redwing. The open farmland to the south of the wood is hunted by barn owl, short-eared owl and buzzard. Given that Sefton is rightly proud of its wildlife and the tourism opportunities that can be gained from it (e.g. the red squirrel reserve at Formby), then bulldozing the wood and building over this diverse pocket of land would seem to be rather at odds with this.

Secondly, the access route to this land would appear to be fraught with potential difficulty, unless a new route into Hightown was to be opened e.g. by widening and fully surfacing Gorse Lane from its junction with Moss Lane. If consideration is not given to this option, then all traffic, both for construction and eventual residents, would be funnelled down Sandy Lane and potentially Elmcroft Lane. This route joins Kerslake Way at a 'give way' junction – a junction that is already dangerous when busy, as demonstrated most Saturdays as many of the people attending matches at the Hightown Junior Football league (off Sandy Lane) seem unable to judge speed of approaching traffic and regularly pull out in front of people on the 'main road' (I have had to brake sharply to avoid collisions on a number of occasions). Adding a large volume of additional traffic to this junction on a daily basis would seem to be foolish, or the actions of people with no local knowledge of the village.

Finally, there is the issue of amenities. I would be interested to know what additional amenities are planned as part of the development of this piece of land? Hightown has no school, a doctors surgery that is overloaded with patients already (we are registered with Dr's in Formby), and a small number of shops with severe parking pressures on them. Presumably the land in question is intended for 'starter homes' – I can see absolutely no justification for larger properties as there is no shortage of them already on the market in the area – and 'starter homes' mean younger people with young families – all of whom need schools, doctors, dentists and shops, facilities which Hightown either does not have, or are already under pressure.

Firstly, I think you should look for alternatives to this portion of land – I don't believe the need for housing in this part of Sefton justifies its use. I'm unsure what criteria you adopted when identifying suitable land, but personally I could identify a number of parcels of land that have fewer obvious drawbacks than this one, for example the land between Holt's Hey Wood and Moor Lane in Ince Blundell would seem to be one location with far fewer access limitations. However, if you really feel that development of this land takes priority over wildlife and preservation of the countryside, then at the very least I would urge you to think very carefully about development of alternative access routes to reach it – ideally, to build a new road from Moss Lane to the easternmost point of the plot of land, or to widen Gorse Lane and create a well-designed junction where it meets Moss Lane. Finally, I believe you also need to ensure that the terms of any housing development includes provision for the building of a school and some retail premises, and this should be enforced when entering into contractual negotiations with prospective developers and housing developers.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.20 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.20 **Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 587 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Mark Holmes
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

If this plan is to succeed you will need to factor in the cost of a new school for Hightown to cope and at least two sets of traffic lights. The level of extra houses to be built is disproportionate in relation to the size of our rural village. It would be an increase of over 10%. And is out of keeping with the character of the village.

We already struggle with lack of facilities, nameley schools and shops. Although we already pay an extra supplement on Council tax noted as Hightown for some reason, as we have no police here or traffic wardens to ticket all the cars that illegally park around the shop/post office/chemist area. There have been accidents in the village and any additional houses will undoubtedly lead to extra cars and heavy goods vehicles. Roads are unfit for purpose and it will be a health and safety nighmare. Pity the people of Elmcroft and Sandy Lane as they small roads who will suffer the brunt of this. My other great concern is the distruption to wildlife, including bats, some of which may be protected specis who will suffer if the area is urbanised.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.20 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.20 **Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 588 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Alison Holmes
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

My main objection would be that there is only one main road in and out of Hightown which is already busy. The increase in houses would only increase this further. There are already a high number of accidents when coming on or off the bypass so increasing traffic would create a need for traffic lights or other changes. I don't believe the roads are wide enough to deal with all these hgvs coming in and out of Hightown. Another objection would be the lack of local facilities such as supermarkets and schools. We are already limited as what we have available and are heavily reliant on Formby. I would like to know that if I have children there will be spaces available for them without having to pay or travel further. If preparations aren't made beforehand to prevent such disturbance then Hightown isn't able to support the increase in houses.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.20 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.20 **Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 591 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Suzanne and David Oliver
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am writing to object to the proposed building of more affordable houses in Hightown. I am against this for numerous reasons, mainly that I moved to the area because it is a very small peaceful town. If I wanted more houses and traffic I would have stayed in Formby. Please reconsider the expansion of Hightown, more traffic for starters! This town is beautiful as it is and does not need more property which will be difficult to sell due to lack of shops and schools here, which is how we love it. No Hightown resident supports your proposal so I ask you kindly to reconsider.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.20 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.20 **Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 598 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Geoffrey and Linda Abrahams
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We object strongly to this proposed development. Hightown is a small village and the proposed building programme would cause appalling congestion on the narrow access lanes and residential areas for 5 years. Parts of Hightown have suffered historic subsidence and this volume of heavy traffic would exacerbate an underlying problem. More school buses and domestic traffic would add to future problems.

Surely there are more suitable areas in Sefton that could be developed if necessary, without destroying scarce green spaces and causing probable damage to existing roads and houses.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.20 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.20 **Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 603 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Anne Axon
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

My objections are as follows. The building will have a detrimental effect on green belt areas and wildlife. The local roads can barely handle volumes of current traffic levels, an increase in traffic would lead to significant congestion. We don't have shops or schools in Hightown so the already overused public transport facilities would become stretched further. The infrastructure is not designed to handle further people living in or accessing Hightown. The timescale for completion would stretch into several years and would be so disruptive within a tiny village. Please do not allow this building programme to take place.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.20 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.20 **Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 612 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Pamela Holmes
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Hightown village only has one road leading in and out and it is unsuitable for the many vehicles which would be involved in the building work, leading to health and safety issues. Hightown is a small rural village and the scale of development is equivalent to nearly 10%. As it is we do not have the amenities to cope. Children have to be bussed out to schools in Formby or Crosby. Trying to get out of the village to commute in the morning is difficult enough as it is with the school buses, refuse collections etc. It is only a matter of time before there is another accident on the bypass coming out of North End Lane and the potential increase from the 130 homes does not bear thinking about. It will have an impact on the residents of Hightown especially people living in Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane. I hope you consider sites MN2.20 and MN.2.21 carefully and understand this development is neither wanted or needed by the residents of Hightown

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.20

Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown

Respondent No 614

Response Ref 1

Representor Name S E Phillips

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The objections to the proposal have been well documented by residents and the Parish Council with valid reasons for the proposal to be rejected, including: Disruption to wild life (bats, red squirrels etc). Increase in traffic/building works enhancing the possibility of further 'movement' to properties already suffering from 'subsidence'. By more than 'doubling' the number of properties to the south east of the railway would render the need for a bus service, a school, a play ground for children etc with no proposal to supply them.

However, the purpose of this letter is to draw your attention to previous precedents set by Sefton Council as follows. It is a council stipulation that any building works must be in keeping with existing properties in the area. Currently, 22 properties are sited in Elmcroft Lane on an area of over 2 ha. The proposal is to build 120 more properties at the end of Elmcroft Lane on an area of 1.2 ha.

There is no conceivable way that the new properties can be 'in keeping' with existing properties and is therefore against your own stipulations. In 2007, I personally, sought permission from yourselves, to install an additional football pitch, on the land adjacent to MN2.20, to be accessed by cars along Sandy Lane. The pitch would have had a maximum of 5 matches spread over 10 hours of a weekend, with each match bringing a maximum of ten cars in and out of Hightown, via Sandy Lane.

I enclose a copy of the letter from your Planning and Economic Regeneration Department' clearly recommending that the proposal be rejected as, I quote, "on the face of it, it is likely to present practical difficulties in terms of vehicular flows in Sandy Lane". The erection of 120 houses will obviously bring dozens more cars, plus, buses, lorries, service vehicles, delivery wagons etc etc and will certainly enhance the concern of your department in terms of 'vehicular flows in Sandy Lane'.

It is also of concern to me that, by their own admission, the police and emergency services are not able to meet their 'Grade 1' call out response deadlines for answering 999 calls in Hightown. Hightown is already 'neglected' by the police service as they are based in either Bootle or Southport and are not able to get to Hightown in the government stipulated call out time. It is also a fact that areas of 'affordable' housing require more policing, which is obviously not possible in Hightown.

I understand the need for more housing in certain areas but the above mentioned precedents', previously set by Sefton Council, together with the problem of policing, make it 'untenable' for the planning department to grant permission to build 120 houses on 1.2ha of land at the end of Elmcroft Lane.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Correspondence with the Council 2007 re Sandy Lane Sports Ground

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 642	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Simone and John Gunn
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Whilst we realise that, nationwide, land needs to be found for new housing, is there any evidence of the demand for housing in Hightown in your housing land availability study? There are already some 70 houses for sale in Hightown, of varying prices, many of which have been on the market for a considerable length of time.

We do not believe safe and suitable access to the sites can be achieved for all people. Whilst it may be possible to create access to the site for any new residents, this would ultimately be at the cost of the existing residents of Hightown, not only the residents of Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane, whose quality of life will suffer, due to the increased traffic in to the Lane and to the village, noise and loss of green belt land.

Elmcroft Lane is a very quiet cul de sac, and its entire nature and environment would be detrimentally affected if 120 houses were to be built on land at the end of the Lane adjoining the current houses. Aside from the infrastructure and access issues, the paddock at the end of the lane has considerable flora and fauna which would be irrevocably destroyed if development was to go ahead on that land.

Sefton's site assessment form actually acknowledges that the impact of the sites is significant on the Green Belt policy of preventing urban sprawl one of the sites adjoins the existing built up area. Whilst we appreciate that in some areas development on the edge of existing urban areas is acceptable even when encroaching into green belt but in Hightown the urban area is very small and does not have the infrastructure. to support significant growth.

Sefton's site assessment form confirms that the sites would not have any other benefits other than meeting affordable housing needs – all other answers on the sheet are no. How can sites be released from the Green Belt when there is only one wider benefit for it? Green Belt land is ultimately protected for a reason and only should be released in our view when the number of wider benefits outweighs the detrimental harm that the land's release from Green Belt through development would bring.

This is already constrained in Hightown, given the location of the village, given that there is only one road in and out. The assessment form concedes that 'slight modifications to highways' will be required but this would in fact need to be considerably more than "slight", as the highways will need to accommodate the significant additional vehicular movements associated with a major housing redevelopment scheme, not just during construction but the longer term impacts and increases in numbers of vehicles. The access road is already close to capacity, especially through essential sport and recreation use of the football fields at weekends, when we literally have to queue to enter or leave Elmcroft Lane / Sandy Lane. There are regular road traffic accidents on the road approaching the village which will surely only increase if there are more vehicles using the roads.

In this case the residential scheme will generate significant movement but the site is not located where the need to travel will be minimised. As Hightown has no schools, food stores or services, all residents will need to travel to use services and therefore this site does not meet this fundamental requirement of the national planning policy. Given the lack of services in Hightown, the need to travel is essential, therefore failing on this point.

The assessment mentions that a transport assessment would be needed to assess highway network capacity but Sefton does not consider it a problem? How can this conclusion be reached without an assessment in place? In particular, Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane cannot support site traffic as they are simply not wide enough. An increase in the level of traffic would be unfeasible and dangerous to existing residents, visitors and contractors.

For the above reasons, we believe the Plan fails on soundness grounds: We believe the plan is not Positively prepared - the plan is not prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development. There are nearby communities such as Thornton, Crosby and Bootle which have a far greater need for housing than Hightown, in far more accessible areas and closer to public transport links and other infrastructure. The plan is not Justified - the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence. The assessment only shows the site as having one benefit i.e. affordable housing, but how will this prevent the site from being used for market housing and not just affordable housing? A council surely cannot rely solely on one benefit of affordable housing to determine if a site is feasible?

The plan is not effective - the plan is not deliverable over its period and not based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities. The provision of a considerable number of additional housing in Hightown will not be an effective means of addressing the housing policies as there is no justifiable need for more housing in Hightown, demonstrated by the number of

houses currently on the market. The plan is not consistent with national policy - the plan does not enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with national policies, for the reasons set out above. The sites are not located where the need to travel will be minimised as explained above.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6		Plan Order Site MN2.20		Other Documents
Policy MN2.20		Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown		
Respondent No 667		Response Ref 1		Representor Name I M Hill
Organisation Name				
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection			

Summary of Main Issues

We would like to object to the above housing allocations included within the Local Plan on the basis "soundness" in that we believe these have not been positively prepared, are not justified and are not effective as demonstrated below.

Hightown is a small community and is accessed via one relatively small country lane. The proposed developments outlined above will add some 130 new dwellings which will increase the traffic flow along this road considerably both during construction and thereafter. This road is simply not designed to cope with this volume of traffic. Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane themselves are narrow residential roads which are simply not capable of accommodating both construction and additional residential traffic. Indeed, at the weekends Sandy Lane is already subject to makeshift traffic control to accommodate the hundreds of vehicles that access the playing fields. Any increase in traffic above this totally lacks any justification. There are no schools in Hightown at present with all children having to access schools in Formby which I understand are already excessively over-subscribed. Any further development of Hightown on the scale proposed would necessitate the provision of a school in Hightown which has not been contemplated in the Plan. There is only one local shop in Hightown and any further development should require that local amenities of this nature are also catered for.

Both of the above housing allocations are situated on designated Green Belt which is detrimental to the essential nature of Hightown. We believe that the Local Plan has not adequately exhausted the use of Brown Field sites before encroaching on Green Belt.

6. We are aware that red squirrels inhabit the area to the rear of our property (MN 2.21) and that development of this site would destroy their habitat. This is contravention of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981 (as amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act, 2000) and, as such, is unlawful. We purchased our property in June 2012 on the basis that it was bordered on two sides by designated Green Belt. Indeed, in the local searches undertaken at that time Sefton made no representation of their intention to consider the developments MN 2.20 and MN 2.21. We have since established that Sefton were considering these developments as early as 2011. The very existence of these proposals has had a significant adverse effect on the value of our property and, should they not be withdrawn, this loss of value will be real. In the event that these are not withdrawn then we would have no alternative but to seek financial recompense from Sefton Council on the basis that they failed to disclose their plans at the time of our purchase in June 2012.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Given the above we would submit that the housing allocations MN 2.20 and MN 2.21 of the Local Plan are both unlawful and unsound and should be withdrawn.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 696	Response Ref 8	Representor Name Robin Buckley
Organisation Name Redrow Homes Ltd		
Obj/Sup/Com Comment		

Summary of Main Issues

The inclusion of Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown as a housing allocation is fully supported (Site references MN2.20). They have emerged as allocations following the Sefton Green Belt Study and the Methodology for Selecting Green Belt Sites. Development on these sites is vital if Sefton is to meet its objectively assessed need for housing. Development on these sites will add significantly to the stock of affordable housing for which there is a distinct need in Hightown.

A Transport Assessment has been prepared. It is based on all development on the housing allocation parcels in Hightown. It examines the capacity of the key junction at Alt Road / Kerslake Way and shows that there is a significant level of spare capacity at this junction. Further modelling at the planning application stage would include a review of capacity and safety at the North End Lane, Alt Road and Moss Lane junction.

The Council highlighted the potential for wintering birds, water voles and other protected species on part of the site. Royal Fern is present on part of the site. The Ecological Assessment found that there are no ecological receptors that would prevent development. The woodland provides the habitat of greatest wildlife value. This should be incorporated into new development. There are no protected plant species. The habitat is not suitable for over-wintering geese or water voles or otters. There is no evidence of protected animals.

The access arrangements are described and shown in the Transport Assessment. Ground Conditions - The sub-strata generally of peat with local developments built on raft or pile construction. This is a common form of construction. It does not impact on the viability or deliverability of development on these land parcels. It has been found that these parcels of land can be excluded from the Green Belt without an unacceptable impact on the purposes of retaining land in the Green Belt. The 'Local Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy Economic Viability Study', December 2014 does not assess the sites at Hightown in any significant detail but it is reasonable to assume that comparison can be made with sites such as land at Andrew's Close in Formby where it is concluded that the baseline position is viable and that the 30% requirement for affordable housing set out in the Local Plan will not impact in a negative way on viability.

The new housing will also be deliverable. It is important to recognise that the development of the subject land is being promoted by a plc housebuilder. There can be a high degree of confidence that housing will be delivered, including affordable housing. This will help significantly to meet the objectively assessed housing need in Sefton.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

(1) Transport Assessment; (2) Ecological Assessment; (3) Appraisal of Landscape Context and Site Masterplan

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 703	Response Ref 19	Representor Name Jackie Copley
Organisation Name CPRE Lancashire		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

We are opposed to the redesignation of this green belt site for residential development. It would represent an extension of an ill-conceived ribbon development and would lack a definitive southern boundary making it susceptible to future unrestricted development. It would also entail the loss of mature woodland and a recreational area devoted to equestrian activities (cf. Policy NH5). Before it could be developed, an Ecological Assessment would be necessary. A Transport Statement or Transport Assessment would also be necessary as specified by par. 32 of the NPPF.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 716	Response Ref 30	Representor Name Robert Swift
Organisation Name	Robert Swift and family	
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Only part of the site has been proposed, and will result in the loss of greenfield land. It is considered within the Sustainability Appraisal that due to the limited facilities within the settlement, only a limited number of dwellings are considered acceptable. Additionally there are some landscape and access considerations associated with the site, alongside heritage, ecology and openness in character.

Summary of Suggested Changes

The indicative capacity of Site MN2.20 should be decreased from 120 to 100 dwellings.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 741	Response Ref 4	Representor Name
Organisation Name Priory Asset Management LLP		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

The 6.5ha site is not specifically assessed within the assessment forms, although it is anticipated that the land could deliver 120 dwellings equating to a density of 18.4 dwellings per hectare. The site includes elements of two sites which have been assessed; a smaller (1.2ha) site off Elmcroft Lane (Site ref. SR4.17) and a larger site described as Land South East of Hightown which is 11.9ha (S068). The sites that have been assessed have varying degrees of impact on the green belt, as well differing levels of constraints. It is therefore difficult to assess what impact the 6.5ha allocated site would have on the surrounding area and its facilities. The partially wooded nature of the smaller site (1.2ha) is seen as being a constraint. Sefton's emerging policy, EQ9, states that any lost trees must be replaced at a ratio of 1:1. This reduces greatly the area available for development and would require a creative landscaping solution. The larger site contains not only the partially wooded area of the smaller site, but also water vole appropriate habitat, habitats suitable for wintering birds, Royal Fern and potential for other protected species which makes this site a 'moderate' ecological constraint rather than a 'minor' constraint. The presence of wintering birds and water voles on site would require further land for habitats, and buffer zones, which would reduce the overall area available for development. Due to the lack of a clear assessment it is assumed that these are all present on the allocated site.

The assessment of the smaller site indicated that the level of development would not have a negative impact on the network capacity within the area. The smaller site would require highways improvements to be delivered, which may be considerable. The larger site would require the construction of two junctions, as well road improvements at Elmcroft lane and Sandy Lane. The larger development has considerable impacts in terms of network capacity on three junctions within Hightown and is the only allocated site assessed to be 'severely constrained'. Even if this increase in highway capacity could be accommodated on the network, significant abnormal costs would accrued in relation to offsite highway improvements. The allocated site would result in some, if not all, of the network problems found on the larger site. This could cause serious disruption and harm to Hightown as well as impacting greatly on the viability of the development.

The larger parcel is assessed within the Sefton Green Belt Study as having a significant impact on the Green Belt, allowing for unrestricted urban sprawl to occur. Just as fundamental is the fact that the proposed boundary would not correspond to a strong geographical feature, which puts pressure on the development of the green belt in the future. The Green Belt Study is clear that in order to allow for the growth in this area to be 'proportionate to the size of the village, which lacks many local facilities including a Primary School', only an area of approximately 1.2ha should be developed.

The site has severe constraints in terms of network capacity; it would have a significant impact upon the green belt by allowing urban sprawl; it contains suitable habitats for water voles and wintering birds; and would also result in the loss of fields which are currently designated as sports grounds. The levels to which these constraints impact upon the actual allocation are unclear, as no specific assessment has been done. It is therefore suggested that the indicative capacity is reduced to 58, as proposed within the Green Belt Assessment, rather than the 120 units quoted in the Local Plan.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Amend Site Reference MN2.20 to reduce the anticipated dwelling yield to 58 homes during the Plan period;

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.20 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.20 **Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 1015 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Janice Doyle
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We are once again dismayed to hear of yet another proposal for houses in Hightown. This is by far the largest proposal so far and one which would hugely affect the village and the people living in it. We can see no possible benefit to the village or its current residents. The effects: Huge increase in volume of traffic through the village which is accessed by only one road. Lengthy build programme - constant flow of heavy goods vehicles. More school buses. No school in Hightown - so why is more housing needed which would be aimed at young families. More loss of precious wildlife and green spaces. Peaceful village life ruined. Both my partner and I strongly object to this application and we only hope that you at Planning have the good sense to turn this one down.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.20 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.20 **Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 1028 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Lee Ashall
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The infrastructure in Hightown will not be able to cope with the addition of an extra 130 houses . There is only one road leading in and out which in recent years caused the vilage to be cut off twice. The vehicles from any extra residents will only exacerbate the problem, especially when there are already numerous school buses travelling around the village at peak periods. The roads are unsuitable for heavy machinery and HGV's which we have already suffered from during the ongoing development by Altcar rifle range and that is only for 13 houses. The roads leading into Hightown from the bypass are very narrow and have deep drainage ditches on either side, we recently had a HGV fall into one of them. Also there have been numerous accidents on the by pass, some fatal, where cars have been trying to get in or out of North End Lane so traffic lights would definitely be required at that junction if this were to go ahead. Also provisions would have to be made to build a local school as Formby schools are already full.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Regarding sites MN2:20 and MN2:21 in the sefton plan, I feel that this is far too large a development for Hightown it is out of keeping with the size and character of the village which is a small rural area. Also the population in sefton is decreasing year on year so who are these houses being built for? This is not a viable site due to the peat substrate within the soil which could potentially lead to subsidence, risking damage to property and lives.

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.20

Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown

Respondent No 1032

Response Ref 1

Representor Name Brian Lea

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The existing infrastructure of roads, schools and shopping in and around Hightown is completely inadequate for the addition of over 100 hundred houses. The plan to increase flows on the existing Alt Rd exit is unsustainable as this is the sole current exit from Hightown. It is narrow, bendy and already carries a significant traffic load particularly at peak times. When the load is further increased by events at the local sports grounds, this leads to delays and increased risk on the single road. Additionally attempting to provide an exit via Sandy Lane simply moves the load onto Moss Lane, which is already even more busy and risky. A whole new exit road out to the Formby bypass with new roundabout or lights will be required as the current exits both accessing onto the bypass are already extremely busy and require much caution. There is no school in Hightown- primary or secondary. All children have to be bussed to Formby or Crosby. The additional houses will demand the creation of a primary school at least. Where can this go if there are already plans to increase the housing numbers and build a solar farm too? There are limited shopping facilities and these are the seaward side of the railway only. A large number of new houses will demand at least some new shops. These are not in the plan. Again this will require significant increase in the flows of traffic over the railway bridge, which is the sole access to the seaward shops and will become intolerable.

The site proposed is notable for poor draining and in times of high rainfall or extended wet weather periods, the water table raises, and small ponds form on the land. The recent attempts of flattening the land by removing a central ditch/depression will simply exacerbate the existing problem. To consider building a large number of houses in an area already understood to have flooding issues is against the present government guidelines. It would be foolhardy, and unacceptable to insurers and existing residents who would have their own houses subjected to much greater flood risk. The land proposed is also adjacent to the declared coastal flood plain over which any new access roads must pass. This would be highly inappropriate, costly to build, and introduces yet another potential flooding issue. The risk increases to unacceptable levels. I trust you will understand the objections, and I look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Policy MN2.20

Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown

Respondent No 1043

Response Ref 1

Representor Name M Jones

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Having been a resident in Hightown since 1971. I have seen many changes including building more houses . I have not objected to any of this extensive building that extends to a very long Thornbeck Avenue and over to Elvington Road. This did however greatly increase the traffic flow more so in the later years as more families became two car owners. The Thornbeck Avenue beyond the playground has almost become a single traffic road with cars parked either side of the road and difficult at evening times.

Since the building of houses by the army camp there has proven to be a congestion problem around the village centre with heavy trucks etc, which may be added to in coming years by people coming into the village centre from the proposed new build. Therefore the prospect of developing the land behind Elmcroft and Sandy Lane will exacerbate the traffic flow problems, particularly at peak time. There may also be a problem at the weekend with traffic for the sports fields aside Sandy Lane. Having mentioned concerns about traffic congestion and infrastructure problems are you really prepared to build on green land with a rising water level which has flooded and a ground soil content that has caused some houses alongside the site to have essential extra underpinning? This at great expense. The cost to build new houses with this problem and including drainage, is this a viable project?

Setting these problems aside this is a popular animal/nature reserve area. Through the years I have walked my children and their friends many times during all the seasons to see the vast flora and fauna this land supports. Now it is my grandchildren who experience the delight of seeing these animals. Many a school project or topic has been completed with a "walk down a country lane" or a sighting and identification of various bird types. To build on this land would be a great loss but an even greater problem of road congestion for the increase in traffic. There are more houses for sale in Hightown than I have ever seen. Is it because of the traffic or locality, lack of school places, a question for you to answer?

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.20	Other Documents
Policy MN2.20	Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 1045	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Carolyn Platt
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I am writing to raise concerns over the proposed developments in Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane, Hightown. The local plan contains details to develop sites in both of these areas, increasing the housing stock of the village by around 150 houses.

I am concerned of the impact this will have on the village, and in particular, the ability of the infrastructure to support both the construction traffic and then the increased car usage.

Both Sandy Lane and Elmcroft are residential streets - neither of which are generous in size. There is one way in and one way out of both Hightown itself and both of these roads - the impact of the additional traffic cannot be dispersed. With the level of housing being proposed, there is the likelihood of an additional 300 cars using the infrastructure and I believe it would be difficult for Hightown to absorb the extra traffic.

Although Hightown is well served by the Merseyrail train service, there is no car park associated with the station (the walk from the new developments to the station would be quite long. There is no infrastructure to support people who travel to the station by car except for a limited amount of street parking. Hightown is poorly served by buses and because of the size of both Sandy Lane and Elmcroft, it would be difficult to run a bus service to support the new developments (even if the bus provider was willing).

I am not convinced of the Councils analysis over the level of demand for the new housing stock (there are currently over 60 houses for sale in Hightown that are not moving well on the market). The village lacks the draw of larger local neighbours because there are very limited facilities for locals in terms of shops, banks, schools etc. Hightown children do not get priority when selecting schools and this can be a disincentive for families moving to the area.

I would be grateful if you could review the decision to include the two plots of land into the local plan.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 99	Response Ref 3	Representor Name Jim O'Gorman
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I live in the Hightown area and am particularly concerned about the lack of any infrastructure plans to support an additional proposed 130 new homes, which probably means there are NO plans for any infrastructure changes ? For a small village with no schools and limited services this is surely not a practical proposal

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.21 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.21 **Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 126 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Peter Walker
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I believe that the infrastructure in Hightown is unsuitable to support this development, on the following grounds. The road in and out of Hightown is already at peak time very busy, and the bends coming into the village are so tight that large vehicles can not go around them without the trailer part of the vehicle crossing onto the opposite carriage way. We have already had a big increase in heavy vehicles and buses with the increased use of the rifle range, up about 25%. This is now running at approx 240000 people in and out of a single access road. The area of the proposed development, also has a football club, which already causes traffic gridlock on Saturdays, without the proposed site traffic, children and heavy plant are not a good mix. There are other problems, school children are already having to be bused in and out as we do not have a school. Minimal facilities and services exist in Hightown. The road going into the proposed site Elmcroft Lane is narrow, and the houses have been subject to subsidence. I do not know if the lane is capable of withstanding heavy vehicles and if not could damage the existing houses with vibration. Current housing developments and existing properties are not selling. The population of Sefton has decreased over the last ten years from 300000 plus to 278000, why do we need more houses, our unemployment levels are increasing, were are these people who need all these houses.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove site MN2.21 from the plan.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.21 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.21 **Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 143 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Peter Smith
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We do not agree to the building of 120 Houses in Hightown. The roads alone are not up to taking any more cars. Consider it has just one small road in and out. There is a complete lack of services and many more points to consider also.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.21 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.21 **Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 148 **Response Ref** 13 **Representor Name** Tim Astbury
Organisation Name Hightown Parish Council
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

In the Council's opinion both MN2.20 and MN 2.21 are unsuitable for development as proposed in the Local Plan owing to network capacity and accessibility. In addition there will be a need for a site specific flood risk assessment of both sites, a satisfactory Transport Statement, and an assessment under the Habitats Directive. The Council is also concerned about the schooling of Hightown children as it is considered this aspect of the Sefton Council Local Plan has not been thought through carefully enough. Finally the question of drainage and sewage in this low lying area of Hightown is of particular concern.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 148	Response Ref 12	Representor Name Tim Astbury
Organisation Name	Hightown Parish Council	
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane comprise high quality properties on the east side of the Northern Railway Line that runs through Hightown Village. At present the south side of Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane fall within Sefton's Green Belt which provides an essential buffer between the North of Crosby and Blundellsands (see NPPF Paragraph 80). Site MN 2.21 Land at Sandy Lane is designated for 10 houses. Access to this site is not as problematical as MN 2.20 though Sandy Lane could be too narrow for a bus route. Again the ground is very damp and the ditch between Sandy lane and the site would need clearing and bridging. Indeed, there is a case to be made for connecting the two sites MN2.20 and 2.21 and retaining Elmcroft Lane as a cul-de-sac.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 162	Response Ref 2	Representor Name John McCall
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Local Plan- Hightown MN20 +MN21

All, please consider this email as full endorsement of Hightown Parish Council's response to you. This is my personal, as a resident, objection to the development, which in my opinion offers little benefit in numbers to the council's wider strategy, whilst devastating a local, rural and coastal community. It is short sighted and the references in the Parish Council's response relating to land drainage, village access, schooling, wider infra-structure, property and access on Elmcroft and the very serious wildlife matter of sustainable bat populations are all valid. I doubt the development is a valid financial proposition for a developer and if started, like on the Range Road, evolving, it could end up ruining the environment whilst not delivering the end product. I would therefore in summary wish for the proposals on both designated sites be withdrawn as viable options. Whilst a member of the Parish Council, this is a residential opposition.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 188	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Debra and Clive Harris
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to raise our objections to the proposed plan to build 120 houses in Hightown. I object on the grounds that the roads into and out of the village will not cope with the volume of lorries and the weight of them. Formby commuters using the Hightown bends as rat runs.

I object on the grounds that already we do not have our own schools and our children do not get their first choice of school and have to travel to attend school. We are currently short of Doctors. The area around the village shops is very congested already with the commuter parking for Liverpool (and I note a great deal of these cars are not Hightown residents but travel in to park before catching a train.)

You have already made this problem worse by allowing the current housing development access to the road by the Hightown railway station- have you ever been there during the morning rush –presumably not as you wouldn't have given planning permission. Why can't these houses be sited on brown field sites.If we had room for expansion in our schools and Doctors surgeries I would agree we could absorb more but we don't. Will these houses be for first time owners? If there is such a shortage of houses in sefton why aren't the current ones selling.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 189	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Thomas Hanlon
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I have just discovered to my dismay and frustration that planning has been submitted to build 120 houses in Hightown. Hightown is possibly one of the last villages in Sefton if not Merseyside that over the past 30 years had gone through a number of phases of expansion with houses being built resulting in the expansion of the village to what it is today. We are at our limit. We have one road in and out which is sufficient for the village as it is now. We are currently going through a building phase at the moment with a small development adjacent to the service road from the rail station to the Army Camp. This development was strongly opposed, but went ahead anyway. This small development has already caused disruption to the village with the re routing of the start of the service road and the repositioning of the bus stop. The current location of the bus stop has still not been finalised as there is not enough natural space around the village green other than its original position which is now the new entrance to the service road to the Army Camp. We do not want or need 120 new houses in Hightown, being built in phased developments lasting a proposed 5 years plus. 5 years of lorries digging equipment disruption to the village. 120 houses would mean another 200 cars and the loss of a nice small village The objections from the village were just ignored in response to the plans to the development on the service road to the Army Camp. Please don't let these objection go unheard.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.21 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.21 **Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 190 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** P Inskip
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Regarding the planning of 120 new houses in Hightown. Enough is enough, there is not the infrastructure to take any more houses in the area, the roads are inadequate plus there is not enough schooling for any younger children, plus the area could not take any more cars, it's too small a village for any more houses
I strongly object to any more building of houses what so ever

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.21 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.21 **Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 202 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Marjorie Walker
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I write with concern about the proposed development in Hightown. I realise that homes will be needed for the future. Amongst a lot of issues this development will cause, I mention just a few. The infrastructure will not cope with the extra traffic, as the development is a distance from the village, people will drive to the centre of the village. As there is limited parking, it is going to cause a greater problem, as it does now with residents using cars on the other side of Hightown, a distance from the village. Also with no schools in Hightown, this will cause another problem, as our own children already living in here have difficulty acquiring places in schools in Formby. These are a few of many problems we have and I would like to register my concern.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove site MN2.21 from the plan.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.21 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.21 **Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 205 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Jane Young
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the building of 120 additional houses in Hightown, my reasons are as follows: Loss of wildlife and green spaces. Potentially 200+ cars travelling in and out of the village causing extra congestion on access roads. Additional school buse. Constant disruption with lorries in and out of the village during approximately 5 year build programme

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove site MN.2.21 from the plan.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.21 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.21 **Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 209 **Response Ref** **Representor Name** Nicholas Deering
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We object strongly, parking and driving is difficult on already crowded congested roads.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove MN2.21 from the plan.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.21 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.21 **Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 213 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Dorothy Walsh
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Access to this site is not as problematical as MN 2.20 though Sandy Lane could be too narrow for a bus route. Again the ground is very damp and the ditch between Sandy lane and the site would need clearing and bridging. Indeed, there is a case to be made for connecting the two sites MN2.20 and 2.21 and retaining Elmcroft Lane as a cul-de-sac. In my opinion both MN2.20 and MN 2.21 are unsuitable for development as proposed in the Local Plan owing to network capacity and accessibility. In addition there will be a need for a site specific flood risk assessment of both sites, a satisfactory Transport Statement, and an assessment under the Habitats Directive. I am also concerned about the schooling of Hightown children as it is considered this aspect of the Sefton Council Local Plan has not been thought through carefully enough. Finally the question of drainage and sewage in this low lying area of Hightown is of particular concern.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.21

Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown

Respondent No 216

Response Ref 2

Representor Name Janeann & David Fealey

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

After consulting the Sefton Local Plan I write to once again express my concerns about the plans to build 130 houses on the two proposed sites on Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane in Hightown. Whilst I was aware that there were proposals to build on sites in Hightown I was astonished to learn of the number of houses proposed which to me seemed to increase? I was at first told the number was to be around 40 so to find out it was 130 was a great shock. As a resident of Elmcroft Lane and a resident of Hightown for 38 years I feel that I know the area and village very well having relied on the facilities and amenities it has to offer. It is this point which I would wish to raise with you now - I do not believe the infrastructure of Hightown could cope with such a large development and the amount of extra people that these houses would bring.

The village is very small with one shop and one post office and it is very far from the proposed sites, especially the larger site at the end of Elmcroft. How would new residents access the village especially elderly residents? I live here and use the roads that you plan to use for the developments and they will not be able to withstand the traffic. Elmcroft Lane itself is not wide enough for public transport vehicles to drive down and I would assume that with such a large development planned that public transport would be required to access the site?

Access to the houses is a massive concern for myself and my neighbours. Already the main and only access road to Elmcroft Lane, Sandy Lane, has constant pot holes in it and is always in need of repair. When the football provision on the sports field began some years back the increase in traffic resulted in more potholes and damage to the road and now you have to swerve to miss the potholes or damage your car. So I am of the opinion if it struggles with that traffic now it most certainly will not be able to withstand heavy duty traffic during the build and in the future when accessing the houses. We constantly get trucks stuck in the road trying to get out of our street - due to the narrow width they have no option but to reverse and once they are approaching Sandy Lane end there is a very small amount of room to reverse so I have often seen it take more than half an hour trying to get a truck out successfully! How would this work with large work vehicles trying to get in and out of the site when building starts? Currently when this happens if you are trying to get into the road there is no option but to sit and wait for the truck to get out.

I mentioned infrastructure earlier and unlike the other areas proposed in the plan we do not have a school in Hightown and have to access schools in Formby and Crosby. We already experience problems in getting Hightown children into schools in Formby so with no plans for a school here how would we have any chance at all with a larger demand for them?

I am very concerned at what this proposal means for this lovely quaint village and whilst I fully understand the need to build more homes in Sefton I think that building in an area such as Hightown without adequate roads, amenities, access to education would be a mistake when there are clearly other areas being proposed that would provide this.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to object to that part of the plan which refers to MN2.20 and MN2.21, the building of houses on Sandy Lane, Hightown and land

at the back of Elmcroft Lane, Hightown. The building of these properties will greatly damage the quality of the rural setting. More importantly, the infrastructure to support more dwellings in the village does not exist. The fields identified as potential building sites have a history of subsidence.

The drainage ditch running through the 6.5 hectare field has been filled in by the current landowner. There is a high Peat level in this field which results in a high water content in the winter months. This dries out in the summer months making the ground unstable. It is doubtful whether piling, which would need to be to a considerable depth, would remove the risk of instability to any structures built. There is also an unconfirmed rumour that, at some time in the past, tobacco waste was dumped on this land. There is only one road into the village. This is a narrow carriageway with deep sided ditches on either side and a 90 degree bend on the approach to the village.

Vehicles veer off the road and into the ditches even in good weather. In snowy and icy conditions, it has been known for the village to have been cut off totally for considerable periods due to accidents on the lanes. In the winter of 1981, blizzard conditions also closed the railway for a number of days which meant that the whole village was cut off. This caused problems for the parents of

very young babies and for the elderly. Such events also greatly hinder access to Police, Ambulance and Fire services to the village.

Trying to enter the village via North End Lane on a weekend when junior football is played on the playing fields adjacent to the proposed building sites is almost impossible due to the constant stream of parents' cars entering or leaving the village. An extra 130

homes would not only exacerbate the situation at weekends but would bring about the same problems every day of the week.

Within

the village there is a Post Office, a newsagent which also sells a few basic supplies, a hairdresser and a pharmacy. There are no other shops.

At times, it is virtually impossible to park a car any where near the shops or the station. When the new road for the Chelmere houses being built near the army camp was being created, there was absolute chaos on the village roads. Water pressure to houses in the village has reduced considerably over the last 20 years or so. One assumes that this would be further reduced by the demands of more users. Conversely, the pressure on the existing sewer system would be increased by the extra waste

created by the occupants of any new properties. Access to any new site is said to be via Elmcroft Lane. This is a very narrow lane and

would not be wide enough to accommodate contractors' plant. Such access would also necessitate the destruction of the small wood at the back of Elmcroft lane.

Has a full independent survey been made of the bat colony which roosts within this wood? When new houses were built on Blundell Road and Elvington Road in 1976, a village school was promised and land set aside. When the next phase of houses were built in the 1980's, part of this land was built on and the remainder became a play area. Children were bussed to school in Formby and Crosby. Formby schools are oversubscribed and it seems obvious that with the level of construction proposed within this plan for both Hightown and Formby, there will not be adequate provision for education within the area.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.21 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.21 **Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 229 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Angela Laffler
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I strongly object to 120 new houses for Hightown. The road leading to the village cannot take more traffic. Think of possibly 240 extra children being ferried to schools. Such a shame to ruin a lovely rural aspect for many residents too.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.21 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.21 **Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 230 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** C Scrine
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am writing to register my strong objection to any proposed further housing developments within Hightown, and in particular the current proposal for 120 houses to be built in our area.

There are many reasons for my objection which I am sure you will be made aware of via the relevant bodies, but as a Hightown resident I at this stage purely wish to register my objection to any housing developments.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.21 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.21 **Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 238 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** D Higham
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to voice my concern for the building of an additional 200 homes in the Hightown area. Apart from the devasation to wildlife and our green belt area. The increase in road traffic and insufficient facilities to cater for the extra people that will occupy these homes will have a huge detriment to our village and community. There are no schools for any children to attend here, there are no old peoples facilities ie day centres or other facilities to cater for as the owners get older. The addition traffic, noise, pollution and general refuse caused by the addition of that many occupiers is un imaginable. This must also effect the farmers locally have their concerns been listened too. The council is all ready strapped for cash providing limited services. Just where do you expect the children to play from these homes as there is nothing for them here. I'm sure there are other concerns I've missed but please rethink the effects this will have on what is a good community and a lovely place to live. Please reconsider and reject this proposal. We are currently experiencing terrible problems with the houses being built by the train station and that's a much smaller holding. So to times this up x 190 just doesn't bear thinking about. So in conclusion that's a no from us.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 275	Response Ref 2	Representor Name G Rowe
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

The proposed building of 10 houses in Sandy Lane will also cause serious road problems as the road is far too narrow for extra traffic. The traffic at the moment is a problem every Saturday due to the football taking place on the spoils ground. Long hold ups are the norm all day Saturday and most evenings during the summer. Red Squirrels are also seen in Sandy Lane with bat roosts in the trees.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 293	Response Ref 2	Representor Name AW & EA Triggs
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I am writing to strongly object to the proposed erection of a large housing estate on nearby Green Belt land. The main access off Sandy Lane is already congested, especially on Saturdays with traffic from the football pitches. This little unspoilt village cannot take such a bottleneck around the station area. Please note our strong objection.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove site MN2.21 from the plan as an allocation.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 294	Response Ref 2	Representor Name M. E. Richardson
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object in the strongest way to the plans for the building of 120 new houses at the end of Elmcroft Lane. This scheme does not take into consideration the situation in Hightown — children having to be taken by bus to school, insufficient places available for any new children, inevitable congestion with added traffic, lack of suitable infrastructure in the village to name a few. The land proposed is, I understand, peat and pile-driving any building will add so much to costs that affordable housing will be impossible.

Why consider Elmcroft Lane as an access road? Any new houses built behind, and parallel to Elmcroft Lane, will require access and any such road could be extended to have entry from Sandy Lane. This would be much more suitable than Elmcroft which is already a busy and, at times, congested road. I trust that you will have second thoughts on the advisability of the current plan and will find the necessary land for new housing in a much more suitable position.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove site MN2.21 from the plan as an allocation.

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown
----------------------	-------------------------------------

Respondent No 298	Response Ref 2	Representor Name David Taylor
--------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

As far as we are aware the current proposal is to erect 10 new properties in 0.7 hectares on the East side of Elmcroft Lane behind the existing properties and with entrance to the site via Sandy Lane. The current proposal is also to erect 120 new properties in 6.5 hectares (16.06 acres) at the South end of Elmcroft Lane which is currently a quiet cul-de-sac. The land at the South end of Elmcroft Lane comprises a wooded area currently used for equestrian purposes and thence to the South, farmland. We understand the wooded area will be left as is but provide access to the proposed new housing area via an extension to Elmcroft Lane through the wooded area. We are assured the developments will be in keeping with the current properties in Elmcroft Lane and will be spaced at 8 —10 properties per acre. The affordable requirement is 30% but we are assured the affordable units will be indistinguishable from the market units albeit smaller types. Whilst we are very much against the development of Green Belt land in Hightown for the reasons set out in this document we understand the thinking behind the choice of Green Belt land. The land in question will always be available for sale as there is no other practical use for the land apart from farming.

In addition to our objection to the development of the Green Belt land we are very much against the use of Elmcroft Lane for access to so many houses. The proposal we consider is unsafe in many ways set out below and has a serious effect on the value of existing properties in Elmcroft Lane. The writer estimates that this proposed development has stopped the sale of houses in Elmcroft Lane and has reduced the values of those properties by some 100— 150K. As far as the writer is aware there is no compensation offered for these losses from any source.

As residents in Elmcroft Lane we are extremely concerned about the effect of extra traffic in the lane and indeed Sandy Lane. Elmcroft Lane is a narrow lane (6M wide) and whilst the road surface in Elmcroft Lane is acceptable the surface in Sandy Lane is not and already shows signs of significant settlement (see photo). Assuming 2 vehicles per property that increases the use of Elmcroft Lane's 23 houses (46 vehicles) to 143 houses (286 vehicles) approximately a 500% + increase. It is hard to imagine how this narrow lane will cope with that volume of traffic in rush hour and Sandy Lane will have that traffic plus an increase of 20 vehicles from the new properties on the East side of Elmcroft Lane and the significant road usage associated with the sporting activities undertaken at the playing fields on the South side of Sandy Lane. It should also be noted there are no schools for any age group in Hightown so all the children and teenagers of Hightown have to attend schools in Formby and Crosby or further away. The school run problem and the fact that, in this day and age, it is very common for both parents to work further accentuates the traffic problems.

The previous point assumes the proposed properties have already been built but in addition to those problems we have the insurmountable problems of volumes of heavy vehicles during the building process. On road parking is already a significant problem due to the very many vehicles using the sporting activities on Sandy Lane and often that parking problem spills into Elmcroft Lane. In addition to the above every vehicle wishing to travel North to Formby or South to Liverpool has to use the same single route in and out of Hightown (Kerslake Way / Moss Lane see photo) which is also a narrow road in itself. The considerable traffic from the West side of Hightown has right of way on Kerslake Way / Moss Lane and a 'T' junction at the end of Alt Road / Sandy Lane (see photo) is the only exit from the East side of Hightown (Elmcroft Lane side). If the planning proposal is approved in its current form the 'T' junction at the end of Sandy Lane will have to be completely redesigned to prevent serious accidents. A further concern is for access by emergency vehicles as they try to attend the new 120 additional houses having to travel down the narrow roads of Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane. The Local Plan points out the convenience of the railway station in Hightown. This provides electric train services to Southport and Liverpool and many stops in between and the trains are good and regular. It should be noted there is no parking facility at all at Hightown station and no room to develop any. This is presumably because Hightown was initially a village and the development of that village has continued at an unstoppable rate. We estimate some 250 houses have been built in Hightown since we have been residents and save for the railway road bridge connecting the West side of Hightown to the East there has been no improvement or development of Moss Lane. In asking questions about the local plan we are informed a Transport Statement/ Assessment has not been undertaken as yet even though we think this document should be produced at the earliest possible opportunity. As the Transport Statement /Assessment is not available to view it is impossible for anyone wishing to comment on the Local Plan to do so with accuracy.

In trying to continue the development of Hightown serious thought has to be given to traffic management and the general facilities in the area. Hightown has one small news agent, one small post office and a Chemist. It also has a doctor's surgery with, as far as we are aware, no permanent doctors and a small dentist's surgery which is full and cannot accept further patients. Hightown was a small village set in pleasant countryside. The development of these sites will have a significant effect on the community. The writer also considers the developments in question will devalue both the quality of life in the community and certainly the value of property in Elmcroft Lane substantially. In the most recent census the population of Hightown was 3,247. With this development of 130 houses plus a further 13 already being built and the U.K. average household of 2.4 people the population growth will be more than 10% which we consider is excessive. The local amenities are suitable for a small village and

residents already have to travel to Formby for any varied and reasonable sized facilities. We are told that the majority of the wooded area at the end of Elmcroft Lane will be retained and that access only will be provided for the 120 new houses through that wooded area and into the existing Elmcroft Lane. It has been mentioned on many occasions in the past that the wooded area at the end of Elmcroft Lane provides for the wellbeing of many red squirrels and bats which are protected species. It is hard to believe that either of these species will remain whilst a two lane road is constructed, old and established trees are removed and the heavy traffic involved in the construction of the road and the 120 new houses passes through the wooded area. After the construction is finished the heavy level of traffic through the woods will undoubtedly deter any significant animal life in the area. Whilst there are few official records of bats in the wooded area at the end of Elmcroft Lane most of the residents of Elmcroft Lane are aware of their presence and it is strongly suggested an official survey is conducted.

Local Plan 7. Site Access — Moderate Constraint — "There is little scope to provide any alternative / additional points of access for either vehicles or pedestrians". Photos Sandy Lane 4 and 5 show from the site development area into Hightown down Sandy Lane and it is not the intention of the writer that the roads in these areas be improved. These photos are for clarity only. It can be seen from the enclosed marked map that Sandy Lane continues past the Northern end of Elmcroft Lane to a right hand bend by cottages on the bend and thence to a left hand bend (approx. 234M) immediately adjacent to the site earmarked for development (photo Sandy Lane Sandy Lane then continues to a 'T' junction with Gorsey Lane (approx. 367M) (photos Sandy Lane 2 and 3). A left turn onto Gorsey Lane (photo Gorsey Lane 1) continues to a 'T' junction at Moss Lane (approx. 935M) (photos Gorsey Lane 2 and 3). Turning right onto Moss Lane (B5193) which is a main route to Liverpool from Hightown through Little Crosby and Crosby. Turning left onto Moss Lane is a route through to Hightown, Formby and Southport.

The site earmarked for development has direct access to Sandy Lane where a right hand turn would lead to Moss Lane and thence Liverpool as described above. Whilst about 50% of Sandy Lane is not made up road it is the opinion of the writer that this unmade track from the development site to Gorsey Lane could easily be widened and surfaced to present an acceptable approach road to the new development. Equally well Gorsey Lane which is made up and narrow but again it is the opinion of the writer that this could easily be widened to present an acceptable approach road for the new development. There is plenty of available land on either side of both roads and the drainage ditches at the side of the roads could be moved to allow for the development. There could also be a walkway provided around and to the East of the wooded area providing walking/cycle access to Elmcroft Lane, the local station and other small services provided in Hightown. This would allow for the minimum of disturbance to the wooded area and avoid to a great extent disturbance to the resident protected species.

Summary of Suggested Changes

The representation indicates that the site MN2.21 should not be allocated. However it is implied that if it is allocated: The site earmarked for development has direct access to Sandy Lane where a right hand turn would lead to Moss Lane and thence Liverpool as described above. Whilst about 50% of Sandy Lane is not made up road it is the opinion of the writer that this unmade track from the development site to Gorsey Lane could easily be widened and surfaced to present an acceptable approach road to the new development. Equally well Gorsey Lane which is made up and narrow but again it is the opinion of the writer that this could easily be widened to present an acceptable approach road for the new development. There is plenty of available land on either side of both roads and the drainage ditches at the side of the roads could be moved to allow for the development. There could also be a walkway provided around and to the East of the wooded area providing walking/cycle access to Elmcroft Lane, the local station and other small services provided in Hightown. This would allow for the minimum of disturbance to the wooded area and avoid to a great extent disturbance to the resident protected species.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 300	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Carole & Grenville Evans
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I am sending this e-mail to you to let you know that we are opposed to this development for the following reasons: Living on Sandy Lane which would provide access to the development we are very concerned about the volume of construction traffic passing our residence, as well as the number of vehicles for the builders themselves. The plan suggests this could go on for 5 years and we do not find this acceptable. We bought our house in Hightown knowing that potential for building projects of this nature were extremely limited, hence we decided to buy. If this development does go ahead the volume of traffic passing us in Sandy Lane could be as high as 200 plus car journeys, especially as Hightown does not have its own school, so the number of school runs morning and night will be very high. This would also cause additional congestion on access roads, as you well know Hightown is a village with one road in and one road out. The likelihood is that the new houses would have children, and if the average of 2.2 per family is the case then there will be an extra 250+ children requiring school places, places which currently do not exist we believe. This also means additional school buses. Not the least is the removal of green land and therefore the loss of wildlife in the area. We were also concerned that there was a suggestion of creating dedicated on road parking spaces in Sandy Lane, but who for and where would they be? I am sure many other residents here in Hightown will be writing to you to object and will be citing similar reasons as outlined above by my wife and I.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove MN2.21 as an allocation.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 305	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Hanorah B Noonan
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I strongly object to the plan to build 120 houses in Hightown, the village itself is only small and 120 houses is out of all proportion to the rest of the properties and will swamp the village and access road. It will also have a negative impact on wildlife and green spaces. I also see it as a Health and Safety issue, the one road actually going into the village consist of a very narrow lane as well as an extremely sharp bend. Lorries required to go in and out of village tend to actually traverse nearly 2 lanes, can't understand why this has not been addressed before. If this road gets blocked it will cause major problems, one road in and one road out, will there be another wider road built to aid extra traffic? We already have new houses being built "Blundell Hamlet" these are in proportion to the rest of the properties and will have little effect in the life of the village but 120 Houses just far too much.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove site MN2.21 as an allocation.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 312	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Kevin Kewn
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Please accept this email as an objection to the proposed building of more houses in Hightown. In my opinion, we are already at saturation point. The traffic load has significantly increased year on year and the proposal of another 120 houses and the further increase in traffic that would follow would impact negatively on already over parked roads, increasing the risk of an accident to motorist, pedestrian and more importantly children. The building traffic would also cause considerable disruption to the village, as is the case with the present building work alongside the station. The council did a magnificent job in creating and walk/cycle path from Hightown to Formby, and this has been virtually unusable since the present builders have been in situ. We have one road in and out of the village, and an increase of traffic which would accompany any further build, could lead to more road traffic accidents. The downgrading of Formby fire station should also be taken into consideration when deciding whether to increase homes in Hightown, as with reduced cover and increased homes the risk would be far greater.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove MN2.21 from the plan as an allocation.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 319	Response Ref 2	Representor Name
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Please find the enclosed list of our objections in this letter on the following grounds for the proposed 120 housing development to be built on our valuable green space which we know will have a detrimental and devastating effect on our wildlife also possibly nother 200+ cars in and out of the village causing such extra disruption and congestion on our already small access roads. We have no local school within Hightown and extra buses would be required (if there where any available places in local schools) and approximately there would be a build programme of 5+ years bringing in a heavy and constant flow of lorries etc, creating more pollution; noise and disruption to our quite village life health and well being and we feel this is unfair that as residents we should suffer this total inconvenience and disruption to our health and well being. We are just a small village that already has limited parking facilities for our own residents and visitors and due to the increasing population here we do on occasions already have to park 2 to 3 roads away from the bus stop and train station making it difficult in bad weather and taking into account the safety aspect in winter months when it is dark etc. We have resided here for over 35 years and our reason for living here was because it was a small village providing a good community life and a healthy place to live also its small population and very low crime rate. We strongly object to this proposal and hope you will take on board our strong objection due to the size and nature of its location that will bring in significant effects and change in terms of visual intrusion and the potential noise impact and severe disruption to existing traffic and the possibility of increased future volume of traffic resulting in chaos because we already have the new upgraded coastal footpath which brings in more people to the area which in turn brings in more litter, noise and general disruption to our small village.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove site MN2.21 as an allocation.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 322	Response Ref 2	Representor Name R, JJ, C & V Wolfe
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Me and all my family strongly object to all the proposed building of new houses in Hightown, and our objections are as follows. There is no need for affordable housing in Hightown, as the price of houses is already affordable, and in your proposal there is no mention of the price for this affordable housing or how you intend to manage the sale of them. In your proposal there are no benefits for any or all of these houses, to any one in Hightown, or any were else. No more shops, no more bus stops, only less green belt land and less sports area, so who is going to benefit? Not the people of Hightown. The building of these houses will be of great upset, to everyone in Hightown, and to people visiting the area.

On a Sunday and Saturday, the traffic is very busy at times with people coming and going from the sports fields, on that side of Hightown, and this is only going to add to that much more traffic, and congestion, as well as the pollution from these lorries, and trucks. The noise level in Hightown can sometimes be very loud, due to the Rifle range, but that will be nothing to the noise over the next 5 years due to the building traffic, which is highly unacceptable.

At the moment my grandson plays at the sports field on that side of Hightown and it is good that we can walk him there, and are not adding to the traffic, but with these fields that being a great source of keeping sport alive and keeping fit, were are they going to go? There seems to be less green area than ever before. The loss of Green belt land is also unacceptable, where is all the local wild life going to go? We have peacock's that walk all around Hightown, at the moment they have the freedom to do this, all the residents that live here know to look out for them, we would not like to see anything happen to these birds. Would we be getting more buses to pick up more children that will need to go to local schools, if they can get in? Where would this money come from for these buses if we did get them?

Please save our village, and keep it the nice place that it is at the moment to live, a very concerned resident of Hightown.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove site MN2.21 as an allocation.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 338	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Phyllis Gunner
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

My objections are: - Village surgery has difficulties with the numbr of residents in 2015, to give an efficient service. Would require extra school buses (if there were available places in local schools). May affect property values. Many more cars travelling in and out of the village causing extra congestion on access roads. Loss of wildlife and greenspaces. Approximate build programme of 5 years duration causing constant flow of lorries in and out of the village.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove sites MN2.20 and MN2.21 as allocations.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 339	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Edward & Blanche Arch
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Our village does not have the infrastructure to support that number of new houses e.g no school. We are trying to maintain a village community. We do not wish to become a dormitory town, there is already building of unnecessary executive housing in progress. More importantly, in the early 1970's Elmcroft Road was improved from an ash road and reconstructed up minimum local authority adoption standards, (i.e. cul-de-sac road) not a through road or spine road. As a retired chartered civil engineer involved in the construction of this work, I know that the thick layer of peat under this road and under the houses was not removed. The road has just survived without much deformation but any increase in traffic, especially heavy goods vehicles, will be beyond capability and cause settlement to the houses. An alternative route would have to be found if the proposed development went ahead.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove sites MN2.20 and MN2.21 as allocations.

An alternative route would have to be found if the proposed development went ahead.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 341	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Malcolm Walker
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

We only have a small village centre and government cutshave resulted in less funding for maintenance of roundabouts and public spaces and volunteers are having to ensure standards are maintained. To build more houses in Hightown would necessitate a monumental alteration to the infrastructure of the area which would prove the development impracticable.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove sites MN2.20 and MN2.21 as allocations.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 353	Response Ref 2	Representor Name
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I and my wife are opposed to the further development for housing in Hightown. Having been a family resident of 39 years in Hightown the scope for development has been limited to individual infill or sale of side garden plots. Only extension into the green belt can further houses be built given the borders of either the railway line, sea/dunes or coastal path. The character of the village is established with the old housing and farm houses/ agricultural land, new housing within the green belt at the road access into Hightown would be a huge 'blot' on the landscape and village setting. the population of Hightown has slowly increased over the years with later developments south to Crosby, there is no primary school yet a much smaller village of Little Crosby has one? A new primary school would have to be built and where would that go, you cannot keep "bussing in" more and more children to Formby which also has proposed increase in developments which will take up more pupil requirements for high and primary schools.

This development is unsuitable and not sustainable for a village such as Hightown. There are hundreds of brown filed sites in litherland/Bootle and Southport where old, redundant empty factories are no longer required and have remained so, being more suitable factory space on proper industrial estates. There is no need for these green belt developments in Formby or Hightown we are losing more and more 'green spaces' on land known for the wildlife such as pheasants and barn owls but most importantly the migrating geese that first land in these fields after crossing the coast. Hightown is right under the migration flight path the geese drop down into this field, rest and feed before onward flight to Martin Mere, they also feed out on the estuary, it is their first landfall for thousands of geese. This green belt development must not be allowed and we object.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove sites MN2.20 and MN2.21 as proposed allocations.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 359	Response Ref 9	Representor Name Catherine Fraser
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

MN2.20 & MN2.21 in Hightown consists of 130 houses. Originally the council proposed building 58 homes in Hightown because I quote "Only a limited amount of development is proposed in the Greenbelt around Hightown. This reflects the limited number of services and facilities in the village" (A Local Plan for Sefton Document) . Sefton now need to explain whether they are going to provide the extra services required. Currently there is a major problem in terms of a lack of GP services. If I remember right there is a pub and a shop. This development cannot possibly be sustainable. The Local Plan needs to say what extra services Sefton are going to provide. This is an increase in the housing allocation of 124%. In any case such a development is going to have a major impact upon a small community. This "about turn" in policy illustrates a certain element of cynicism.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove site as an allocation.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 361	Response Ref 17	Representor Name A D Fraser
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

(vi) MN2.20 & MN2.21 in Hightown consists of 130 houses. Originally the council proposed building 58 homes in Hightown because I quote "Only a limited amount of development is proposed in the Greenbelt around Hightown. This reflects the limited number of services and facilities in the village" (A Local Plan for Sefton Document) . Sefton now need to explain whether they are going to provide the services needed. Currently there is a major problem in terms of a lack of GP services. If I remember right there is a pub and a shop. This development cannot possibly be sustainable. The Local Plan needs to say what extra services Sefton are going to provide. This is an increase in the housing allocation of 124%. In any case such a development is going to have a major impact upon a small community. This "about turn" in policy illustrates a certain element of cynicism.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove Green Belt sites as allocations.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 385	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Shirley Roberts
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I object on the grounds that there is only one narrow road into and out of Hightown, which is extremely congested during rush hour already and is, therefore not suitable for any increase in traffic which would result from lorries transporting building materials to and from the site during construction of the proposed development and, in the long term, additional vehicles belonging to residents of the houses. The Hightown access road is bounded on both sides by extremely deep drainage ditches and there have been numerous accidents, with cars ending up in the ditches, particularly in winter when the road is icy.

There is no school in Hightown, so children have to be bussed into either Formby or Crosby, although schools in both areas have , in the past, been unable to accommodate Hightown children on several occasions. There is, consequently a glut of school buses and coaches using the access route on school holidays. This development will not provide new or improved road/rail infrastructure and would require substantial improvements and alterations to the existing infrastructure. I fail to see why, with the reduction in Sefton's population, so many more houses are required, particularly on Green Belt land. Should any more be needed there are sufficient brownfield sites on which to build.

Summary of Suggested Changes

No development should take place until the road infrastructure is dramatically improved e.g by widening the access roads. A primary school should be built in Hightown to accommodate the extra influx of children into the village. All brownfield sites and empty houses should be used before any encroachment on the Green Belt.

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.21

Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown

Respondent No 389

Response Ref 2

Representor Name Stephen Smith

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We have major concerns about the effect that this will have upon us. We understand that the only access to this proposed site will be via Elmcroft Lane with no exit road from any part of the site. Traffic visiting the site during its construction and after its completion will have to drive down the small roads of Alt Road, Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane. These roads already show signs of settlement and increased heavy traffic will only add to the problem. The residents of these roads will find that their environment and the character of their dwellings will change significantly. Major factors when we bought the house were its quiet location and minimal traffic. The proposed site will change these aspects completely and one can only imagine will have a dramatic effect on the value of the property.

There are other concerns that we have about the overall impact on Hightown which we now detail. Proposed growth of Hightown One concern is the size of the proposed growth of Hightown which is out of keeping with its character and socio-economic function in the borough. Hightown is a much smaller settlement to neighboring Formby on which most Hightown residents are dependent for local amenities. In the 2011 census the population of Hightown was 3,247. In addition to the proposed development of 120 houses at the end of Elmcroft Lane there is another proposed development of 10 houses in a nearby location. Based upon the UK average household size of 2.4 people the two proposed development sites could result in a population growth of nearly 10%.

Another concern is Hightown lacks local amenities for its population of 3,247 and with a proposed population growth of 10% this lack of amenity will be further exasperated. A small newsagents and a small post office store do not meet the needs of Hightown residents who have to travel to Formby and other shopping centres for shopping facilities. This is also no school in Hightown which means that Hightown school children have to travel to other schools in the borough for their education. Most residents of Hightown have no option but to use the one road to drive in and out of Hightown. This leads to a convergence of traffic where the vehicles from the west side of Hightown meet the traffic from the east side of Hightown. This is the 'T' junction where Alt Road joins Kerslake Way.

The cars of the residents of the proposed extra 130 houses in Hightown will add to this busy 'T' junction which will need to be better controlled by the introduction of a roundabout or traffic lights if the risk of increased road traffic accidents is to be avoided. Should there be a need for emergency vehicles to access the two proposed sites then there could be delays as the emergency vehicles go down the narrow roads of Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane.

The peat substrate within the soil causes concern about the risk of further subsidence in Hightown which represents danger to life and property. Hightown is a small settlement, pleasantly situated in a rural location and there are many types of wildlife including bats in the vicinity of the proposed sites. The development of the two sites will have a significant effect on the character of the area. They will have the effect of urbanising the settlement with negative impacts on the amenity for the residents of Hightown and in particular those that live on Alt Road, Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane. They will also impact on the setting of Rose Farm Cottage which is a Grade II Listed Building. I trust that the planning team will give due consideration to these major concerns and recognise that the proposed developments are not acceptable.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove MN2.20 and MN2.21 as allocations in the plan.

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The following are 5 major concerns that I have about the proposed development of up to 130 houses referred to as sites MN2.20 and MN2.21 in the Sefton Plan.

Firstly, high level of housing growth in Hightown The plan gives cause for concern about the size of the proposed growth of Hightown which is out of keeping with its character and socio-economic function in the borough. Hightown is a much smaller settlement to neighboring Formby on which most Hightown residents are dependent for local amenities. In the 2011 census the population of Hightown was 3,247 while in Formby the population was 24,996. Based upon the UK average household size of 2.4 people the two proposed development sites in Hightown could result in a population growth of nearly 10%.

Secondly, lack of amenities in Hightown Hightown lacks local amenities for its population of 3,247 and with a proposed population growth of 10% this lack of amenity will be further exasperated. A small newsagents and a small post office store do not meet the needs of Hightown residents who have to travel to Formby and other shopping centres for shopping facilities. This is also no school in Hightown which means that Hightown school children have to travel to other schools in the borough for their education.

Thirdly, road infrastructure in Hightown Most residents of Hightown have no option but to use the one road to drive in and out of Hightown. This leads to a convergence of traffic where the vehicles from the west side of Hightown meet the traffic from the east side of Hightown. This is the IT' junction where traffic using Sandy Lane and Alt Road joins the traffic using Kerlake Way. The cars of the residents of the proposed extra 130 houses in Hightown will add to the busy IT' junction which will need to be better controlled by the introduction of a roundabout or traffic lights if the risk of increased number of road traffic accidents is to be avoided. The only access to 120 of the proposed 130 houses will be via the small roads of Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane. These roads already show signs of settlement and increased heavy traffic will only add to the problem. The residents of both of these roads will find that that their environment and the character of their dwellings will change significantly. It is hard to imagine that it will be considered adequate, from a health and safety point of view, for Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane to provide access to 120 additional houses with no other road providing an exit from the proposed new development. Should there be a need for emergency vehicles to access one of 120 additional houses at the end of Elmcroft Lane then there could be delays as the emergency vehicles go down the narrow roads of Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane.

Fourthly, deliverability and viability of the site The peat substrate within the soil raises questions about the deliverability and viability of the site as there is a high cost associated with its removal. There is also the risk that potential subsidence could take place, representing danger to life and property.

Finally, changing the character of Hightown Hightown is a small settlement, pleasantly situated in a rural location and there are many types of wildlife including bats in the vicinity of the proposed sites. The development of the two sites will have a significant effect on the character of the area. They will have the effect of urbanising the settlement with negative impacts on the amenity for the residents of Hightown and in particular those that live on Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane. They will also impact on the setting of Rose Farm Cottage which is a Grade II Listed Building.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Policy MN2.21

Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown

Respondent No 430

Response Ref 2

Representor Name Craig Stobie

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The following are major concerns that I have about the proposed development of up to 130 houses referred to as sites MN2.20 and MN2.21 in the Sefton Plan.

Hightown is a small settlement, pleasantly situated in a rural location and there are many types of wildlife including bats in the vicinity of the proposed sites. The development of the two sites will have a significant effect on the character of the area. They will have the effect of urbanising the settlement with negative impacts on the amenity for the residents of Hightown and in particular those that live on Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane. They will also impact on the setting of Rose Farm Cottage which is a Grade II Listed Building.

The plan gives cause for concern about the size of the proposed growth of Hightown which is out of keeping with its character and socio-economic function in the borough. In the 2011 census the population of Hightown was 3,247 and based upon the UK average household size of 2.4 people the two proposed development sites in Hightown could result in a population growth of nearly 10%.

Hightown lacks local amenities already for its population of 3,247 and with a proposed population growth of 10% this lack of amenity will be further exasperated. A small newsagents and a small post office store do not meet the needs of Hightown residents who have to travel to Formby and other shopping centres for shopping facilities. This is also no school in Hightown which means that Hightown school children have to travel to other schools in the borough for their education.

Residents of Hightown have no option but to use the one road in and out of the village. The only access to 120 of the proposed 130 houses will be via the small roads of Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane. The roads around Sandy Lane already show significant signs of settlement and increased heavy traffic will only add to the problem impacting road quality but also the drains and sewers in Hightown. It will also have a significant impact for the residents of both of these roads who will find that their environment and the character of their dwellings will change significantly.

The peat substrate within the soil raises questions about the deliverability and viability of the site as there is a high cost associated with its removal. There is also the risk that potential subsidence could take place, representing danger to life and property. I trust that the planning team will give due consideration to these major concerns and recognise that the proposed developments are not justifiable in size and scope, not feasible and certainly not acceptable to myself or other Hightown residents.

Summary of Suggested Changes

The redevelopment of existing sites and development of land accessible by the new link road from switch island.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 466	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Sarah and Darin Harrison
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I have lived in Hightown my whole life. We chose to live here, as this is such a quiet village, and a peaceful place to raise our family. We have paid a premium to purchase a house here - we could have bought a larger house for less in another area of Sefton, but decided this is where we wanted to set up our family home. If we wanted to live in a busy town or city, we would have done, but we don't, which is why we chose Hightown. We are extremely lucky here to have walking paths to Formby and Hall Road, as well as the green belt area at the end of Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane. The addition of 120+ homes would cause significant detriment to Hightown, not only those on Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane, but all of its residents.

If granted, the proposal will: Turn Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane into 'main roads' - these roads are not suitable for heavy traffic. Increase the number of people in the village with school age Children - where are my children going to go to school if others move into the area? Increase the number of people/youths loitering around Hightown - there are no facilities here for large numbers of older teenagers. Could cause an increase in crime in the area. Put significant pressure on the roads leading into Hightown from the Formby by-pass A565, and the route from Little Crosby Village- these roads are already extremely busy, especially during peak times. Having an increase in traffic on these routes could cause safety issues/an increase in accidents. Put significant pressure on the utilities and services in the area - the sewer system in Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane is probably as old as the houses on it; these houses are in excess of 80 years old. This may lead to flooding at either end of the development - or on the railway line. Decrease the value of the houses along Sandy Lane, and Elmcroft Lane. Ultimately change Hightown - it will not longer be the small, quiet village for young families and retired people looking for a quiet peaceful life - it will be turned more towards a small town - thus making Hightown less desirable to live, and hence reducing all house prices across the village. Cause a significant impact during construction - noise, dust, pollution, vibration, a significant increase in HGVs/vehicle movements - all which will be detrimental to the local population - especially given the lack of access (only one access road).

Although I appreciate the need for housing in Sefton, I would have considered it be more appropriate to regenerate brownfield sites, not only to generate new housing, but also reduce these derelict areas. Hightown has already recently succumbed to a development which is currently underway, adjacent to the Railway Line and Altcar Rifle Range - the addition of these houses is proportionally significant, considering how small the village is. I feel that Hightown has already contributed to the need for housing in Sefton. The proposal for 120 + houses will absolutely devastate the village. Please consider other areas in Sefton for new housing. Do not destroy our lovely quiet village.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 484	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Barbara A Macy
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

If Elmcroft Lane is opened up as a through road, I am extremely concerned at the damage which will inevitably be caused to the existing properties. My own property is already subject to subsidence due to the unstable nature of the land. What guarantee do residents have that any damage will be made good? The drainage in this area also gives cause for serious concern - the system is barely adequate to sustain the existing properties. Also, all the roads in the area would need to be completely relaid, neither Sandy Lane nor Elmcroft Lane is robust enough to sustain the increased volume of traffic which would inevitably follow any development. We have an abundance of wildlife in this area. I feel that disturbance of their habitat should not be permitted.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 492	Response Ref 13	Representor Name
Organisation Name Craig Seddon SIPP		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

Land at Sandy Lane (Site MN2.21) measures 0.7ha and is identified for 10 dwellings (14 dwellings per ha). The site is currently allocated in the UDP as falling within the Green Belt. The site is located to the north east of Land at Elmcroft Lane (MN2.20) and was included within the same Site Assessment Form (reference S068). Given the size of the site it is questionable why the site has been identified as a Housing allocation. Notwithstanding this comment, the site would be accessed off Sandy Lane, which is an unadopted single access road. Even though the allocation is only for 10 dwellings, it is considered road widening and improvement works will be necessary to accommodate the development. From the information currently available, it is questioned whether this can be achieved within the land ownership. The northern and western boundaries of the site are fairly heavily wooded. It is considered therefore that there is the potential for ecological issues which have not been addressed to date. Whilst the site is adjacent to the existing residential development along Elmcroft Lane, it would back onto the rear of these houses. For that reason it is considered the site is segregated from the existing residential area. The site is not well contained by strong boundaries, it is open to Green Belt land on three sides. Given the site's size and the potential highways and access constraints, as well as its poor geographical location on the edge of the Green Belt, it is questioned whether the site should be included within the Local Plan.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 494	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Derek Jones
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

I bought my house in 1989/90 fully knowing that it had suffered some of the worst subsidence of any property in this area but I was determined to see it restored and not demolished. In the 1970s, the then owner added an extension without adequate foundations and when the water table subsequently shifted, the house moved with it. To guarantee that the property would be free from any future subsidence issues, I employed Mowlem Construction, experts in this field of work, to mini-pile the whole house. There are 82 load-bearing pins under this property, several of them to a depth of 13 metres, to reach solid structure. The cost of this work was in excess of £40,000 (imagine what that cost would be today). My point in telling you this is that I understand there is a plan proposed to build ten-plus houses on a parcel of land at the back of my property. This piece of land is of the same composition, containing a belt of peat and sand, as the land on which my house and others in the vicinity were built, each of which has seen a degree of subsidence through the decades. Surely this parcel of land is totally unsuitable for any new housing development and what self-respecting developer would want to take on such a project knowing the costs involved in specialist piling of every home's foundations.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.21 Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown

Respondent No 499 Response Ref 2 Representor Name John Foley

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I object to the proposed development amounting to an additional 130 Houses to be built in Hightown.

I believe that this proposal will cause major environmental problems to the existing village community.

Access to the village is by one narrow two lane road, Alt Road, with the village split by the Liverpool -Southport Railway line.

Hightown is connected to the Formby By- Pass (A565) either via North End Lane, if driving towards Southport, or via Moss Lane , if travelling towards Crosby/Liverpool and the Motorway Network. Both these roads, (North End Lane and Moss Lane) are narrow, twisting with numerous bends, two lane roads which are, already known to be subjected to traffic incidents that have in some cases involved serious injuries and fatalities.

Hightown is located within the coastal boundary sandhills, the River Alt flowing into the sea and the Altcar Rifle Range to the west and agricultural fields on the otherside to the north, east and to the south towards Little Crosby.

Any further development will lead to the further loss of green spaces on the edge of the village. This will cause a loss of wildlife which does include Bats roosting off Elmcroft Lane and Red Squirrels that are known to inhabit this area and around Hightown.

Hightown also has numerous other wildlife visitors in the shape of wild ducks and geese that use the surrounding fields to feed/graze as they migrate to and from their breeding grounds.

The fields around Hightown are subjected to periodic flooding following heavy and persistent rain with the local drainage system struggling to cope.

The proposal of the additional 120 houses off Elmcroft Lane and a further 10 houses off Sandy Lane will mean the destruction of a wooded area off Elmcroft Lane. Access to this proposed site would be via Alt Road, Sandy Lane and on to Elmcroft Lane. Alt Road /Sandy Lane are both very narrow tree lined roads, heavily used as access to the local Hightown Cricket Sports Club grounds and, especially at weekends, when there are numerous junior football teams playing on the surrounding sports fields causing a large number of cars to visit and park in the area whilst transporting the young players.

The local infrastructure will struggle to cope with an additional 130 houses. There are already many "two car plus households" in Hightown and possibly another 200+ cars travelling in and out of the village will cause extra congestion on the already busy roads. The proposed development would have to be supported on piles because of the underlying ground structure. The new properties would of course need to be connected to the existing electric, gas, water and sewage systems that are currently under pressure from the existing residents in the village.

Hightown residents also have sporadic mobile telephone coverage.

Any Hightown residents who do not possess their own vehicle have to rely on the Merseyrail services or the local 206 bus service which links Hightown to Crosby. This service only operates Monday to Saturday between 08.00 and 17.00 with no service on Sundays and Bank Holidays. If the Merseyrail service is subject to engineering work on Sundays the 30 minute service is replaced by buses that only operate into Hightown once an hour.

Hightown does not possess any schools and all pupils have to be taken either by car, train or by extra school buses. The local provision for education does mean that there are few places available within the existing education establishments.

There are already problems as regards medical provision in Hightown, the local doctors surgery is often staffed purely by locums and even in the surrounding locations of Formby and Crosby it is difficult to obtain appointments with doctors.

The proposed build programme of 5 years duration will cause a constant flow of heavy lorries in and out of the village using the narrow twisting access routes.

The Altcar Rifle Ranges is one of the Army's major training centres for both Regular and Territorial soldiers. With the rise of terror threats in the world there is a noticeable rise in the traffic on to the Ranges. It is further likely that the Ranges use will grow even more due to other training establishments reducing their size and capacity. There are also numerous times when Army Helicopters are involved in the training. The Ranges are also used to train Army Cadets from England, Wales, Northern Ireland and

Scotland. Merseyside Police also utilise the Ranges for firearm training.

There are already in Hightown numerous empty new properties and houses for sale/rent so why build even more large expensive unwanted homes.

I therefore object to the implementation of the plan to expand the village of Hightown by this proposal and any further future housing development.

I have been a Hightown resident since 1976 and I do not want to see the unique village that is Hightown destroyed by these unnecessary houses. The GREEN BELT must be protected from this urban spread. There are numerous "brown field " sites across Sefton Borough that would be more suitable for housing.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6		Plan Order Site MN2.21		Other Documents
Policy MN2.21		Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown		
Respondent No 503		Response Ref 2	Representor Name David Llewellyn	
Organisation Name				
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection			

Summary of Main Issues

I am a resident of Hightown and write with respect to my observations on the local proposals, particularly concerning water and drainage issues. As you correctly point out under "Infrastructure" issues, water to this area is supplied from River Dee and Lake Vyrnwy and comes to the area via Prescott Treatment Works. The pressure for the whole area is therefore limited by the elevation of those works. Hightown is at the northern extremity of the Liverpool area and already suffers somewhat low pressure as a direct result of its location and the demand which takes place ahead of it through the system.

Because pressure cannot be increased in a system governed by gravity alone (as it is entirely from Norton Tower onwards), my concern is that to allow further development in the village (areas MN2 20 & 21) and areas beyond, in the south of the borough, will further reduce water pressure to an unacceptable level for both domestic usage and firefighting. I believe these proposals should therefore be opposed.

Over a number of years I have watched with concern the effect of rainfall on the River Alt and its local tributaries. On a number of occasions they have all overtopped their banks. I accept that your requirement will be for all new development to drain to soakaway. However there must also be a considerable hard-surfaced area, namely driveways and roads which will still drain to local watercourses, even through oversized sewers/tanks. This will, I believe, inevitably impact on the already strained drainage capacity of watercourses and lead to flooding. My view therefore is that on this ground too the proposals in areas MN2 20 & 21 should be opposed.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.21

Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown

Respondent No 514

Response Ref 2

Representor Name D&L Larkey

Organisation Name**Obj/Sup/Com** Objection**Summary of Main Issues**

I am opposed to the destruction of green belt land situated to the south of Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane which also provided an essential space between Hightown and Crosby/Blundellsands. I am also opposed to the destruction of small coppice at the end of Elmcroft Lane and the subsequent detrimental effect that will have on local wildlife.

Elmcroft Lane is currently only six metres wide and would need to be widened initially to provide adequate access for vehicles associated with the building process and then to provide access to the new homes. Such action would cause tangible damage to properties in Elmcroft Lane, adversely affect property values and severely diminish the quality of life of long term residents. Given the inevitability of such damage, contingency plans for compensation should be made known. The introduction of a bus route would also require the road to be widened to the detriment of local residents.

The Sefton Local Plan suggests only slight modifications would be required to road layout. However, it is clear that major modifications would be required and that consideration should be given to the provision of alternative access. If no alternative plans are available, the proposed development should not be built. Sefton Council appear to consider the building of 120 additional homes would cause no issues in terms of capacity despite the plans being subject to a satisfactory transport statement. Given the number of personal, public and private service vehicles likely to be associated with that number of dwellings, there quite clearly will be issues. Furthermore, the likely introduction of parking restrictions would also adversely affect local residents.

The building of a further 120 homes in Hightown will place additional pressure on local school provision. Demand for places will increase and if no suitable provision is available within Hightown, an increased number of children will have to be bussed or driven elsewhere. This will add to congestion, pollution and carbon emissions. It is unlikely that developers would contribute towards the building of a school in Hightown, that suitable land would be available and that any progress would ever be made.

Development of a further 120 properties would add to the existing problems with drainage which are already well documented. Ditches in the area regularly overflow causing surface flooding and, after heavy rain, sewers/drains also overflow. Despite the coastal protection work already carried out, it has proved inadequate and the coastal area from Blundellsands to Hightown also remains at risk of tidal flooding.

Development in the area planned would adversely affect legally protected species including badgers, bats, water voles and pink footed geese. There is evidence of bats roosting in the coppice at the end of Elmcroft Lane and in the area around Rose Cottage (a grade 2 listed building). To destroy such habitat would surely be in breach of UK legislation and EU directive. Adverse effect on property prices. Possible damage to properties in Elmcroft Road. Protracted building programme with associated noise and disruption.

In conclusion, I believe the areas suggested for development are unsuitable due to network capacity and accessibility. There is a danger of flooding which requires risk assessment and assessments will also be needed in respect of a satisfactory Transport Statement and to ensure compliance with the Habitats Directive. I have further concerns over drainage and sewerage arrangements and the provision of school places for children resident in Hightown.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 520	Response Ref 2	Representor Name L and J Tynon
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I write to express my concerns about plans to build 130 homes in Elmcroft and Sandy Lane, Hightown. My biggest worry is about the road itself. I do not think the road is wide enough to withstand large works vehicles. We already have many problems with access. Sandy Lane is the only road currently used to gain access to Elmcroft and already can't hold the amount of cars that drive on it. There are many potholes and it is always in need of repair. Elmcroft Lane itself is a narrow road and large vehicles struggle to get down the road even if one car is parked up. Hightown is a small village and I do not think that it has the infrastructure to cope with an increase in population that these developments will bring. I would urge you to reconsider plans to develop homes here.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 522	Response Ref 2	Representor Name George Copeland
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Adverse effect on property prices. Possible damage to properties in Elmcroft Road. Loss of wildlife and green spaces. Additional private, public and personal vehicles associated with 120 extra properties. Increased congestion, pollution and carbon emissions Requirement for extra access roads. Protracted building programme with associated noise and disruption. Insufficient provision of school places and subsequent increased transport needs. Increased pressure on local services.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.21

Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown

Respondent No 523

Response Ref 2

Representor Name Jane Larkey

Organisation Name**Obj/Sup/Com** Objection**Summary of Main Issues**

I am opposed to the destruction of green belt land situated to the south of Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane which also provided an essential space between Hightown and Crosby/Blundellsands.

I am also opposed to the destruction of small coppice at the end of Elmcroft Lane and the subsequent detrimental effect that will have on local wildlife.

Elmcroft Lane is currently only six metres wide and would need to be widened initially to provide adequate access for vehicles associated with the building process and then to provide access to the new homes. Such action would cause tangible damage to properties in Elmcroft Lane, adversely affect property values and severely diminish the quality of life of long term residents. Given the inevitability of such damage, contingency plans for compensation should be made known.

The introduction of a bus route would also require the road to be widened to the detriment of local residents.

The Sefton Local Plan suggests only slight modifications would be required to road layout. However, it is clear that major modifications would be required and that consideration should be given to the provision of alternative access. If no alternative plans are available, the proposed development should not be built.

Sefton Council appear to consider the building of 120 additional homes would cause no issues in terms of capacity despite the plans being subject to a satisfactory transport statement. Given the number of personal, public and private service vehicles likely to be associated with that number of dwellings, there quite clearly will be issues. Furthermore, the likely introduction of parking restrictions would also adversely affect local residents.

The building of a further 120 homes in Hightown will place additional pressure on local school provision. Demand for places will increase and if no suitable provision is available within Hightown, an increased number of children will have to be bussed or driven elsewhere. This will add to congestion, pollution and carbon emissions. It is unlikely that developers would contribute towards the building of a school in Hightown, that suitable land would be available and that any progress would ever be made.

Development of a further 120 properties would add to the existing problems with drainage which are already well documented. Ditches in the area regularly overflow causing surface flooding and, after heavy rain, sewers/drains also overflow. Despite the coastal protection work already carried out, it has proved inadequate and the coastal area from Blundellsands to Hightown also remains at risk of tidal flooding.

Development in the area planned would adversely affect legally protected species including badgers, bats, water voles and pink footed geese. There is evidence of bats roosting in the coppice at the end of Elmcroft Lane and in the area around Rose Cottage (a grade 2 listed building).To destroy such habitat would surely be in breach of UK legislation and EU directive.

In conclusion, I believe the areas suggested for development are unsuitable due to network capacity and accessibility. There is a danger of flooding which requires risk assessment and assessments will also be needed in respect of a satisfactory Transport Statement and to ensure compliance with the Habitats Directive. I have further concerns over drainage and sewerage arrangements and the provision of school places for children resident in Hightown.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Organisation Name**Obj/Sup/Com** Objection**Summary of Main Issues**

I am writing in regards to the proposed development in Hightown. Old Hightown is such a beautiful place, a rarity in such a built-up area, It is proposterouse to even contemplate building houses opposite Rose Cottage or having a busy road running past it. This is a listed building - does this count for nothing? To have a road running through woodland is unacceptable. This is the home to so much wildlife. Car fumes - a dangerous road - noise - destroyed countryside - unhappy children - losing the charm of the area, just a few reasons to say don't do this. The residents of Hightown get by with one pub, one chemist, one shop, one post office and one hairdressers. We are happy, we are small and beautiful. We are just asking to be allowed to stay that way.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Policy MN2.21

Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown

Respondent No 525

Response Ref 2

Representor Name J Wain

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

High level of housing growth in Hightown The plan gives cause for concern about the size of the proposed growth of Hightown which is out of keeping with its character and socio-economic function in the borough. Hightown is a much smaller settlement to neighboring Formby on which most Hightown residents are dependent for local amenities. In the 2011 census the population of Hightown was 3,247 while in Formby the population was 24,996. Based upon the UK average household size of 2.4 people the two proposed development sites in Hightown could result in a population growth of nearly 10%.

Lack of amenities in Hightown Hightown lacks local amenities for its population of 3,247 and with a proposed population growth of 10% this lack of amenity will be further exasperated. A small newsagents and a small post office store do not meet the needs of Hightown residents who have to travel to Formby and other shopping centres for shopping facilities. This is also no school in Hightown which meansthat Hightown school children have to travel to other schools in the borough for their education.

Road infrastructure in Hightown Most residents of Hightown have no option but to use the one road to drive in and out of Hightown. This leads to a convergence of traffic where the vehicles from the west side of Hightown meet the traffic from the east side of Hightown. This is the "V junction where traffic using Sandy Lane and Alt Road joins the traffic using Kerslake Way. The cars of the residents of the proposed extra 130 houses in Hightown will add to the busy 'T' junction which will need to be better controlled by the introduction of a roundabout or traffic lights if the risk of increased number of road traffic accidents is to be avoided. The only access to 120 of the proposed 130 houses will be via the small roads of Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane. These roads already show signs of settlement and increased heavy traffic will only add to the problem. The residents of both of these roads will find that that their environment and the character of their dwellings will change significantly. It is hard to imagine that it will be considered adequate, from a health and safety point of view, for Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane to provide access to 120 additional houses with no other road providing an exit from the proposed new development. Should there be a need for emergency vehicles to access one of 120 additional houses at the end of Elmcroft Lane then there could be delays as the emergency vehicles go down the narrow roads of Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane.

Deliverability and viability of the site the peat substrate within the soil raises questions about the deliverability and viability of the site as there is a high cost associated with its removal. There is also the risk that potential subsidence could take place, representing danger to life and property.

Changing the character of Hightown Hightown is a small settlement, pleasantly situated in a rural location and there are many types of wildlife including bats in the vicinity of the proposed sites. The development of the two sites will have a significant effect on the character of the area. They will have the effect of urbanising the settlement with negative impacts on the amenity for the residents of Hightown and in particular those that live on Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane. They will also impact on the setting of Rose Farm Cottage which is a Grade II Listed Building.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Policy MN2.21**Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown****Respondent No** 526**Response Ref** 2**Representor Name** M L Tyrer**Organisation Name****Obj/Sup/Com** Objection**Summary of Main Issues**

I have following two concerns regarding the proposed housing development in Hightown. As far I am aware the proposed development at the end of Elmcroft Lane will be built on land prone to flooding. Would this be desirable? Particulary in view of climate change which forecasts extremes in weather including increased rainfall. This would represent a danger, not only to property but to lives. Access to Hightown is limited, being served by small rural roads hardly adequate for the expected increase in traffic. I have lived in Hightown for over 47 years and in that time on three occasions bad weather has denied access in and out of the village. This would equally apply to emergency services and police.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Policy MN2.21

Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown

Respondent No 549

Response Ref 1

Representor Name Alan Verinder

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We are writing to object to the above noted proposed development at Hightown on the grounds that they are wholly inappropriate and would have a devastating effect on the infrastructure of the area.

The initial site traffic which would presumably be in evidence over a period of approximately five years and subsequently the traffic movements required to sustain 130 additional houses, would make an already difficult traffic problem unbearable for the residents of Sandy Lane, Elmcroft Lane, Alt Road, St Georges Road, Thiiimere Road and Windermere Road. You are probably aware that Our Lady of Victories Catholic Church is situated on Sandy Lane, and we enclose details of the Church's weekly activities signed by the parish priest Fr David Gambol. Sandy Lane is a relatively narrow and winding road and at times of church activities vehicles are parked on both sides of the road and in cul-de-sacs making life very difficult for local residents.

You will also be aware that sports grounds on Sandy Lane are the venue for the Hightown Junior Football League and we are informed that this generates between 800 and 1,000 vehicles accessing the grounds, via Alt Road and Sandy Lane every week during the football season. The combination of Church Services and Junior Football taking place simultaneously frequently leaves Sandy Lane gridlocked and there have been a number of incidents involving 'football' vehicles and local resident's vehicles as the space between parked cars is blocked and vehicles are unable to move.

The prospect of this already very difficult situation being exacerbated by site traffic is frankly frightening and the ensuing chaos is unimaginable. We enclose copy correspondence between Mr Phillips the leaseholder of the sports ground, and Sefton Council during 2007. You will note Mr Faulkner, of Sefton Council, refers to the increase in the number of teams being potentially significant in terms of the vehicular flows from Sandy Lane. The number of teams has increased since 2007, and now there is the prospect of site traffic and eventually vehicles from 130 new houses, plus the vehicle movements required for deliveries, public services, visitors etc.

There is a history of houses in Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane experiencing settlement and requiring underpinning, and there are general problems with drains in the area. The addition of building site traffic over a sustained period will almost certainly cause damage to property and the drainage system.

You are no doubt aware that Hightown does not have a school, and that many of the children of Hightown are bussed to school. Children residing in the proposed 130 new houses will also be bussed to school, unless Sefton Council propose to build a school in Hightown, which would require further land development, and therefore this will require a bus route via Alt Road, Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane with the resultant additional chaos and damage.

We understand that there is evidence of bats and bat roosts in the coppice at the far end of Elmcroft Lane and in the trees around Rose Cottage on Sandy Lane. Further we understand that all bat species and their roosts are legally protected in the UK. In conclusion we believe that these proposed developments are unsuitable due to network capacity issues, accessibility, drainage and sewage problems, underprovision of schooling, damage to existing property and probably the requirement to protect the bat population.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Correspondence re activities at Church and Sports Grounds.

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 557	Response Ref 2	Representor Name David and Bridget Jacks
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Hightown is a small village effectively split into two parts by the Liverpool – Southport railway. The western part is already fully developed with Thornbeck Avenue providing a good newer access road between the old and newer properties. This part contains the only shops in the entire village – a Post Office, one small newsagent/general store, a pharmacy and ladies hairdressers. There are no schools in the village. There is a small doctor’s surgery in St Georges Road on the eastern side of the village. This eastern part is where MN2.20 (120 houses) and MN2.21 (10 houses) are proposed with sole access through the existing roads of Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane. These are lined by established trees and substantial good class detached properties which give, particularly this part of Hightown, its distinctive character. A Google search on “Rightmove, Elmcroft Lane (or Sandy Lane) and then street view” will illustrate the point.

Access to MN2.20 is through Sandy Lane and then Elmcroft Lane which is currently a cul-de-sac with the top end closed off by a long-established copse of mature trees, which provide a habitat for bats (a protected species), red squirrels, barn owls and wild peacocks, which frequently walk along Elmcroft Lane. This copse would be largely destroyed by the new road to provide access to MN2.20. Hightown, especially Elmcroft Lane, is an area of known subsidence. Some houses have required underpinning at significant cost to their owners.

The proposed access roads (Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane) to MN2.20 and MN2.21 are totally inadequate for developments of this size. In respect of Sandy Lane, this has already been openly acknowledged by Sefton Council in its exchange of letters (provided) which talks of the need to widen Sandy Lane to accommodate the extra traffic caused if the proposed 10 additional junior football teams (see later) were allowed. Elmcroft Lane (6 metres), which was not directly affected by this proposal is much narrower than Sandy Lane which because of its geography is of varying widths;

Any widening of both Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane would entail the removal of approximately 78 fully mature trees (32 in Elmcroft Lane and 46 in Sandy Lane). This would destroy the essential character of the area as a whole;

In the case of Elmcroft Lane in particular, this is an area especially prone to subsidence as evidenced by the number of houses which have required underpinning. The significant increase in traffic, including the heavy construction vehicles, would render the adjacent properties at greater risk of further subsidence damage.

In the case of Sandy Lane, traffic problems are already at a critical point (all the following points are well-known to the Council). These problems are caused by the following:- Our Lady of Victories RC church and adjoining church hall are situated here and details are attached of the extensive use each day of these facilities, provided by the Parish Priest, Fr. David Gamble. There are no designated parking facilities and the existing parking takes place outside the church/hall, often on both sides of Sandy Lane. Sometimes use of the church/church hall coincides with the junior football. Adjacent to the church is a British Rail repair depot which is often serviced by heavy vehicles, often parking on Sandy Lane to pick up heavy equipment. Sandy Lane is also used by approximately 800-1000 vehicles at weekends and occasionally on weekday evenings to facilitate the junior football which takes place on the sports field off the unadopted portion at the top of Sandy Lane and on the southerly side of Elmcroft Lane. This is the largest junior football league on Merseyside. There is designated parking for these vehicles on the sports field but inevitably some parents park in Elmcroft Lane. In addition, Sandy Lane is the feeder road to Thirlmere Road for access to the Hightown Sports & Social Club where there are rugby (two pitches), tennis (six courts), and veteran’s football (one pitch) and in the summer cricket. There is also a modern clubhouse with two bars to provide facilities for the players and social events in the evenings. All facilities are in regular use. Some vehicles also use the gate along the unadopted portion of Sandy Lane, opposite the junior football, to park on the edge of the cricket field to picnic in good weather. Opposite the entrance to Elmcroft Lane lies the Hightown Bowling Club and in summer months in particular some bowls players park on Sandy lane near the Elmcroft Lane junction. Rail commuters, many from outside Hightown, use the railway station here to travel to Liverpool/Southport stations. There is no designated parking and users utilise Alt Road up to the junction of Sandy Lane for this purpose.

Sefton, concerning network capacity, contends that there is no “...issue in terms of capacity given the level of housing proposed, however, this will be subject to a satisfactory Transport Statement”. With respect, on the basis of the information set out, there are already issues and these will be exacerbated beyond breaking point if these developments are allowed to proceed. There would be a need to accommodate, approximately, an extra 250 vehicles along Elmcroft Lane/Sandy Lane plus school buses as there is currently no school planned to be built on the new developments.

The present infrastructure within Hightown village is insufficient to sustain the proposed additional housing. Currently, there are problems over sewage disposal, particularly during rainy weather. As already indicated, there are no schools at all in the village and a shortage of shops and other facilities.

There is also a suggestion that yellow lines may be used in Sandy Lane/Elmcroft Lane. This is wholly impracticable. Where are visitors then going to park, including service vehicles such as postal delivery vans (daily), repairers, ambulances/health workers, gardeners and decorators? There are no parking spaces available elsewhere and no places where they could be built. It would again destroy the essential character of this area.

The presumption in favour of sustainable development is not absolute and has to be weighed in the balance with The obligation to preserve and protect the rare wildlife detailed above. The bats, in particular, have statutory protection. The obligations set out in paragraph 10 and EQ9 of the Local Plan that developments must not result “result in unacceptable loss of, or damage, to existing trees of woodlands or significant landscaping” and the obligation to “preserve and/or enhance” the character of this area. The destruction of 78 mature trees in Elmcroft Lane/Sandy Lane plus the trees in the coppice at the top of Elmcroft Lane is unacceptable and would destroy the essential and distinctive character of this part of Hightown. A viewing of the street view the Rightmove site would demonstrate this.

Summary of Suggested Changes

The obligation to maintain a safe and secure environment for the existing residents of this part of Hightown; The following alternatives are proposed:- To build an alternative access road to MN2.20. This proposal also faces great problems; if this is not acceptable, to avoid building the developments on MN2.20 and MN2.21 entirely.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 588	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Alison Holmes
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

My main objection would be that there is only one main road in and out of Hightown which is already busy. The increase in houses would only increase this further. There are already a high number of accidents when coming on or off the bypass so increasing traffic would create a need for traffic lights or other changes. I don't believe the roads are wide enough to deal with all these hgv's coming in and out of Hightown. Another objection would be the lack of local facilities such as supermarkets and schools. We are already limited as what we have available and are heavily reliant on Formby. I would like to know that if I have children there will be spaces available for them without having to pay or travel further. If preparations aren't made beforehand to prevent such disturbance then Hightown isn't able to support the increase in houses.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 612	Response Ref 3	Representor Name Pamela Holmes
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Hightown village only has one road leading in and out and it is unsuitable for the many vehicles which would be involved in the building work, leading to health and safety issues. Hightown is a small rural village and the scale of development is equivalent to nearly 10%. As it is we do not have the amenities to cope. Children have to be bussed out to schools in Formby or Crosby. Trying to get out of the village to commute in the morning is difficult enough as it is with the school buses, refuse collections etc. It is only a matter of time before there is another accident on the bypass coming out of North End Lane and the potential increase from the 130 homes does not bear thinking about. It will have an impact on the residents of Hightown especially people living in Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Whilst we realise that, nationwide, land needs to be found for new housing, is there any evidence of the demand for housing in Hightown in your housing land availability study? There are already some 70 houses for sale in Hightown, of varying prices, many of which have been on the market for a considerable length of time.

We do not believe safe and suitable access to the sites can be achieved for all people. Whilst it may be possible to create access to the site for any new residents, this would ultimately be at the cost of the existing residents of Hightown, not only the residents of Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane, whose quality of life will suffer, due to the increased traffic in to the Lane and to the village, noise and loss of green belt land.

Elmcroft Lane is a very quiet cul de sac, and its entire nature and environment would be detrimentally affected if 120 houses were to be built on land at the end of the Lane adjoining the current houses. Aside from the infrastructure and access issues, the paddock at the end of the lane has considerable flora and fauna which would be irrevocably destroyed if development was to go ahead on that land.

Sefton's site assessment form actually acknowledges that the impact of the sites is significant on the Green Belt policy of preventing urban sprawl one of the sites adjoins the existing built up area. Whilst we appreciate that in some areas development on the edge of existing urban areas is acceptable even when encroaching into green belt but in Hightown the urban area is very small and does not have the infrastructure. to support significant growth.

Sefton's site assessment form confirms that the sites would not have any other benefits other than meeting affordable housing needs – all other answers on the sheet are no. How can sites be released from the Green Belt when there is only one wider benefit for it? Green Belt land is ultimately protected for a reason and only should be released in our view when the number of wider benefits outweighs the detrimental harm that the land's release from Green Belt through development would bring.

This is already constrained in Hightown, given the location of the village, given that there is only one road in and out. The assessment form concedes that 'slight modifications to highways' will be required but this would in fact need to be considerably more than "slight", as the highways will need to accommodate the significant additional vehicular movements associated with a major housing redevelopment scheme, not just during construction but the longer term impacts and increases in numbers of vehicles. The access road is already close to capacity, especially through essential sport and recreation use of the football fields at weekends, when we literally have to queue to enter or leave Elmcroft Lane / Sandy Lane. There are regular road traffic accidents on the road approaching the village which will surely only increase if there are more vehicles using the roads.

In this case the residential scheme will generate significant movement but the site is not located where the need to travel will be minimised. As Hightown has no schools, food stores or services, all residents will need to travel to use services and therefore this site does not meet this fundamental requirement of the national planning policy. Given the lack of services in Hightown, the need to travel is essential, therefore failing on this point.

The assessment mentions that a transport assessment would be needed to assess highway network capacity but Sefton does not consider it a problem? How can this conclusion be reached without an assessment in place? In particular, Elmcroft Lane and Sandy Lane cannot support site traffic as they are simply not wide enough. An increase in the level of traffic would be unfeasible and dangerous to existing residents, visitors and contractors.

For the above reasons, we believe the Plan fails on soundness grounds: We believe the plan is not Positively prepared - the plan is not prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development. There are nearby communities such as Thornton, Crosby and Bootle which have a far greater need for housing than Hightown, in far more accessible areas and closer to public transport links and other infrastructure. The plan is not Justified - the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence. The assessment only shows the site as having one benefit i.e. affordable housing, but how will this prevent the site from being used for market housing and not just affordable housing? A council surely cannot rely solely on one benefit of affordable housing to determine if a site is feasible?

The plan is not effective - the plan is not deliverable over its period and not based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities. The provision of a considerable number of additional housing in Hightown will not be an effective means of addressing the housing policies as there is no justifiable need for more housing in Hightown, demonstrated by the number of

houses currently on the market. The plan is not consistent with national policy - the plan does not enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with national policies, for the reasons set out above. The sites are not located where the need to travel will be minimised as explained above.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6		Plan Order Site MN2.21		Other Documents
Policy MN2.21		Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown		
Respondent No 667		Response Ref 2		Representor Name I M Hill
Organisation Name				
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection			

Summary of Main Issues

We would like to object to the above housing allocations included within the Local Plan on the basis "soundness" in that we believe these have not been positively prepared, are not justified and are not effective as demonstrated below.

Hightown is a small community and is accessed via one relatively small country lane. The proposed developments outlined above will add some 130 new dwellings which will increase the traffic flow along this road considerably both during construction and thereafter. This road is simply not designed to cope with this volume of traffic. Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane themselves are narrow residential roads which are simply not capable of accommodating both construction and additional residential traffic. Indeed, at the weekends Sandy Lane is already subject to makeshift traffic control to accommodate the hundreds of vehicles that access the playing fields. Any increase in traffic above this totally lacks any justification. There are no schools in Hightown at present with all children having to access schools in Formby which I understand are already excessively over-subscribed. Any further development of Hightown on the scale proposed would necessitate the provision of a school in Hightown which has not been contemplated in the Plan. There is only one local shop in Hightown and any further development should require that local amenities of this nature are also catered for.

Both of the above housing allocations are situated on designated Green Belt which is detrimental to the essential nature of Hightown. We believe that the Local Plan has not adequately exhausted the use of Brown Field sites before encroaching on Green Belt.

6. We are aware that red squirrels inhabit the area to the rear of our property (MN 2.21) and that development of this site would destroy their habitat. This is contravention of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981 (as amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act, 2000) and, as such, is unlawful. We purchased our property in June 2012 on the basis that it was bordered on two sides by designated Green Belt. Indeed, in the local searches undertaken at that time Sefton made no representation of their intention to consider the developments MN 2.20 and MN 2.21. We have since established that Sefton were considering these developments as early as 2011. The very existence of these proposals has had a significant adverse effect on the value of our property and, should they not be withdrawn, this loss of value will be real. In the event that these are not withdrawn then we would have no alternative but to seek financial recompense from Sefton Council on the basis that they failed to disclose their plans at the time of our purchase in June 2012.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Given the above we would submit that the housing allocations MN 2.20 and MN 2.21 of the Local Plan are both unlawful and unsound and should be withdrawn.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.21 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.21 **Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 696 **Response Ref** 9 **Representor Name** Robin Buckley
Organisation Name Redrow Homes Ltd
Obj/Sup/Com

Summary of Main Issues

The inclusion of Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown as a housing allocation is fully supported (Site references MN2.21). They have emerged as allocations following the Sefton Green Belt Study and the Methodology for Selecting Green Belt Sites. Development on these sites is vital if Sefton is to meet its objectively assessed need for housing. Development on these sites will add significantly to the stock of affordable housing for which there is a distinct need in Hightown.

A Transport Assessment has been prepared. It is based on all development on the housing allocation parcels in Hightown. It examines the capacity of the key junction at Alt Road / Kerslake Way and shows that there is a significant level of spare capacity at this junction. Further modelling at the planning application stage would include a review of capacity and safety at the North End Lane, Alt Road and Moss Lane junction.

The Council highlighted the potential for wintering birds, water voles and other protected species on part of the site. There are no protected plant species. The habitat is not suitable for over-wintering geese or water voles or otters. There is no evidence of protected animals.

The access arrangements are described and shown in the Transport Assessment. Ground Conditions - The sub-strata generally of peat with local developments built on raft or pile construction. This is a common form of construction. It does not impact on the viability or deliverability of development on these land parcels. It has been found that these parcels of land can be excluded from the Green Belt without an unacceptable impact on the purposes of retaining land in the Green Belt.

The 'Local Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy Economic Viability Study', December 2014 does not assess the sites at Hightown in any significant detail but it is reasonable to assume that comparison can be made with sites such as land at Andrew's Close in Formby where it is concluded that the baseline position is viable and that the 30% requirement for affordable housing set out in the Local Plan will not impact in a negative way on viability.

The new housing will also be deliverable. It is important to recognise that the development of the subject land is being promoted by a plc housebuilder. There can be a high degree of confidence that housing will be delivered, including affordable housing. This will help significantly to meet the objectively assessed housing need in Sefton.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.21 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.21 **Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 716 **Response Ref** 54 **Representor Name** Robert Swift
Organisation Name Robert Swift and family
Obj/Sup/Com Support

Summary of Main Issues

Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown (site MN2.21) - the site has an indicative capacity of fewer than 50 dwellings. We agree with the Council's indicative capacity on this site.

Summary of Suggested Changes

None requested.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.21 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.21 **Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 1015 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Janice Doyle
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We are once again dismayed to hear of yet another proposal for houses in Hightown. This is by far the largest proposal so far and one which would hugely affect the village and the people living in it. We can see no possible benefit to the village or its current residents. The effects: Huge increase in volume of traffic through the village which is accessed by only one road. Lengthy build programme - constant flow of heavy goods vehicles. More school buses. No school in Hightown - so why is more housing needed which would be aimed at young families. More loss of precious wildlife and green spaces. Peaceful village life ruined. Both my partner and I strongly object to this application and we only hope that you at Planning have the good sense to turn this one down.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.21 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.21 **Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown**
Respondent No 1028 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Lee Ashall
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The infrastructure in Hightown will not be able to cope with the addition of an extra 130 houses . There is only one road leading in and out which in recent years caused the village to be cut off twice. The vehicles from any extra residents will only exacerbate the problem, especially when there are already numerous school buses travelling around the village at peak periods.

The roads are unsuitable for heavy machinery and HGV's which we have already suffered during the ongoing development by altcar rifle range and that is only for 13 houses, the roads leading into Hightown from the by pass are very narrow and have deep drainage ditches on either side, we recently had a HGV fall into one of them. Also there have been numerous accidents on the by pass, some fatal, where cars have been trying to get in or out of North end lane so traffic lights would definitely be required at that junction if this were to go ahead. Also provisions would have to be made to build a local school as Formby schools are already full.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Regarding Sites MN2:20 and MN2:21 in the sefton plan, I feel that this is far too large a development for Hightown it is out of keeping with the size and character of the village which is a small rural area. Also the population in sefton is decreasing year on year so who are these houses being built for? This is not a viable site due to the peat substrate within the soil which could potentially lead to subsidence, risking damage to property and lives.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 1029	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Alexandra Holmes
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

There are not enough places in schools as it is, with Formby schools already full to capacity, a school would have to be built in Hightown and who would pay for that? There is a lack of facilities in Hightown with residents having to travel to Formby along the only road leading in and out which is bordered on either side by deep drainage ditches. In the last month we have had a HGV fall into one of these and only last week there was a bad accident on the same stretch it is surely unwise for any more houses to be built with the extra households and their cars having to use this route, has it been considered what would happen of emergency vehicles need to access the new homes?

I am concerned about the threat to wildlife, including bats around this site, and the impact this development will have on rose farm cottage, which is a grade II listed building. I hope you will give the utmost consideration to my concerns when you make the decision about sites MN2.20 and MN2.21.

Summary of Suggested Changes

The road leading to the proposed MN2.20 and MN 2.21 sites is not wide enough to be able to cope with the vehicles needed to build there, it is health and safety issues. It would also cause major disturbance to the residents of Sandy Lane and Elmcroft lane. There is no need for a development of this scale as the population of sefton is in steady decline and this village is not a suitable location for an increase in population of over 10%.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.21	Other Documents
Policy MN2.21	Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown	
Respondent No 1029	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Alexandra Holmes
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

There are not enough places in schools as it is, with Formby schools already full to capacity, a school would have to be built in Hightown and who would pay for that? There is a lack of facilities in Hightown with residents having to travel to Formby along the only road leading in and out which is bordered on either side by deep drainage ditches. In the last month we have had a HGV fall into one of these and only last week there was a bad accident on the same stretch it is surely unwise for any more houses to be built with the extra households and their cars having to use this route, has it been considered what would happen of emergency vehicles need to access the new homes?

I am concerned about the threat to wildlife, including bats around this site, and the impact this development will have on rose farm cottage, which is a grade II listed building. I hope you will give the utmost consideration to my concerns when you make the decision about sites MN2.20 and MN2.21.

Summary of Suggested Changes

The road leading to the proposed MN2.20 and MN 2.21 sites is not wide enough to be able to cope with the vehicles needed to build there, it is health and safety issues. It would also cause major disturbance to the residents of Sandy Lane and Elmcroft lane. There is no need for a development of this scale as the population of sefton is in steady decline and this village is not a suitable location for an increase in population of over 10%.

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.21

Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown

Respondent No 1032

Response Ref 2

Representor Name Brian Lea

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The existing infrastructure of roads, schools and shopping in and around Hightown is completely inadequate for the addition of over 100 hundred houses. The plan to increase flows on the existing Alt Rd exit is unsustainable as this is the sole current exit from Hightown. It is narrow, bendy and already carries a significant traffic load particularly at peak times. When the load is further increased by events at the local sports grounds, this leads to delays and increased risk on the single road. Additionally attempting to provide an exit via Sandy Lane simply moves the load onto Moss Lane, which is already even more busy and risky. A whole new exit road out to the Formby bypass with new roundabout or lights will be required as the current exits both accessing onto the bypass are already extremely busy and require much caution. There is no school in Hightown- primary or secondary. All children have to be bussed to Formby or Crosby. The additional houses will demand the creation of a primary school at least. Where can this go if there are already plans to increase the housing numbers and build a solar farm too? There are limited shopping facilities and these are the seaward side of the railway only. A large number of new houses will demand at least some new shops. These are not in the plan. Again this will require significant increase in the flows of traffic over the railway bridge, which is the sole access to the seaward shops and will become intolerable.

The site proposed is notable for poor draining and in times of high rainfall or extended wet weather periods, the water table raises, and small ponds form on the land. The recent attempts of flattening the land by removing a central ditch/depression will simply exacerbate the existing problem. To consider building a large number of houses in an area already understood to have flooding issues is against the present government guidelines. It would be foolhardy, and unacceptable to insurers and existing residents who would have their own houses subjected to much greater flood risk. The land proposed is also adjacent to the declared coastal flood plain over which any new access roads must pass. This would be highly inappropriate, costly to build, and introduces yet another potential flooding issue. The risk increases to unacceptable levels. I trust you will understand the objections, and I look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Policy MN2.21

Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown

Respondent No 1043

Response Ref 2

Representor Name M Jones

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Having been a resident in Hightown since 1971. I have seen many changes including building more houses . I have not objected to any of this extensive building that extends to a very long Thornbeck Avenue and over to Elvington Road. This did however greatly increase the traffic flow more so in the later years as more families became two car owners. The Thornbeck Avenue beyond the playground has almost become a single traffic road with cars parked either side of the road and difficult at evening times.

Since the building of houses by the army camp there has proven to be a congestion problem around the village centre with heavy trucks etc, which may be added to in coming years by people coming into the village centre from the proposed new build. Therefore the prospect of developing the land behind Elmcroft and Sandy Lane will exacerbate the traffic flow problems, particularly at peak time. There may also be a problem at the weekend with traffic for the sports fields aside Sandy Lane. Having mentioned concerns about traffic congestion and infrastructure problems are you really prepared to build on green land with a rising water level which has flooded and a ground soil content that has caused some houses alongside the site to have essential extra underpinning? This at great expense. The cost to build new houses with this problem and including drainage, is this a viable project?

Setting these problems aside this is a popular animal/nature reserve area. Through the years I have walked my children and their friends many times during all the seasons to see the vast flora and fauna this land supports. Now it is my grandchildren who experience the delight of seeing these animals. Many a school project or topic has been completed with a "walk down a country lane" or a sighting and identification of various bird types. To build on this land would be a great loss but an even greater problem of road congestion for the increase in traffic. There are more houses for sale in Hightown than I have ever seen. Is it because of the traffic or locality, lack of school places, a question for you to answer?

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Policy MN2.21

Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown

Respondent No 1045

Response Ref 2

Representor Name Carolyn Platt

Organisation Name**Obj/Sup/Com** Objection**Summary of Main Issues**

I am writing to raise concerns over the proposed developments in Sandy Lane and Elmcroft Lane, Hightown. The local plan contains details to develop sites in both of these areas, increasing the housing stock of the village by around 150 houses.

I am concerned of the impact this will have on the village, and in particular, the ability of the infrastructure to support both the construction traffic and then the increased car usage.

Both Sandy Lane and Elmcroft are residential streets - neither of which are generous in size. There is one way in and one way out of both Hightown itself and both of these roads - the impact of the additional traffic cannot be dispersed. With the level of housing being proposed, there is the likelihood of an additional 300 cars using the infrastructure and I believe it would be difficult for Hightown to absorb the extra traffic.

Although Hightown is well served by the Merseyrail train service, there is no car park associated with the station (the walk from the new developments to the station would be quite long. There is no infrastructure to support people who travel to the station by car except for a limited amount of street parking. Hightown is poorly served by buses and because of the size of both Sandy Lane and Elmcroft, it would be difficult to run a bus service to support the new developments (even if the bus provider was willing).

I am not convinced of the Councils analysis over the level of demand for the new housing stock (there are currently over 60 houses for sale in Hightown that are not moving well on the market). The village lacks the draw of larger local neighbours because there are very limited facilities for locals in terms of shops, banks, schools etc. Hightown children do not get priority when selecting schools and this can be a disincentive for families moving to the area.

I would be grateful if you could review the decision to include the two plots of land into the local plan.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.22	Other Documents
Policy MN2.22	Land at Hall Road West, Crosby	
Respondent No 376	Response Ref	Representor Name Michael Gradwell
Organisation Name Network Rail		
Obj/Sup/Com Support		

Summary of Main Issues

Network Rail fully supports and endorses the representations submitted by Morris Homes (reference 721), who have entered into a development agreement relating to the delivery of housing on the site. Network Rail has already undertaken work to ensure that the construction of housing on this site is both developable and deliverable. This has included site surveys & assessments, including the production of an indicative site masterplan. Planning permission will be sought immediately after the local plan has advanced sufficiently and if appropriate during 2015/16. Construction on site would commence immediately after the attainment of planning permission, potentially leading to the completion of all 14 units before the end of 2016/17. Network Rail has secured Office of Rail Regulation (ORR) consent to the disposal of the site which confirms it to have no foreseeable future operational railway use.

The submitted Habitat Survey concluded that the habitats present on site are considered to be of little retention value, based on low diversity of species and the small area covered. Mitigation would be possible on site. The Ground Conditions Assessment concluded that there are no insurmountable obstacles to development from a geotechnical and contamination perspective. The Transport Statement demonstrated that the site is well located in relation to existing sustainable transport corridors, particularly pedestrian bus and rail routes.

The site is located to the north of the Crosby urban area. There is a small cluster of houses to the immediate north of the site. The Green Belt boundary in this area does not correspond with the logical boundaries of the urban area. At the time of designation of the Green Belt in 1983, the boundary would have cut straight through the railway Light Maintenance Depot (LMD) buildings, which until 2009, filled the majority of the application site despite the fact that the site in its entirety presented similar characteristics.

It is considered that the Green Belt boundary in this location does not accord with the thrust of National Planning Policy Framework Green Belt policy, which states 'when defining boundaries, local planning authorities should ... define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent' (paragraph.85). The aggregated effect of this is to discredit the value and integrity of the Green Belt boundary in this area.

The site does not meet any of the other Green Belt purposes, but represents an 'island' of undeveloped land with a small collection of buildings to its immediate north. It is considered that the principle of infilling this 'gap' with a well-designed scheme, sensitive to the context of the surroundings, would not represent a form of encroachment into the countryside and would not read as an urban area's unrestricted sprawl.

Redevelopment would represent both limited infilling and the redevelopment of a brownfield site and could make an early contribution to the delivery of new homes on non-agricultural land in a sustainable location. There are no insurmountable issues which cannot be overcome through suitable design or mitigation.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Geotechnical Phase 1 & Phase 2 Surveys; Habitat Phase 1 Report; Highways / Transport Statement; Environmental Noise Impact Report; Buried Services Survey; Topographical Survey; Indicative scheme

Policy MN2.22 **Land at Hall Road West, Crosby**

Respondent No 716 **Response Ref** 55 **Representor Name** Robert Swift

Organisation Name Robert Swift and family

Obj/Sup/Com Support

Summary of Main Issues

Land at Hall Road West, Crosby(MN2.22) - the site has an indicative capacity of fewer than 50 dwellings. We agree with the Council's indicative capacity on this site.

Summary of Suggested Changes

None

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.22	Other Documents
Policy MN2.22	Land at Hall Road West, Crosby	
Respondent No 721	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Andrew Thompson
Organisation Name Morris Homes		
Obj/Sup/Com Support		

Summary of Main Issues

Morris Homes in conjunction with landowner Network Rail (P.376) supports the allocation of site reference MN2.22: Land at Hall Road West, Crosby. The indicative capacity of 14 is consistent with the latest draft layout. In making our case we will have regard to technical evidence produced on behalf of the landowner Network Rail and the evidence base of the Local Plan produced on behalf of the Council.

As part of the Local Plan evidence base, the Council undertook a Green Belt Study and it has subsequently produced Site Assessment Forms to support the Plan. In relation to Green Belt, the contribution of the site to its purposes has been assessed as being 'minor' or 'none'. In terms of sustainability, its outstanding feature is that it adjoins Hall Road Station, which provide a high frequency service between Liverpool and Southport and serves numerous intermediate stations within Sefton Borough. It also benefits from good access to bus services. Employment, shops and educational facilities are therefore readily accessible without dependence on the use of a private car. In the immediate area, amenities within a short walking distance include public open space, the promenade and beach, Merchant Taylors' Sports Ground which is also used by independent sports clubs and West Lancashire Golf Club.

There are no other housing allocations proposed within Crosby. The allocation of the subject site will therefore contribute to an appropriate distribution of housing across the Borough in a location which has only experienced limited development in recent years.

The technical reports which are available show that there are no abnormal constraints which cannot be dealt with through routine site remediation and mitigation and that its development is not dependent on the provision of significant new infrastructure. A draft layout showing 14 detached dwellings has been subject to pre-application discussions with the Local Planning Authority, whose comments have been taken into account in the latest version (SK2B) which accompanies this representation. It proposes family housing which the Local Plan identifies as appropriate for the changing demographics of the area. The layout responds to the linear form of the site and to design constraints of railway noise and surface water. Rear gardens which are more noise sensitive will back onto the adjacent golf course rather than the railway line. It is agreed by the Highway Authority that design measures within the highway can address the relationship with the nearby level crossing.

Many of the proposed housing allocations are large greenfield sites that will have significant lead in times to development. It is therefore important to include sites such as Land at Hall Road West which are relatively small scale and will not require a significant lead-in time. Given that none of the identified constraints are unexpected or abnormal and that this is a strong housing market area, issues of viability do not arise. It is envisaged that development will commence during 2016 and that the 14 dwellings proposed would be completed within 12 months of a start on site. It is envisaged that development will commence during 2016 and that the 14 dwellings proposed would be completed within 12 months of a start on site.

The site does not have any ongoing beneficial use and is surplus to the operational requirements of landowner Network Rail, which has already been through its internal procedures to allow disposal. In addition, Network Rail has secured Office of Rail Regulation (ORR) consent to the disposal of the site. There is a contract in place for the developer Morris Homes to acquire the site from Network Rail subject to planning permission. The commitment of Network Rail to the development of the site is demonstrated by their own representations in favour of development, commissioning of technical reports, attainment of ORR consent to the disposal and entry into contractual arrangements with Morris Homes for its sale and development. This site-specific representation on behalf of Morris Homes should be read alongside a parallel representation from Network Rail which is accompanied by the technical documents referred to.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Thornton MN2 Thornton sites

Respondent No 363 Response Ref 1 Representor Name John Lemon

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

A housing studies document published by the Council in early 2014, commissioned by Sefton concluded that Sefton was still losing population although the rate of loss was reducing, Another report stated that there were approx. 5,822 empty homes in the borough (the second highest on Merseyside by 0.01%) and that despite house building, the percentage of empty houses over the last ten years from 4.6% to 4.44%, yet Sefton is pursuing a bizarre policy in building on Green Belt land to meet a projected housing shortfall. It would thus appear that the "increase" in population would depend on a large increase in migration from well outside the area.

Developers say that the plan is not ambitious enough and want to build nearly 30,000 over the next 15 years, especially on Green Belt as the easy option. I would argue that there appears to be no need to develop on Green Belt anywhere in Sefton as old housing stock can be demolished and renewed or renovated. If as the Plan states that at least 5,000 homes will be built on brownfield sites plus the existing housing stock plus renewal plus outward migration (there is no evidence that this will cease). Who will occupy these houses which are to be built? Inspectors may well have allowed development on high quality agricultural land in other areas but the pressures for development might well be greater.

The former Secretary of State for the Environment is on record as stating that we should grow more food ourselves and import less instead of building on Green Belt. The MP for Sefton Central is also on record in saying that he is against building on Green Belt and should use brownfield instead. I would reject any charge against me of nimbysism. I am of an age in which I would probably would not see any development around Thornton anyway. I understand the need for food security nor can the effects of global warming be estimated in these uncertain times. Land that is built on can never be used for growing food again.

In the plan Sefton argues that the new Thornton to Switch Island Link will provide a strong boundary to the Green Belt and that journey times will also be reduced. This ignores reality in that the initial road study suggested an increase in traffic of at least 10% along the A565 to join the link without additional housing. Sefton Council is proposing development in this area have negated any advantage in building the link which was to reduce traffic in the Thornton area. It hardly needs saying that over 700 houses will generate a considerable amount of additional traffic especially during rush hour given the paucity of bus services.

In addition, the Council have aggravated the problem by closing Thornton J & I School and allowed a development on former church land with the unfulfilled promise of a community centre or some affordable homes on the site.

Despite the claims that this plan takes a long term view, Sefton has in the recent (3 years) past allowed the opposite in allowing demolition of existing properties without renewal viz:

A) Site 4.32 (Z Block) Some years ago, there were a number of two-storey flats which were re-roofed, demolished some 18 months later and the site derelict for three years.

B) Flats on Marian Way, Netherton demolished and the site grassed over with no plans as yet to develop. There is a park, shops and health centre in close proximity.

C) One Vision Housing are set to demolish two blocks of multi-storey flats in Seaforth and Bootle on the grounds of lack of demand! There is another multi-storey empty for some years. A number of multi-storey flats in these areas and Waterloo have been renovated and occupied so why not these?

All the sites in Thornton have flaws in their descriptions and the site assessments fail to state how they would contribute towards another area's (Crosby) affordable housing needs. There is no community centre as shown on some plans and the park is an open area mainly used by dog owners.

Do the sites comply with current guidelines with regard to traffic fumes, light and noise pollution from the adjacent link road? I suspect that they do not.

In addition, all the sites suffer from poor drainage, especially surface water. Pre-1900 maps show the existence of ponds and ditches, some of which have been filled in over time and yet still cause problems. This side of Hartdale Road/Water Street/Green Lane suffers from the Holgate/Back Lane (SR4.21/22) areas. Towards the underground water course draining SR4.25. This in turn causes flooding to houses and gardens along its length through to Ince Road and a ditch which eventually drains the link road. The Council claim that matters have been improved but we have had a comparatively dry winter and water has still flowed across our neighbours gardens on occasion. Flooding is a constant topic at Parish Council meetings and has been for a number of years. Will

developers improve the existing drainage or just plug in to the current overloaded system? At the time of writing (3/15) and a comparatively dry winter, there area series of ponds adjacent to the link road which are being pumped out into overgrown water-courses draining towards Lunt Village.

At the northern end of the new Thornton Link Road is a large pond into which drains the surface water given the road and thence into local ditches (see previous para). The surface water drainage from SR4.20 - SR4.22 also partly drains in this direction which because of the nature of the land, drains slowly if at all. The eventual toxicity of this pond and drainage must cause concern. Sefton Council's declaration that the necessary infrastructure ie drainage, can be provided at the right time is optimistic as they are unable to provide drainage now never mind any future development; witness the roads after heavy rain at any time of the year.

With regard to sites on Green Belt around Thornton:- There are buses until early evening then becoming infrequent finishing at 2210 from Liverpool and 2055 from Southport thus too early for a visit to the cinema, theatre or other evening activity.

Whilst there is a Catholic Primary School within 800 metres , the state primary school is at least 1,500 metres away with no bus service. The state high school is just 1500 metres away with a bus route 400 metres away. All these distances are as the crow flies whilst the capacity of these schools to take more pupils must be open to doubt.

I have commented earlier on the road network capacity., site access, drainage and the proximity of the Thornton Link with regard to pollution.

Frequent bus stops - the 1/2 hourly bus service finishes at 1800 and takes nearly an hour into Liverpool whilst the only advantage of the other bus route (again 1/2 hourly) is that it goes to the District General in the late evening but does not go into either Liverpool or Southport necessitating a change. This service does pass two stations but again, too early for any cultural activity.

Whilst the Catholic Primary School is within 800 metres in all these areas, the state primary and high schools are further than SR4.20 - 25 unless by unlit footpath.

Residents from the area adjacent to these sites were unaware that they were living within an area within the 20% most deprived in the UK. The Council does not state how this statement is arrived at nor how building more houses would improve matters. At the moment, they look out over countryside which is more pleasing than more houses. It is a relatively mature estate yet Sefton Council has demolished the community centre and failed to provide facilities and decent access to work.

I would therefore contend that the plan with regard to Thornton is unsound.

Summary of Suggested Changes

I have detailed why Green Belt land around Thornton should not be used and suggest infilling as a partial solution ie

Land to SW of Edge lane adjacent to the sports ground, the NW edge of Rimrose Valley from Drummond Road to St Mary's Road and to the West of SeftonSefton Moss Lane.

Schools and bus routes as well as other services are more convenient as well as access to work.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Thornton Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Thornton **MN2 Thornton sites**
Respondent No 1033 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Sharon and Alfred Edwards
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We strongly object to the proposals to build on greenbelt land in Sefton, and in particular within the Village of Thornton. We were shocked to find there are six potential sites that could be developed for 743 new homes. This would result in almost doubling the population of Thornton (the 2001 census showed the population of Thornton to be 2262 persons). Assuming each house will accommodate approximately 3 persons, this will mean in excess of a further 2000 people living in the village – this will put a great strain on the already stretched infrastructure of the village – ie schools, doctors etc.

After attending a consultation at the Crosby Local Plan, I received the following from Ingrid Berry:

'Further to your query at the Crosby Local Plan consultation event last week, on 1st April 2013 there were 125413 dwellings in Sefton, of which 5104 were vacant. This represents 4.1% of the total stock.'

If all these properties are still vacant, why are they not being restored for occupation. And if there is a need for an extra 10,000 homes, as is proposed in the plan, why are these properties still vacant? Building on greenbelt should be THE LAST RESORT, can you please tell me if all the brownfield sites have been deemed as unsuitable, and if so why?

If the plan to build the new properties goes ahead, how will this affect the traffic in the area? The new 'Link Road' is being built to alleviate congestion, but surely if all these new houses are built, assuming most homes having two cars, then the congestion will only get worse. Having seen the plans for the Link Road, are these now to be altered to accommodate the extra traffic and if so, at what cost to the taxpayer and to the environment?

The loss of greenbelt land will have a very detrimental impact upon the social, leisure and recreational activities that the local population currently use the land for - walks, rambling, dog walking and exercise. It will also result in a loss of wildlife. On the proposed site between Rothwells lane and Holgate there are numerous owls and bats and it is a haven for a host of other wildlife who would lose their habitat if houses were built there. The council has a duty to protect woodland and the wildlife under the UK biodiversity action plan.

There are substantial brownfield sites in the Sefton Borough that are derelict. Surely these could be used for building new houses, and if not, why not? Is it because the "house builders" do not want to build in these areas, preferring to build on "prettier rural sites". If the houses that are to be built are "sustainable affordable housing" why are the house builders being "given" areas to build on where the neighbouring housing is not in the "sustainable affordable housing" bracket.

We have only recently moved to Sefton, choosing to live in Thornton because of its semi-rural location and the fact that it is "still considered to be a village". We have, like many other residents in the area, worked hard to afford to live in an area of outstanding natural beauty and are horrified that this may be taken away from the people of Sefton. Buildings can be built and knocked down, and built up again, but once the land is gone it can never be replaced and is gone forever. This would be a great loss not only for the residents now, but for our children and grandchildren. Greenbelt land was designated for the following reasons:

- To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas
- To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another
- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
- To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Once an area of land has been defined as green belt, the stated opportunities and benefits include:

- Providing opportunities for access to the open countryside for the urban population
- Providing opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation near urban areas
- The retention of attractive landscapes and the enhancement of landscapes, near to where people live
- Improvement of damaged and derelict land around towns
- The securing of nature conservation interests
- The retention of land in agricultural, forestry and related uses.

And in our opinion this land should stay as it was designated for.

Once again we strongly oppose the use of greenbelt for housing and business development within Thornton and await your written reply.

In paragraph 1.6 you state that Sefton can be considered as part of a Liverpool Housing Market. In the 2011 Census, Liverpool has

a growing population, whilst the population of Sefton is in decline, therefore why are you designating greenbelt areas of Sefton for building on?

As residents of Thornton, we would like to preserve the historical and rural nature of the village. A village noted in the doomsday book. Building the 700 plus houses quoted in the local plan in Thornton would almost double the population and cannot be sustained by the current infrastructure in place.

Taking the above into account, how can it be justifiable to build on Grade 1 Arable Land which is what is planned for the area of Thornton. Greenbelt land should be protected and only used when every other avenue has been exhausted. There are many brownfield sites in the borough of Sefton and these should be built on first, regardless of the cost of cleaning them up.

The greenbelt area in Sefton is the first piece of green land outside of Liverpool and has a plethora of plants and animals and this environment should be protected for the future of our children and our children's children. We live in a very "fast driven" environment and the need for open spaces, for people to relax and exercise and take in the beauty should be taken into account, when planning applications are submitted.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.23	Other Documents
Policy MN2.23	Land at Southport Old Road, Thornton	
Respondent No 18	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Paul Bentzien
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I refer to the site designated MN2.23. During the consultation period for the Thornton to Switch Island Link Road, the residents of Southport Road queried what was to become of the land directly opposite their property upon the completion of the new road. Sefton Council responded as follows -: The section of the main Southport Road between Park View and Long Lane will be removed and the area returned to an agricultural field. No mention was ever made of plans to build houses upon this land.

The plan proposes the construction of 306 houses on sites MN2.23 and MN2.24, virtually on top of the Moor Lane/Green Lane junction (a notorious traffic bottleneck) with all the attendant residential traffic this will generate together with any vehicular access that will be required to the new housing estates. I would argue that such a proposal negates the benefit of the Link Road since it is self-evident that parents occupying the proposed housing will transport their children down Moor Lane to schools in Thornton and Crosby rather than out of the area towards Switch Island. Southport Road residents have now endured months of dirt, dust, traffic disruption and noise pollution during the construction of the link road tempered by the supposed assurance that upon completion they would still enjoy an uninterrupted view across agricultural land all the way to Ormskirk.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Cancel plans for site MN2.23

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.23	Other Documents
Policy MN2.23	Land at Southport Old Road, Thornton	
Respondent No 52	Response Ref 5	Representor Name Ian Cowell
Organisation Name	Ince Blundell Parish Council	
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Ince Blundell Parish Council would urge the Planning Inspector to avoid housing development, wherever possible, on the sites with best & most versatile agricultural land. This site is grade 2.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Delete the allocation.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.23	Other Documents
Policy MN2.23	Land at Southport Old Road, Thornton	
Respondent No 100	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Lin Carvell
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

We want to strongly object to your current proposals to build on our current greenbelt land as proposed in your recent communication.

We were assured at the time the link road (A5758) proposals were being promoted that the land between our properties and the link road would not be used for development, but planted with trees and shrubs to protect us from the noise, pollution and unsightly on look.

At present it takes me 15 minutes to get from my house on Southport Road to Blundellsands which is only a couple of miles away, due to extreme traffic congestion. Moor Lane cannot possibly cope at present with the volume of traffic, let alone cope with any increase in traffic that would occur if you build an additional 743 homes within a small area on the boundary of Thornton.

The local schools, doctors and dentists surgeries, refuse collections and public services are already to full capacity.

Once you have taken away this prime farming land and built on it, it can never be recovered and will be lost forever. Any additional building of houses will impose a threat to our local wildlife, environment, will add more pollution, noise, congestion and spoil the natural beauty of our country side.

At present the local greenbelt/brownbelt land opposite Southport Road floods in parts and our gardens at present floods. Additional building would increase the flood risk to our properties. I can't believe that you would consider building on land that is also prime farming land.

There are already ample properties for sale in the area with lack of demand, so where is the evidence that more housing is required. Also where is the evidence of the number of jobs that will be created and where?

Affordable Housing in the area will have a detrimental affect on existing property prices in a highly desirable area and prime location. Affordable housing sometimes attracts a different type of resident into the area with a lack of respect for its upkeep and maintenance, which often results in an increase in refuse around, crime and drugs.

This is not what we want for our local area and beautiful country side and we completely oppose your plans to build on MN2.23 to through to MN2.26 due to the detrimental affect this would have on our area.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Delete the allocation.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.23	Other Documents
Policy MN2.23	Land at Southport Old Road, Thornton	
Respondent No 336	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Kathleen Phythian
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

This land is green belt. The land was farmed until planning permission was given to build the bungalows and houses along the lane. What resulted was farmland to the rear that wouldn't drain properly. It floods on a regular basis. After a period of time they gave up on farming this land. Over this time I have walked my dogs on this land daily and I have seen the wildlife grow considerably. This land is a Haven to wildlife and the creatures that live there should be allowed to multiply and breed. There is Japanese Knotweed in three different areas they are stable at the moment but if they are disturbed you could have a costly problem on your hands. Thank you for taking the time to read this, Greenbelt is not for building on.

Summary of Suggested Changes

De-allocate this site .

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.23	Other Documents
Policy MN2.23	Land at Southport Old Road, Thornton	
Respondent No 530	Response Ref 2	Representor Name J K Hounsell
Organisation Name	Thornton Parish Council	
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Both the urban and rural areas have been and are still prone to flooding. The drainage system in the urban areas is apparently unable to cope adequately with some of the extreme weather that we experience in this day and age whilst the ditches and water courses, many of which are in riparian ownership including Sefton Council, that provide the main drainage for the rural areas are constantly blocked and overgrown with vegetation. Add to this an increasingly high water table and thereby lies a big problem. Flooding is the main problem affecting the Parish of Thornton today and whilst efforts are being made to address the issue it is still a major cause for concern.

The Alt Crossens Catchment Flood Management Plan published in 2009 covers the greater part of Thornton Parish. In August 2009, The Watercourse Maintenance & Flooding Working Group of Sefton Council produced its final report [extracts and recommendations provided].

I do not think much has changed since that report was published. Whilst there is evidence that a considerable amount of work has been carried out in the urban part of Thornton to improve the flow of surface water in the area, incidents are still occurring in which drains become overwhelmed and raw sewerage flows into some urban areas. Sefton is still not very good in having ditches or water courses in riparian ownership including its own cleaned out on a regular basis.

I also believe that a further complication may be added by the drainage system to be installed in connection with the new road

Its second major problem is traffic congestion and the air pollution which comes with it. The A565 connects Liverpool with Southport and passes through Crosby and Thornton. A stretch of it leading from the Port of Liverpool at Seaforth and Green Lane in Thornton was the subject of a major Route Management Study several years ago. Engineering solutions to relieve some of the congestion and pollution which were identified in that study are continuing. Thornton suffers major traffic problems from commuter traffic not only on the A565 but also from traffic heading to and from the national motorway network links M57, M58 and M62.

This is a very heavily congested area at most times of the day and provides connections to other parts of Sefton and north Merseyside via the Northern Perimeter Road and a number of minor roads some of which, i.e., Lydiate Lane,(A5207) and Edge Lane run through Thornton. The Thornton to Switch Island Link Road is due to open in June 2015.

Paragraphs 4.42, 4.43, 4.44 of the Plan indicate the uncertainty about the impact of the major developments currently taking place in the Port of Liverpool and the need for improved transport links. So much so that they refer to studies now being carried out focussing on the land needs arising from the port expansion, the results of which may require the Plan for Sefton being revisited at an early stage to take account of the results of this study in a co-ordinated sub-regional manner. In my view the need to revisit the plan at an early stage to a serious weakness in the plan as a whole

As a consequence I, personally, believe that there will be a need and a requirement to improve this road by dualling it or constructing another carriageway before the end of the life of the proposed plan for Sefton.

There are 2 sites planned for housing development in Thornton Parish, MN2.23, MN2.24, and 2 others MN2.25 and MN2.26 close by.

MN2.23 is to some degree unique in that part of it is currently metalled and part of the A565 and is known as Southport Old Road. The existing carriageway at this location will be dug up and returned to the green belt when the new road opens as Park View will continue east for approximately 100 metres where a new roundabout is to be constructed. The area returned to the green belt and the adjacent field between the lines of the new road will become MN2.23 and set aside for housing. MN2.24 is adjacent to it on the other side of the extension to Park View and is currently agricultural land.

Building so close to the line of the new road severely limits the scope for increasing the capacity of the new road in the future. If housing does take place on these two sites at some time in the future and it becomes essential for the new road to be further developed to cope with increasing capacity then the future of the properties on the sites must short lived because the only thought currently given to the land usage is housing, no account having been taken of a potential need for the land to be used for transport.

All of the surface water from the new road will be collected by drains and chambers which will then discharge their contents in to four storage ponds to be constructed on the rural side of the new road. The contents of the four storage ponds will be managed in

that they will be released into local ditches and brooks at appropriate times. These are the very same ditches which run across the flood plain. I believe the storage ponds are relevant for 2 reasons, firstly they add to the existing water discharged into the area and, secondly, they restrict the potential future expansion of the road on that side.

The proposal for a number of housing developments on a flood plain, the proliferation of the number of small watercourses which form the main drainage system in the area, the warning given by the Association of British Insurers and the findings of the Watercourses Group, all suggest that there is too much happening in an area subject to risk. This begs the question why take the risk of building houses in the areas of Thornton indicated? Could they not be built elsewhere on 'safer' ground?

We have seen no evidence in Thornton of a serious intent on the part of developers to build houses on a large scale in both the Parish of Thornton and the areas adjacent to it which share the same name. I find it difficult to accept that land in Thornton identified in the Plan for Sefton as suitable for housing would be acceptable to developers because if that were the case why have they not shown an interest before now as they have done in other areas of the Borough?

The absence of a Plan to replace the former UDP puts the Local Authorities at risk of being helpless in the face of such pressure to stop any developments which were proposed. I believe that Sefton sought to distribute them as evenly as possible throughout the various parts of Sefton whether there was a demand in individual areas such as Thornton or not.

It should also be borne in mind that there is no doubt this plan will be followed by another to cover a further period beyond 2025. Would it not be sensible to accept that there are risks in the Plan for Sefton insofar as it relates to the Parish of Thornton outlined in this document which suggests that the housing developments proposed should be omitted?

Should attention be directed to resolving the flooding problems identified in this document, assessing the actual impact of the development of the Port of Liverpool on this part of Sefton as it occurs and determining if that impact has implications for the new road with a view to revisiting the area when preparing the successor to the current plan?

Summary of Suggested Changes

Delete sites MN2.23 and MN2.24.

Evidence Submitted

Thornton Parish Council Response April 2014

Extracts and Recommendations of the 'Report of The Watercourse Maintenance & Flooding Working Group of Sefton Council, 2009

Maps and Photographs of Thornton Parish Council Area and the New Brooms Cross Road A5758.

Policy MN2.23

Land at Southport Old Road, Thornton

Respondent No 548

Response Ref 1

Representor Name Michael and Julie Corbitt

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We object to any proposals to develop any sites within Thornton, your reference areas:

MN2.23 Land at Southport Old Road, Thornton,

MN2.24 Land at Holgate, Thornton,

MN2.25 Land at Lydiate Lane, Thornton, and

MN2.26 Land south of Runnell's Lane, Thornton.

The Local Plan initiative relates to other areas of the country where it is acknowledged further housing is required; this is not Sefton's requirements, hence it is not 'Local'. It is our belief that only new jobs will bring in additional requirements. To date, there is no significant evidence of new jobs forthcoming in Sefton. This is not positively prepared or justified.

Sefton already suffers from poor drainage with known areas of flooding. Some of these sites nominated are in these areas. This should not be allowed to happen. It is understood that the building of the Brooms Cross Link Road (A5758) has already suffered due to additional drainage problems, thus demonstrating the problems of building in this area, despite it having been 'thoroughly surveyed' beforehand. If the Local Plan is implemented, we may well be forced to consider leaving this area. We had hoped to grow old and retire in Thornton, but these potential plans threaten our future here.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Ensure that there are no wildlife 'protected species' affected by the Local Plan.

Confirm that houses will not be built on poor drainage areas.

Confirm that developing these proposed sites within Thornton would not be grossly disproportionate on the existing village in terms of size and scale.

Confirm that Thornton does not have the infrastructure to support this Local Plan

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.23	Other Documents
Policy MN2.23	Land at Southport Old Road, Thornton	
Respondent No 656	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Ian Wolfenden
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to object to the proposed building of houses around Thornton identified as MN2.23, MN2.24 MN2.25 and MN2.26. I feel that these areas should not be used for the following reasons: A new road (A5758) has been built to alleviate travel problems caused by heavy traffic. Building more houses next to this road will contribute more traffic, potentially causing traffic build up and undermining the reason the road was built in the first place. What is the point of building a new road to alleviate traffic congestion if you then build more houses around the road, and create more traffic?

There is a problem with drainage in the Thornton area as indicated by the long delay in the road building due to weather. There has also been problems with flooding in Water Street and Hartdale Road in recent years, particularly since new houses were built on the site of the old garage. Building more houses would put further strain on drainage systems in the existing built up areas.

Increasing the size of the built up area is detrimental to public health, due to increased pollution and the increased distance having to be travelled to enjoy open space. These areas are valuable to local wildlife and are inhabited by a number of declining species such as Barn Owl and Little Owl. The Barn Owl has special protection in law. They are also used by many of the local garden birds, some species of which are declining nationally. Removal of these areas would lead to a decline in number and variety of birds currently visiting existing gardens. This would be detrimental to the health of residents due to the loss of enjoyment from interacting with them.

I do not agree with the estimate of houses that need to be built in Sefton. There are many empty houses in Sefton, including unused rented accommodation. These should all be occupied before houses are built. Brownfield sites should then be used. Green belt should only be used when all other options have been exhausted. We cannot afford to build houses at the rate suggested, as we are losing valuable agricultural land and open spaces important to the health and welfare of residents. This country is too small to allow building at this rate.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.23	Other Documents
Policy MN2.23	Land at Southport Old Road, Thornton	
Respondent No 716	Response Ref 45	Representor Name Robert Swift
Organisation Name Robert Swift and family		
Obj/Sup/Com	Support	

Summary of Main Issues

Land at Southport Old Road, Thornton (Site MN2.23) is Council owned land, and whilst there are a number of habitat, heritage and highway concerns, it is considered that due to the recent Thornton to Switch Island Link, these can be addressed. We agree with the Council's indicative capacity on this site.

Summary of Suggested Changes

None needed.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.24 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.24 **Land at Holgate, Thornton**
Respondent No 18 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Paul Bentzien
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The proposed building plan calls for the construction of 306 houses (MN2.23/MN2.24) virtually on top of the Moor Lane/Green Lane junction (a notorious traffic bottleneck) with all the attendant residential traffic this will generate together with any vehicular access that will be required to the new housing estates. I would argue that such a proposal negates the benefit of the Link Road since it is self-evident that parents occupying the proposed housing will transport their children down Moor Lane to schools in Thornton and Crosby rather than out of the area towards Switch Island. Southport Road residents have now endured months of dirt, dust, traffic disruption and noise pollution during the construction of the link road tempered by the supposed assurance that upon completion they would still enjoy an uninterrupted view across agricultural land all the way to Ormskirk.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Cancel plans for site MN2.24

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.24 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.24 **Land at Holgate, Thornton**
Respondent No 52 **Response Ref** 6 **Representor Name** Ian Cowell
Organisation Name Ince Blundell Parish Council
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Ince Blundell Parish Council would urge the Planning Inspector to avoid housing development, wherever possible, on the sites with best & most versatile agricultural land.

This site is Grade 2 and 3(a) land

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.24

Land at Holgate, Thornton

Respondent No 100

Response Ref 2

Representor Name Lin Carvell

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We want to strongly object to your current proposals to build on our current greenbelt land as proposed in your recent communication.

We were assured at the time the link road (A5758) proposals were being promoted that the land between our properties and the link road would not be used for development, but planted with trees and shrubs to protect us from the noise, pollution and unsightly on look.

At present it takes me 15 minutes to get from my house on Southport Road to Blundellsands which is only a couple of miles away, due to extreme traffic congestion. Moor Lane cannot possibly cope at present with the volume of traffic, let alone cope with any increase in traffic that would occur if you build an additional 743 homes within a small area on the boundary of Thornton.

The local schools, doctors and dentists surgeries, refuse collections and public services are already to full capacity.

Once you have taken away this prime farming land and built on it, it can never be recovered and will be lost forever. Any additional building of houses will impose a threat to our local wildlife, environment, will add more pollution, noise, congestion and spoil the natural beauty of our country side.

At present the local greenbelt/brownbelt land opposite Southport Road floods in parts and our gardens at present floods. Additional building would increase the flood risk to our properties. I can't believe that you would consider building on land that is also prime farming land.

There are already ample properties for sale in the area with lack of demand, so where is the evidence that more housing is required. Also where is the evidence of the number of jobs that will be created and where?

Affordable Housing in the area will have a detrimental affect on existing property prices in a highly desirable area and prime location. Affordable housing sometimes attracts a different type of resident into the area with a lack of respect for its upkeep and maintenance, which often results in an increase in refuse around, crime and drugs.

This is not what we want for our local area and beautiful country side and we completely oppose your plans to build on MN2.23 to through to MN2.26 due to the detrimental affect this would have on our area.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Chapter General	Plan Order Site MN2.24	Other Documents
Policy MN2.24	Land at Holgate, Thornton	
Respondent No 530	Response Ref 3	Representor Name J K Hounsell
Organisation Name Thornton Parish Council		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

Both the urban and rural areas have been and are still prone to flooding. The drainage system in the urban areas is apparently unable to cope adequately with some of the extreme weather that we experience in this day and age whilst the ditches and water courses, many of which are in riparian ownership including Sefton Council, that provide the main drainage for the rural areas are constantly blocked and overgrown with vegetation. Add to this an increasingly high water table and thereby lies a big problem. Flooding is the main problem affecting the Parish of Thornton today and whilst efforts are being made to address the issue it is still a major cause for concern.

The Alt Crossens Catchment Flood Management Plan published in 2009 covers the greater part of Thornton Parish. In August 2009, The Watercourse Maintenance & Flooding Working Group of Sefton Council produced its final report [extracts and recommendations provided].

I do not think much has changed since that report was published. Whilst there is evidence that a considerable amount of work has been carried out in the urban part of Thornton to improve the flow of surface water in the area, incidents are still occurring in which drains become overwhelmed and raw sewerage flows into some urban areas. Sefton is still not very good in having ditches or water courses in riparian ownership including its own cleaned out on a regular basis.

I also believe that a further complication may be added by the drainage system to be installed in connection with the new road

Its second major problem is traffic congestion and the air pollution which comes with it. The A565 connects Liverpool with Southport and passes through Crosby and Thornton. A stretch of it leading from the Port of Liverpool at Seaforth and Green Lane in Thornton was the subject of a major Route Management Study several years ago. Engineering solutions to relieve some of the congestion and pollution which were identified in that study are continuing. Thornton suffers major traffic problems from commuter traffic not only on the A565 but also from traffic heading to and from the national motorway network links M57, M58 and M62.

This is a very heavily congested area at most times of the day and provides connections to other parts of Sefton and north Merseyside via the Northern Perimeter Road and a number of minor roads some of which, i.e., Lydiate Lane,(A5207) and Edge Lane run through Thornton. The Thornton to Switch Island Link Road is due to open in June 2015.

Paragraphs 4.42, 4.43, 4.44 of the Plan indicate the uncertainty about the impact of the major developments currently taking place in the Port of Liverpool and the need for improved transport links. So much so that they refer to studies now being carried out focussing on the land needs arising from the port expansion, the results of which may require the Plan for Sefton being revisited at an early stage to take account of the results of this study in a co-ordinated sub-regional manner. In my view the need to revisit the plan at an early stage to a serious weakness in the plan as a whole

As a consequence I, personally, believe that there will be a need and a requirement to improve this road by dualling it or constructing another carriageway before the end of the life of the proposed plan for Sefton.

There are 2 sites planned for housing development in Thornton Parish, MN2.23, MN2.24, and 2 others MN2.25 and MN2.26 close by.

MN2.23 is to some degree unique in that part of it is currently metalled and part of the A565 and is known as Southport Old Road. The existing carriageway at this location will be dug up and returned to the green belt when the new road opens as Park View will continue east for approximately 100 metres where a new roundabout is to be constructed. The area returned to the green belt and the adjacent field between the lines of the new road will become MN2.23 and set aside for housing. MN2.24 is adjacent to it on the other side of the extension to Park View and is currently agricultural land.

Building so close to the line of the new road severely limits the scope for increasing the capacity of the new road in the future. If housing does take place on these two sites at some time in the future and it becomes essential for the new road to be further developed to cope with increasing capacity then the future of the properties on the sites must short lived because the only thought currently given to the land usage is housing, no account having been taken of a potential need for the land to be used for transport.

All of the surface water from the new road will be collected by drains and chambers which will then discharge their contents in to four storage ponds to be constructed on the rural side of the new road. The contents of the four storage ponds will be managed in

that they will be released into local ditches and brooks at appropriate times. These are the very same ditches which run across the flood plain. I believe the storage ponds are relevant for 2 reasons, firstly they add to the existing water discharged into the area and, secondly, they restrict the potential future expansion of the road on that side.

The proposal for a number of housing developments on a flood plain, the proliferation of the number of small watercourses which form the main drainage system in the area, the warning given by the Association of British Insurers and the findings of the Watercourses Group, all suggest that there is too much happening in an area subject to risk. This begs the question why take the risk of building houses in the areas of Thornton indicated? Could they not be built elsewhere on 'safer' ground?

We have seen no evidence in Thornton of a serious intent on the part of developers to build houses on a large scale in both the Parish of Thornton and the areas adjacent to it which share the same name. I find it difficult to accept that land in Thornton identified in the Plan for Sefton as suitable for housing would be acceptable to developers because if that were the case why have they not shown an interest before now as they have done in other areas of the Borough?

The absence of a Plan to replace the former UDP puts the Local Authorities at risk of being helpless in the face of such pressure to stop any developments which were proposed. I believe that Sefton sought to distribute them as evenly as possible throughout the various parts of Sefton whether there was a demand in individual areas such as Thornton or not.

It should also be borne in mind that there is no doubt this plan will be followed by another to cover a further period beyond 2025. Would it not be sensible to accept that there are risks in the Plan for Sefton insofar as it relates to the Parish of Thornton outlined in this document which suggests that the housing developments proposed should be omitted?

Should attention be directed to resolving the flooding problems identified in this document, assessing the actual impact of the development of the Port of Liverpool on this part of Sefton as it occurs and determining if that impact has implications for the new road with a view to revisiting the area when preparing the successor to the current plan?

Summary of Suggested Changes

Delete sites MN2.23 and MN2.24.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter	Plan Order	Site	MN2.24	Other Documents
Policy	MN2.24			Land at Holgate, Thornton
Respondent No	548	Response Ref	7	Representor Name
				Michael and Julie Corbitt
Organisation Name				
Obj/Sup/Com				Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We object to any proposals to develop any sites within Thornton, your reference areas:

MN2.23 Land at Southport Old Road, Thornton,

MN2.24 Land at Holgate, Thornton,

MN2.25 Land at Lydiate Lane, Thornton, and

MN2.26 Land south of Runnell's Lane, Thornton.

The Local Plan initiative relates to other areas of the country where it is acknowledged further housing is required; this is not Sefton's requirements, hence it is not 'Local'. It is our belief that only new jobs will bring in additional requirements. To date, there is no significant evidence of new jobs forthcoming in Sefton. This is not positively prepared or justified.

Sefton already suffers from poor drainage with known areas of flooding. Some of these sites nominated are in these areas. This should not be allowed to happen. It is understood that the building of the Brooms Cross Link Road (A5758) has already suffered due to additional drainage problems, thus demonstrating the problems of building in this area, despite it having been 'thoroughly surveyed' beforehand. If the Local Plan is implemented, we may well be forced to consider leaving this area. We had hoped to grow old and retire in Thornton, but these potential plans threaten our future here.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Ensure that there are no wildlife 'protected species' affected by the Local Plan.

Confirm that houses will not be built on poor drainage areas.

Confirm that developing these proposed sites within Thornton would not be grossly disproportionate on the existing village in terms of size and scale.

Confirm that Thornton does not have the infrastructure to support this Local Plan

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.24 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.24 **Land at Holgate, Thornton**
Respondent No 656 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Ian Wolfenden
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to object to the proposed building of houses around Thornton identified as MN2.23, MN2.24 MN2.25 and MN2.26. I feel that these areas should not be used for the following reasons: A new road (A5758) has been built to alleviate travel problems caused by heavy traffic. Building more houses next to this road will contribute more traffic, potentially causing traffic build up and undermining the reason the road was built in the first place. What is the point of building a new road to alleviate traffic congestion if you then build more houses around the road, and create more traffic?

There is a problem with drainage in the Thornton area as indicated by the long delay in the road building due to weather. There has also been problems with flooding in Water Street and Hartdale Road in recent years, particularly since new houses were built on the site of the old garage. Building more houses would put further strain on drainage systems in the existing built up areas.

Increasing the size of the built up area is detrimental to public health, due to increased pollution and the increased distance having to be travelled to enjoy open space. These areas are valuable to local wildlife and are inhabited by a number of declining species such as Barn Owl and Little Owl. The Barn Owl has special protection in law. They are also used by many of the local garden birds, some species of which are declining nationally. Removal of these areas would lead to a decline in number and variety of birds currently visiting existing gardens. This would be detrimental to the health of residents due to the loss of enjoyment from interacting with them.

I do not agree with the estimate of houses that need to be built in Sefton. There are many empty houses in Sefton, including unused rented accommodation. These should all be occupied before houses are built. Brownfield sites should then be used. Green belt should only be used when all other options have been exhausted. We cannot afford to build houses at the rate suggested, as we are losing valuable agricultural land and open spaces important to the health and welfare of residents. This country is too small to allow building at this rate.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.24 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.24 **Land at Holgate, Thornton**
Respondent No 716 **Response Ref** 31 **Representor Name** Robert Swift
Organisation Name Robert Swift and family
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Land at Holgate, Thornton (Site MN2.24) is located adjacent to the Thornton to Switch Island Link which may create residential amenity issues due to the proximity of the site to the island link. It is considered that only the western part of the site (6.9 ha) is available for development, as the remainder of the site to the east, whilst it is in part within the Council's ownership (northern end), the southern part of the site is not, and will result in a gap created. For the site to work effectively, this land would be required, which is not the case. There are also highway, heritage and residential amenity concerns associated with the site. A density of 30 dph has been applied.

Summary of Suggested Changes

The indicative capacity of Site MN2.24 should be reduced from 221 to 120 dwellings.

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name**Obj/Sup/Com** Objection**Summary of Main Issues**

We want to strongly object to your current proposals to build on our current greenbelt land as proposed in your recent communication.

We were assured at the time the link road (A5758) proposals were being promoted that the land between our properties and the link road would not be used for development, but planted with trees and shrubs to protect us from the noise, pollution and unsightly on look.

At present it takes me 15 minutes to get from my house on Southport Road to Blundellsands which is only a couple of miles away, due to extreme traffic congestion. Moor Lane cannot possibly cope at present with the volume of traffic, let alone cope with any increase in traffic that would occur if you build an additional 743 homes within a small area on the boundary of Thornton.

The local schools, doctors and dentists surgeries, refuse collections and public services are already to full capacity.

Once you have taken away this prime farming land and built on it, it can never be recovered and will be lost forever. Any additional building of houses will impose a threat to our local wildlife, environment, will add more pollution, noise, congestion and spoil the natural beauty of our country side.

At present the local greenbelt/brownbelt land opposite Southport Road floods in parts and our gardens at present floods. Additional building would increase the flood risk to our properties. I can't believe that you would consider building on land that is also prime farming land.

There are already ample properties for sale in the area with lack of demand, so where is the evidence that more housing is required. Also where is the evidence of the number of jobs that will be created and where?

Affordable Housing in the area will have a detrimental affect on existing property prices in a highly desirable area and prime location. Affordable housing sometimes attracts a different type of resident into the area with a lack of respect for its upkeep and maintenance, which often results in an increase in refuse around, crime and drugs.

This is not what we want for our local area and beautiful country side and we completely oppose your plans to build on MN2.23 to through to MN2.26 due to the detrimental affect this would have on our area.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Chapter		Plan Order Site MN2.25	Other Documents
Policy	MN2.25	Land at Lydiate Lane, Thornton	
Respondent No	548	Response Ref 8	Representor Name Michael and Julie Corbitt
Organisation Name			
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

We object to any proposals to develop any sites within Thornton, your reference areas:
MN2.23 Land at Southport Old Road, Thornton,
MN2.24 Land at Holgate, Thornton,
MN2.25 Land at Lydiate Lane, Thornton, and
MN2.26 Land south of Runnell's Lane, Thornton.

The Local Plan initiative relates to other areas of the country where it is acknowledged further housing is required; this is not Sefton's requirements, hence it is not 'Local'. It is our belief that only new jobs will bring in additional requirements. To date, there is no significant evidence of new jobs forthcoming in Sefton. This is not positively prepared or justified.

Sefton already suffers from poor drainage with known areas of flooding. Some of these sites nominated are in these areas. This should not be allowed to happen. It is understood that the building of the Brooms Cross Link Road (A5758) has already suffered due to additional drainage problems, thus demonstrating the problems of building in this area, despite it having been 'thoroughly surveyed' beforehand. If the Local Plan is implemented, we may well be forced to consider leaving this area. We had hoped to grow old and retire in Thornton, but these potential plans threaten our future here.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Ensure that there are no wildlife 'protected species' affected by the Local Plan.
Confirm that houses will not be built on poor drainage areas.
Confirm that developing these proposed sites within Thornton would not be grossly disproportionate on the existing village in terms of size and scale.
Confirm that Thornton does not have the infrastructure to support this Local Plan

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.25

Land at Lydiate Lane, Thornton

Respondent No 655 Response Ref 3 Representor Name

Organisation Name Nuffield College

Obj/Sup/Com Support

Summary of Main Issues

THIS IS A SUMMARY

The site at Rakes Park, Thornton has been allocated for housing (site reference MN2.25). Our vision document demonstrates the suitability of the site for a sustainable urban extension which would provide an opportunity to deliver high quality housing. The statement demonstrates the sites suitability for residential development which will underpin the promotion of the site as part of the Local Plan process. It also sets out the economic benefits that the development of this site would generate from the erection of up to 270 houses on the site.

The site is located adjacent to the current urban fringe of Thornton and sits between Thornton Cemetery and Crematorium, the new Link Road (A5758, currently under construction) and housing off Lydiate Lane (A5207), just 1.6 miles west of the junction between the M57 and M58, close to shops, schools, employment areas, established residential neighbourhoods, bus stops and health care facilities.

The masterplan allows for:

- Homes to become part of the environment into which they are placed,
- The village to grow in a sympathetic and organic way so that the development is immediately part of the wider settlement,
- Residents and visitors to navigate their way around the development intuitively via the hierarchy of streets, lanes and spaces,
- Passive solar gain is maximised through the orientation of the layout,
- Space for the community to 'breathe', through the low density nature of the development and creation of paths and streets which provide direct access to open spaces, offering space to play, the discovery of nature and interaction with neighbours and the wider community,
- Retention of existing site features such as the watercourses ponds and hedgerows to ensure the proposals are grounded and part of the landscape into which they're set,
- A strong green and blue infrastructure network providing space for natural habitats and thus the wildlife using them,
- A well surveilled site which allows the wider community to use and enjoy the open spaces in a safe environment,
- A connected development which is part of the wider settlement, is outward facing and completes the north eastern edge of the village.

These proposals demonstrates that residential development can be more than 'just another housing estate' by creating a contextually responsive finished edge to the settlement, which is outward looking, permeable and just as accessible to the existing community as well as new residents.

Summary of Suggested Changes

None

Evidence Submitted

Vision Statement for 'Rakes Park, Thornton'

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.25	Other Documents
Policy MN2.25	Land at Lydiate Lane, Thornton	
Respondent No 656	Response Ref 3	Representor Name Ian Wolfenden
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to object to the proposed building of houses around Thornton identified as MN2.23, MN2.24 MN2.25 and MN2.26. I feel that these areas should not be used for the following reasons: A new road (A5758) has been built to alleviate travel problems caused by heavy traffic. Building more houses next to this road will contribute more traffic, potentially causing traffic build up and undermining the reason the road was built in the first place. What is the point of building a new road to alleviate traffic congestion if you then build more houses around the road, and create more traffic?

There is a problem with drainage in the Thornton area as indicated by the long delay in the road building due to weather. There has also been problems with flooding in Water Street and Hartdale Road in recent years, particularly since new houses were built on the site of the old garage. Building more houses would put further strain on drainage systems in the existing built up areas.

Increasing the size of the built up area is detrimental to public health, due to increased pollution and the increased distance having to be travelled to enjoy open space. These areas are valuable to local wildlife and are inhabited by a number of declining species such as Barn Owl and Little Owl. The Barn Owl has special protection in law. They are also used by many of the local garden birds, some species of which are declining nationally. Removal of these areas would lead to a decline in number and variety of birds currently visiting existing gardens. This would be detrimental to the health of residents due to the loss of enjoyment from interacting with them.

I do not agree with the estimate of houses that need to be built in Sefton. There are many empty houses in Sefton, including unused rented accommodation. These should all be occupied before houses are built. Brownfield sites should then be used. Green belt should only be used when all other options have been exhausted. We cannot afford to build houses at the rate suggested, as we are losing valuable agricultural land and open spaces important to the health and welfare of residents. This country is too small to allow building at this rate.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.25	Other Documents
Policy MN2.25	Land at Lydiate Lane, Thornton	
Respondent No 698	Response Ref 7	Representor Name Anthony Swift
Organisation Name	Anthony Swift and Kipros Pittaris	
Obj/Sup/Com	Support	

Summary of Main Issues

Ince Blundell Parish Council would urge the Planning Inspector to avoid housing development, wherever possible, on the sites with best & most versatile agricultural land.

Grade 2 and 3(a) land

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.25	Other Documents
Policy MN2.25	Land at Lydiate Lane, Thornton	
Respondent No 703	Response Ref 20	Representor Name Jackie Copley
Organisation Name CPRE Lancashire		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

We strongly oppose the release of this site from Green Belt because it encloses the cemetery on a third boundary to its southern side and encroaches onto a green corridor between Thornton and Netherton settlements. Notwithstanding the new Broom's Cross Road (A65758) this land should stay open. The site is agricultural use and should be maintained especially as part of it is best and most versatile agricultural land Grade 2 status.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.25	Other Documents
Policy MN2.25	Land at Lydiate Lane, Thornton	
Respondent No 716	Response Ref 19	Representor Name Robert Swift
Organisation Name Robert Swift and family		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

Land at Lydiate Lane, Thornton (Site MN2.25) - There are significant accessibility concerns associated with the site, which include limited services and facilities in close proximity to the site, and poor public transport linkages. The development of the site would also result in the loss of Greenfield land and there are standing water and ecology concerns associated with the site.

The site is also isolated and separate from the remainder of the settlement, and the Sustainability Appraisal considered that any potential development of the site should only be after the development of MN2.26 to minimise any impact on openness, accessibility and ecology. We consider that due to the isolated nature of the site to the remainder of the settlement, the site should be discounted.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Land at Lydiate Lane, Thornton (Site MN2.25) should not be allocated in policy MN2.

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.25 Land at Lydiate Lane, Thornton

Respondent No 741 Response Ref 6 Representor Name

Organisation Name Priory Asset Management LLP

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The Land at Lydiate Lane (Site MN2.25) is approximately 10.3ha in size and is expected to deliver 265 dwellings despite not being specifically assessed, although a larger site with an area of 11.7ha was.

The development site encroaches on the setting of both the Lunt Village and Sefton Village Conservation Areas, including the St Helen's Church which is Grade 1 listed. It may also impact upon Broom's Cross Road (A5758). The impact of developing this site should be assessed as part of the allocations process as the amount of damage which could be caused through the development is not currently evident.

The site assessment indicates that a shared access between this site and the Runnell's Lane site (Site Ref. MN2.26) is ideally what is required in this location. This indicates that alone the site cannot provide a satisfactory access. The site is therefore dependent on the development coming forward on Runnell's Lane. This allows for a ransom situation and could delay or even prohibit development occurring on this site.

The Local Authority has indicated the need for a significant change to the junction between Lydiate Lane near Buckley Hill Lane for the proposed development (and the land at Runnell's Lane) to be brought forward. It is suggested that a new signalised four arm junction would be required. The cost of such a junction may prohibit the site coming forward in isolation due to the cost. This might also reduce the sites ability to supply affordable housing.

The requirement for the Lydiate Lane and the Runnell's Lane developments to be brought forward in tandem is unrealistic and could prejudice the delivery of both allocations, which equate to approximately 402 units of Sefton's housing supply. Lydiate Lane comprises the current green belt boundary in this location and is considered to form a strong, defensible and durable edge. The proposed boundary to the north of the site would be equally as strong, as it would constitute Broom's Cross Road. However, the boundary to the east would not be able to endure beyond the plan period as it is not delineated by any strong geographical features. This could lead to further encroachment and pressure for development within the Green Belt. Development in this location is identified within the Sefton Green Belt Study as being an 'essential gap' between Thornton and Netherton. Though this isn't at the narrowest point the lack of a defensible boundary would allow for further encroachment in the future. This harm to the Green Belt is assessed as being significant.

It is also clear that Sefton have other options for development which would not have such a fundamental impact on agricultural land or the Green Belt.

The proposed allocation would require significant improvements in infrastructure in the surrounding area, and this would require both this site and the site at Runnell's Lane to be developed together and both to contribute towards the infrastructure improvement. This jeopardises the delivery of both sites and could result in a ransom situation between the two. The sensitivities of the 'essential' green belt role that the site plays, together with the proximity of designated heritage assets, impacts greatly on the ability to deliver the required density of housing allocated due to the requirement for mitigation and sympathetic design.

It is suggested that prior to any allocation in this location other sites are reviewed. There are other sites available, which are deliverable, with less prohibitive constraints, and which would cause less harm to the Green Belt available within the locality. It is recommended that these be fully assessed before allocating sites within such a sensitive area of the Green Belt.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Delete Site Ref MN2.25

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.26	Other Documents
Policy MN2.26	Land south of Runnell's Lane, Thornton	
Respondent No 52	Response Ref 8	Representor Name Ian Cowell
Organisation Name	Ince Blundell Parish Council	
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Ince Blundell Parish Council would urge the Planning Inspector to avoid housing development, wherever possible, on the sites with best & most versatile agricultural land.

This site is Grade 1 and 2 land

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.26	Other Documents
Policy MN2.26	Land south of Runnell's Lane, Thornton	
Respondent No 100	Response Ref 4	Representor Name Lin Carvell
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

We want to strongly object to your current proposals to build on our current greenbelt land as proposed in your recent communication.

We were assured at the time the link road (A5758) proposals were being promoted that the land between our properties and the link road would not be used for development, but planted with trees and shrubs to protect us from the noise, pollution and unsightly on look.

At present it takes me 15 minutes to get from my house on Southport Road to Blundellsands which is only a couple of miles away, due to extreme traffic congestion. Moor Lane cannot possibly cope at present with the volume of traffic, let alone cope with any increase in traffic that would occur if you build an additional 743 homes within a small area on the boundary of Thornton.

The local schools, doctors and dentists surgeries, refuse collections and public services are already to full capacity.

Once you have taken away this prime farming land and built on it, it can never be recovered and will be lost forever. Any additional building of houses will impose a threat to our local wildlife, environment, will add more pollution, noise, congestion and spoil the natural beauty of our country side.

At present the local greenbelt/brownbelt land opposite Southport Road floods in parts and our gardens at present floods. Additional building would increase the flood risk to our properties. I can't believe that you would consider building on land that is also prime farming land.

There are already ample properties for sale in the area with lack of demand, so where is the evidence that more housing is required. Also where is the evidence of the number of jobs that will be created and where?

Affordable Housing in the area will have a detrimental affect on existing property prices in a highly desirable area and prime location. Affordable housing sometimes attracts a different type of resident into the area with a lack of respect for its upkeep and maintenance, which often results in an increase in refuse around, crime and drugs.

This is not what we want for our local area and beautiful country side and we completely oppose your plans to build on MN2.23 to through to MN2.26 due to the detrimental affect this would have on our area.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.26	Other Documents
Policy MN2.26	Land south of Runnell's Lane, Thornton	
Respondent No 367	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Kathleen Phythian
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

This land is green belt. The land was farmed until planning permission was given to build the bungalows and houses along the lane. What resulted was farmland to the rear that wouldn't drain properly. It floods on a regular basis. After a period of time they gave up on farming this land. Over this time I have walked my dogs on this land daily and I have seen the wildlife grow considerably. This land is a Haven to wildlife and the creatures that live there should be allowed to multiply and breed. There is Japanese Knotweed in three different areas they are stable at the moment but if they are disturbed you could have a costly problem on your hands. Thank you for taking the time to read this, Greenbelt is not for building on.

Summary of Suggested Changes

There are plenty of brownfield sites in Bootle please develop these and leave our green belt alone.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.26	Other Documents
Policy MN2.26	Land south of Runnell's Lane, Thornton	
Respondent No 479	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Mary McBride
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Comment	

Summary of Main Issues

I am concerned about the flooding. When it rains very heavy the field overflows into my garden causing a lot of upset [photographs provided]. We have had the road closed many times. Even buses can't go down. We've had sandbags piled at the patio doors for weeks. The MP, local councillor, drainage team and United Utilities are all aware of the problem. The worry I have is building the houses, and the building up of land would cause more flooding so I would like some assurance that would not be the case and the problem which have been here for years would be cured.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Photographs of flooding events at property.

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.26	Other Documents
Policy MN2.26	Land south of Runnell's Lane, Thornton	
Respondent No 492	Response Ref 17	Representor Name
Organisation Name Craig Seddon SIPP		
Obj/Sup/Com Support		

Summary of Main Issues

This area of land was assessed at Stages 3a and 4 of the Council's Green Belt Study and has been identified within the Publication Draft Local Plan as a Housing Allocation (reference MN2.26). The Stage 4 assessment of the Green Belt Study stated that, 'Development would only be acceptable in the field adjacent to the house fronting Runnell's Lane so as not to narrow the gap between Thornton and Netherton.'

Land south of Runnell's Lane comprises 5.3ha of land and is identified as being suitable for the delivery of 137 dwellings (26 dwellings per ha). The site is currently allocated in the UDP as falling within the Green Belt. A Site Assessment Form has been prepared for this site (reference SR4.25). Both our client's site and Land south of Runnell's Lane are adjacent to a site which contains a grade II listed building, Tanhouse Farm. A Heritage Assessment has been undertaken for Land south of Runnell's Lane, which concludes that there is some sensitivity in terms of the impact on the setting of the listed building. Within the Assessment Form, the Council assess this heritage impact as a moderate constraint.

The Assessment Form continues to state that the site projects out into the Rimrose Valley, which is a narrow gap between Thornton and Netherton. In justifying the site's inclusion as a Housing Allocation the Council state that the site's projection into the Rimrose Valley 'would not be at the narrowest point in the gap between the settlements' and is therefore deemed to be acceptable. The Assessment Form concludes that 'the site is appropriate to allocate for housing development in the Local Plan'. Our client is supportive of Land south of Runnell's Lane's proposed inclusion as a Housing Allocation within the Local Plan.

Summary of Suggested Changes

None needed.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter	Plan Order Site MN2.26	Other Documents
Policy MN2.26	Land south of Runnell's Lane, Thornton	
Respondent No 548	Response Ref 9	Representor Name Michael and Julie Corbitt
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

We object to any proposals to develop any sites within Thornton, your reference areas:

MN2.23 Land at Southport Old Road, Thornton,

MN2.24 Land at Holgate, Thornton,

MN2.25 Land at Lydiate Lane, Thornton, and

MN2.26 Land south of Runnell's Lane, Thornton.

The Local Plan initiative relates to other areas of the country where it is acknowledged further housing is required; this is not Sefton's requirements, hence it is not 'Local'. It is our belief that only new jobs will bring in additional requirements. To date, there is no significant evidence of new jobs forthcoming in Sefton. This is not positively prepared or justified.

Sefton already suffers from poor drainage with known areas of flooding. Some of these sites nominated are in these areas. This should not be allowed to happen. It will be the house buyers who bear the consequences, long after the builders have left. It is understood that the building of the Brooms Cross Link Road (A5758) has already suffered due to additional drainage problems, thus demonstrating the problems of building in this area, despite it having been 'thoroughly surveyed' beforehand.

If the Local Plan is implemented, we may well be forced to consider leaving this area, which is contrary to the aims of the Local Plan. We had hoped to grow old and retire in Thornton, but these potential plans threaten our future here.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Ensure that there are no wildlife 'protected species' affected by the Local Plan.

Confirm that houses will not be built on poor drainage areas.

Confirm that developing these proposed sites within Thornton would not be grossly disproportionate on the existing village in terms of size and scale.

Confirm that Thornton does not have the infrastructure to support this Local Plan

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.26	Other Documents
Policy MN2.26	Land south of Runnell's Lane, Thornton	
Respondent No 656	Response Ref 4	Representor Name Ian Wolfenden
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to object to the proposed building of houses around Thornton identified as MN2.23, MN2.24 MN2.25 and MN2.26. I feel that these areas should not be used for the following reasons: A new road (A5758) has been built to alleviate travel problems caused by heavy traffic. Building more houses next to this road will contribute more traffic, potentially causing traffic build up and undermining the reason the road was built in the first place. What is the point of building a new road to alleviate traffic congestion if you then build more houses around the road, and create more traffic?

There is a problem with drainage in the Thornton area as indicated by the long delay in the road building due to weather. There has also been problems with flooding in Water Street and Hartdale Road in recent years, particularly since new houses were built on the site of the old garage. Building more houses would put further strain on drainage systems in the existing built up areas.

Increasing the size of the built up area is detrimental to public health, due to increased pollution and the increased distance having to be travelled to enjoy open space. These areas are valuable to local wildlife and are inhabited by a number of declining species such as Barn Owl and Little Owl. The Barn Owl has special protection in law. They are also used by many of the local garden birds, some species of which are declining nationally. Removal of these areas would lead to a decline in number and variety of birds currently visiting existing gardens. This would be detrimental to the health of residents due to the loss of enjoyment from interacting with them.

I do not agree with the estimate of houses that need to be built in Sefton. There are many empty houses in Sefton, including unused rented accommodation. These should all be occupied before houses are built. Brownfield sites should then be used. Green belt should only be used when all other options have been exhausted. We cannot afford to build houses at the rate suggested, as we are losing valuable agricultural land and open spaces important to the health and welfare of residents. This country is too small to allow building at this rate.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.26	Other Documents
Policy MN2.26	Land south of Runnell's Lane, Thornton	
Respondent No 698	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Anthony Swift
Organisation Name	Anthony Swift and Kipros Pittaris	
Obj/Sup/Com	Support	

Summary of Main Issues

THIS IS A SUMMARY

The Council's Site Assessment Form (Site Reference MN2.26) makes it clear that there are no constraints which would be likely to prevent or delay the early deliverability of this site following the adoption of the Local Plan. It remains the intention of the landowners to release this site for development at the earliest opportunity, following adoption of the Local Plan. To that end, the landowners have commissioned a number of technical reports and appraisals which will assist prospective developers in formulating their development proposals and tenders when the site is marketed. Neither the Phase 1 Geo-Environmental Desk Study Assessment Report (the Phase 2 has yet to be completed) nor the Phase 1 Habitat Survey have revealed any constraints which would preclude future residential development of this site. Similarly the Highway & Access Considerations report confirms that a satisfactory vehicular access, to service the scale of residential development envisaged for the site (circa 136 dwellings), can be achieved directly from Lydiate Lane without any adverse impact on the local highway network.

The marketing exercise itself will be undertaken by P Wilson & Company.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

These include a Phase 1 and 2 Geo-Environmental Assessment (Brownfield Solutions Ltd, Geo-Environmental Engineers), an Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey (The Tyrer Partnership, Ecological Consultants) and a Highways & Access Considerations Report (SCP, Transportation Planners & Infrastructure Designers). Desk Study Assessment Report (Brownfield Solutions March 2015)

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.26 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.26 **Land south of Runnell's Lane, Thornton**
Respondent No 703 **Response Ref** 21 **Representor Name** Jackie Copley
Organisation Name CPRE Lancashire
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We are opposed to the development of this Green Belt site. We believe nothing should be done to further narrow the already narrow gap between Thornton/Crosby and Netherton/Ford. We do not agree that, because the nursery already projects into the gap and the proposed development would not project further, the development would not significantly impact on the perceived separation of Crosby and Thornton.

The scale of the proposed development is significant and would substantially alter the character relative to that of the nursery. Furthermore, the character of the nursery is more fitting to rural character than volume housing. The eastern boundary of each site would not be marked by a definitive physical feature, making future encroachment by unrestricted residential development more likely.

In addition, we believe the extension of Rimrose Valley Park should remain an unconstructed corridor to the open countryside, something of continuing value even to people (visual receptors) travelling on the soon-to-be completed Broom's Cross Road. We attribute considerable importance to the fact that both sites contain best and most versatile agricultural land of particularly high quality (i.e Grades 1 and 2).

A Transport Statement or Transport Assessment would be necessary, as specified by NPPF paragraph 32, for both sites before they could be developed. This site is adjacent to a site that contains a grade II listed building at Tanhouse Farm.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.26 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.26 **Land south of Runnell's Lane, Thornton**
Respondent No 716 **Response Ref** 46 **Representor Name** Robert Swift
Organisation Name Robert Swift and family
Obj/Sup/Com Support

Summary of Main Issues

Land south of Runnell's Lane, Thornton (MN2.26) - Whilst there are accessibility concerns associated with the site, it relates better to the settlement than MN2.25. We agree with the Council's indicative capacity on this site.

Summary of Suggested Changes

None requested.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.26 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.26 **Land south of Runnell's Lane, Thornton**
Respondent No 716 **Response Ref** 32 **Representor Name** Robert Swift
Organisation Name Robert Swift and family
Obj/Sup/Com Support

Summary of Main Issues

Whilst there are accessibility concerns associated with Site MN2.26 (Land south of Runnell's Lane, Thornton), it relates better to the settlement than MN2.25. We agree with the the Council's indicative capacity.

Summary of Suggested Changes

None.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.26	Other Documents
Policy MN2.26	Land south of Runnell's Lane, Thornton	
Respondent No 740	Response Ref 34	Representor Name
Organisation Name Formby Residents Action Group		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

We wish to rely on the representation of Mr John Williams [Rep No. 1026] for flood risk issue on this site.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.26	Other Documents
Policy MN2.26	Land south of Runnell's Lane, Thornton	
Respondent No 741	Response Ref 7	Representor Name
Organisation Name Priory Asset Management LLP		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

The site at Runnell's Lane, Thornton (MN2.26) is allocated for 137 dwellings at approximately 25.8 dwellings per hectare. This site is currently in agricultural use and lies to the south of Thornton, within the 'essential gap' between Thornton and Netherton. Development in this location would impact on the setting of the Grade 2 listed Tanhouse Farm building. The impact of this and development on a Green Belt site should be weighed heavily when assessing whether development in this location would be sustainable or if the harm caused is too significant to outweigh the need for housing within this location. It is clear that the requirements of Paragraph 134 of the NPPF, that 'Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use' has not been considered within the site allocation process.

The site assessment indicates that a shared access between this site and the Runnell's Lane site (Site Ref. MN2.26) is ideally what is required in this location. This indicates that alone the site cannot provide a satisfactory access. The site is therefore dependent on the development coming forward on Runnell's Lane. This allows for a ransom situation and could delay or even prohibit development occurring on this site.

The Local Authority has indicated the need for a significant change to the junction between Lydiate Lane near Buckley Hill Lane for the proposed development (and the land at Runnell's Lane) to be brought forward. It is suggested that a new signalised four arm junction would be required. The cost of such a junction may prohibit the site coming forward in isolation due to the cost. This might also reduce the sites ability to supply affordable housing or other benefits.

The requirement for the Lydiate Lane and the Runnell's Lane developments to be brought forward in tandem is unrealistic and could prejudice the delivery of both allocations.

The proposed development only adjoins the existing settlement boundary along 30% of the site. Though the existing boundary is weak, the proposed boundary would be weaker and may not endure through the plan period. A weak boundary could result in for further encroachment in to the green belt in the future. The impact of this is worsened as the site is within an essential gap between Thornton and Netherton, and proposed development would reduce this gap significantly. The gap between these two settlements should be protected so as to reduce urban sprawl, prevent them merging, and allow both towns to maintain their individual character.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Delete Site Ref MN2.26

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd	MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites	
Respondent No 5	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Elizabeth Thompson
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

It is important to protect all green spaces in England, and there should be tight guidelines in place to carefully decide the impact of releasing this land for other uses. However, it is imperative to understand the significant difference between A1 and A2 agricultural land, with green belt land. If you look at the map attached which you can also find at http://magic.defra.gov.uk/staticmaps/maps/alc_col.pdf supplied by DEFRA (Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs), only 2% of our country contains A1 agricultural land, and of that 2%, 20% of this A1 land is in Sefton and surrounding areas. What an amazingly important asset this is locally and for our country. If Sefton Council went ahead and built on the locations they have put proposals forward for, the country could lose approximately 10% of this invaluable land. A1 agricultural land in Sefton produces more crops per acre than anywhere in the country, it would be absolute criminality to concrete over this actively farmed and productive arable land, when there are many brownfield sites available.

Food prices are set to rise by 40% over the next decade, with the biggest increase in produce prices being for wheat and grain (The Guardian, 15.06.10). The increases are being driven by global shortages in crops, and demand created by China's rampant economic growth (Telegraph, 15.01.2011), with supermarket prices already increasing at a rapid rate. I look out onto one of the fields that Sefton Council has pinpointed as a possible new housing site, and this field has just had a very productive wheat crop harvested and the land is of A1 agricultural quality yielding many different crops per year. The new policies being introduced are impulsive and have not considered the impact of building on this farm land and the effects on our future food production. Has this unilateral approach been discussed with the DEFRA? Not to mention the Farmers Union on its impact on local agricultural employment and viability of local farms.. Protection needs to be placed on this grade A1 and A2 land to protect our sustainability for the future. Once the land has gone the decision is irreversible.

Council officials who have made the ill-thought decisions will have moved on with no accountability for the irreversible damage they will have caused with the country having lost one of its biggest assets. We will be unable to provide for ourselves and will be paying highly inflated prices to import food from other countries, which we could have produced locally reducing our carbon footprint and really utilising the meaning of the word 'Sustainability' not abusing it with the phrase 'Sustainable Housing'. We don't know what will happen in the future, and we may be unable to source food from other countries so we have to be self-sufficient in food. In the last World War, when imported food supplies could not reach this country, the very land that Sefton Council is considering building on in Maghull and Lydiat, was farmed by the Land Army, and this first class fertile and productive land played a crucial role in providing the nations food during those war years. Previously Sefton in various papers, denoted the importance to Sefton of this agricultural land, but over the past few years they have done everything they can to try and make it acceptable to build on it, even trying to get the land downgraded, by paying a lot to get the soil tested.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

[Link to DEFRA Agricultural Land Quality Map](#)

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd	MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites	
Respondent No 12	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Muriel Lammond
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Looking at the official form for comments, it looks like you have covered all of the bases legally, but this is not the point that most people are querying. The point is the community you represent do not want building going up on green belt land and whether or not that is legal according to the government, you as our representatives should be fighting against this. Maghull has plenty of houses for sale and land that can be utilised for buiding without using green belt. The land in this area is the best agricultural land in probably the whole country - why destroy it - once built upon there is no going back, if this building on green belt continues very soon we will have a country of concrete with no countryside.

Maghull is not a place that is growing, people dont want to come here because we have nothing here. No decent shops just a tatty square,if you want to build, knock the square down and build there because the shops are no good, to shop people have to travel out of the area.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd	MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites	
Respondent No 49	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Paul Illingworth
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I am against any building on green belt land. The land in question is grade 1 agricultural land, the type of which is very rare in the UK. I find it unbelievable this valued land could considered for building on, why would anyone want to destroy food security for future generations, especially when climate change is already having such a detrimental impact on global food supplies. Going away from my general perception of building on this valuable land, I believe Maghull and its surrounding areas do not have the adequate infrastructure to sustain such a large growth in population:

1. GP surgeries are full to capacity, I cannot even get my children into my family GP.
2. School's are full and cannot take in anymore children.
3. Local amenities are poor and already cannot cope with the local population.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 81 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Elaine and Peter Charnock
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

My husband and I object to the Local Plan of building new houses on rural land in Maghull/Lydiat.

The infrastructure we have is already at breaking point . Additional housing would become a tipping point where services i.e Health Care/Schools would not cope.
We are keen ramblers and the loss of wildlife and habitats would be disastrous with the greater risk of flooding and pollution.

Please, please leave Maghull/Lydiat as it is

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 89 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** George Waters
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

My wife and I are strongly against the Local Plan to develop so many new houses and a big distribution centre in our small town. We have a few local schools in the area and It would be a lot more dangerous for the school children to have so many large lorries driving along our congested roads. I always believed the farmland in our area was prime land for growing crops. We do know that new houses have to be built but as I have already mentioned its the idea of so many that bothers us.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 90 **Response Ref** 3 **Representor Name** Helen Bromfield
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Support

Summary of Main Issues

Having seen the plans for development in Maghull and Lydiat I would like to register my objections to any planned development at these locations. This area is part of the countryside that local people have enjoyed for many years and would like to continue to do so. It is prime greenbelt land.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 93 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Andrew Heckle
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The proposed house building in the Maghull and Lydiat area is a complete scam. We have so many unused areas where regeneration is the best case. Not using grade 1 agricultural land drastically reducing our precious green belt. I have lived in Maghull all of my life, myself and many other generations have benefited from having such a valuable area to enjoy, endless summers enjoyed playing in the fields, walks with our parents, wildlife on our door step, such a special thing to have and you want to build unnecessarily there to generate money. It's a complete disgrace, the town environment we have cannot cope with the extra population, the infrastructure just isn't up to it, the doctors can't cope, the schools are full, the roads are always very busy, the amenities are brimming, the council can't even look after what's already there never mind adding fuel to the fire! Look at Maghull square in needs money spending on it drastically! Adding more to the current situation will bring the standard of living down, I am fiercely against this as are many hundreds more.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 96 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** John Barrett
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

As a resident I write in connection with the latest planning application for the Maghull and Lydiat areas I have examined the plans and I know the site well. I wish to object strongly to the development of these houses in this local plan is an un-aspirational, and it is only about overloading Sefton with more houses to get more taxes and the new homes bonus, it hasn't been assessed logically on need and what is best for the area.

We don't need new houses, official population figures have shown that population in Sefton is on the decline, so how can you warrant so many new homes

There has not been enough consideration in the local plan on the effect these new houses will have on infrastructure, road, GP services, crime, living standards of the area, wildlife, areas used for leisure by local residents, health, and schools.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 106 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Stephen & Christine Adamson
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

There has always been a lack of infrastructure in Lydiat considering the size of the population. This new so called plan will increase the population of the area to a ridiculous size with no thought given to the effect of already overburdened amenities and infrastructure. The effects of such a development in this will be catastrophic in all areas and seem to be so ill thought out. As a result of such planning we would lose a huge swathe of our green belt, surrounding ourselves in further buildings and roads causing greater amounts of pollution and social pressures which we will be unable to cope with

Summary of Suggested Changes

stop building unsustainable developments stop building on green belt land. Stop making politically motivated plans We do not want this plan and we have a right to protest and have our protests examined properly

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 108 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name**
Organisation Name The Cowell Family
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

There is concern that whilst Green Belt release around Maghull is justified and supported because of its position in the settlement hierarchy, the number of such releases is questioned. They consider that there are sites within the existing boundaries of Maghull that can make a positive contribution towards meeting housing needs and thus reduce the need for Green Belt releases.

We would question whether the Council has given sufficient consideration and consider that a proper assessment of available non Green Belt sites, including urban greenspace, should be carried out and the extent of Green Belt releases should be revisited.

Furthermore the Council concede that many of the sites, especially around Maghull will require considerable infrastructure works to allow them to come forward, and consider sites should be identified for housing which can meet the immediate needs of the Borough. We are also concerned about the Council's comments in paragraph 6.17 where it is stated the allocations only exceed the total housing requirement by around 6.5%, and would question whether they can meet their objectively assessed needs with this approach. Given the Council state that they have not been able to demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land since 2010, it is considered vital that sites are brought forward that can contribute to the housing land supply immediately to overcome the acknowledged shortfall in supply. The Council should be allocating sites to ensure that it can meet its housing requirements as soon as possible and not seek to only meet housing needs towards the back end of the plan period which is the case when relying on sites currently in the Green Belt and with significant infrastructure requirements.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Undertake a review of all Non-Green Belt sites should be undertaken.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 109 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Diane Harvey

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I oppose the Local Plan for Maghull & Lydiat based on the following points:-

The land proposed is on Grade 1 agricultural land which is a precious resource to the country and the community in terms of future farming. Why use such precious land when the population of Sefton has declined?

The current green and open spaces are used for recreation purposes such as walking, cycling, running etc. This helps to keep the community fit and healthy.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 110 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Stephen Lange

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I object to the proposed developments in Sefton East for the following reasons:

There should be no building on grade 1 agricultural land, as this is a precious resource to the country and the community in terms of self provision.

We need green and open spaces in our community, and the decline of these will affect our health.

The council and councillors have been undemocratic in the whole local plan consultation, and have not represented their electorate. They have not listened to residents and have in cases been devious and conveniently poorly communicated information about the local plan to residents, especially in the early stages.

The local plan is un-aspirational, and it is only about overloading Sefton with more houses to get more taxes and the new homes bonus, it hasn't been assessed logically on need and what is best for the area.

We don't need new houses, official population figures have shown that population in Sefton is on the decline, so how can you warrant so many new homes.

There has not been enough consideration in the local plan on the effect these new houses will have on infrastructure, road, GP services, crime, living standards of the area, wildlife, areas used for leisure by local residents, health, and schools.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd	MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites	
Respondent No 111	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Natalie Burke
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the proposed local plan for Maghull for the reasons listed below:

1. The lack of initial consultation and no response to questions/concerns already raised by the public.
2. Increased pressure on services in the local area doctors, dentists and schools are already oversubscribed.
3. With Maghull ambulance station being recently closed this will not assist with the problems accessing emergency services plus Maghull police station is closing which will make Maghull a more attractive target to criminals and all the problems a larger population in the area will create.
4. Lack of sufficient public transport, Maghull train station is already used beyond capacity and parking is near impossible after 9am. Where will these extra residents park as it is doubtful that Network Rail will approve and fund a new station?
5. There will be even more traffic on our already congested roads and pollution due to the increase in housing.
6. There will undoubtedly be a pressure on drainage and I am sure developers contractors will choose the cheapest materials and options.
7. A proportion of the housing will be social housing which causes its own problems. The two areas in Maghull which are predominantly social housing are the Alt estate and Coppull Road estate Lydiat, these already bring social housing associated problems to Maghull.
8. We lose valuable agricultural land which is short sighted. "When the last tree has been cut down, the last fish eaten, the last lake poisoned, then man will know that he cannot eat money." However I am sure this won't matter to those who are lining their own pockets from selling off our greenbelt.
9. Bill Esterson quoted "There's lots of issues and lots of questions which need addressing and I and my Labour colleagues want all of the residents' concerns heard before any decisions are made." and "My starting point is that we should not have any major development in the green belt. The Labour government after the war created the green belt to protect communities and to keep open spaces between towns and villages like those here in Sefton Central. I have said from the start of this whole process that we need to protect the greenbelt. But I am afraid that Sefton's latest draft of the Local Plan does not do that and in my opinion it does not benefit the people who live in Sefton Central." He recognised that people had concerns and it is wrong to build on greenbelt yet all labour councillors voted for the plan, surely this seems suspicious as they have gone against residents concerns?
10. Will council tax increase to pay for extra services such as refuse collection for these thousands more homes across the borough?

I grew up in Maghull and it was a fantastic place to grow up, the proposed plans will adversely affect the character of our town and will result in the loss of our greenbelt. I have worked hard to afford a house in this area as if I start a family I want my children have the same childhood experiences of growing up in this wonderful town.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd	MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites	
Respondent No 114	Response Ref 5	Representor Name Barbara Keenan
Organisation Name Lydiat Parish Council		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Lydiat simply does not have the huge housing requirements that this plan is imposing upon it. Its housing needs are of a much smaller scale and very much associated affordable housing which this plan is not seriously addressing. But overriding all this has to be the nature and uniqueness of the high grade agricultural land surrounding our community.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd	MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Respondent No 118	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Kathy Munro
--------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am very concerned about plans to build on Green Belt land in Sefton. As you know designated areas of Green Belt were intended to control urban growth and prevent urban sprawl. What is the point if its just going to be developed anyway? I have enjoyed living in Maghull for over 30 years but I've witnessed a marked increase in traffic and congestion which would only be made worse by building more houses, please don't ruin it by turning it into one big housing estate.

I object because of - permanent loss of Green belt, no Brownfield first policy, loss of wildlife, permanent loss of agricultural, increased risk of flooding, pressure on local services, increased pollution.

Why aren't brownfield sites being developed first? We're a small island and if we continue as we are there will be no wildlife, woodland and fields. Its very short sighted to just keep building, where's the demand anyway most young people cant afford mortgages. Housing in Maghull is never 'affordable' anyway, just another opportunity for house builders to make more money at the expense of the environment,

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd	MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Respondent No 129	Response Ref 1	Representor Name John & Rosemary Haworth
--------------------------	-----------------------	---

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We have lived in Maghull for forty years having been attracted to the town by its rural location. Over the years we have seen greenfield sites being lost to housing but not on the scale envisaged in Sefton's Local Plan. Building over 2000 homes as part of the first phase will create numerous problems, some of which we have listed below:

- . Social problems and an increase in crime.
- . Increased congestion on our roads.
- . Increased pollution and carbon emissions.
- . Added pressure on local services which are already overstretched i.e. Doctors,Dentists,Schools and Hospitals.
- . Added pressure on Council services that are already being cut.
- . Our nearest Fire Station is some miles away in Buckley Hill, our Ambulance Station closed recently and we have no Police Station in the town. There will be an increased need for these services as our population grows.
- . We will lose our identity as we become part of the urban sprawl which has already occurred in Sefton.

The disappearance of large swathes of green belt will have a profound effect on the local environment:

- . Loss of good quality agricultural land.
- . Loss of much of our farming community.
- . Loss of wildlife and habitats

Sefton Council have kept us informed about the Local Plan and they have held a number of public events but it seems to us that this has been a fait accompli from the outset. Despite all the objections they do not appear to have made any changes to their original plans for Maghull.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove allocations on Green Belt sites from the plan.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 130 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Lynn Macadam

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I strongly object to the Local Plan to build a minimum of 1400 homes with a business park and distribution centre in the areas of Melling, Maghull, Lydiat and Aintree. I understand the need for more houses but not at this grand scale. Our roads and other infrastructure just cannot support this level of expansion. This will destroy our existing communities including farming and food production for the future. Once green belt land is build upon it is lost forever and it sets a precedent for future development in Maghull and Lydiat. Sefton should be opting for "brown field first" sites.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove allocations proposed in the Green Belt

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents** SHLAA

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 133 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** John Carragher

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

It is beyond belief that you are planning housing developments on green belt land when there is so much Brownfield in Sefton. The infrastructure and services cannot support your plan. Can I please refer you to the Maghull Local Plan survey of 2013. I believe this Survey was destroyed.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove housing allocations in the Green Belt from the plan.

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites

Respondent No 136 Response Ref 1 Representor Name Derek McStea

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am extremely concerned that Sefton Council have agreed on a Local Plan that has faced much local opposition during the consultation stages. It seems that the motivator for adopting this plan is to raise more council tax rather than following their own key planning aims which are striving to create a high quality, sustainable environment, which will meet the needs of future generations as well as our own, and to protect the conditions in which people live and work .

How can a plan which aims to promote "sustainable environment that protects the conditions where people live" want to build circa 2,000 houses in Maghull and Lydiat (with an option for another 1,000 on greenbelt land)? This could add approximately 9,000 residents in an area where the population is circa 28,000 residents (2001 census), which is a 32% increase in the local population and would put a huge strain on the local services and infrastructure. This would certainly not be "protecting the conditions where people live and work" for the Maghull and Lydiat local residents.

This local plan has no aspiration for the area or residents but is only about overloading Sefton with more houses to get more taxes and the new homes bonus, it has not been assessed logically on housing needs and what is best for the area. Sefton does not need 7,000 new houses and Maghull/Lydiat should certainly not be earmarked for 2,000 of these which is a huge 30% of the total planned new houses.

Summary of Suggested Changes

The proposals to build circa 2,000 homes in Maghull/Lydiat need to be scaled back as the area cannot cope with the additional residents. It may be acceptable to have a plan for 50% of this number in the area to make the plan sound.

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd

MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites

Respondent No 139

Response Ref 1

Representor Name David Partington

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

objections are as follows:

There are brownfield sites in Sefton available for use yet it seems that there is a eagerness to build on Green belt sites when we need land to feed our population. Once green belt land is used for housing it is gone for ever. The brownfield sites have been used before so will not affect good agricultural land.

The plan is for 5 years and whilst any houses could be built quickly the roads, schools, transport, health facilities needed will not be established as quickly and will put severe pressure on the small resources that currently exist. For example in the last 10 years the bus services in Lydiat have been drastically reduced-it seems because the authorities are under the mistaken belief that everybody owns a car! In Bootle for example there are plenty of buses for people to use yet car ownership is still fairly high.

When the area has a lot of rain the roads flood and so do the fields. If the drainage system cannot cope at present how do you expect it to cope with more houses. In brownfield sites the drainage system is already there and would be able to cope with additional houses etc.

It appears that there may well be a financial element to the plans since building houses in Maghull & Lydiat would bring in more council tax than building houses in Bootle as the rateable values would almost certainly be higher in Maghull & Lydiat than Bootle. Financial considerations should not play a part in such plans but it seems that those who live in "better off area's" are deemed to be able to subsidise those who live in "poorer area's" -such views are without foundation.

Recently 20 mph limits have been introduced to protect pedestrians and yet these plans will only increase the amount of cars on the road even before taking into account the lorries etc before the houses are built and the "buses" etc following any building (should new bus services be introduced!). We have problems at the moment with cars parking on pavements at the local schools in Lydiat meaning at certain times of the day you cannot drive on the roads. Increase traffic will only bring more chaos!

There are very little recreational facilities in the area for the present population. The space for increasing such facilities does not exist now and will be even worse if this plan is implemented.

There is no land available to build shops for an increased population whereas near brownfield sites such facilities already exist.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove Green Belt sites from the plan.

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites

Respondent No 140 Response Ref 2 Representor Name Ian Harvey

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The statistics Sefton council are using to justify the plan are blatantly flawed: The plan is based on estimated figures that bear no relation to the real world. I am a mortgage surveyor working in the Sefton area, and the number of houses for sale, the price structure of the houses and time it takes to sell indicate that the housing demand in the area, at the current pricing, is satisfied.

There is no evidence to suggest that this will increase to such an extent that over 2000 additional properties will be needed in Maghull in the next 15 years. The labour councillors who are keen for this plan, and who have voted for it, are generally not representing the areas it will affect. Their decision to vote for the scheme is three fold: firstly, the houses are planned in the more affluent areas of the borough, thus will have a larger council tax return. Secondly, the labour councillors on the planning committee seem to have a wish to build in these areas, as there only a few labour councillors at risk (these were voted in at the last election with a promise that they would fight to save the green belt. They have patently failed to do so). Thirdly, the labour councillors are trying to blame their decision on the government rules, arguing that if the plan is not in place developers could apply to build and build anywhere. A little white lie, serving to pass the blame onto the government whilst serving their own agenda.

Turning to the practicalities of the proposals, it is madness to build so many properties around the perimeter of Maghull, on agricultural land. The main proposed site, although on plan filling in a neat rectangle of land, will add at least 2000 cars to already busy roads in the area, at present the roads are full at morning and evening school and work rush hours, the schools are full, the train station car park is so full that people already park on nearby roads(that have not been given yellow lines) and we have difficulty exiting our road onto the main road, this problem will be compounded by the additional cars. Overcrowding on trains will also be exacerbated.

The proposals will change Maghull irrevocably, and not for the better, nor for the good of the Maghull residents. Maghull is a dormitory town, most people who live in the area do not work there, and have to commute. The additional houses will, therefore, significantly add to traffic congestion in all roads from the area towards Liverpool and elsewhere, including through Melling, Aintree, Sefton village and Netherton. (The proposals in the plan to include some light industrial development close to the motorway will not provide jobs for the new residents, as the lower paid workers ,who will take up the bulk of the workforce will not be able to afford the houses, (even if the council say they will be affordable) and thus more commuting will occur from elsewhere to the site, compounding the traffic problems.)

I can guarantee that affordable housing will not be built on the site, no matter what the councillors would like to believe, as once planning permission is passed developers will price their site to the surrounding area. These houses would be on a prime site, very valuable with planning permission. A further concern is what happens in 15 years time: if this plan is passed, the houses will sell, and the Maghull population will expand by, I understand, about 10%. Where do we go to when the next local (produced by people not working for the local community) plan has to be produced. Surely it is more sensible to refuse this application.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Review and reduce housing figures and protect green belt land.

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd	MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Respondent No 145	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Lawrence Burke
--------------------------	-----------------------	--

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the local plan proposed by Sefton council on the following grounds:

Roads in Maghull & Lydiat are already congested and with an increase in residents the town will be gridlock, particularly during peak traffic hours.

There is lack of proper drainage provision and support from United Utilities this will result in possible flooding of the area.

There is already a high demand and shortage of Dr's surgeries in Maghull, with additional residents it will become near impossible to obtain an appointment.

The loss of our much loved greenbelt which makes Maghull a pleasurable place to live.

There are brownfield sites within Sefton which should be built upon before destroying our greenbelt.

Council tax will increase due to additional council services needed such as refuse collection.

I have lived in Maghull for 35 years, the area was attractive as a suburb with access to countryside and this was the reason we moved here to start a family. Had we have wanted to live in an overpopulated developed town we would have chosen to live elsewhere. Living in Maghull has allowed us to provide a good area to raise our children and we are saddened that future generations may not reap the benefit of our area due to the development of our town with large scale housing estates.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd	MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Respondent No 149	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Shorna Warren
--------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I believe the Local Plan has not been thought through and clearly there has been little consideration for local residents. Local roads will not cope with the increased volume of traffic. My own road has much foot traffic including families, ramblers and dog walkers and increased vehicle traffic, in the absence of pavements will mean it is dangerous for pedestrians. I do not want my road to be unsafe for my children to walk on.

There is already high demand for places at our local schools. There is not enough places at local schools to support the increased demand development will bring. This also goes for local shops - Central Square in Maghull is already at capacity with car parking. Morrisons, Maghull is another carpark that is always full.

If our local GPs have to register more patients, this will increase the waiting time for a GP appointment, something I feel very strong about having a young family. Car parking at High Pastures is another difficulty with the carpark already too small for the number of patients. The local plan will mean this is again going to be more difficult. Main roads - including the A59 will be chaos.

The local land is high grade agricultural land, it is stated in the top 2% in the country. Why build on this? Surely there are alternative Brown field sites that would be more suitable and sensible.

It appears this Local Plan will benefit developers only, yet it is existing residents that will suffer in the long-run, long after developers have left.

Please consider local, existing residents who live here with families. I urge you to take my concerns seriously as well as others from local residents as we will have to live with the consequences long after developers have gone. Once green belt land is built upon, it is lost forever.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiate sites**

Respondent No 151 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Matthew Warren

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I understand there is a requirement for new housing to meet the needs of the growing population and to enable first time buyers to set-up home – I fully support this. However, what I do not support is the development of substantial residential areas where the existing infrastructure/community facilities are already under pressure. I am not confident that effective and meaningful provisions have been fully considered to supplement this housing increase with suitable infrastructure.

The commute to work along the A59 to ‘Switch Island’ is currently a struggle now with high levels of congestion. This is a the main route into Liverpool. How are the developers/Sefton going to remedy this? Maghull Train Station car park is full too (making park and ride difficult too).

In addition, doctor appointments, dentists and walk-in centres are over-stretched (one would wait two weeks for an appointment if booked today). Not to mention, current amenities are fully utilised already – the Central Square in Maghull is already at capacity with car parking. Morrisons, Maghull is another carpark that is always full.

I want to see the rationale or justification for picking these sites against potential brown field sites - especially given this land, in many cases is high grade agricultural land and the remaining greenbelt is used for recreational purposes by the current residents. Without this robust justification, It appears this Local Plan will benefit developers only, yet it is existing residents that will suffer in the long-run, long after developers have left.

Please consider local, existing residents who live here with families. I urge you to take my concerns seriously as well as others from local residents as we will have to live with the consequences long after developers have gone. Once green belt land is built upon, it is lost forever.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 152 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Carmel Gresham

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

One of the main attractive features of Maghull is the beautiful green belt surrounding the towns of Maghull and Lydiat. Building on this green belt will be a disaster for the area. I believe that Sefton as a location has plenty of brown field sites available which would enable you to leave the green belt and the semi-rural aspect of areas of the borough intact. The council should implement a brown field first policy in the local plan.

Over the years, the town of Maghull has deteriorated, with litter strewn streets and grass verges, and a shopping centre filled with charity shops, bargain shops and bookmakers sadly the norm. The ability to access the green belt and Cheshire Lines cycle paths remains a personal pleasure which is under serious threat with the local plan.

The council tax with the additional Maghull Precept is extortionate, and all I can see with the local plan is a further deterioration of the local area and even less value for money for residents like myself.

The schools are at capacity in the local area (I work in two of the secondary schools and they are bursting at the seams) and there are just not enough facilities in the Maghull area e.g. Doctors Dentists to accommodate the influx of new families to the area.

The roads are already terribly congested, try getting across Maghull and Lydiat in the rush hours and then imagine the pressure on the local roads with the extra cars new houses would bring, not to mention the extra carbon monoxide emissions in the area.

I would urge anyone who is responsible for the proposals in the local plan to think again and not rush into destroying our local heritage and green belt.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 157 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Mike Pearson

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The Sefton plan is designed to fit with the political "climate" rather than being what is needed for Sefton. The mad dash for house building is permitting "easy" sites to be selected rather than concentrating on resolving the challenges of brownfield sites. There is insufficient thought given to the creation of a "living community" with easy access to schools, shops, jobs, leisure space etc.

In regard to Maghull in particular, this area does not need another massive increase in housing - it is already woefully served in terms of facilities for leisure, entertainment, restaurants etc. It is particularly weak in terms of green space available for walking. The plans for the old Moss Side hospital site are already challenging and the massive expansion next to the M58 is a serious threat to the local services. Local schools will need expanding.

I note that the only facilities it does have eg the town hall have been built from extra precepts on the residents - unlike other parts of the borough where they are from communal rates. Maghull has never developed into a community - it's a series of housing estates with no social cohesion. Plans should be to consider how best to create a better quality of life for the town and its residents. This plan makes it worse.

But more serious the land is grade 1 agricultural land and greenbelt and both should be enough to block this proposal. The UK home production of food has fallen from 70% to 60% which puts us the countries long term independence at risk. It's a madness destroy good food producing land.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 164 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** A Hagan
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to register my opposition to any proposals for housing development on green belt land in the Maghull area.

In the area where I live there are fields which are A1 agricultural land and it would be criminal to permit any development. It is claimed more houses are needed because of increase in the Sefton population but I do not believe that this is the case.

The area has got innapropriate access with roads already heavily congested at rush hour and public services/shops/schools/GP'S would not be able to cope with increase of housing.

Green Lane is a local leisure amenity and wildlife habitat where we walk, run and cycle.

I have no doubt that there are many brown field sites in Sefton which could be utilised and I urge the council to reject any proposals which extend into green belt/ agricultural land.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 168 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Joan Balfour
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to place on record that I strongly object to this council or any other, building on green belt sites. There are plenty of Brownfield sites that are well suited to this purpose. I am sure that you have been made aware on many occasions that the infrastructure in and around Maghull will not sustain any major development. We are very short of good doctors in this area and good facilities e.g the promised walk in centre that did not materialise. Councils are elected by the people for the people, and should listen to what the electorate want instead of only seeing pound signs.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 183 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** William Supple
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I object most strongly to the Sefton Local Plan on the following grounds. The sheer size of the building proposed for Maghull and Lydiat is unwarranted in view of our static population and small immigration. Building on Green Belt sites is criminal as there are enough Brown Field sites in Sefton area for aprox 6000 houses (also there are over 6000 good empty houses. There has been a deliberate attempt by the Labour Councillors to bulldoze this plan through and ignoring the local electorate.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 185 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Marie Dewhurst
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The nature and extent of the plan will permanently damage the culture and nature of Lydiat which is primarily a rural/agricultural area. The loss of valuable green belt will push up food prices and impact on the amount of imported fruit and vegetables. Once lost this prime agricultural land is gone for ever. The impact on the environment extensive building and concreting over fields and hedgerows will inevitably result in rising of the water table and flooding. I believe the numbers presented in the plan are flawed and the building of 75% of all the houses stated in the plan, in Maghull and Lydiat will destroy the historical and cultural nature of the area.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 212 **Response Ref** 8 **Representor Name** Angela McIntyre
Organisation Name Maghull Town Council
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Residents commented in the Maghull Town Survey that a brownfield first policy should be rigorously applied to protect the Green Belt. This policy should now be applied to recent changes in planning law where industrial and commercial land can now be used for housing. This change in planning law means that there is now a potential for 'windfall' sites on commercial and industrial land to be factored into the Local Plan, alleviating the pressure on Green Belt for house building. The survey indicates that the need for industrial and commercial land may be currently overstated as there is plenty of industrial and commercial land available at the moment and estimate suggest that between 20% and 30% of land currently used for retail will become available as consumer habits change, footfall declines and use of the internet increases.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

1. The Town Survey, which was conducted in July 2013, was submitted to Sefton MBC following their publication of the Plan at the Preferred Option stage. (Appendix 1)
2. The Additional Sites response which was submitted following the consultation on the proposed additional sites in 2014. (Appendix 2)
3. The Infrastructure Working Group recommendations. Following examination by Sefton Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Regeneration and Environmental Services) an Infrastructure Working Group was set up to look at the issues and concerns regarding infrastructure which had been raised by the Plan. The recommendations of the group were submitted to Cabinet and approved at the meeting held on 15th January 2015. (Appendix 3)

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 214 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Brenda Brown
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I have lived in Maghull for 25 years. It has changed greatly. There are so few green belt areas. Maghull will just become an unattractive urban town. Wildlife will be affected.

The infrastructure is under tremendous pressure. Appointments at doctors surgeries are already hard to come by. I find trying to get an appointment at the surgery very stressful.

When I moved here 25 years ago I did so because it was a friendly, attractive place to live. The amenities were good. The local health centre is under a lot of pressure now. When I have used it the staff have found it difficult to make appointments within the required prescribed time. Nurses obviously very busy. The current service is under enough pressure.

Our roads are ridiculously busy. Cars parking on pavements. It is very difficult to find parking at Maghull Square.

I am against the proposed further development of Maghull.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 225 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Jackie Taylor
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am objecting to Sefton Councils local plan on the possible building on the greenbelt. I live in Maghull and even though it's grown enormously - it is still semi rural with beautiful open spaces for wildlife and lovely open farmland. Why should a handful of people have the right to completely destroy my families hometown and ruin the whole infrastructure of the place for so many (probably not even needed) new builds?

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 226 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Alan Grimshaw
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I object to building yet more housing in Maghull which is already one of the largest housing estates in Europe. I object to building houses on prime agricultural land which we will surely need in the future as the population increases. I object to building on green belt land. Maghull has few recreational facilities for it's the size of its population the green belt is one of them. I object to the extra traffic that will be created adding to already congested roads. I object to our schools and health services having to cope with even more people, they are already stretched.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Sefton has many brownfield sites which should be exhausted before considering building on agricultural/greenbelt land. Any further increases in housing and population should only happen if the local schools, health services and roads can accommodate them. Any such changes to the local area should only take place after full consultation with the local populace.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 235 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Ian Whiley
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

In relation to site at Ledsons Bridge [north of Specers Lane, west of canal] which was deemed unsuitable, I find this to be a ridiculous decision that has been made without consultation with local residents or the village community. Nearly everyone I have discussed this with in the village state this is their preferred location. It provides easy access and regress to the main road, is less damaging to the environment and provides easy access to village amenities. It has suitable drainage and you can start from foundation levels to ensure adequate sewerage is put in place that will be less damaging to the village and reduce the already present flood risk. The local planning officer I spoke to on your events evening did not provide an adequate explanation as to why this was excluded other than it would damage the greenbelt too much. I don't agree with this and nor do local residents. Consultation is about you listening to residents not telling them what a planning officer deems acceptable!

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 252 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Helen Gannon

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the local plan proposed by Sefton Council for both Lydiat and Maghull on the following grounds:

The loss of greenbelt will inevitably create urban sprawl which can already been seen in other parts of Sefton where they have joined West Lancashire.

It is clear that the required infrastructure is not in place and that the local plan is relying upon the developers to ensure this is in place. There will already be an increase in traffic to switch island and the motorways from the new dock terminal. Extra housing in Lydiat and Maghull will just add to this, causing more problems for people travelling to and from work in Liverpool and Bootle.

It is already difficult to get doctor and dentist appointments now, an increase in people living in the area will exacerbate this problem. It will also add extra pressure to local hospitals at a time where resources are already stretched and being cut. There are insufficient school places and no facility to build extra ones. Local shopping facilities will have to crease causing more congestion and problems with parking.

It is clear that affordable housing will not be achieved and again we are relying upon the developers. Building in the greenbelt will put a premium on the housing which will clearly make them unaffordable especially to the young people in the area.

At a time when we are all being encouraged to be greener and consider the environment, building on prime agricultural land that supports wildlife and is aesthetically pleasing is not conducive to a greener environment. There are plenty of brownfield sites that could be developed or existing run down housing that could be improved.

In light of all the above I wish to strongly object to the plan.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 253 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Peter Gannon

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the local plan proposed by Sefton Council for both Lydiat and Maghull on the following grounds:

The loss of greenbelt will inevitably create urban sprawl which can already been seen in other parts of Sefton where they have joined West Lancashire.

It is clear that the required infrastructure is not in place and that the local plan is relying upon the developers to ensure this is in place. There will already be an increase in traffic to switch island and the motorways from the new dock terminal. Extra housing in Lydiat and Maghull will just add to this, causing more problems for people travelling to and from work in Liverpool and Bootle.

It is already difficult to get doctor and dentist appointments now, an increase in people living in the area will exacerbate this problem. It will also add extra pressure to local hospitals at a time where resources are already stretched and being cut. There are insufficient school places and no facility to build extra ones. Local shopping facilities will have to crease causing more congestion and problems with parking.

It is clear that affordable housing will not be achieved and again we are relying upon the developers. Building in the greenbelt will put a premium on the housing which will clearly make them unaffordable especially to the young people in the area.

At a time when we are all being encouraged to be greener and consider the environment, building on prime agricultural land that supports wildlife and is aesthetically pleasing is not conducive to a greener environment. There are plenty of brownfield sites that could be developed or existing run down housing that could be improved.

In light of all the above I wish to strongly object to the plan.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd	MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Respondent No 266	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Alyson Thornton
--------------------------	-----------------------	---

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am writing to object to the Council's plan to build on Greenbelt land in Maghull and Lydiat.

Why is the Council choosing to build on precious farmland when there are brownfield sites available in the Sefton area? Surely brownfield was an option in the original plan? I don't feel that the consultation has been at all transparent.

I moved back to the area 13 years ago, one of the reasons being that it's in a semi rural location and I fully appreciate the surrounding green spaces. How do you plan to build 'affordable' houses here? Is there really a demand? Sefton's plan will completely change the face of Maghull and Lydiat forever and will affect all the residents, not just those who live adjacent to the proposed sites. Our transport links are already inadequate, especially for those of us that don't drive. Getting timely doctor's/dentist appointments already prove difficult. I also understand that United Utilities have expressed concern at the number of houses in the plan as they can't accommodate this level of service. This will affect water supplies across the whole borough.

I live adjacent to one of the proposed sites at Turnbridge Road. To build on this piece of land will cause chaos in the surrounding roads. The bridge at Green Lane/ Liverpool Road is already congested and obviously not suitable for wagons so this will mean lorries coming through the Green Lane estate. Good luck if you need to navigate the area around school opening and closing times.

Please be assured, local residents will not sit back and accept this violation of our green spaces.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd	MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Respondent No 284	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Emma & Jimmy Brand & Sprung
--------------------------	-----------------------	---

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I object to Sefton Council allocating housing sites on prime A1 agricultural land. I object to the scale of proposed development around Maghull, Lydiat, Melling and Aintree and the huge increase in population this will bring.

I feel the council hasn't been open about specific issues and the work they have undertaken, keeping local residents in the dark. Affordable housing is being promoted solely to generate money for the council.

The borough lacks infrastructure and services to accommodate an influx of new residents (GPs, schools etc). I do not see how Sefton's current road network can be adapted to handle such increases in traffic, they are already heavily congested in places. Pollution is a key concern here, and living along a main road I would be personally affected.

I believe the Plan in its current form will destroy Sefton's countryside, damage habitats and wildlife and limit recreational opportunities. When the green belt is lost, it's lost forever.

Other concerns include a decrease in house prices due to oversupply and increased crime levels as a result of an increase in population.

The council should focus on regenerating its 3,000 empty properties and foremost, utilise brownfield sites.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiate sites**

Respondent No 313 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Sandra Hartley-Clegg

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I object to all the building proposals on all green belt areas. I feel that the amount of housing proposed is too much for the area to handle eg schools, doctors, dentists and the roads cannot possible handle the amount of extra traffic that this will bring around the area. I feel that the people of Maghull have not been informed properly and certainly all the people I speak to either oppose or are not aware. When moving to Maghull over 30 years ago I came to the area as it had more green areas and almost had a countrified feeling but with the amount of buildings that are proposed to be built it will feel more like an urban sprawl. After reading about a survey that was conducted on over 500 homes I would like to know what areas/roads this was done in. The results certainly do not portray the feelings of the many people I have spoken too.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Just do not go ahead with the building it would be a tragedy to lose the green belt areas.

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Before I commence I should comment that the use of different numbering between different phases of this process for the same site is not helpful at all, this only makes the process of responding more complicated and I wonder if this has been done deliberately to confuse residents such as myself?

I am objecting to a number of the 'Local Plan Sites' selected, both within the plan and additional sites. In particular those in the Maghull Area as shown in your plan Ref AS12, AS13, AS14, AS15, AS16 and in particular AS24.

In my opinion, the developments already included in the plan already submitted namely SR4.26, SR4.27 SR4.47 and SR.48, and those now designated SR4.48, MN2.29, MN2.46 MN 8.1 and MN8.2 will absolutely cripple the already crumbling and non-existent infrastructure in this 'stranded' part of Sefton. Maghull is already stranded by the carbuncle/bottleneck otherwise known as Switch Island, and the addition of further residential properties in AS12-16 and AS24 will simply exacerbate this problem even further. Maghull is already hemmed into the south by Switch Island which suffers innumerable problems during rush hour, and access to the A59 south at any time during the weekend is difficult at the best of times due to the weight of traffic around ASDA and then Aintree Retail Park further along.

Exiting Maghull to the north hit's the bottle neck at Ormskirk, which is already gridlocked at rush hour peak times and weekends, and it's a similar story to the east when trying to exit the M58 at the M6 Junction. Even a detour through Rainhill via the by-pass then hits a known bottle neck at the East Lancs Road. The addition of further housing will only add to the current hemming in of Maghull, which will be virtually 'land-locked' by traffic bottle necks to all points on the compass. The addition of entry/exit slips to the 'Ashworth junction on the M58' will not necessarily assist with the problems at Switch Island, or the other bottlenecks a little further afield that I have referred to here.

Furthermore, Maghull is already suffering from a lack of facilities to support the local community as it is. Shopping is a dead loss in Maghull, hence the traffic issues around Switch Island and Ormskirk as people seek out decent shopping. Local schools are almost capacity (especially since the closure of Old Hall High School some years back), and those with some existing spare capacity certainly would not have enough to cope with the demand caused by plans already submitted and then the addition of these further plans on top. Maghull is already suffering from a lack of investment from both the council and local business over recent years, and the addition of some much new housing will only dilute the effect of the £/head investment over the coming years.

I understand that the council would hope that public transport might alleviate some of the issues I have raised. However, the addition of a 'halt' alongside Ashworth will be neither use nor ornament unless the capacity on the Northern Line can be increased by either more frequent trains, particularly at peak times, or longer trains throughout the day (6 instead of 3 carriages).

It is well known in the local area that Maghull has grown as a commuter town, which goes some way to explaining the poor infrastructure in place to cope with day to day life, as most day to day life takes place either in schools or at the workplace. Unless there are clear plans in place to improve the overall access into and out of Maghull, along with clear plans to improve local infrastructure, then the addition of this housing will be intolerable for the existing local community.

Lastly, all of the plans I am objecting to (bar one on Sefton Lane) are being proposed on prime agricultural green belt land. The reduction in the amount of both green belt are well trodden arguments I need not repeat here. Suffice to say that the loss in both counts while other underutilised brown field sites go unnoticed or not considered.

It is clear to me that building on greenfield/green belt is much, much cheaper for developers, lowers their overheads and build costs and keeps their margins high by not having to prepare brownfield sites for building. It is absolutely clear to me that developers are using the 'local plan' requirements and initiative to submit speculative plans to use the 'easy' pickings of green belts etc that under any other circumstances would never be approved – if they would, then why have they not applied before?

This is an attempt to exploit a fast money opportunity to ride rough shod over some of the best agricultural land in the UK and existing, tried and tested planning considerations.

I oppose to these plans for the additional and selected sites in the strongest terms.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Do not allocate land in the Green Belt for development.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 340 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Laura Harvey
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Objecting to Sefton's Local Plan because I would like Sefton Council to choose a brown field first policy for building new houses. Maghull and Lydiat do not have enough money, more housing would mean more pressure on our doctors, dentists and hospitals. We do not want to lose our lovely open spaces to developers. We do not want many years of building and construction of new homes in Maghull and Lydiat.

Summary of Suggested Changes

The Local Plan should include a brownfield first policy.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 351 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Mike Penn
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Along with many other residents of Maghull and Lydiat I want to indicate my opposition to the Local Plan. There are many reasons to support my opposition which have been well documented in letters and the local press. I am concerned about the destruction of prime agricultural land and the affect on the environment. Our current infrastructure cannot take any further increase in population and traffic and the demands on public services. This over development will destroy our community. We already have a prison and secure mental hospital in our area with the likelihood of another being built. Our current bus services are poor and almost non existent at night. Our shopping centres are poor and in decline. I moved to Maghull in 1970 to bring my family up in a pleasant semi-rural area. Over the years I have witnessed a significant increase in housing/population etc. I recognised the need for development but we have passed saturation point and enough is enough, democracy and the will of the people should prevail.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove housing allocations in Maghull and Lydiat area.

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 358 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** John Thompson

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

- 1) Government guidelines state that only in exceptional circumstances should green belt land be released. Much of the greenbelt proposed for development in Sefton's Local Plan is prime agricultural land used for crop growing. There are no exceptional circumstances in Sefton that justify releasing greenbelt - see (2).
- 2) Based on the latest data from the Office for National Statistics, the projected population increase for Sefton for the period of the plan is around 5,000. Planners are proposing 11,000 new houses sufficient for 24,000 people based on an average of 2.2 per household. Thus the proposals are totally inconsistent with the latest data and are unsound. Indeed, there are sufficient brownfield sites in Sefton to accommodate housing for 5,000 people so no green belt land needs to be used.
- 3) There are no plans in place for upgrading the infrastructure to accommodate the extra people. This is especially relevant in the Maghull/Lydiat areas where the plan proposes a very significant increase in the population. Already schools are oversubscribed and appointments for doctors and dentists are at a premium.

Summary of Suggested Changes

The plan needs to be revised to provide sufficient housing based on the latest data from the ONS. Detail must be provided on how the infrastructure will be improved to accommodate extra people. This would make the plan "sound".

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiate sites**

Respondent No 366 **Response Ref** 5 **Representor Name** Margaret Anne Hill

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Maghull is a village; already overgrown into a town with significant traffic congestion. There is a small amount of traffic to and from the M58 but the vast majority of traffic movement is on village roads leading to the A59 route through the middle of, into and out of Maghull. The village roads are narrow, single lane and winding. 1/2 mile tailbacks to reach/cross the A59 are common now.

The proposal for massive increase in building in Maghull is not positively prepared nor justified. For example, the proposal for Maghull East, bounded by the Motorway, railway, School Lane and Poverty Lane, would result in enormous increase in traffic along School Lane to Deyes or Foxhouse Lanes and Poverty Lane. There is no room for other roads to the A59 without pulling down houses. I am told that Sefton Council say that there is no 'tipping point' in relation to the number of vehicles able to use roads. That is self-evidently not a sensible nor reasonable stance. There are now frequently close to gridlock situations in the Foxhouse Lane, Station Road area where there are narrow roads with frequent junctions, frequent road closures [trains] and single file traffic [canal crossing or Station Road]

Similar road difficulties occur near most of the greenfield and agricultural land areas proposed for development in Maghull. A proposed site has single route access which includes single file access across the Leeds Liverpool canal; a route which is frequently closed for 15 mins at a time while the canal leisure boats journey through.

Surely a health and safety matter in relation to fire and ambulance access to the estate. There is, of course the excellent MerseyRail network with its large car park at Maghull and bus interchange The car park is full by early morning. Station Road is so narrow that traffic frequently has to stop to 'take it in turns' if there is a bus using the road. The 7 minute duration road closures every 15mins cause hold-ups and increase the flow of traffic along the parallel Poverty Lane; a boundary to the Plan's Maghull East site.

Poverty Lane is also a narrow winding single lane road, with a 20 mph speed limit, speed bumps and primary school; so single file traffic at the start and end of the school day. Should the school be increased in size, the road would become unuseable. Access to Poverty Lane from the Maghull East site would have to be close to the primary school because of the bridges over the railway and the motorway. You cannot pull down hundreds of houses to widen the roads [to build hundreds of houses on greenfield sites] to change the village road structure into an effective town road structure. Housing and industrial development must be within the capacity of the road structure to support it. The brownfield sites are located where there is a good road network.

The Maghull East site has been subject to flooding in recent years. In this regard, the plan is neither positively prepared nor justified. The plan to build on Maghull East site is also contrary to national policy [being agricultural land] and earlier proposals to develop it were rejected by Sefton Council. The plan is not effective as it cannot deliver an effective road network in Maghull to support the massive development proposals.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 368 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** M. F. Robinson

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Maghull is a small town. We are already living on top of each other as it is without even more housing, and losing what green belt we have. This road I have lived in for the past twenty years has gradually become a rat run due to the increase in traffic. The majority living here are, like myself, elderly. Trying to cross this road in peak times is dicing with death. Recent twenty mile limits being totally ignored. The people who make these decisions(Government) seem to be only interested in packing more and more people together causing even more discord. If something is not done about this immigration problem soon, this country, our green and pleasant land will just sink beneath the waves, as it seems to have already started doing down south. One good thing about it is we will no longer have any problems.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents** Green Belt Study

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 383 **Response Ref** 5 **Representor Name** Malcolm Gore

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The reason for greenbelt creation was:

- 1) To preserve prime agricultural land and the land around Maghull and Lydiat is the best and most versatile.
- 2) To enable small towns and villages to maintain their identity and preventing urban sprawl.

We here are in a rather unique position as we border West Lancs on one side and Knowsley on the other. We also border Aintree separated largely by motorways. Our greenbelt is almost non existent now and any further development of it will result in the urbanisation of Sefton from its borders with Liverpool in the south to West Lancs in the north and Knowsley to the east. Maghull/Lydiat as a community will no longer exist.

I would like to draw your attention to comments made by Eric Pickles and Brandon Lewis and published in "The Planner" 6th October 2014. You no doubt have read it many times and I and thousands of other residents would argue that for all the reasons I have outlined, Sefton council are contravening the guidance in every respect and they do not have any reason and have not proved there are any "exceptional circumstances" to destroy huge areas of greenbelt.

The plan is opposed by almost everyone in the area. Even the local Labour M.P Bill Esterson says their figures are wrong and the Council should build on brownfield first in fact he says they should "go back to the drawing board". Even Labour run Maghull Town Council's survey showed only a 6% support of the plan. This was conveniently destroyed we are told as it was a Labour party document.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 384 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Stephen and Clare Jones
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I write to lodge my objection to the development of the green space in Maghull and Lydiat. I strongly object to the development and building on grade 1 agricultural land, as this is a precious resource to the country and the community in terms of self provision.

- We need green and open spaces in our community, and the decline of these will affect our health.
- I also feel that Sefton council and councillors have been undemocratic in the whole local plan consultation, and have not represented their electorate! They have not listened to residents and have in cases been devious and conveniently poorly communicated information about the local plan to residents, especially in the early stages.
- We don't need many more new houses, official population figures have shown that population in Sefton is on the decline, so how can you warrant so many new homes.
- There has not been enough consideration in the local plan on the effect these new houses will have on infrastructure, road, GP services, crime, living standards of the area, wildlife, areas used for leisure by local residents, health, and schools.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 408 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Tony Brandwood
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to formally object to the planning proposals for Maghull on the following grounds:-

The amount of building proposed for the Maghull area is out of all proportion to the infrastructure available or planned to support it. We have recently suffered severe flooding in Maghull and further building combined with the more extreme and frequent weather events caused by climate change will only make matters worse. The roads are busy enough already and if the number of houses planned are actually built the roads will be permanently gridlocked for large parts of the day. This will be especially so if the ridiculous idea to build a large distribution centre in the area goes ahead, this would be so inappropriate it's hard to believe that the proposal is even being looked at.

With the UK population growing year on year increasing the demand for food it makes no sense to build on prime agricultural land. Sefton should adopt a policy to build on so called brownfield sites wherever possible.

There is no excuse for building on green belt land. While the UK population may be increasing overall the Governments own figures show that the population in Sefton is declining so why are we proposing so many new houses?

The community has made it clear that it does not want building on this scale and you may consider this to be a case of nimbyism but I would argue it is niabyism (not in anyone's back yard) that is to say no community anywhere in the country should have to face such inappropriate, excessive and destructive building proposals.

I am not suggesting that no homes should be built at all but please do the right thing and scale back these proposals dramatically to present a plan that is acceptable to the locals and one that can be supported by the infrastructure available.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 409 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Angela O'Brien
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I object to the Local Plan for Sefton in regard to Maghull. The land allocated for housing is disproportionate to the size of the town, it appears to be up to 25% of the area of Maghull.

I fear the amenities needed for the new development cannot be supported by the town and I lack faith in the council providing more. Smaller developments over the whole of Sefton would be preferable, being less disruptive.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 418 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** DE Budd
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

No Green Belt land should be built on in Lydiat or Maghull. There are plenty of brownfield sites in Sefton to accommodate the building of houses and a retail park near a residential area would be ridiculous.

The Green Belt land in this area is prime agricultural land. Where will the food be grown in the future?

The 370 homes on the former Ashworth Site is enough for this area. The roads and infrastructure can't cope. School Lane floods now, it will be a lot worse if too many homes are built in this area. It is hard to get a doctor/dentist appointment, it will get worse. Where are the children going to go to school.

The crossing at Deyes/School Lane is already treacherous. It will be worse if more traffic uses this route.

The drains as you come into Hesketh Drive smell terrible now, they are not going to cope with more sewerage in the drainage system.

Sefton should reconsider and choose a brownfield first policy. Maghull and Lydiat are rural communities and should remain so. Who is going to live in these new houses? The younger generation can't afford them.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 420 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** C Bradburn
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The areas of concern to me are Maghull and Lydiat. Green Belt land is protected for a reason as is obvious once built lost forever. With so much public concern of this Local Plan I hope the Council and powers to be be will reject this plan.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 433 **Response Ref** 11 **Representor Name** Eric Haworth

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Sefton MBC's Local Plan will contribute to the destruction of the unique village identity & historical heritage of Lydiat, just as they've already done with other parishes.

The NPPF declares that areas of historical importance should be discounted from such development plans. However, Lydiat or "Hild-Geat", meaning "swing gate" in Old English, goes back over 1,000 years, and in 1086 was referenced in the Domesday Book, as having woodland a mile long. It is believed that this wood ran adjacent the main route North from Liverpool, now Liverpool Road, adjacent the current site of Highway Farm, (Tysons Triangle) which is targeted as development site MN2.28 in this Local Plan. There are also historical records of a Viking encampment in the area.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 433 **Response Ref** 9 **Representor Name** Eric Haworth

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

An aspect of the NPPF is the avoidance of urban sprawl and the merging of distinct communities. The Parish of Lydiat is ostensibly a village farming community. This has already been eroded to some extent by poor council planning with Maghull having already being allowed to merge into Lydiat. In some areas it has been allowed to such an extent that visitors would be unable to determine where one ended and the other began.

West Lancashire Borough Council have already formally expressed their concerns on this matter when commenting on this Local Plan. The Lydiat sites incorporated within the Local Plan share their boundary with West Lancs who are concerned that these developments will mean the merging of the Lydiat community with their Aughton community, a concern shared by the residents of Lydiat.

Another concern expressed by West Lancs that are shared by residents of Lydiat, is the increase in vehicular traffic directly through our communities. The Kenyons Lane/Lambshear Lane route within Lydiat is commonly used as a "short-cut" by vehicles travelling between the M58 motorway and the western areas of the borough, i.e. Formby, Southport, etc. With the developments in these areas and that proposed within Lydiat itself will significantly add to this traffic. This route has three primary schools within a space of a few hundred metres and the dangers to the young school children has been such that the council has already been prompted to introduce extensive traffic calming measures and more recently to impose a 20 mph speed limit. There has been a lack of genuine and effective cross-boundary working with West Lancashire Borough Council. These concerns have been raised over a long period and have not been reassured by the denials of Sefton MBC. Indeed, the more one considers this aspect of the Sefton Local Plan the more one thinks that it should have been pursued as a joint plan with West Lancashire Borough Council, as has happened in other parts of England.

Sefton has a huge boundary with West Lancashire, vastly greater than any boundary it has with Liverpool or Knowsley Councils. Lydiat is surrounded by West Lancashire on 3 sides with only its southern boundary being connected to the rest of the Borough of Sefton and indeed to Merseyside. Our economic, housing, education, health and social needs are as much, if not more, connected to those of our neighbouring communities in West Lancashire as they are to those in Sefton/Merseyside. Sefton MBC just do not grasp or want to grasp this and seem to adopt an inward looking Merseyside-centric approach which works to the disadvantage of communities such as Lydiat. This is not a sound approach to a Local Plan process.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites

Respondent No 478 Response Ref 1 Representor Name J Smallpage

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I believe that building on any agricultural land, not just first class land, would be a very short-sighted and foolhardy strategy at a time when we should be looking to produce more food in our own country given the increasingly unstable world, both economically and politically, in which we live. We ought to be capable of self-sufficiency should the need arise (as it has in the past). I have read of a report by the University of Cambridge warning that Britain faces a 'significant' predicted shortfall of farmland of 2 million hectares by 2030. Arable land is under increasing pressure from demands for land for housing and renewable energy.

We should grow as much as we can locally to cut down on the transporting of food, given the need to reduce our carbon emissions.

Sefton has done a lot of work to promote a healthy lifestyle for its residents. I have read of research done by the Centre for Environment and Society at the University of Essex that shows that being able to spend time in green spaces has substantial benefits for mental health in addition to physical health being strengthened by exercise. Studies undertaken by the Human Environment Research Laboratory at the University of Illinois have shown that direct exposure to nature can relieve symptoms of attention-deficit disorders. Many people use paths through the Green Belt areas for recreation and this trend should be encouraged and developed rather than prevented by building on them.

I understand that there are many long-term vacant houses already in Sefton together with unused Brownfield sites which should be used in preference to grade 1 agricultural land. It is inevitable that more of these will become available in the course of time therefore Green Belt land should continue to be protected from development and developers should not be allowed to have access to even small parts as this could lead to an eventual escalation of development.

Traffic congestion is already too great at key times (for example at either end of the school day as well as at the rush hour). The existing infrastructure in Maghull, especially to the west of the canal, would not be able to cope with increased housing and the resulting increase in transport needs, both public and private.

Maghull has had many problems with drainage over the years and building on parts of the Green Belt land would add to the burden in parts of Maghull as it is very close to the Alt flood plain.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 487 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Carolyn Rodick

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The vast majority of the development planned for East Sefton is on agricultural land, it is important that the country as a whole retains the ability to grow its own food, once this land is built on it will be lost forever.

Agricultural land provides a valuable habitat for both native and migratory species of insects and birds. Many once abundant species of birds such as Sparrows and Lapwings are now becoming rare and loss of habitat is one of the known causes of this decline.

The sites around east Maghull, sites together with the planned new facilities on the Ashworth site, will have a considerable impact on the level of traffic along School Lane/Deyes Lane/Eastway and Poverty Lane/Eastway. The School Lane/Deyes Lane/Eastway corridor is particularly busy, as it provides a through route to the A59 and all three local senior schools, which can only get worse if the development goes ahead. In addition access to the library, sports facilities, banks and local shops is via these access roads and there is little scope for any road widening.

I have heard the argument that 'market forces' will ensure that new GP's and dentists will be appointed to meet the increased demand, however, as a Chartered Accountant I know from experience that doctors and dentists are run as businesses, to make living/profit for the partners, owners or shareholders. Appointing new staff takes time, to advertise, interview etc and will be delayed as long as possible meaning that the existing service can only get worse for residents in the short term. Additionally, staff can only be appointed if the existing buildings have space available for them, if this is not the case then moving to new premises or extending existing ones will only extend the period were access to NHS services is worsened.

Almost every Local Plan site in East Sefton states that there will be erosion of the boundary between two areas, e.g. Maghull and Melling; Lydiat and Aughton Village; Maghull and Kirkby.

There must be some consideration for the cumulative effect on the existing community if all these sites are confirmed, what makes each one of these towns unique will be lost and Sefton will become one large homogenous conurbation.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 528 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Stuart Rodick

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am writing to strongly object to Sefton Council's "Local Plan" as it will result in the substantial loss of Agricultural Land.

Almost all of the development planned for East Sefton is on agricultural land, it is essential that this agricultural land is preserved for food production, protection of wildlife habitat and to protect the essential character of Sefton.

The planned developments will have a huge impact on traffic volumes through Maghull and will put an immense strain on the already busy roads and car parks in the area. Also, access to many of the services in Maghull, like banks, shops and sports facilities will be made much more difficult and frankly these services will be overcrowded and virtually unusable!

There will not be sufficient access to healthcare services in the newly proposed massive Sefton conurbation! The argument that 'market forces' will ensure that new GP's and dentists will be appointed to meet the increased demand is simply unrealistic

Implementation of the "Local Plan" site in East Sefton will result in the severe erosion of the boundaries between Maghull, Melling, Lydiat, Aughton Village and Kirkby.

This will generate one huge sprawling conurbation and the individual identities of these towns will be lost forever.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 529 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Vincent Bowe

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I urge the Inspector to go and look at the extent of the land it is proposed to develop for housing to the north east of Maghull. From Summerhill Primary to the north and east the farmlands are clearly prime agricultural lands and have been so from time immemorial. This is our bread basket, our food supply for the future. Some parts of our heritage must never be lost and prime agricultural land is perhaps the most important asset on this tiny UK island. Every bit of land is important.

Because of the dilatory approach of the Planning Department Maghull has been selected by the Planners to take the vast majority of housing need for the whole of Sefton. This is not a fair sustainable outcome for the people of Maghull. The whole nature and ethos of the existing town will be altered irrevocably if this plan goes ahead.

I would ask the Planning Inspector to examine the underlying financial implications in choosing Maghull. Maghull residents are the highest paying taxpayers under Sefton's current council tax regime and by a very substantial amount. Could this plan be the underlying motive by Sefton Council to double the size of the town but also to double the return of Maghull's Council Taxation? The only one's who would benefit will be Sefton Council.

I have lost count of the number of times Sefton Council have chosen to ignore the narrow lane, canal bridge and motorway connectivity of the vast majority of Maghull's infrastructure. This town will not readily lend itself to development unless this very serious question is addressed and costed.

You only have to look at the latest roadworks at Tesco's in Litherland, where to accommodate massively increased traffic to and from the Docks, when the new container terminal comes on stream later this year, Sefton Council have reduced southbound traffic to one lane.

This is the sort of thing we don't want to see in Maghull and we hope the Inspector will address this in their detailed examination on behalf of the public.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

A letter to Maghull Town Clerk 22/4/14

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I strongly object the plans put forward for the sites outlined in the Local Plan

In my mind, the sites outlined will cause the following problems:

- Increased noise
- Increased traffic including strain on the motorway network which at times is already congested – especially switch island. The local roads are poor quality, constricted by parked cars, only single carriageway and with many speed bumps already hampering traffic flow
- Increased pollution from traffic, litter
- Lack of a provision for a park or some open space in the new development
- Loss of habitat for wildlife, including potentially endangered species – we know that bats currently live in the area and could be a protected species
- Loss of countryside affecting peoples wellbeing - loss of walking area and green space
- Loss of drainage area - Adding to the already prolific flooding problems the area already has
- Shortage of shops
- Shortage of school places in the areas primary schools
- Lack of amenities – local retail parks are already at capacity for parking, especially weekends
- Cause increased strain on the local high schools such as those in Maghull
- Increased strain on public transport
- Increased strain on water supplies – water pressure in the area is already low. Also increased strain on power and gas networks
- Increased crime – Copy lane police station has been recently closed, more people = more crime
- Increased strain on local Fazakerley hospital
- Lack of fire stations in the area already – is Aintree fire station capable of covering the additional area
- There are abundant brownfield sites in and around the “greater Liverpool” area. There are run-down areas that NEED re-developing – WHY use the greenbelt land which was until recently, protected? I fear the real reason is because it is cheaper to ruin pristine countryside rather than regenerate dilapidated urban areas.
- The local area is already saturated with houses. Maghull, Melling, Waddicar and Aintree already have too many houses for the infrastructure currently in place to handle.
- People in the areas of Aintree, Melling, Maghull and Waddicar live in these areas for many positive reasons, but one is because of the nice green open space. I for one do not want to turn the beautiful countryside, which is of great community value to us all to turn into another concrete jungle. If we wanted to live in a city, there is a brilliant one just down the road - Liverpool.

It seems like hardly anyone knows about the above plans. I am certain that if they were better publicised, with greater public knowledge, there would be greater outrage at them. I strongly suggest that before making any sort of decision on these, the local people are truly involved in the decision making about the area people call their home.

I understand that other plans regarding development of the greenbelt have already been thrown out, including those put forward by Peel Holdings. I hope this is still the case. If not, this should be made clear and in my mind should not, and cannot come to fruition.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 552 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Susan Allen

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We do not need more houses in Sefton as the population is not increasing. There is no reason to build on Green Belt grade 1 agricultural land as we need this land to grow food (we would have to import more food) In Maghull and Lydiat there will not be extra facilities for the extra housing eg: schools, shops, GP services etc. The effect on the infrastructure of the area will be huge as it will affect the living standards of the area, wildlife, roads, areas used by the residents for leisure etc. There has been no thought put into how this will all affect the area in the future as the council are just looking at how much extra money they will receive and this is not a reason to destroy a pleasant and green area.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

It goes without saying the openness of the countryside would be adversely affected and eroded. Indeed, 2011 the amount of Green Belt for development in Sefton was 2.6%; from there it increased to 3.2% and then crawled to 3.6% before now landing on 4.4%.

Country Lanes are not robust boundaries and if the Turnbridge Road proposal was allowed the next robust boundary would be Southport Road, which is an A road to the north several large fields away. A similar situation arises to the east of Lydiat where lack of robust boundaries would lead to a 'doughnut' of housing encircling the current village of Lydiat. As the West Lancs border closely follows Lydiat in a rabbits ear shaped boundary the whole village could be developed in future up to the border.

I would also like to object to these proposed developments on the grounds of the quality of farmland in this area, which is described by an agronomist as being noted for its excellence of agricultural production. Once developed this land would be lost to farming. The UK already has a balance of payments deficit in international food trade. And security of supply has long been claimed as a national goal by governments. The soils here are classed as amongst the Best Most Versatile in the country and hence most valuable.

Given the NPPG advice that 'unmet housing need is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the 'very special circumstances' justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt' I hope you will agree with me that this is the case in this instance. I make this request especially as there are brownfield sites (some very large) in urban areas demanding development and regeneration for the sake of residents living in close proximity to eyesores and dangerous derelict works and areas of contaminated sites, now fenced off, from a less caring time. Some of these sites in the local plan are not scheduled for development for a despairingly long time. And it is clear that there will be a Green Belt first situation.

Should development be allowed on Green Belt land first there is the distinct possibility that the brownfield sites will lay unloved in a rust belt amongst family homes. It could be argued that the housing market in this area is supply led (Zoopla shows house price are falling now in L31) and if demand dries up the brownfields will not be enhanced. One site was given planning permission around 2004 but the developer let the permission lapse. This brownfield site consists of a number of old works, factories along the Hawthorne Road/ Canal corridor.

There is also an issue with the high number of vacant housing throughout the borough. Which is higher than the government's aims at 5822 over 4% of housing stock. One wonders if building so many new houses will lead too more vacant housing. When I asked about refurbishment I was told it would cost £90,000 per house. I found this strange given that a year earlier the price was said to be £35,000. There now appears to be large scale demolition of 2 bed housing in the Klondyke estate.

I would also like to draw your attention to both Maghull and Lydiat with regard to education and the Local Plan. There is also a real concern around the potential increase in school requirements. Sefton schooling officials claim (with some uncertainty) that the total average child yield for Sefton schools would be 32 per hundred households. They don't show where they acquired these stats. The average Child Yield for other authorities in the region would show the following numbers: Average Child Yield for primary school children equals 25 children per 100 households, 16 secondary school pupils per hundred households and 3 for upper school children. So this adds up to 526 extra school places in the primary sector alone resulting from the developments around Maghull and Lydiat.

I would suggest that tacking the odd classroom to existing schools may be inadequate. And children from other authorities in Sefton Schools have rights as do their younger siblings to Sefton education services.

Another concern throughout this area of Maghull and Lydiat (Park and Sudell Wards) is the predicted increase in traffic. To suggest that 4,000 extra vehicles would spread evenly through the day is very questionable and seems to defy the times of stress (rush hours) I find the comparison between residential areas and Switch Island also questionable. Switch Island has had millions of pounds and several adjustments to get the feeder roads to the level of today.

There is also a wide variety of wildlife supported by the fields around Lydiat. To the west fields support pink footed geese in the season and there are bats roosting near Bells Lane (reported to Sefton ecology) there are of course many other examples of habitats and wild life which would need to be taken into consideration.s present.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the local plan opposed by Sefton Council on the following grounds:-

Housing figures do not give "special circumstances" for building on the greenbelt. In Litherland and Bootle alone there is extensive house building. A school opposite Tesco on Hawthorne Road, Litherland was demolished. The land is still vacant. A new housing estate has been built on the old Hugh Baird College Site on Church Road, Litherland. The area known as Klondyke in Bootle is still undergoing development. There are numerous vacant houses still boarded up. Only recently The Priory Hotel in Litherland was demolished to pave way for more housing. The Liverpool Arms on Gorse Lane was demolished years ago and the land still remains vacant.

Taking the above into account, I see no reason why building on greenbelt for more housing should be given the go ahead in the Maghull/Lydiat area.

There would be the loss of the best and versatile agricultural land. Agricultural and forestry land should be protected. Once this is gone, we would lose it forever.

People would like to see more trees planted and more local produce grown/bred in the local area. This would help the environment by reducing food miles.

The openness of the countryside will be eroded. Having the openness of the countryside helps to tackle the huge challenges of climate change.

There would be the loss of wildlife and habitats.

Some people move away to escape the urban areas. Building on green belt land would mean the loss of the border with neighbouring authorities. The loss of green belt will create an urban sprawl which can be seen in other parts of Sefton where they have joined Lancashire.

Increased risk of flooding to existing properties.

There would be an increased volume in traffic on the roads which are already congested.

There would be an increase in pollution and carbon emissions — not good for the environment.

Additional housing would increase the pressure on services — Doctors, Dentists, Schools and Hospitals which are already over extended.

There are insufficient school places in the areas where housing has been allocated.

Having the open countryside provides a breathing place/escape for people and nature long into the future.

It is very clear that affordable housing will not be achieved and again the Council is relying on the developers. Building on greenbelt land will put a premium on the housing which will make them unaffordable.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 582 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Sheila Supple
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the local plan proposed by Sefton Council on the following grounds. The green belt in Lydiat and Maghull is grade 1 agricultural land which is being used to grow much needed food we can't continue flying food in from all around the world if this land is built on it is lost for ever. The schools in the area are full and it is difficult to get an appointment at the doctors. There are plenty of brownfield sites which should be built upon before our precious fields. There is also an increased risk of flooding which will impact on existing houses.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 584 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Lisa Edwards
Organisation Name Goose Meadow Farming Limited
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Object to housing development in Sefton East.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites

Respondent No 590 Response Ref 2 Representor Name Sheila Brown

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The roads in Maghull & Lydiat are already congested and with an increase in residents the town will be gridlocked, particularly during peak hours. This has significant impact especially around schools. It is very dangerous already with the cars packed tightly at school times it is only a matter of time before there are some serious accidents. An increase in population would have a major impact on this with all the increased vehicles.

There is a lack of proper drainage provision and support from United Utilities and this will result in possible flooding of the area.

We have no ambulance station - with increased traffic it will have impact on accessing emergency services. No Police station which makes the town a bigger target for criminals which this plan of building will create for a much larger population (some of which is social housing which brings its own problems)

There is already a lack of public transport. Without a car it is impossible to rely on what transport there is especially for people with mobility problems.. This being, the amount of cars that would be using the roads will only add to the problems of gridlock already mentioned but also add pollution to our environment. It is difficult to even get parked at the overused Train Station.

There is pressure on GP surgeries increasing the inability to get appointments.

One of the biggest arguments for me is the loss of our much loved greenbelt land. Not only is it valuable Agricultural Land which we may well need to rely on to grow the crops necessary to feed everyone. Producing these would mean fewer vehicles on the road transporting around the country and to here, what we can grow ourselves. This would cut down on Transport Costs, Motorway congestion.. I could go on. Most importantly it is fresh local produce.

Another implication will be of Council Tax rises which will be inevitable for Council Services.

Bill Esterson MP quoted "There's lots of issues and lots of questions which need addressing and I and my Labour Colleagues want all of the residents' concerns heard before any decisions are made" My starting point is that we should not have any major development in the green belt. The Labour Government after the war created the green belt to protect communities and to keep open spaces between towns and villages like those here in Sefton. I have said from the start of this whole process that we need to protect the Greenbelt. But I am afraid that Sefton's latest draft of the Local Plan does not do that and in my opinion does not benefit the people who live in Sefton." Although he recognised that people had concerns and it's wrong to build on Greenbelt all labour councillors voted for the plan. How can this be - they have gone against the residents concerns.

There are brownfield sites in Maghull which could be built on before destroying the green belt. I believe there are empty homes too that could be brought into use. Once our precious greenbelt land goes it has gone forever.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 592 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Teresa Baker
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am writing to confirm my objection to the SEFTON LOCAL PLAN.
I am a resident of Maghull and as such observe the already congested local roads on a daily basis. Even the thought of adding more traffic to allow access to the proposed building area makes me frustrated and filled with dread. My road is very narrow and is not coping with the cars parked outside houses as it is, never mind more traffic trying to get passed.

This is as well as the strain on our already full services such as doctors,schools,dentists and hospitals.

Then there is the obviously disastrous effect on the green belt and the associated farming and wildlife. Soon sefton will be one huge urban congested area without a green field or tree in sight, I can't believe you would consider destroying what green spaces we have left.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 608 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Angela Berry
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I do not believe that the plan is a Sound Plan for the following reasons:-
1. On 6th October 2014 the DCLG Eric Pickles re-affirms that Local Councils should protect green space and protect urban sprawl at bay through their local plans.
"This government has been very clear that when planning for new buildings, protecting our precious green belt must be paramount" Eric Pickles taken from The Planner RTP1.
2. Best agricultural land will be lost forever- when we should be utilising this for local produce and thus creating less food miles and less carbon omissions. This needs protecting for future generations
3. Lack of resource / infrastructure in Maghull there are already issues with school placements, Doctors and Dentist appointments are at a premium. In fact myself and partner after living in the Maghull area for 12 years have kept Doctors in our previous neighbourhood because of these issues.
4. Sefton council have as much of admitted that Affordable housing is not the priority if developers can't support the costs. Plans already submitted for Maghull behind the crescent ((currently rejected) stated a % affordable to be included, and these were three and 4 bed detached with some semis and three storey. Hardly affordable!
One developer Bellway homes is asking circa £100,000 more for the same style house in Formby than in Bootle .
5. Congestion is already at a peak in the Maghull area in rush hour with an extra 2000+ homes and a potential of thousands more cars this will become a logistical nightmare
6. Population figures for the Sefton borough have been way over estimated when taking the ONS figures into account. This, inspite of an ageing demographic in the area.
8. United Utilities have already said the can only cope with 30 new homes per year. The current plans are nearer to 5 fold this number.
7. Flooding Maghull and Sefton are low lying areas already having experienced flooding. Key sites such as the Land East of Maghull is a Critical Drainage Area, if that is built on the overflow will run down the various brooks to the Alt with a potential to flood homes en-route
8. Area of natural habitat and wildlife will be lost and the openness of the countryside eroded
9. Brownfield first must be adopted to protect our environment now and for future generations

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 652 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Barbara Graham

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to strongly object to Sefton's plans to obliterate valuable green belt land (which should without question be saved for future generations) in favour of housing. Housing that Sefton most certainly does not need in the volume stated. Having been a resident of Maghull for some 40+ years I feel justified in adding my voice to the many who are fighting to retain our precious green belt. There are more than enough brownfield sites that should be a natural first choice for limited housing. Maghull is at saturation point with housing. A small central shopping area which barely meets the needs of the present population. Roads that are gridlocked at peak times. Schools that are fully occupied. GP surgeries that are full to capacity.

I totally support CPRE in their observations, objections and commonsense suggestions.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd	MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites	
Respondent No 670	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Karen Williamson
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the local plan proposed by Sefton Council on the following grounds:

I live in a beautiful village called Lydiat. We are surrounded by Greenbelt, much of which is prime agricultural land. The only other area with such prime land is Somerset in the Southwest. Our council are very happy to allow developers to build on this land. What an absolute outrage, even if we forget about the local issues this raises, what about our Carbon Footprint, increasing the amount of food that will need to be imported once we lose this land, and when it is gone, it is gone forever?

2. This beautiful area will be spoilt. We are a village, the volume of houses that this plan proposes will result in an adverse impact on the character and identity of the local area.

3. The loss of greenbelt will inevitably create urban sprawl which can already be seen in other parts of Sefton where they have joined West Lancashire. I believe that even West Lancashire council have raised concerns regarding this with Sefton Council, who do not appear to be willing to listen to anyone.

4. I do not object to new homes being built, what I object to is the volume of homes that are being proposed, we do not need this huge development. Also, there are many empty homes that have not been taken into consideration in Sefton Planners projections. There are also many areas (all highlighted by local action groups to the planners) that need to be developed, but they have been ignored or discounted by the council, without, in my opinion, fair consideration. Put simply, I believe we need less homes than this plan proposes and there is enough Brownfield sites to accommodate all the developments that this area can sustain.

5. I wonder how many other councils have forced residents to make appointments to attend consultation evenings, and by the way, only a limited amount of appointments were made available. I would also like to know from our council why residents were excluded from a Stakeholder meeting. Planners and developers were invited, but residents were told that they were not welcome and if they attended they would not be allowed in, not even residents groups representing local people. Surely residents are the largest stakeholder of all? Also, everytime a residents group wanted to speak at a council meeting, they had to collect almost 3000 signatures for a 5 minute slot. This does not sound like a council who wants to listen to its residents.

6. It is clear that the infrastructure is not in place and that the local plan is relying upon the developers to ensure this is in place.

7. It is clear that affordable housing will not be achieved and again we are relying upon the developers. Building in the greenbelt will put a premium on the housing which will clearly make them unaffordable.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd	MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites	
Respondent No 671	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Jane Tasker
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I strongly oppose the building on green belt land in and around Maghull.

I strongly oppose the addition of any further traffic on our roads, already full enough, the schools are already full enough, the health facilities are already full enough. Don't ruin our area by building another 1500 homes in an area already full to capacity, don't spoil our countryside, build housing in areas that are deprived, run down and require modernisation and have capacity for further traffic and availability in schools and health centres.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiate Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiate sites**
Respondent No 673 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Kim Albanese
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am writing to express my disgust at the local plan for Maghull. I was fortunate enough to grow up in the lovely semi rural community of Maghull and have indeed settled here with my now grown children. Maghull has sadly changed immeasurably over the past 25years with one of the issues being the building on every scrap of land & now they want to use up precious green belt. Farming and green space was always part of Maghull's culture, heritage and appeal. Throughout Sefton there is plenty of areas that could be redeveloped, land that is suitable for building on in areas where it is already residential. It appears that no one should aspire to work hard and move up the housing ladder to nicer areas, it's just expected that affordable housing should be available

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiate Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiate sites**
Respondent No 689 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Mick Clarke
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Building on green belt goes against the unitary development plan published by Sefton in the 80s where green belt was to be protected. Maghull does not have the necessary infrastructure to support thousands of new houses. Schools do not have capacity, some roads regularly flood because drainage is inadequate. Most importantly, it is unfair for Maghull to have thousands of houses built on green belt, and Crosby, Bootle, Formby and Southport have less in total than Maghull alone. There are enough empty houses and brownfield land in the borough to accommodate additional housing. Sefton struggle to provide decent services as it is so please don't make matters worse

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiate Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiate sites**
Respondent No 690 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Louise Graham
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I totally disagree with the plans to build thousands of houses in Maghull.

I actually think it is outrageous and can't believe that anyone would ever think that this is an acceptable thing to do.

I have lived in Maghull for over 25 years and would hate for the recent development plans to ruin the lovely place I call home.

I sincerely hope the plans are disregarded and Maghull is left to be the place it always has been without monstrous housing plans wrecking it.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiate Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiate sites**
Respondent No 691 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Jennifer Wright
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I stand by all the reasons for objecting to this plan. Loss of green belt when there seems plenty of alternatives. The increase in population, traffic and all other inconveniences. If Maghull/Aintree are full then they are full. This will reduce the rateable value of my property, no longer the area I first bought into. On a personal level, I am facing major work on my house as the front is subsiding, along with immediate neighbours properties, so seems to be not a good idea to plan more building and further stress all amenities.

Not enough thought has been given to residents wishes and reason for not wanting this plan to go ahead.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiate Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiate sites**
Respondent No 699 **Response Ref** 4 **Representor Name** P O'Hanlon
Organisation Name Maghull and Lydiate Action Group
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

THIS IS A SUMMARY
Because Maghull and Lydiate are low-lying, we already experience serious flooding issues. The drainage systems are old, and struggle to cope with current demand. Adding pressure to these systems will cause further problems. United Utilities budget will only allow provision for 30 new houses in Maghull each year. Put simply, more concrete, more flooding.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiate Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiate sites**
Respondent No 724 **Response Ref** 5 **Representor Name** Paula Keaveney
Organisation Name Sefton Central Liberal Democrats
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The development suggested for the Maghull and Lydiate areas is completely out of scale with the needs of these areas. It would also mean losing high grade agricultural land.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 743 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Enid and Paul Hoole

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Having resided in Maghull for 38 years, we have seen many changes, not all for the better. The biggest change, in our opinion, has been the increase in traffic and the impact this has had on the infrastructure. Our first objection to the plan, therefore, is that there will undoubtedly be an increased volume of traffic on the roads, which are already congested. Along with the increased traffic, there will be an increase in pollution, noise pollution and carbon emissions.

The loss of green belt in Sefton is a great concern to us. Once green belt land is built upon it is lost forever. If left unchanged, the local plan will see a minimum of 2000 homes plus a business park in the Maghull and Lydiat area, in the first phase. Our understanding is that the next phase will include green belt land. Not only will this mean the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land but also the loss of farming communities and food production for the future. We have already seen the loss of wildlife and habitats with increased urbanisation of the borough. The local plan will be devastating to wildlife and habitats, and the openness of the countryside will be further eroded. Why isn't Sefton opting for a "brown field first" policy, like other Boroughs?

Furthermore, United Utilities say they can only cope with a maximum of 30 homes per year. We face years of construction chaos, following on from the chaos that exists around Switch Island, gridlock, overcrowded schools and, in some cases, flooding!

There has not been sufficient public consultation. Our councillors should listen to the concerns of local residents. The local plan should recognise that Sefton is unique and has limited land to build on due to environmental constraints: Coast Line, SSIs, National Trust, Golf Courses and large areas which are natural flood plains.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiate sites**

Respondent No 746 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Sandra Halligan

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The local plan lists a great number of houses and even a retail park to be built in Maghull but does not address the problem of overcrowding and the lack of facilities to deal with a large increase in population. From my experience it is already very difficult to obtain a doctors appointment without having to wait 3 or more days and the situation at the Maghull Health clinic is even worse.

The local traffic around Maghull is already close to gridlock at times especially at the rush hours morning and evening. Switch Island and the roads leading into this overcrowded roundabout such as Dunning Bridge Road and the A 59 are already at a very slow stop / start situation. The new road from Switch Island to Thornton at present under construction will we are told improve the situation but this I honestly doubt. This road has been years in planning and the opening is already 5 months overdue and will in my opinion just add to the problems at switch island as more traffic comes up the new road from Formby and Crosby.

Reports indicate that there is space for 6000 houses on brown land in Sefton and this should be used first before land around Maghull designated green belt. There are areas in Bootle that are being allowed to degenerate to almost slum condition instead of being improved by rebuilding.

Also the calculation of the required number of new building is by new reports an over estimation. But once green belt protection is removed the land will not be returned to agricultural use even if found not required for Building. Green belt land should be released gradually when it is fully proved to be necessary.

Also the available Brown land in Sefton is I think more suitable for lower cost affordable housing. Maghull is the highest cost area for Council Tax, maybe this is why council has marked Maghull for such a large number of houses, so developers will I believe not build affordable first time houses here in Maghull.

Local plan does not have any real plan to deal with proper improved drainage to prevent flooding. Maghull has some problem with flooding / drainage and the building of all these extra houses will just make this worse unless a proper well designed plan is put in place. The system of building houses on top of some type of water tanks for water storage and later drainage is really a poor unsuitable method.

I hope that present Sefton Plan is not passed as suitable and that plan is amended / modified taking into account all local concerns.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiate sites**

Respondent No 747 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Katie Halligan

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Short list of main objections that need to be modified / added to plan.

The number of planned houses to be built on green land is excessive. There is space for 6000 houses on brown land in Sefton and I think this should be used first before taking green belt land.

Also the number of planned houses seems more than required. The estimate used by council does not seem accurate when the latest figures are examined.

The local plan should include plans of increased local facilities. As the mother of 3 young children my concerns include school places, play areas, number of GP Doctors available and the local plan does not seem to address any of these.

Local plan also needs to take into account the possibility of flooding and ensure that proper drainage of new and present areas of housing is fit for use. Some places in Maghull do have a problem with flooding / drainage. I have been told that the location planned for building 1400 houses is at a bad drainage area.

Also I am worried about the increase in traffic that will be in and around Maghull. First of all there will be heavy contractors lorries whilst building work is in progress and plan does not seem to have any planned access to building sites and this traffic will be using our residential roads. I am also concerned about the reported possible increase of traffic of container lorries coming up from Liverpool dock area to a proposed container storage hub close to the motorways off switch island.

These are my main concerns but I do feel that the plan at present does need amending and additions made to ensure that Maghull remains a pleasant residential area.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 748 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Brian Halligan
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection
Summary of Main Issues

First concern is the amount of increased traffic that can be expected with the large increase of population around Maghull. Traffic congestion at rush hours is already a daily event. Also I understand that a container park is planned and this will mean large heavy traffic to and from Maghull to the dockland Container terminal via Switch Island and Dunning's Bridge Road.

Local plan does not contain a suitable plan to deal with the problem of drainage and flooding. Maghull already has some problem with flooding and the drainage from the large area planned for building 1400 houses will add to the level of the River Alt causing a significant rise in the water level which will affect the areas downstream that already drain to this river. I have been informed that United Utilities have a plan to deal with an annual increase of just 30 houses a year and the local plan calls for 3 times that number each year.

Local plan calls for green belt land to immediately be released for building especially around Maghull. There is no incentive for developers to make use of the brown land in Sefton by upgrading areas that have old houses and other buildings that are already falling into a poor condition. Why take away good land that can be used for agriculture and let some areas that will soon become an eyesore go unimproved. The brown land should be improved before green belt land is released. Sefton has an estimate for 6000 homes that can be built on brown land.

Also whilst I agree that houses need to be built I think that the planned number for Sefton is beyond the requirements for this area. Sefton is not a large industrial area and the population increase in this area is not as large as areas around other larger cities.

Also I do not think that the present Local plan deals with many other items that should be included. Any plan should include provisions for Local Shopping areas. Primary and Secondary Schools, Play areas including football and cricket pitches, tennis courts, swimming pools etc. Maghull has a number of these (although the swimming pool is very small) but with the large increase of population if all these homes are built these amenities must be planned to increase.

I hope that present local plan will be returned so that improvements can be made and concerns of the local people dealt with and not just be ignored.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 755 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Eric Calvert
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I strongly object to the Sefton Local Plan. This land is Green Belt and should not be built on. The land is of very high quality agricultural soil and should not be built upon. Brownfield sites be used before and Green Belt land should even be considered to be built on. There are plenty of bf sites even if it costs more money, they should be used first. No GB land should be built until all the bf sites have been used.

I also think we have a problem with drainage if this land was to be built on.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd	MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Respondent No 759	Response Ref 1	Representor Name
--------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I WOULD LIKE TO OBJECT TO THE LOCAL PLAN PROPOSED BY SEFTON COUNCIL ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS:

1. The loss of green belt land to sefton
2. Increased volume of traffic, especially regarding the proposed 40 new houses at the end of Turnbridge road. All building traffic will be routed through Green Park as the existing swing bridge has a weight limit. Obviously the planners have not done their homework as Green Park has two primary schools attached to it and excessive building traffic will create a dangerous risk to school children and residents alike. Also the recent poor L.E.D. lighting upgrade will increase the risk of accidents with increased traffic.
3. There are enough brownfield sites
4. Added pressure on Doctors ,Dentists Schools and Hospitals.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd	MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Respondent No 760	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Jennifer Burke
--------------------------	-----------------------	--

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I WOULD LIKE TO OBJECT TO THE LOCAL PLAN PROPOSED BY SEFTON COUNCIL ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS:

1. The loss of green belt land to sefton
2. Increased volume of traffic, especially regarding the proposed 40 new houses at the end of Turnbridge road. All building traffic will be routed through Green Park as the existing swing bridge has a weight limit. Obviously the planners have not done their homework as Green Park has two primary schools attached to it and excessive building traffic will create a dangerous risk to school children and residents alike. Also the recent poor L.E.D. lighting upgrade will increase the risk of accidents with increased traffic.
3. There are enough brownfield sites
4. Added pressure on Doctors ,Dentists Schools and Hospitals.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to register my strongest objection to that part of the plan which affects Maghull. My reasons are as follows:

1. Most of the proposed development will take up greenbelt areas which are also Grade 1 agricultural land. Apart from its use as a food producer, the greenbelt defines MAGHULL — a now sizeable town having grown from a scattered village in the last sixty years. A great deal of land has already been taken in the building of the town. It is not rich in open spaces and, therefore, the greenbelt around it offers a welcome open area for the townspeople. To develop the huge piece of land in School Lane would create the kind of urban sprawl by means of which a conurbation becomes a featureless smudge on the map. Places with their own character should be kept apart. The borough of Sefton is not a homogeneous place — it is made up of distinct localities put together to form a bureaucratically acceptable municipal unit. Citizens would rarely say they come from Sefton — they 'come from' Maghull of Formby or Southport etc.

2. The government requirement to build 11,000 houses in Sefton is entirely notional — places should grow organically according to need. Then they should be sited largely on 'brown sites' of which there are plenty in Sefton. I note that the present government has made an election pledge to place development on brown sites.

3. If the plan goes ahead, Maghull will be expected to accommodate 2105 houses of which 1400 will be sited at School Lane (East Maghull). This is a massive number of units to absorb. Also there are plans for a business park at the same place — quite unsuitable for this residential area.

4. Imagine the effect of this scale of building on the physical problems that will be created. Maghull is a low-lying area where drainage is already a headache. How will water be provided and waste disposed of?

5. There are social considerations. Two thousand homes means seven or eight thousand people. Our present educational facilities are full. We can expect an extra two thousand vehicles (at least) on our roads. If the 30% share of housing development (which is Maghull's 'share') goes ahead, will the Council guarantee that the extra facilities required are in place before they are needed?

6. A final point. There is something wilful in this scheme. Not only is Maghull threatened both in the east and the north of the town. There is also a proposition to develop a huge piece of land (the 'Peel' plan) to the West of Maghull. Even our local, Labour M.P. (Bill Esterson Esq.) is opposed to these propositions. At local level these proposals are made and ratified by a Council and commercial interests which seem to have little understanding or empathy with the citizens of Maghull.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to register my strongest objection to that part of the plan which affects Maghull. My reasons are as follows:

1. Most of the proposed development will take up greenbelt areas which are also Grade 1 agricultural land. Apart from its use as a food producer, the greenbelt defines MAGHULL — a now sizeable town having grown from a scattered village in the last sixty years. A great deal of land has already been taken in the building of the town. It is not rich in open spaces and, therefore, the greenbelt around it offers a welcome open area for the townspeople. To develop the huge piece of land in School Lane would create the kind of urban sprawl by means of which a conurbation becomes a featureless smudge on the map. Places with their own character should be kept apart. The borough of Sefton is not a homogeneous place — it is made up of distinct localities put together to form a bureaucratically acceptable municipal unit. Citizens would rarely say they come from Sefton — they 'come from' Maghull of Formby or Southport etc.

2. The government requirement to build 11,000 houses in Sefton is entirely notional — places should grow organically according to need. Then they should be sited largely on 'brown sites' of which there are plenty in Sefton. I note that the present government has made an election pledge to place development on brown sites.

3. If the plan goes ahead, Maghull will be expected to accommodate 2105 houses of which 1400 will be sited at School Lane (East Maghull). This is a massive number of units to absorb. Also there are plans for a business park at the same place — quite unsuitable for this residential area.

4. Imagine the effect of this scale of building on the physical problems that will be created. Maghull is a low-lying area where drainage is already a headache. How will water be provided and waste disposed of?

5. There are social considerations. Two thousand homes means seven or eight thousand people. Our present educational facilities are full. We can expect an extra two thousand vehicles (at least) on our roads. If the 30% share of housing development (which is Maghull's 'share') goes ahead, will the Council guarantee that the extra facilities required are in place before they are needed?

6. A final point. There is something wilful in this scheme. Not only is Maghull threatened both in the east and the north of the town. There is also a proposition to develop a huge piece of land (the 'Peel' plan) to the West of Maghull. Even our local, Labour M.P. (Bill Esterson Esq.) is opposed to these propositions. At local level these proposals are made and ratified by a Council and commercial interests which seem to have little understanding or empathy with the citizens of Maghull.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

At a meeting on 22 January 2015 Sefton's Local Plan was approved by Labour Councillors, this meeting was a complete farce. Sefton residents presented nearly 10,000 signatures and were allowed 3x5 minute speeches. This was a complete waste of time as we now know that the decision to approve the Local Plan had already been taken by the Labour Councillors prior to the meeting. Sefton Council has been undemocratic in the whole process and are not representing the electorate.

Sefton's Local Plan lacks imagination, is badly thought out and will destroy the present community. This Sefton Local Plan is not what the Sefton community wants and I believe Labour Councillors are using this as a political football to put the blame on the current Government.

Official figures show Sefton population is on the decline, the figures used for the recent consultation by Sefton Council were wildly exaggerated and thoroughly misleading, there is no demand for extra housing on the green belt. The development on the scale proposed by Sefton Council is absurd. Maghull would lose its identity and character altogether as the proposed houses would almost double the size of the town and create a massive urban sprawl. This proposed Local Plan and the scale of development would have a damaging longterm effect on the health and well-being of the existing community and affect the social stability of the area in general.

Furthermore Sefton Council has refused to adopt a 'brownfield first' policy even though there are sufficient brownfield sites available to accommodate 6,000 homes. There are also 6,000 empty properties in Sefton which is criminal in itself, these should be brought back in to use which would help and build on existing communities. Improving these properties would provide a better place for people to live, work and enjoy their leisure time. Derelict land, unimproved properties attract vandals and anti social behaviour and store up trouble for the future.

Sefton has some of the best agricultural land in the country. In Maghull and Lydiat we have Grade One agricultural land, the most productive land for growing crops and as such is a precious resource, once this is concreted over it will be lost for ever. We need to be a sustainable country, 20% of England's Grade One agricultural land is in Sefton, we cannot afford to lose this land. Recently, schools, hospitals, public service organisations, government departments were instructed to cut down on imported food and buy British instead, how can we be self sufficient if our agricultural land is lost forever.

The areas of Maghull and Lydiat are low-lying and can be subject to flooding at times. There have been serious drainage problems in recent years any further concreted areas would only add to the pressure on the present systems.

There has been no consideration regarding the infrastructure which would have to be in place to support this number of additional homes. The area of Maghull and Lydiat is constrained by narrow roads and canal bridges which was recognised by Sefton Council itself. I live by two schools and the roads and canal bridges are completely blocked at school times and already causing major problems in this area. Listening to Labour Councillors at Sefton Planning Meeting and again at the Local Plan Meeting, Sefton Labour Councillors seem to think that the infrastructure will happen by magic if they get this plan approved.

Building as proposed in the Local Plan would have a devastating effect on the natural habitat and wild life in this area in general with an increase of pollution and massive swathes of concreted areas. In my immediate area people spend their leisure their time walking, cycling, fishing, bird watching, nature trails, etc. A recent survey highlighted the increase in the bird population, notably pink-footed geese which have started to frequent the area since the flooding in the last few years.

Local services such as hospitals, doctors, dentists are already at breaking point how would they cope with this sort of development and increase in patient numbers. Schools would not be able to cope with the increased numbers of children.

Developers have no interest in the future well being of the community, they just want to make a quick profit and move on. Sefton Council should be making decisions in the interest of the community not in the interest of the developers.

I urge you to reject the proposed Sefton Local Plan and the damage and devastation this would cause to my community.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

At a meeting on 22 January 2015 Sefton's Local Plan was approved by Labour Councillors, this meeting was a complete farce. Sefton residents presented nearly 10,000 signatures and were allowed 3x5 minute speeches. This was a complete waste of time as we now know that the decision to approve the Local Plan had already been taken by the Labour Councillors prior to the meeting. Sefton Council has been undemocratic in the whole process and are not representing the electorate.

Sefton's Local Plan lacks imagination, is badly thought out and will destroy the present community. This Sefton Local Plan is not what the Sefton community wants and I believe Labour Councillors are using this as a political football to put the blame on the current Government.

Official figures show Sefton population is on the decline, the figures used for the recent consultation by Sefton Council were wildly exaggerated and thoroughly misleading, there is no demand for extra housing on the green belt. The development on the scale proposed by Sefton Council is absurd. Maghull would lose its identity and character altogether as the proposed houses would almost double the size of the town and create a massive urban sprawl. This proposed Local Plan and the scale of development would have a damaging longterm effect on the health and well-being of the existing community and affect the social stability of the area in general.

Furthermore Sefton Council has refused to adopt a 'brownfield first' policy even though there are sufficient brownfield sites available to accommodate 6,000 homes. There are also 6,000 empty properties in Sefton which is criminal in itself, these should be brought back in to use which would help and build on existing communities. Improving these properties would provide a better place for people to live, work and enjoy their leisure time. Derelict land, unimproved properties attract vandals and anti social behaviour and store up trouble for the future.

Sefton has some of the best agricultural land in the country. In Maghull and Lydiat we have Grade One agricultural land, the most productive land for growing crops and as such is a precious resource, once this is concreted over it will be lost for ever. We need to be a sustainable country, 20% of England's Grade One agricultural land is in Sefton, we cannot afford to lose this land. Recently, schools, hospitals, public service organisations, government departments were instructed to cut down on imported food and buy British instead, how can we be self sufficient if our agricultural land is lost forever.

The areas of Maghull and Lydiat are low-lying and can be subject to flooding at times. There have been serious drainage problems in recent years any further concreted areas would only add to the pressure on the present systems.

There has been no consideration regarding the infrastructure which would have to be in place to support this number of additional homes. The area of Maghull and Lydiat is constrained by narrow roads and canal bridges which was recognised by Sefton Council itself. I live by two schools and the roads and canal bridges are completely blocked at school times and already causing major problems in this area. Listening to Labour Councillors at Sefton Planning Meeting and again at the Local Plan Meeting, Sefton Labour Councillors seem to think that the infrastructure will happen by magic if they get this plan approved.

Building as proposed in the Local Plan would have a devastating effect on the natural habitat and wild life in this area in general with an increase of pollution and massive swathes of concreted areas. In my immediate area people spend their leisure their time walking, cycling, fishing, bird watching, nature trails, etc. A recent survey highlighted the increase in the bird population, notably pink-footed geese which have started to frequent the area since the flooding in the last few years.

Local services such as hospitals, doctors, dentists are already at breaking point how would they cope with this sort of development and increase in patient numbers. Schools would not be able to cope with the increased numbers of children.

Developers have no interest in the future well being of the community, they just want to make a quick profit and move on. Sefton Council should be making decisions in the interest of the community not in the interest of the developers.

I urge you to reject the proposed Sefton Local Plan and the damage and devastation this would cause to my community.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

At a meeting on 22 January 2015 Sefton's Local Plan was approved by Labour Councillors, this meeting was a complete farce. Sefton residents presented nearly 10,000 signatures and were allowed 3x5 minute speeches. This was a complete waste of time as we now know that the decision to approve the Local Plan had already been taken by the Labour Councillors prior to the meeting. Sefton Council has been undemocratic in the whole process and are not representing the electorate.

Sefton's Local Plan lacks imagination, is badly thought out and will destroy the present community. This Sefton Local Plan is not what the Sefton community wants and I believe Labour Councillors are using this as a political football to put the blame on the current Government.

Official figures show Sefton population is on the decline, the figures used for the recent consultation by Sefton Council were wildly exaggerated and thoroughly misleading, there is no demand for extra housing on the green belt. The development on the scale proposed by Sefton Council is absurd. Maghull would lose its identity and character altogether as the proposed houses would almost double the size of the town and create a massive urban sprawl. This proposed Local Plan and the scale of development would have a damaging longterm effect on the health and well-being of the existing community and affect the social stability of the area in general.

Furthermore Sefton Council has refused to adopt a 'brownfield first' policy even though there are sufficient brownfield sites available to accommodate 6,000 homes. There are also 6,000 empty properties in Sefton which is criminal in itself, these should be brought back in to use which would help and build on existing communities. Improving these properties would provide a better place for people to live, work and enjoy their leisure time. Derelict land, unimproved properties attract vandals and anti social behaviour and store up trouble for the future.

Sefton has some of the best agricultural land in the country. In Maghull and Lydiat we have Grade One agricultural land, the most productive land for growing crops and as such is a precious resource, once this is concreted over it will be lost for ever. We need to be a sustainable country, 20% of England's Grade One agricultural land is in Sefton, we cannot afford to lose this land. Recently, schools, hospitals, public service organisations, government departments were instructed to cut down on imported food and buy British instead, how can we be self sufficient if our agricultural land is lost forever.

The areas of Maghull and Lydiat are low-lying and can be subject to flooding at times. There have been serious drainage problems in recent years any further concreted areas would only add to the pressure on the present systems.

There has been no consideration regarding the infrastructure which would have to be in place to support this number of additional homes. The area of Maghull and Lydiat is constrained by narrow roads and canal bridges which was recognised by Sefton Council itself. I live by two schools and the roads and canal bridges are completely blocked at school times and already causing major problems in this area. Listening to Labour Councillors at Sefton Planning Meeting and again at the Local Plan Meeting, Sefton Labour Councillors seem to think that the infrastructure will happen by magic if they get this plan approved.

Building as proposed in the Local Plan would have a devastating effect on the natural habitat and wild life in this area in general with an increase of pollution and massive swathes of concreted areas. In my immediate area people spend their leisure their time walking, cycling, fishing, bird watching, nature trails, etc. A recent survey highlighted the increase in the bird population, notably pink-footed geese which have started to frequent the area since the flooding in the last few years.

Local services such as hospitals, doctors, dentists are already at breaking point how would they cope with this sort of development and increase in patient numbers. Schools would not be able to cope with the increased numbers of children.

Developers have no interest in the future well being of the community, they just want to make a quick profit and move on. Sefton Council should be making decisions in the interest of the community not in the interest of the developers.

I urge you to reject the proposed Sefton Local Plan and the damage and devastation this would cause to my community.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to object to the Local Plan proposed by Sefton Council. The plan is not sound because it is not consistent with national policy for the following reasons

Loss of the Greenbelt

All 3 sites proposed for Maghull and Lydiat serve 4 of the 5 purposes of greenbelt land;

To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another

To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and urban land.

All the land proposed contains the best and most versatile agricultural land in country. It is short sited to use land that is needed for food production whenthe National Farmers Union recently sent out a warning that the UK is importing more food than ever before and we risk being unable to feed ourselves in times of crisis.

Building over 2000 homes in Maghull and Lydiat is out of all proportion to their current sizes and demand at this level for homes is not there.

Proposals to build business parks on greenbelt land cannot be justified when the net increase in local employment opportunities can only be small and likely to result in minimum wage jobs. These should be built on brown field sites of which there are many throughout Sefton. Giving away the best agricultural land in the country because it's location is strategically convenient for business interests needs rethinking.

Infrastructure

As Sefton's local plan outlines, a significant number of commuters still travel to work by car. You only have to approach Switch Island at rush hour to see this in action. Maghull railway station is full by Barn and the station platform and trains get overcrowded. There are severe limitations to the road system surrounding Maghull and Lydiat because of the canal bridges which are single lane. Traffic gets stacked up particularly around school sites. If a new railway station ever gets built it won't be until 500 houses have been completed. So the first residents will have no option but to use cars to travel to work.

The Overview and Scrutiny report (December 2014) raises valid concerns about the ability of utility companies to provide the necessary infrastructure to service such large sites as their business models are dependent on market forces and investment. This could mean half completed sites dotted around the borough as United Utilities struggle to cope with the demand placed upon them.

Health Services

Lydiat has no GP or dental surgery and the ambulance station has been relocated to Netherton. GP surgeries in Maghull already struggle to provide timely appointments as an ageing population inevitably places more demand on health services. One of the aims of the Local Plan is to attract a younger population to the borough. Antenatal and maternity services for Maghull and Lydiat and the whole of South Sefton are located either at Ormskirk hospital in West Lancs or the Womens hospital in South Liverpool. The maternity unit at Fazakerley hospital was closed many years ago. An increase in demand for these services at the same time as West Lanes plans for population growth would place a strain on these already stretched services.

Schools

Schools in Maghull and Lydiat are at capacity. The Local Plan makes assumptions that Summerhill School which is nearest to the MN2.46 site can build upwards to accommodate new entries. This would entail severe disruption to the children's daily lives. It states that Lambshear Lane school in Lydiat near the MN2.28 site could be extended by taking up part of the playing field. Playing fields are vital to the health and wellbeing of children. To suggest removing one for more building is at odds with other aims of the Local Plan to protect green spaces.

The Local Plan needs to be revised and scaled down to reflect real need not some projected need in the future which makes assumptions that all the planned homes can be sold/ occupied. George Osbourne's plan to allow pensioners to cash in their annuities will lead to more buy to let opportunities for them. What is to stop developers selling new homes in this way. Also infrastructure needs to be guaranteed. There should be no building on greenbelt until all the brown field sites have been independently assessed and graded. These sites will already have various levels of infrastructure which can be re- utilised. We need affordable homes / starter homes for first time buyers but giving developers the right to decide whether they are viable as they have on the MN2.46 site cannot be justified.

Given the level of cuts meted out to local authorities over the past 5 years there must be real concern about the ability of Sefton's planning department to monitor a development plan on this scale. I doubt if the budget of Sefton's planning department can be ring fenced and by the time the council gets the new homes bonus into it's coffers it will be too late.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to object to the Local Plan proposed by Sefton Council. The plan is not sound because it is not consistent with national policy for the following reasons

Loss of the Greenbelt

- All 3 sites proposed for Maghull and Lydiat serve 4 of the 5 purposes of greenbelt land;
- To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas
- To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another
- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and urban land.

All the land proposed contains the best and most versatile agricultural land in country. It is short sited to use land that is needed for food production whenthe National Farmers Union recently sent out a warning that the UK is importing more food than ever before and we risk being unable to feed ourselves in times of crisis.

Building over 2000 homes in Maghull and Lydiat is out of all proportion to their current sizes and demand at this level for homes is not there.

Proposals to build business parks on greenbelt land cannot be justified when the net increase in local employment opportunities can only be small and likely to result in minimum wage jobs. These should be built on brown field sites of which there are many throughout Sefton. Giving away the best agricultural land in the country because it's location is strategically convenient for business interests needs rethinking.

Infrastructure

As Sefton's local plan outlines, a significant number of commuters still travel to work by car. You only have to approach Switch Island at rush hour to see this in action. Maghull railway station is full by Barn and the station platform and trains get overcrowded. There are severe limitations to the road system surrounding Maghull and Lydiat because of the canal bridges which are single lane. Traffic gets stacked up particularly around school sites. If a new railway station ever gets built it won't be until 500 houses have been completed. So the first residents will have no option but to use cars to travel to work.

The Overview and Scrutiny report (December 2014) raises valid concerns about the ability of utility companies to provide the necessary infrastructure to service such large sites as their business models are dependent on market forces and investment. This could mean half completed sites dotted around the borough as United Utilities struggle to cope with the demand placed upon them.

Health Services

Lydiat has no GP or dental surgery and the ambulance station has been relocated to Netherton. GP surgeries in Maghull already struggle to provide timely appointments as an ageing population inevitably places more demand on health services. One of the aims of the Local Plan is to attract a younger population to the borough. Antenatal and maternity services for Maghull and Lydiat and the whole of South Sefton are located either at Ormskirk hospital in West Lancs or the Womens hospital in South Liverpool. The maternity unit at Fazakerley hospital was closed many years ago. An increase in demand for these services at the same time as West Lanes plans for population growth would place a strain on these already stretched services.

Schools

Schools in Maghull and Lydiat are at capacity. The Local Plan makes assumptions that Summerhill School which is nearest to the MN2.46 site can build upwards to accommodate new entries. This would entail severe disruption to the children's daily lives. It states that Lambshear Lane school in Lydiat near the MN2.28 site could be extended by taking up part of the playing field. Playing fields are vital to the health and wellbeing of children. To suggest removing one for more building is at odds with other aims of the Local Plan to protect green spaces.

The Local Plan needs to be revised and scaled down to reflect real need not some projected need in the future which makes assumptions that all the planned homes can be sold/ occupied. George Osbourne's plan to allow pensioners to cash in their annuities will lead to more buy to let opportunities for them. What is to stop developers selling new homes in this way. Also infrastructure needs to be guaranteed. There should be no building on greenbelt until all the brown field sites have been independently assessed and graded. These sites will already have various levels of infrastructure which can be re- utilised. We need affordable homes / starter homes for first time buyers but giving developers the right to decide whether they are viable as

they have on the MN2.46 site cannot be justified.

Given the level of cuts meted out to local authorities over the past 5 years there must be real concern about the ability of Sefton's planning department to monitor a development plan on this scale. I doubt if the budget of Sefton's planning department can be ring fenced and by the time the council gets the new homes bonus into it's coffers it will be too late.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd	MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites	
Respondent No 770	Response Ref 1	Representor Name
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Our objections to the Local Plan in Maghull are several and are as follows:

The infrastructure along the proposed main road, from the motorway, is not capable of supporting such a large development in what is a relatively small town. There is only one road linking this proposed development, directly to Maghull Town Centre. This is already a very busy road with existing traffic to and from the motorway from Kirkby. Along this 1.5 mile stretch there are 13 side roads, all of which service a large population of elderly people and young children and all vehicles in use. Three of these roads are also 'feeder' roads, bringing people in and out of Maghull by bike, car and bus.

When the new railway station is built, if and when that happens, will only exacerbate the problem with more traffic and pedestrians.

Where will the extra vehicles park in Maghull Centre? Parking for the shops is already difficult with present volumes.

The proposed housing development is too far from existing schools to be practical for most families.

Arranging an appointment to see a doctor or dentist even now requires more time than is acceptable.

With regard to the business park and retail centre, why does Maghull even need one? We already have 3 of these within 2 miles of Maghull TC.

These proposals appear to be about satisfying the ambitions of developers, Local Councillors. The Councillors who support these proposals need to take heed of the wishes and needs of the voters who put them there and re-think the proposals.

Some months ago we attended a meeting in Maghull TH about these very developments. At this meeting representatives of the developers were there but not a Council member. Enough said.

This particular proposal appears to be lop-sided and more suitable smaller brown field sites could prove more acceptable.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 771 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Lynn Allen

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am writing to object to Sefton's proposed plans to build on GB in Maghull.

Apart from good farming land it will create more congestion in Maghull with the proposed build of thousands more homes, thus causing more problems around schools, doctors, shops etc which at the moment are a nightmare to pedestrians and motorists.

I have always been proud to say I live in Maghull because of the lovely surrounding countryside but if these plans go ahead we might as well say we live in Kirkby, Bootle or Liverpool.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 772 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Paula Robinson

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to put forward my objection to the local plan proposed by Sefton council to build 1500 homes (at minimum) on our greenbelt land. Initially put in place to prevent urban sprawl this land represents the unique personality and identity belonging to Lydiat and Maghull. The local population, many of which have lived here their entire lives, are mainly unaware of this plan in its entirety and the serious consequences it holds both during the potential building process, with the inevitable disruption that may last for half a dozen years, to its completion and the multiplying of population that will add to an already stretched for services community we experience today. The vagueness surrounding the subject of infrastructure and how this might be tackled is extremely

worrying and the lack of proposed plans towards catering for this increased population with basic services such as doctors, schools, employment etc. makes the whole plan seem like it belongs to a fairy tale from Brother Grimm's. I agree we have a housing shortage and know many local people, like myself, who have older children that have never been able to buy or rent in their home town. I would love my grandchildren to live local enough for me to have more involvement in their lives and to help my son or daughter in their busy working time of life bringing up young children.

The total of proposed homes is blatantly not for the benefit of the local community it is far above the scale of need. This plan is based on the free market and is profit-driven ignoring the very people it has been made in the name of. It does not lie compatible with saving any 'eco footprint' and will destroy the habitat for many animals, insects, plants and trees and could be put to much superior use as allotments, small or large scale farming for local produce and many open space projects benefitting young and old (the list is endless). I propose the possibility of food shortages in the future and our very special agricultural land as our only viable source for local communities or even a two tier marketing business venture involving locally sourced products for health and wellbeing with employment for all ensured and the coming together of young people with energy and strength alongside older members full of experience and wisdom. Is this a prettier fairy tale? This is a reality for certain communities.

Mostly I propose that every brownfield site and every empty home that already exists in Sefton (especially Bootle) is made use of first and foremost and building of homes to a more realistic amount with the full attention of the local citizens included remould be a fairer way to solve our house 'crisis'. This could be a time for communities to take more control of their areas with involvement and responsibility not everyone wants to be part of huge national free market profit driven entities.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 776 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Alan and Karen Range
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

This plan is ill conceived for a whole host of reasons too numerous to mention, however the following are some of my major concerns

The amount of green belt land which will disappear is phenomenal

This green belt land acts as a natural drainage plain and the consequence will be flooding of local areas on a large scale resulting in damage to the local environment, housing and the ensuing increased home insurance costs. The local water courses which drain surface water are already struggling to cope, this plan will cause further environmental problems

The amount of additional traffic on our roads will be considerable. These roads are already severely congested.

The added pressure on services such as schools, GP surgeries, Dentists, hospitals etc will be considerable.

There will be considerable loss of farming communities and food production for the future.

Maghull and Lydiat will be turned into one mass of urban sprawl rather than an attractive area to live with accessible open spaces and local countryside.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 778 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Alan W and Mary Range
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

This plan is ill conceived for a whole host of reasons too numerous to mention, however the following are some of my major concerns

The amount of green belt land which will disappear is phenomenal

This green belt land acts as a natural drainage plain and the consequence will be flooding of local areas on a large scale resulting in damage to the local environment, housing and the ensuing increased home insurance costs. The local water courses which drain surface water are already struggling to cope, this plan will cause further environmental problems

The amount of additional traffic on our roads will be considerable. These roads are already severely congested.

The added pressure on services such as schools, GP surgeries, Dentists, hospitals etc will be considerable.

There will be considerable loss of farming communities and food production for the future.

Maghull and Lydiat will be turned into one mass of urban sprawl rather than an attractive area to live with accessible open spaces and local countryside.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites

Respondent No 779 Response Ref 1 Representor Name John Ramsden

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Lydiat has a falling population (as does Sefton) and this is will continue

The main house building took place from 1955 until the early 60s and the first occupants were mainly young couples. They raised their families from the 1960s onward.

In many cases the parents remained and are now in their late 70s or 80s.

A snapshot of the nearest houses illustrates the point. They were all built as 3 bed-roomed semi-detached houses though several have had extensions to give a fourth bedroom.

6 have single elderly occupants (widows/widower)

10 are occupied by elderly retired couples

2 have middle-aged couples

3 have couples with young adult off-spring living with them

5 have couples with school age children

More than half of these houses will be coming up for sale as ageing takes its toll. (18/26 would class as under-occupied under local authority rules.)

The local estate agents always have in excess of 50 properties for sale in Lydiat and adjacent Maghull with prices from £70,000 for flats, £120,000 for mid-terraced houses and £150,000 for 3-bedroomed semi-detached houses.

I doubt that any new houses could be built for less.

Facilities

Lydiat can offer very few facilities to attract new people.

There are: no Banks

no Post-offices

no G.P. practices

no Dentists

no Station

no Garages for M.O.T. servicing or repairs

no Youth Club

no Secondary School

and virtually no shops.

Originally 3 areas of shops were built. One row of shops was converted to houses in the 1960s and the 2 remaining zones contain mainly services. What in the past were shops selling everyday needs now include 2 ladies hairdressers, a beauty salon, a dog grooming parlour and a funeral directors. This row now has the only pharmacy in Lydiat and 3 shops.

Employment

There is very little employment in Lydiat - apart from housing the area is largely rural with farms, market gardens and nurseries. The area is listed as Grade 1 agricultural land. There is some seasonal picking work but the major employers are the 3 local junior schools.

Any building on this valuable land will reduce employment prospects in the long term, cause yet more congestion on local roads, increase the dangers of flooding by concreting over yet more of this flood plain.

I submit that Sefton has not produced any valid argument for house building in Lydiat. I believe that there a large number of unoccupied houses in Sefton that could be modernised or the land could be used for new building as well as available brownfield sites instead of using Grade 1 agricultural land.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 783 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** K Puckey

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am concerned about the Local Plan and the damage and traffic carnage it will cause.

We have lived in Maghull and Lydiat for over 10 years. I have experienced the problems increasingly to obtain school places, doctors, and other services. These are at breaking point.

Please leave our lovely and much needed farm land to our childrens future. Follow the advice of of the government to utilise brownfield land and empty properties in consultation with local services and shops etc. Don't make Maghull a second concrete Kirkby.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 788 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Pradip Patel

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I believe the Local Plan has not been thought through and clearly there has been little consideration for local residents.

- Local roads will not cope with the increased volume of traffic.
- My grandson is coming up to school age and there is already high demand for places at our local schools. There is not enough places at local schools to support the increased demand development will bring.
- Local roads in Maghull and Lydiat and other infrastructure CANNOT support the level of proposed expansion. I drive on the A59 to work every day to Netherton and this road is already busy with morning traffic — with increased traffic it will be chaos.
- Central Square in Maghull is already at capacity with car parking. Morrisons in Maghull is another carpark that is always full. The public services are already running at capacity. It makes no sense to expect them to cope with increased demand.
- If our local GPs have to register more patients, this will increase the waiting time for a GP appointment, something I feel very strong about as I get older. It is already impossible to get a parking space at Westway Medical Centre. How are elderly patients to be expected to get to doctor's appointments on time?
- The local land is HIGH GRADE agricultural land, it is stated in the top 2% in the country. Why build on this? Surely there are alternative Brown field sites that would be more suitable and sensible. Why is Sefton not proposing this, like other Boroughs?

It appears this Local Plan will benefit developers only, yet it is existing residents that will suffer in the long-run, long after developers have left.

Please consider local, existing residents who live here with families. I urge you to take my concerns seriously as well as others from local residents as we will have to live with the consequences long after developers have gone. Once green belt land is built upon, it is lost forever.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I believe the Local Plan has not been thought through and clearly there has been little consideration for local residents. Local roads will not cope with the increased volume of traffic. My nephew is coming up to school age and there is already high demand for places at our local schools. There is not enough places at local schools to support the increased demand development will bring. Local roads in Maghull and Lydiat and other infrastructure CANNOT support the level of proposed expansion. I drive on the A59 to work every day to Netherpton and this road is already busy with morning traffic — with increased traffic it will be chaos. Central Square in Maghull is already at capacity with car parking. Morrisons in Maghull is another carpark that is always full. The public services are already running at capacity. It makes no sense to expect them to cope with increased demand. If our local GPs have to register more patients, this will increase the waiting time for a GP appointment, something I feel very strong about as my parents get older. It is already impossible to get a parking space at Westway Medical Centre. How are elderly patients to be expected to get to doctor's appointments on time?

The local land is HIGH GRADE agricultural land, it is stated in the top 2% in the country. Why build on this? Surely there are alternative Brown field sites that would be more suitable and sensible. Why is Sefton not proposing this, like other Boroughs? Like many local residents we enjoy greenbelt land as a place to walk our dogs and keep fit. I care about my health and do feel increased traffic, congestion and development will cause more local pollution, with negative health implications and will cause significant adverse effects on the lifestyle of many local residents.

It appears this Local Plan will benefit developers only, yet it is existing residents that will suffer in the long-run, long after developers have left.

Please consider local, existing residents who live here with families. I urge you to take my concerns seriously as well as others from local residents as we will have to live with the consequences long after developers have gone. Once green belt land is built upon, it is lost forever.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites

Respondent No 799 Response Ref 1 Representor Name Mariane Patel

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Please accept this email as my own personal objection to Sefton's Local Plan.

I believe the Local Plan has not been thought through and clearly there has been little consideration for local residents.

1. Local roads will not cope with the increased volume of traffic.
2. My grandson is coming up to school age and there is already high demand for places at our local schools. There is not enough places at local schools to support the increased demand development will bring.
3. Local roads in Maghull and Lydiat and other infrastructure CANNOT support the level of proposed expansion. I drive on the A59 to work every day to Netherton and this road is already busy with morning traffic — with increased traffic it will be chaos.
4. Central Square in Maghull is already at capacity with car parking. Morrisons in Maghull is another carpark that is always full. The public services are already running at capacity. It makes no sense to expect them to cope with increased demand.
5. If our local GPs have to register more patients, this will increase the waiting time for a GP appointment, something I feel very strong about as I get older. It is already impossible to get a parking space at Westway Medical Centre. How are elderly patients to be expected to get to doctor's appointments on time?
6. The local land is HIGH GRADE agricultural land, it is stated in the top 2% in the country. Why build on this? Surely there are alternative Brown field sites that would be more suitable and sensible. Why is Sefton not proposing this, like other Boroughs?

It appears this Local Plan will benefit developers only, yet it is existing residents that will suffer in the long-run, long after developers have left.

Please consider local, existing residents who live here with families. I urge you to take my concerns seriously as well as others from local residents as we will have to live with the consequences long after developers have gone. Once green belt land is built upon, it is lost forever.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 802 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** M O'Hanlon

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

What special circumstances will allow over 2000 houses, 2 distribution centres and a retail park, all on prime agricultural land in Maghull and Lydiat. This land is the country's finest growing land and will be lost forever once built upon.

We have enough brownfield sites in Sefton to build over 6,000 houses and over 6,000 houses lie empty. This is plenty to satisfy the future needs of this Borough.

The Green Belt was evolved to protect villages, towns and cities from merging together in an urban sprawl, protecting people's health and environment and protecting our wildlife and their habitats. We would have no crops at all without this wildlife to pollinate our plants. Animals and insects throughout the world are drastically in decline due to human interference.

We are already a high risk flood area. Concreting over our natural land drainage system will only increase our chances of flooding.

We import 60% of our food at present. By using our protected Green Belt/agricultural land for development, we will have to import more of our food. Given the political climate worldwide and global warming, this agricultural land will be a priceless asset, not only now but more so for future generations. We will not be forgiven for being reckless with our children's and their children's future.

The Local Plan theme emphasis is on reducing the carbon footprint. This is totally misleading. Every house built and the energy they consume, every car and lorry on the road will increase dramatically our carbon footprint. Even the world's largest container ships, bringing containers to Seaforth Docks, which are banned from main Europe and the United States, will increase pollution/CO2 affecting the health of people in Bootle and surrounding areas.

We do not have the infrastructure in place to accommodate large numbers of extra properties. Our schools, doctors, dentists are all over-subscribed and our roads are badly congested at peak times. The village roads and canal bridges were built for horse and cart, not for what is planned.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Maghull Labour Action Group Leaflet Summer 2011

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites

Respondent No 804 Response Ref 1 Representor Name P O'Hanlon

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We have some of the best quality agricultural land in this country. Once it is built upon, it will be lost forever. As world resources become scarcer, this land will become even more valuable. We already import 60% of our food in this country and this percentage will increase still further. To be so dependent on other countries is foolish with political instability, unpredictable global warming, volcanic and tsunami effects, etc. Where would we then get our food from?

Lydiat is a village and Maghull a small town. We are presently surrounded by green belt. Encroachment on to this green belt/agricultural land would result in an urban sprawl from Liverpool City Centre through to the borders with West Lancashire. Lydiat and Maghull have many listed buildings, one dating back as far as 1320. It is important to preserve our identity and our historic heritage for future generations.

Sefton has enough brownfield sites to build an additional 6,000 properties and a further 6,000 properties lie empty in Sefton. Why are Sefton Council refusing to adopt a "brownfield first policy"?

Present infrastructure in Maghull and Lydiat is inadequate. We do not have a Doctor's Surgery in Lydiat and have never had one. Our only Dentist's Surgery has now closed. We have witnessed both our local Post Offices being shut down in recent years. Maghull shopping centre is a positive disgrace. Former Council occupied buildings lie derelict in Maghull Centre, namely Bryant House, former Maghull Library and Stafford Moreton Youth Centre. A purpose-built Police Station in Maghull and an Ambulance Station in Lydiat have both closed. Our narrow roads are at full capacity now at peak times and getting in and out of the area is a positive nightmare.

Additional/improved infrastructure has just not been thought out by this Council. They prefer to leave it to the generosity of the developers which will just not happen. Sefton Council's own Infrastructure Working Group have expressed grave concerns about future infrastructure provision. In particular they have questioned the degree and extent of the implementation of enforcement measures to ensure that new developments include the essential infrastructure, services and facilities and the ability of the infrastructure providers to provide the necessary funding.

Maghull and Lydiat currently experience flooding issues because they are low-lying. Additional development will place a further burden on drainage systems, particularly as United Utilities have admitted they only have funding for 30 new houses per year. During the last bout of flooding in 2012, some residents were absent from their homes for 15 months. Our climate is changing and our part of the world is becoming wetter.

It is a known fact that green spaces are essential to health and well-being. Those who live further away from cities generally enjoy a longer life expectancy.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 806 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** B Newell
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The current Local Plan needs a rethink. The build up of traffic on our roads will be worse with many more lorries than ever before. The corner of Deyes Lane/Eastway and Deyes Lane shops is a serious accident waiting to happen.

Who is going to buy all these houses and why so many? By the Councils own forecast the population in Maghull and Lydiat has fallen. There must be a re-think.

To say it already to get a doctor's appointment is putting it mildly. Schools we really going to have more schools built. I remember well the closure of a grammar school here in Maghull.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 808 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** C Maylor
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I oppose your plan to build homes in Lydiat and Maghull. I realise homes have to be built but there are other more suitable locations, e.g. Buckley Hill, Netherton.

The area in which I grew up is full of greenery and wildlife. I wish to ensure children have the same opportunity to enjoy the surrounding environment as I did.

Schools, doctors and dentists are already bursting point. My family and I have to travel to St Helens Town Centre to see a HNS dentist as this is the nearest one that has spaces. Imagine the impact of new house developments in Lydiat and Maghull on dentists alone.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 810 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Paul Martin
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

- I wish to raise my objection to the SEFTON LOCAL PLAN for the following reasons.
- A. The loss of Seftons green belt with the effects on farming, wildlife and future food production.
 - B. Maghull and Lydiat lack the required infrastructure for circa 2000 new houses.
 - C. The current roads are congested already. Many of the roads are too narrow to take the HGV's exiting the M58. Consideration must also be given to the added noise pollution and carbon emissions.
 - D. Use the brownfield area's to prevent further urban sprawl.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 811 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** D Seddon

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I object very strongly to Sefton's Local Plan, I feel the proposed number of new houses are not required, we have hundreds of houses in Formby and throughout Sefton for sale, there is no demand for housing in this area. There are plenty of brownfield sites in Sefton that need to be cleaned up and regenerated without touching our top grade crop producing farm fields. We have hundreds of empty houses in Sefton that should be refurbished and brought back into use. This would bring employment to local people and help local supply companies.

All land around Formby is within the greenbelt, if you exclude coastline; National Trust land; golf courses; sports facilities; RAF Woodvale; MOD Altcar training camp; horticultural greenhouses; Mersey-rail land; and riding stables; what's left is high-grade, arable, farm land that provides the UK with good quality food. There is no need to build on this land.

Downholland Brook and The River Alt discharge into the Irish Sea just beyond Formby, these large rivers stretch for over 100 miles, when the North West gets a lot of rain the two rivers are full to bursting, Formby's water cannot enter the rivers due to the height of water and the flap valves being closed, (Water Locked) water then backs up into Formby causing flooding. If builders are allowed to build on this flood land by raising the ground artificially by 1 to 2 meters then existing houses will store this water in there houses and gardens.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 813 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Roy Martin

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to raise my objection to the Local Plan for the following reasons.

A. The loss of Seftons green belt with the effects on farming, wildlife and future food production.

B. Maghull and Lydiat lack the required infrastructure for circa 2000 new houses.

C. The current roads are congested already. Many of the roads are too narrow to take the HGV's exiting the M58. Consideration must also be given to the added noise pollution and carbon emissions.

D. Use the brownfield area's to prevent further urban sprawl.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 815 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Dorothy Martin
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to raise my objection to the SEFTON LOCAL PLAN for the following reasons.
A. The loss of Seftons green belt with the effects on farming, wildlife and future food production.
B. Maghull and Lydiat lack the required infrastructure for circa 2000 new houses.
C. The current roads are congested already. Many of the roads are too narrow to take the HGV's exiting the M58. Consideration must also be given to the added noise pollution and carbon emissions.
D. Use the brownfield area's to prevent further urban sprawl.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 816 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Alexandra Martin
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to raise my objection to the SEFTON LOCAL PLAN for the following reasons.
A. The loss of Seftons green belt with the effects on farming, wildlife and future food production.
B. Maghull and Lydiat lack the required infrastructure for circa 2000 new houses.
C. The current roads are congested already. Many of the roads are too narrow to take the HGV's exiting the M58. Consideration must also be given to the added noise pollution and carbon emissions.
D. Use the brownfield area's to prevent further urban sprawl.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 823 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Ann Logan
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I have lived in Maghull for 40 years and wish to register my heartfelt objection to proposed plans for unnecessary plans for additional housing in our lovely Green Belt.

I feel that a brownfield first policy in the Local Plan should be introduced. By doing this it will not have as much impact on loss of wildlife and habitats which will be protected if the countryside is not eroded.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd	MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Respondent No 827	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Carol Sahin
--------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to make an objection to the Sefton Local plan. This plan, if implemented, will greatly change the area in which we live for the worse.

There are so many reasons why this ill thought out "plan" should not be allowed. It proposes building in the Melling and Aintree area that will have a dreadful effect on already congested roads. Due to traffic at the Aintree Retail Park we are already cant move at weekends. Two of the three major routes out of Aintree rely on single lane bridges. There are no plans to change this so any increase in traffic will only add to a worsening problem. I live in Altway and can barely get my car out of my path. Neither Melling nor Aintree has the appropriate infrastructure to take further building. We have no social amenities to speak of. Our bus services are limited to daytimes and are non-existent at weekends.

These issues are also reflected in our school. Aintree schools are oversubscribed with siblings having to attend different schools. There are no plans to improve this situation and building more houses will make this situation worse.

My husband and I find it difficult to get a GP appointment at the moment and this will only get worse if the area grows without any new infrastructure.

Our area already floods and building will make it worse. Everybody knows this but nobody is listening to the residents. The green belt will be ruined for no reason and it will be too late then. What about air quality?

The site on Wango Lane is totally unsuitable for building houses. I know surveyor's (and councillors?) who accept this privately. There is a waste pipe through the centre of it for goodness sake.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd	MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Respondent No 839	Response Ref	Representor Name Denise Forrest
--------------------------	---------------------	--

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

In my own particular area [Lydiat] the population growth projections have fluctuated with each draft plan. The area has been assessed by the local Parish Council as not having the scale of housing need shown in the Local Plan.

The plan has as one local observer has noted 'an inward looking Mersey-centric approach' to the disadvantage of such communities as Lydiat connected to the neighbouring communities in West Lancashire.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 847 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Ken Smith
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object the the Local Plan on the following grounds:

The loss of Greenbelt in Maghull and creating urban sprawl which has already occurred in the borough. The number of proposed new homes in Maghull compared to its size would totally change its character. The loss of top grade and most versatile agricultural land. The openness of the countryside will be eroded. There are enough brownfield sites in Sefton to accommodate the housing.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 849 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Elaine Smith
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object the the Local Plan on the following grounds:

The loss of Greenbelt in Maghull and creating urban sprawl which has already occurred in the borough. The number of proposed new homes in Maghull compared to its size would totally change its character. The loss of top grade and most versatile agricultural land. The openness of the countryside will be eroded. There are enough brownfield sites in Sefton to accommodate the housing.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd	MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Respondent No 852	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Rhona Simon
--------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to strongly OBJECT to the above plan.

In my opinion the amount of houses planned for Maghull, far outweigh the need. It is certainly not acceptable to build on our local GREEN BELT which is top grade farming land. Our country needs to increase its agricultural output, not reduce it. There are brownfield sites in Sefton which should be considered first. Also there are many unoccupied properties in the borough which should be used.

Lots more houses mean lots more people! Our doctor's surgeries are already overstretched and our schools are full. The extra cars on our roads will increase pollution.

We already have drainage problems in Maghull when it rains heavily many places flood. When fields are saturated the water drains away gradually into the many streams and ditches of the area, subsequently into the nearby river. The vast amount of new properties will mean that the water systems may well be unable to cope. According to United Utilities they can only cope with 30 properties per year being connected to the drains of the area. We have not had assurance from Sefton that they have a plan IN PLACE to deal with these problems.

Apart from the motorway nearby and main dual carriageway which divides the town, most of the approach roads are narrow, with many country lanes. The amount of extra traffic the local plan will bring will cause much congestion and pollution to our community.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd	MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Respondent No 855	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Peter Robinson
--------------------------	-----------------------	--

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I have lived in Maghull for 45 years. We are proud of our community. We have seen how it has evolved over the years, some of it good, some of it not so good. So it was with amazement to see this Local Plan being proposed for the future of our borough. Nightmare scenario for a developers charter is a more fitting title for these proposals. They are definitely not in the interests of our community. The thought of a giant business park and distribution centre being built on agricultural land that will be lost forever so close to the town and the problems of pollution and congestion it will create defies belief.

Over 2000 homes to be built in Maghull and Lydiat with more Green Belt land and agricultural land being lost forever. Surely there are brownfield sites that can be used first. Developers are going to have a field day in the borough. The local infrastructure is surely not capable of supporting this massive change to our town and surrounding area. Schools, doctors, dentists, services, transport etc will become harder to access. The disruption to the borough if this becomes a reality will have an adverse effect on the well-being of our community for years to come. Add to this the proposal for fracking in the nearby countryside and this is indeed a nightmare scenario.

I would ask the local planners to think of their local communities wishes and not dictate from remote politicians in Westminster and go back and find a more practical, realistic and sensible community friendly local plan that fits the needs and aspirations of the local community. Once our green spaces are gone they are lost forever. If this current local plan was to be implemented it would turn our borough into a blot on the landscape.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd	MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Respondent No 929	Response Ref 1	Representor Name
--------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com

Summary of Main Issues

I first came to live in Maghull in 1950, in those days Maghull was governed by Maghull Rural district council. We were a close knit community of only 18,000 people. Nearly everybody knew everybody else. We knew all the shop-keepers + people who worked in our village by their first name.

As the years went by, things began to change, fields and orchards we enjoyed walking through were sold for housing + some shops. We understood that a certain amount of land was required to settle people who were back from the 2nd world war so they could settle down to family life but unfortunately things started to accelerate and now we have reached a stage where we risk losing what is left of our beautiful countryside. This state of affairs has now gone too far and our quiet habitats have become noisy + sometimes frightening places to move about in.

Roads have become congested with traffic and my road (Hall Lane) especially so, almost like a motorway: we cannot afford to allow this situation to get any worse + we must not lose any more of our precious open spaces or we suffocate. Please do not permit this to happen to what remains of a pretty small town. We have undergone a large amount of cuts. The Ambulance station has gone, the emptying of dust bins has become frustrating and erratic.

Police are nowhere to be seen except in and it is also becoming difficult to set an appointment to see the Doctors. Schools are full to capacity. This cannot be right, enough is enough!

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd	MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Respondent No 932	Response Ref 1	Representor Name E Brady
--------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Like to see a Brownfield first policy in local plan. Small communities are losing their identities, they are being blended together. Maghull has been melting into Lydiat, plan will have Maghull moving east into Melling and Lydiat stretching forth into Aughton.

Sefton Local Plan makes no mention of Social housing. Are all these new homes to be built by private developers? Do the council or Housing associations going to have any say in this matter?

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 942 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Janet Watson
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I object to building on the green belt in Lydiat and Maghull area.

There are only 3 doctors surgeries in Maghull. There would have to be more GP surgeries for the influx of new residents. Have we enough schools in the Lydiat/Maghull area to accommodate the children of the new residents? Presuming that the majority of the new residents will be younger people with young families. At the moment we have a rising birthrate. The national press are stating that there will be a knock on effect for the children who are now in the primary schools when they progress to the senior schools. Have we enough senior schools in the Maghull area for the children of the new residents? The councillors need to go down to Maghull station at 3:30 pm to see how many Maricourt pupils are travelling out of maghull to the Old Roan, Aintree and Orrell park areas. There is no senior school in melling so the melling children are also travelling to Maghull for education.

At the moment deposits for buying houses are so high the property market is a rental market. Are these new houses going to sell? The government have got a scheme to help first time buyers. The roads in the Lydiat/Maghull area are going to be much busier because of these new residents.

The councillors need to go to the KenyonLane/Lambshear area at rush hour to see how much traffic there is. There is a continual flow of traffic . The motorists are just passing through the area. I have lived in this area since 1973 (42 years) I enjoy seeing the countryside near to my home and I am totally against Sefton Council building in our green belt area.

I think these plans (ie the infrastructure have not been totally thought through by Sefton Council.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 944 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** S Pendleton
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The no of houses, business park, forensic clinic [sic] is ridiculous. We have one road which comes from Kirkby passed "Ashworth" This is grid locked at school times and commuters now. Cant get a Dr's appointment now, we do not want all our green land built on it is too big housing etc for Maghull. I am 69 and lots of pensioners will be affected by this enormous disruption to our Maghull all extra traffic etc.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 952 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Matthew Smith
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the local plan proposed by Sefton Council on the following grounds-
The loss of green belt in Maghull and creating urban sprawl which has already occurred in the borough. The number of proposed new homes in Maghull compared to its size would totally change its character. The loss of top grade and most versatile agricultural land. The openness of the countryside will be eroded; There are enough brownfield sites in Sefton to accommodate the housing.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 953 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Lesley Smith
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

OBJECTION TO SEFTON'S LOCAL PLAN

I am writing to object to the local plan proposed by Sefton council on the following grounds:
The National Planning Policy Framework stipulates that Greenbelt land must only be released under exceptional circumstances. There are no such exceptional circumstances within Sefton. We would lose the open aspect of the countryside.

Maghull and Lydiat would lose their character completely, as urban sprawl occurred. Traffic in Maghull and Lydiat is already beyond the point of capacity. These areas could not cope with an increase. There would not be sufficient school places to accommodate an increase in population. Doctor and dentist surgeries are already at capacity.

There would be an unacceptable increase in carbon emissions and pollution arising from the volume of homes set out in the Local Plan. There is an existing flood risk across most of Sefton, which is low lying. This would be exacerbated if the building of such a volume of new houses was implemented.

The figures arrived at by Sefton council are inaccurate and have no sound basis. A 'Brownfield first policy should be adopted if any building were to take place. The current high volume of empty properties should be allocated before any building is considered. No fair public consultation has been undertaken. Sefton Council are known to have destroyed a survey which showed that its residents did not agree with the draft plan.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd	MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Respondent No 954	Response Ref 1	Representor Name T Williams
--------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I object to Sefton's proposed local plan on the following grounds:

Sefton council are not adhering to the guidelines set out in the N.P.P.F, which clearly states that

greenbelt should only be released under exceptional circumstances. There are no such exceptional circumstances.

Currently, 60% of our food is imported. It is imperative that we retain the means to produce our own food for present and future generations. Proposed sites would obliterate large tracts of high quality agricultural land.

Sefton's character would be changed forever, with small town and villages like Maghull and Lydiat encroaching on neighbouring town boundaries. Sefton would also encroach on the West Lancs border.

Extra traffic resulting as consequence of proposed building would produce an unacceptable level of pollution. Sefton's carbon footprint would increase drastically. Sefton council would be reliant upon developers to ensure necessary changes in infrastructure would be put into place.

There would be insufficient school places and medical facilities such as doctor and dentist surgeries in Maghull and Lydiat to adequately serve an increase in population as proposed. The numerous low lying areas in Sefton would be at increased risk of flooding. The current drainage system struggles to cope.

The population of Sefton has been shown to be decreasing, not increasing. This brings into question the need for any housing at all.

Over 6,000 dwellings in Sefton lie vacant. These should be utilised first before any further building is inflicted upon Sefton. Sefton council have refused to adopt a 'Brownfield first' policy. There are currently spaces on Brownfield sites to accommodate approximately 6,000 houses.

Sefton council have ignored the wishes of its residents, who have clearly demonstrated dislike of the corrupt Local Plan by way of petitions containing around ten thousand signatures, which were gathered within just a couple of weeks.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd	MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Respondent No 955	Response Ref 2	Representor Name E Williams
--------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

There are no 'special circumstances' for release of Sefton's greenbelt (National Planning Policy Framework).

Maghull is at capacity and cannot cope with large scale, unnecessary building; Maghull and Lydiat are constrained by the Leeds-Liverpool canal. Our narrow bridges cannot be widened and struggle to cope with current traffic volume.

There is no evidence to suggest the need for 11,000 new homes in Sefton. To the contrary, over 6,000 homes lie vacant, and existing brownfield sites are available to accommodate what is surely a more realistic figure; The loss of greenbelt would result in urban sprawl; Our drainage system would be unable to cope with such an increased demand.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 958 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** P Waring

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The amount of green belt land which will disappear is phenomenal. This green belt land acts as a natural drainage plain and the consequence will be flooding of local areas on a large scale resulting in damage to the local environment, housing and the ensuing increased home insurance costs. The local water course which drain surface water are already struggling to cope, this plan will cause further environmental problems.

The amount of additional traffic on our roads will be considerable. These roads are already severely congested. The added pressure on services such as schools, GP surgeries, Dentists, hospitals etc will be considerable. There will be considerable loss of farming communities and food production for the future. Maghull and Lydiat will be turned into one mass or urban sprawl rather than an attractive area to live with accesible open spaces and local countryside.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 959 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Christine Walker

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am writing to object to the Sefton Local Plan which I believe is severly flawed. My main objection to the Plan is the inclusion of houses to be built on greenbelt land. I believe that this is absolutely wrong, not only for this area but for our entire country. While I fully accept that Sefton needs more houses I believe that the Sefton Plan should adopt a Brownfield first policy.

The greenbelt in Lydiat and Maghull consists of the best agricultural land in the country. It would be very foolish of us to build on this land while there are any other sites that could be built on first. It may be easier for developers to be given a large greenbelt site to build on but this plan should consider what is best for this community and this country, not what enables developers to make most profit.

There is very little greenbelt left between Lydiat and Ormskirk now and I believe that as a nation we should do everything we can to maintin our green and pleasant land and the farming communities and wildlife that live there.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Regret that I object to the present Sefton Local Plan as I consider it not fit for service. My main objections are as follows:-

The amount of green land planned for development may sound a very small percentage, however Maghull area where I live is earmarked to build the greatest number of houses and also a retail park. Maghull will be losing a lot of good agricultural green land which I do not think is necessary.

The number of planned houses to be built on green land seems excessive. Reports indicate that there is space for 6000 houses on brown land in Sefton and also there is a large number of empty houses available in Sefton even some in the Maghull area. Also the calculation of the required number of new building is by many reports an over estimation. However once green belt land is released it will not be returned to agricultural use even if found not required for building. I believe that green belt land should be released gradually when it is fully proved to be necessary.

The local plan should in my opinion ensure that brown land is used before a great amount of green belt land is lost and should include a requirement that if a developer requests to build on released green belt land that he should also be required to also build a percentage on brown land. The available Brown land in Sefton is I think more suitable for lower cost affordable housing. I have grandchildren who are having to move out of the Maghull area as even the cheaper houses in Maghull area are too expensive for many first time buyers. Maghull is a fairly expensive area so that if developers build smaller cheaper houses (which I tend to think they will not do in Maghull) they will still be out of the budget of many first time buyers.

Local plan does not address a lot of issues. Maghull does have a problem with flooding / drainage. The location planned for building 1400 houses is at a critical drainage area. I believe that this area draining to the river Alt will cause a significant rise in the Alt river water level which will affect the present areas draining into the Alt River further downstream. It is reported that United Utilities have at present available facilities / plans to deal with an extra 30 houses per year around Maghull area. Plan is for a much greater number than this but has no information / requirements on dealing with this drainage issue.

Local plan also does not deal properly with the required extra local facilities that will be required with such a large increase in houses / residents. Already the situation with GPs and Medical Centre is oversubscribed. Frequently it is necessary already to wait a week for an appointment at the GP surgery and / or Maghull Medical Centre and the delays can only increase with the planned increase.

I am also concerned about the probable problems of access for the building contractor's large vehicles to the proposed sites. Due to the weight restrictions for vehicles crossing the small bridges over the Leeds / Liverpool canal it will be necessary at some locations for these heavy vehicles to be driven through residential areas.

These are only my main concerns but I do feel that our present council, although going through the motions, are ignoring the feelings of a great number of the local residents and I hope that at the next stage the local plan will be sent back for modification / amendment by the Inspector so that we eventually have a good Local Plan that sensibly covers all areas / concerns.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites

Respondent No 965 Response Ref 1 Representor Name Tracy Smith

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Infrastructure.

Much of Lydiat and Maghull consists of narrow lanes, constrained in many places by the Leeds-Liverpool canal with swing bridges at the canal crossings. These crossings are narrow, restricted and completely unsuitable for heavy traffic, and the surrounding lanes are often congested at peak times. To take specific examples: anyone who travels by road during peak hours on a school day around Lambshear Lane/Sandy Lane in Lydiat, or between the A59 and the railway station in Maghull, knows that those narrow roads are already congested and frequently at gridlock, with buses, refuse lorries and (potentially) emergency services completely unable to get through. Consider the impact of increasing that congestion by adding over 2,000 families, with all the extra traffic that implies.

Sefton Council's Local Plan states that it will "restrict uses (of land) that have a negative impact on health, e.g. those that cause pollution and result in high traffic levels in sensitive areas - such as residential areas, schools..."

Yet (to take an example), a large development is planned around Kenyons Lane/Lambshear Lane (site MN2.28), with a much larger "safeguarded" site (MN8.1) set aside for possible future development. There are three schools in the immediate vicinity of these sites - Lydiat Primary School, Lambshear Lane; St. Gregory's, Sandy Lane, and St. Thomas's Church of England school (directly abutting on site MN2.28). The impact of 295 additional houses (from MN2.28 alone), generating probably at least 300 more cars on the road, would add significantly to the existing peak-time traffic and congestion in this area. Sefton Council's Site Assessment concedes that this issue constitutes a "moderate" constraint and recognises that the "cumulative effects with other proposed sites in Lydiat and Maghull would need to be assessed".

The following is from Sefton Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Regeneration and Environmental Services) Infrastructure Working Group Final Report (December 2014):

"The proposed major development in Maghull could generate up to 4000 additional vehicles on the highway network and (it is difficult to see how the network could cope..." "Surveys undertaken in Maghull identified that a large percentage of respondents were concerned about highway infrastructure issues associated with new development. It was difficult to understand how the effects of 4000 additional cars in east Maghull could be mitigated."

(The response to this comment - from a Team Leader in the Strategic Transportation Planning Unit - was somewhat bizarre: "This figure sounds a lot but spread out throughout the day it could be done." It is intriguing to speculate as to how exactly this "spreading" would be managed! Will Maghull and Lydiat residents be given staggered times to begin and end their school or working day?).

School places

Working on the basis of 32 children per 100 households, the proposed developments around Maghull and Lydiat alone could result in a demand for around 640 more places in local schools, where places are already, limited.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiate Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiate sites**
Respondent No 970 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** S Lee
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

To whom it may concern, regarding the new developing in Maghull, I object to strongly! In 1946 what attracted my husband and I to Maghull was its green fields and village, (like we left in Ireland). My children played in these fields, my grandchildren and a few months ago my lovely great grandson. I would dearly like to finish my days in the place I've loved and still be able to enjoy the open land and fields.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiate Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiate sites**
Respondent No 971 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** M Kearney
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Objection. Lydiate and Maghull
Already enough housing. Infrastructure cannot sustain any more new builds. New Houses in Lamshear lane empty and unfinished. Crime to build on such excellent farm land in the country. Use brown field sites.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiate Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiate sites**
Respondent No 976 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** J Lammond
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I OBJECT TO THE LOCAL PLAN FOR MANY REASONS SOME OF WHICH ARE BELOW:-
The infrastructure of this area is and will be insufficient. The draiange system is and will always be insufficient.

The traffic will be horrendous it is that now and will increase. We have little or no shops at present to serve Maghull so what will happen if all these houses are built. The schools are overcrowded.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 977 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** JE Lammond
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The infrastructure of this area is and will be insufficient. The drainage system is and will always be insufficient. The traffic will be horrendous it is that now and will increase. We have little or no shops at present to serve Maghull so what will happen if all these houses are built. The schools are overcrowded.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 979 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Mary Kirkwood
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to add my name to the list of the many Maghull residents who strongly object to the Sefton Local Plan. I have lived in Maghull for the past 25 years very happily, but have noticed a gradual decline in the availability of medical services. We wait longer for Hospital appointments, Doctors appointments etc. With the influx of so many more people into the community that this development would bring, not to mention the extra traffic, it would change the whole character of Maghull and turn it into an Urban Sprawl. Maghull has a large percentage of elderly people, we do not need such a huge influx of properties into the area.

I do not object to building affordable housing in Maghull, it is the quantity that is unacceptable and the fact that Builders cram too many houses into plots to expand their profit. Is it too much to ask to have the residents of Maghulls views listened to and taken into account.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 983 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** M Kilroe
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Dear Planning Officer I wish to object to the above for the reasons as listed below:-
Housing figures do not qualify for (special circumstances) for building on the green belt. The rural aspect of the Maghull and Liverpool would be lost forever and become part of an urban sprawl. There would be a significant increase in the volume of traffic in the district, which is already congested ,this would result in gridlock situations on a frequent basis in the district.

A brownfield policy first should have been included in the Local Plan. There is a lack of detailed infrastructure planning to cater for the increased housing and population I .e. additional pressure on, DOCTORS, DENTISTS,SCHOOLS and HOSPITALS. The Local Plan if passed would become a living document and would allow the council to revisit the green boundaries in future years. The majority of the residents in the Maghull and Lydiat area are not in favour of the plan. The plan if implemented would greatly increase the risk of flooding in the district.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 984 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** J and S Lawton

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Support

Summary of Main Issues

I object to Sefton Council Local Plan

Brownfield sites should be built on before anywhere else. There are enough in the Liverpool area to be considered before Lydiat, Maghull and Sefton. Pygons Hill lane was a quiet lane but over the years there has been a steady increase in traffic. I imagine building on green field sites, the contractors lorries would be unbearable.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 986 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** B Jukes

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

RE: OBJECTION TO SEFTON'S LOCAL PLAN

I am writing to you to submit my objection to Sefton Council's proposed Local Plan. The population in Sefton is not increasing therefore we do not need extra houses. There are over 6000 unoccupied properties in Sefton.

There should be no building on A1 agricultural land which is a precious resource to the country and the community - all brownfield sites should be used first. The loss of greenbelt will inevitably create urban sprawl which can already be seen in other parts of Sefton where they have joined West Lancs - plus the openness of the countryside will be eroded.

The proposed developments would have a damaging long term effect on the health and well being of the existing community, the local environment, and the natural habitat - and lead to an increase in pollution. It will add pressure on services to include doctors, dentists, schools and hospitals.

It is clear that the infrastructure is not in place and that the local plan is relying upon the developers to ensure this is in place. This would lead to increased volume of traffic on roads which are already congested.

The council and councillors have been undemocratic in the whole local plan consultation and are not representing the electorate - most of whom are against it.

As stated in your own summaries areas suggested:- are Green Belt Land; are subject to flooding; and have problems with drainage; have insufficient infrastructure for additional transport; have Grade 1 Agricultural Land Classification; have significant historical classification; have a reducing population

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 992 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** E Hughes
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I object to the plans to build more houses in and around Maghull.

It is not necessary to use the prime agricultural land when there are brown field sites available.

There are not enough facilities, eg leisure, shops, schools, health care for the current number of residents. Maghull and Lydiat will not be able to cope with more people without better facilities, including transport.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 994 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Susan Hughes
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the planning provisions in and around Maghull relating to the Sefton Local plan. It is not positively prepared in so much as it does not fit infrastructure requirements. It is proposed on high class agricultural land, when there are other brown field sites available. While it proposes to increase the bricks and mortar housing in the area it does not address the needs of existing and potentially new residents in terms of facilities such as schools, doctors, health care, shops, and leisure. Maghull is already a poor relation in terms of community facilities and putting more people into an area without increasing the facilities adds to the problems

Summary of Suggested Changes

Move to a brown field site

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 999 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Pauline Irving

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I believe the Local Plan has not been thought through and clearly there has been little consideration for local residents. I do not support is the development of substantial residential areas where the existing infrastructure and community facilities are already under pressure. I am not confident that effective and meaningful provisions have been fully considered to supplement this housing increase with suitable infrastructures etc.

Real life examples of the above would include -

Maghull train station — the car park is already full to capacity during week days. I rely on the train service to get to areas of Liverpool I am not confident to drive to.

Doctors appointments. I wait weeks for a doctors appointment already and feel the service is overstretched already. I am appalled to think that this will get worse.

Other carparks - Central Square in Maghull is already at capacity with car parking. Morrisons, Maghull is another carpark that is always full.

My grandchildren are school age and there is already high demand for places at our local schools. There is not enough places at local schools to support the increased demand development will bring.

I want to see the rationale or justification for picking these sites against potential brown field sites - especially given this land, in many cases is high grade agricultural land and the remaining greenbelt is used for recreational purposes by the current residents.

Without this robust justification, it appears this Local Plan will benefit developers only, yet it is existing residents that will suffer in the long-run, long after developers have left. Please consider local, existing residents who live here with families. I urge you to take my concerns seriously as well as others from local residents as we will have to live with the consequences long after developers have gone. Once green belt land is built upon, it is lost forever.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**

Respondent No 1018 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name**

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I write to object to the Sefton local plan which is nothing but an appropriation of Green Belt land when there is more than adequate brownfield sites in Bootle + Liverpool which should be built on. In Sefton in particular Maghull there is a shortage of the infrastructure, shops, GP surgeries, schools, healthcare, roads + public transport. I believe the plan does not provide to force developrs to install such infrastructure. The roads are already over-congested, it seems idiotic to build hundreds of homes in the green belt, when building nearer Liverpool would reduce the need to commute.

Also Sefton is very low lying + prone to flooding. The natural drainage in Maghull is already above capacity + the extra run off from new housing will create more flooding. The councils plan to use sumps to prevent flooding will not work. Already the sump under King George V park in Maghull has failed, many times after heavy rain hall lane between the Meadows + Northway is awash with sewage. The river Alt regularly floods and is at capacity.

Bootle is better drained, has better public transport links, has unused schools and plentiful supermarkets. The plan should be rethought. The loss of farmland and the natural environment in the current plan is ill thought out, criminal and should be stopped.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd

MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites

Respondent No 1024

Response Ref 1

Representor Name Paul O'Toole

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to object to the local plan as I do not believe that the plan is a Sound Plan for the following reasons:-

1. There are currently 6000 homes lying empty in the Sefton area I ask that these are considered when calculating the number of required homes for the Local Plan
 2. On 6th October 2014 the DCLG Eric Pickles re-affirms that Local Councils should protect green space and keep urban sprawl at bay through their local plans.
 3. Brownfield sites are available in the area but are not included in the Local Plan some were even proposed in the draft but rejected in favour of green belt?? A Brownfield first policy should be adopted in all areas.
 4. Prime grade A&B agricultural land of which Sefton has a high circa 20% of the overall countrys prime farming land. We need this for food production for future generations the world is a very precarious place and we should not be / become even more reliant on outside sources to meet our needs. There is also the impact of food miles and carbon footprint
 5. Infrastructure in Maghull there are already issues with school placements, Doctors and Dentist appointments are at a premium.
 6. Sefton council have as much of admitted that Affordable housing is not the priority if developers can't support the costs. Plans already submitted for Maghull behind the crescent (currently rejected) stated a % affordable to be included, and these were three and 4 bed detached with some semis and three storey. Hardly affordable!
 7. Congestion is already at a peak in the Maghull area in rush hour with an extra 2000+ homes and a potential of thousands more cars this will become a logistical nightmare
 8. Population figures for the Sefton borough have been way over estimated when taking the ONS figures into account. This, inspite of an ageing demographic in the area.
 9. United Utilities are already stretched with inadequate outdated drainage systems and are not able to cope with the projected 150 homes per year.
 10. Flooding is an issue in Maghull and Sefton as they are low lying areas . In 2012 Fouracres which is an extension of the Crescent was flooded due to poor drainage and homeowners were out of their homes for up to 18 months. I do not wish to see this repeated and put my own home at risk.
 11. I have had many Insurance companies willing only to insure to the exclusion of flooding. This will become the rule if this mass build plan goes ahead. Our homes will become un-insurable and potentially un-saleable
 12. There are many areas of natural habitat and canals which are part of the attraction in the area for Leisure time.
- In closing these are just some of my objections and I do hope that my concerns and the views of the majority will be listened to.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

LOCATION — MAGHULL AND LYDIATE

I would like to object to the local plan opposed by Sefton Council on the following grounds:-

1. Housing figures do not give "special circumstances" for building on the greenbelt. In Litherland and Bootle alone there is extensive house building. A school opposite Tesco on Hawthorne Road, Litherland was demolished. The land is still vacant. A new housing estate has been built on the old Hugh Baird College Site on Church Road, Litherland. The area known as Klondyke in Bootle is still undergoing development. There are numerous vacant houses still boarded up. Only recently The Priory Hotel in Litherland was demolished to pave way for more housing. The Liverpool Arms on Gorsey Lane was demolished years ago and the land still remains vacant.

Taking the above into account, I see no reason why building on greenbelt for more housing should be given the go ahead in the Maghull/Lydiat area.

- 2. There would be the loss of the best and versatile agricultural land. Agricultural and forestry land should be protected. Once this is gone, we would lose it forever.
- 3. People would like to see more trees planted and more local produce grown/bred in the local area. This would help the environment by reducing food miles.
- 4. The openness of the countryside will be eroded. Having the openness of the countryside helps to tackle the huge challenges of climate change.
- 5. There would be the loss of wildlife and habitats.
- 6. Some people move away to escape the urban areas. Building on green belt land would mean the loss of the border with neighbouring authorities. The loss of green belt will create an urban sprawl which can be seen in other parts of Sefton where they have joined Lancashire.
- 7. Increased risk of flooding to existing properties.
- 8. There would be an increased volume in traffic on the roads which are already congested.
- 9. There would be in an increase in pollution and carbon emissions — not good for the environment!
- 10. Additional housing would increase the pressure on services — Doctors, Dentists, Schools and Hospitals which are already over extended.
- 11. There are insufficient school places in the areas where housing has been allocated.
- 12. Having the open countryside provides a breathing place/escape for people and nature long into the future.
- 13. It is very clear that affordable housing will not be achieved and again the Council is relying on the developers. Building on greenbelt land will put a premium on the housing which will make them unaffordable.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites

Respondent No 1068 Response Ref 1 Representor Name Ben Albanese

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am objecting to the proposed plans to build 1,500+ houses in Maghull, on greenbelt, including land that is currently farmed for food and has been proved to be some of the highest quality crop growing land in the country. I love our Maghull, and I have always felt lucky to have grown up here. We are close to Liverpool city centre, as well as the beach town of Southport, and yet also have fields for us to walk through, for our children to play in and explore; places for us to feel free. These spaces are important for our health, and many also provide local food to local people. The area is already feeling the strain from our own existing population. The schools have classrooms which are full (and they were already full when I went to them), and yet are extremely limited in regards to expansion. Some, such as Maghull High, cannot expand at all having been built with houses enclosing its perimeter. A boom in migration into Maghull, caused by the building of the proposed 1,500+ new houses, would be catastrophic to an

already struggling infrastructure. The schools, as I have already mentioned, would have to cope with the influx, endangering the education of all children within them. The roads would be gridlocked for even longer periods than they already are, especially around peak times. There would still be a painful deficit of jobs to those leaving schools, or returning from university. You are not building homes for these people because they cannot afford them. I have asked my friends, who are also 25, what sort of price house they could afford. Their response is a unanimous "None, I couldn't afford any". Our first aim is to find a job, and then find a career. Then, and only then, will any of us be able to even consider the possibility of a house. For the moment, the best we can hope to do

is rent, and for most of us that means leaving Maghull to cities where we can rent cheap apartments, or move to towns where the rental for a whole property is more affordable. Long before people get to this situation, they will have to survive being a teenager in

Maghull, something that so many have already struggled with because of the painful lack of anything to do; even the local bowling alley down the road in Aintree (well within walking distance to those of us who couldn't afford the train) has closed and instead there is now a B&M. What are all these additional teenagers supposed to do? Stay indoors and play on consoles? Drink and smoke on street corners like so many that are already doing so? Form gangs and get into fights with each other? The area already struggles with the consequences of an aimless and bored teenage population and increasing the size of the town would only make this problem worse. As well as all these issues, there is the fact that these house are proposed to be built on land that is currently farmed for food and has been proven to be rich, high grade land. With an increased population, surely the permanent removal of this

land will only magnify the growing problem of local people having to use food banks. Why not community initiatives to cultivate more of this high quality land? Why not get some younger people involved and teach them skills that they will be able to take with them through the rest of their lives? In short, I think that the Local Plan is short minded, underdeveloped, under planned, inconsiderate to local people, insulting to the heritage that the area holds, and, ultimately, does not have the local communities best interests at its heart, and instead would damage the community. These are just some of the reasons why I object, with all my heart, to the Sefton Local Plan. Please keep our Maghull alive and free, to breath and grow at a controlled and realistic rate. Thank you for your time.

Summary of Suggested Changes

A drastically reduced quantity of houses, looking at the possibility of integrating those that are built with the chance to open shops or business either from the same building (townhouses built above affordable shop space) or nearby. To look at alternative sites, specifically making use of all brownfield sites before any greenbelt is touched. To create a plan to get people into houses that are currently unoccupied. If people own houses that are empty, then they should receive penalties for doing so with an appeal procedure

in place. Most of all, do everything openly and aim for the full support of the community before making these decisions. You cannot

say that you are doing it for the people of Maghull if you show us your plans and find that we do not agree.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 1070 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Jane Cunningham
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am writing to object to the housing plans for Maghull.
The reasons for this objection is that Maghull is not equipped for the extra population either in its infrastructure such as roads or the central square, or the land itself.
Maghulls schools are at capacity so how extra children would be catered for is up for question.
The road systems are not able to cope with extra traffic.
The land surrounding Maghull is grade one agricultural land as well as being prone to flooding which would be exacerbated by additional housing.
Residents pay premium council tax rates which we accept is for living in a semi rural area tge housing proposals would mean us living in a built up area so why pay premium rates?
Please do not approval these plans which would ruin the area.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 1290 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Pauline and Peter Gibney
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

SOS Petition+
Very concerned about amount of traffic especially big wagons + heavy traffic already causing problems on our local roads. I Fox houses Lane, Hall lane, days lane where trying to reverse or turn around. These roads are not able to take that amount of traffic now.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 1291 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name**
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

SOS Petition+
I've seen a change in this part of Maghull Lydiat, pleas don't spoil it anymore. We cant cope with anymore traffic, not many buses to compensate, the schools are already full, no fire station anymore, god help us, pensioner.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 1292 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Patricia Jeffrey
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

SOS Petition+
Having been born + bred in Maghull I do not feel we need any additional housing but more facilities are a must as the present are inadequate for Maghull residents.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Maghull/Lydiat Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Mag/Lyd **MN2 Maghull/Lydiat sites**
Respondent No 1297 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** R Rennie
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

SOS Petition+
Ive lived here in Moss Lane since 1958. The plans proposed are dreadful and will ruin Maghull completely.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.27 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.27 **Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull**
Respondent No 11 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Kevin Duggan
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The infrastructure in some areas where house building is proposed is insufficient to sustain an increase in traffic and population. FBells Lane, Lydiat is adjacent to a canal bridge and if access to Turnbridge Road is constructed to enable traffic to avoid the canal bridge, this will increase vehicular movements on this and surrounding roads; no doubt adding more traffic taking a 'short cut' over the Green Lane canal bridge, which is already overused by traffic. In addition, the bus services in the Bells Lane vicinity are not very frequent (3 per hour to Liverpool). This site is totally the wrong place to construct yet more houses.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.27 **Other Documents**

Policy MN2.27 **Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull**

Respondent No 57 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Joyce Scott

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am against Green Belt development so oppose site MN2.27 being used [for homes] and hope this land is left for the flora and fauna. For me there is enough land being taken for development without using Green Belt. Access to Turnbridge Road is limited. I believe protecting the Green Belt is paramount.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.27 **Other Documents**

Policy MN2.27 **Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull**

Respondent No 58 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Andrew and Margaret McDonald

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We are very much against the proposed building. To put yet more houses on Turnbridge Road will only lead to further problems in the Green Lane area. The volume of traffic for a narrow lane is already crazy, and plan to put more vehicles in the area is indeed flawed. The local schools are at bursting point now and the doctor's practices are unable to cope with their current volume of patients. Access to Green Lane is a nightmare, despite what you may have been told by the Highways Agency.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.27 **Other Documents**

Policy MN2.27 **Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull**

Respondent No 75 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Lesley Sarsfield

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

My arguments are in relation to the Green Lane/Bells Lane Site being no longer suitable for development, but Turnbridge Road is. There is more of a chance of Turnbridge Road being flooded than Green Lane/Bells Lane as it is much closer, and Turnbridge Road and Greenbank Avenue were flooded in the late 90's from the Canal bursting its banks.

Why is Turnbridge Road treated differently they are both in Flood Zone 1 areas? Site Access:- Why is Turnbridge Road a Minor Contraint but Green Lane/Bells Lane is a Significant Contraint for the same bridge? The whole area is sand and clay so if it is not fit for purpose on Green Ln/Bells Ln site, how can it be fit for purpose on the Turnbridge Rd Site?

Utility Infrastructure:- It is the same area if new water infrastructure is required on one side of this field it is also required on the other? Green Ln/Bells Ln is one side of this field Turnbridge being the other side of the same field. How can one side have access to highway and transport problems, but the other side has not?

Seeing as the proposed site is an extension of the field at Green Ln/Bells Ln how on earth can your constraints differ vastly ie: Turnbridge is still a Flood Zone, it still has a Swing Bridge for site access just like Green Lane and Bells Lane. The Ground Conditions are still Sand and Clay, and it would need a new water infrastructure, again just like Green Ln/Bells Ln. The access to Public Transport is exactly same as Green Ln and Bells Ln. In addition Turnbridge Road is Agricultural Land 1&2 in The Sefton Agricultural Land Survey (2012). The whole green belt area stretching from Green Ln/Bells Ln and Turnbridge Rd is the same area , so how on earth can one side of the field be Poorly contained with significant constraints, but the other side of the field is not?

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.27 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.27 **Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull**
Respondent No 114 **Response Ref** 3 **Representor Name** Barbara Keenan
Organisation Name Lydiate Parish Council
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Whilst MN2.27 could be said to be a relatively small development it is still to be built on high grade agricultural land which frankly we find a ridiculous thing to do. Have we learned nothing from being an island nation dependent on importing food? This is not sustainable development.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.27 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.27 **Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull**
Respondent No 183 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** William Supple
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I object strongly to the Turnbridge site in Maghull. Only one access road will lead to increased disruption in neighbouring roads via Green Lane.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.27 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.27 **Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull**
Respondent No 247 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** L Marten
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would also make specific objection to proposed site MN2.27: 40 houses at Turnbridge Road, Maghull. In my opinion this site is merely an extension to an additional site (AS12- Bells Lane to South Meade) which was rejected by the Council prior to finalisation of the Local Plan. The Council set out numerous reasons for its deselection of additional site AS12. Amongst the many reasons given by the Council for the rejection of additional site AS12 was that of access. The proposed site MN2.27 is similarly affected. Main access is by way of (a) a narrow bridge over the Leeds/Liverpool canal which is suitable for only 1 vehicle at a time, or (b) through an existing housing estate (Green Park) which has two busy primary schools and typically, narrow estate roads. The proposed site MN2.27 can be reached only through Turnbridge Road itself, which again is a narrow suburban estate road bounded by domestic properties either side. I understand that the proposed site has only a single entrance/exit in and out of the site. Surely access to the site by public service vehicles (fire, ambulance etc) would be seriously restricted if that is the proposed configuration of the site?

Site MN2.27 suffers from exactly the same disadvantages as its "parent" site AS12 and should be rejected for the same reasons.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.27	Other Documents
Policy MN2.27	Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull	
Respondent No 478	Response Ref 2	Representor Name J Smallpage
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to point out that access to the proposed development would be difficult and create higher and therefore unacceptable levels of congestion and noise both for existing and potential future residents. I note that the developers have spent some time doing traffic surveys for example but this was before the increase in the use of the canal for leisure purposes and at a time of day and year when the volume of traffic canal and road tends to be less anyway. I have seen and experienced traffic congestion and build up onto Liverpool Road as well as down Green Lane both as a pedestrian and as a motorist; this is despite the recent road signs and markings intended to make traffic on the Green Park side of the canal give way to traffic on the Liverpool Road side.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.27	Other Documents
Policy MN2.27	Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull	
Respondent No 568	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Peter Greener
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Para 83 states that 'once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At the time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.' I'm sure I hardly need to point out that in the case of MN2.27 Turnbridge Road land, a drain could not be considered a durable boundary as required in paragraph 85. And if allowed development of this site would open the whole area to the North and West of the Leeds to Liverpool canal to later development. This area is currently acknowledged as being unattached to an urban area.

Country Lanes are not robust boundaries and if the Turnbridge Road proposal was allowed the next robust boundary would be Southport Road, which is an A road to the north several large fields away.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.27	Other Documents
Policy MN2.27	Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull	
Respondent No 699	Response Ref 9	Representor Name P O'Hanlon
Organisation Name Maghull and Lydiate Action Group		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

Developers who have proposed the site at Turnbridge Road have not considered its limitations.

The site is inappropriate for housing development because it is not consistent with national policy. Turnbridge Road forms part of a small post war housing development which is bound on one side by the Leeds/ Liverpool canal and on the other by Green Park, a larger housing estate. Turnbridge Road is a dead-end, with the only access to Bells Lane, Lydiate by means of a footpath over the Maghull Brook.

Gaining access to the site during development would mean opening up Turnbridge Road and bridging the brook. This would cause significant disruption and noise to the daily lives of residents. Residents park cars on both sides of Turnbridge Road so lorries and JCBs etc would have continual difficulty getting through to the site.

The increased volume of traffic generated by new 40 homes on already congested roads would be problematic. Further difficulties would occur with site traffic approaching Turnbridge Road. Green Lane is the only approach to the site, either via the single lane swing bridge (weight limit 8 tonnes, no pavement) or the longer route coming via Liverpool Road South through the Green Park estate passing 2 primary schools (Green Park and St John Boscoe). The residential areas surrounding the schools are already pinch points twice a day as parents deposit and collect their children and vie for parking. Building 40 houses would entail bringing large lorry loads of building materials and equipment to the site which could not use the swing bridge so would have to use roads through the Green Park estate where children's safety would be compromised.

The NPPF practice guidance states that the intrusive, cumulative effects of noise to residents must be considered. "At the highest extreme, noise exposure would cause extensive and sustained changes in behaviour without an ability to mitigate the effect of noise. The impacts on health and quality of life are such that regardless of the benefits of the activity causing the noise this situation should be prevented from occurring" (NPPF)

These constraints together represent an unacceptable harm to local residents who have a right to go about their daily lives unimpeded by what would amount to a prolonged level of disruption, pollution, noise and risk.

Sefton's Local Plan aims to tackle the poor air quality in parts of the borough by reducing emissions from traffic and supporting the "transition to a low carbon future." Sending lorry loads of building materials through narrow residential streets and past 2 primary schools is contradictory to these aims.

As there would only be one entrance and exit into and out of this site, consultation would need to take place with the emergency services as statutory consultees.

The Maghull Brook runs alongside the proposed site. In October 1994 a culvert carrying water from the brook underneath the canal collapsed at this precise location sending 2 million gallons of water, mud and sludge from the canal into neighbouring properties and fields & causing devastating damage to homes, health and wildlife.

The site assessment form describes the flood risk as minor and as having susceptibility to ground water flooding with only a residual risk coming from canal failure. It ignores the historic context and the specific risk of building new homes on the site of a previous catastrophic failure of a watercourse. This is contrary to the NPPF and NPPF planning practice guidance. Concreting over an area of land that currently acts like a sponge will lead to an increased risk of flooding elsewhere. Homes in Greenbank Avenue which back on to this site already experience surface water flooding at times of high rainfall.

The ecology of the site requires further assessment, to determine whether other protected species are present besides the identified potential for water voles. Natural England states that water voles, their breeding sites and resting places are protected by law, and that 'destroying or disturbing their habitat, destroying or disturbing places used for shelter/ protection or changing the water quality' can affect their survival. We have photographic evidence of pink footed geese sighted near the Turnbridge Road site.

This site has lain undisturbed and has not been used for agricultural purposes for more than 20 years. As a contained, cut off and very private area of land that can only be seen from the canal towpath, it is likely to support diverse wildlife and plants. It provides a notable view point when walking along the canal from Green Lane to Bells Lane. The NPPF references the importance of the visual aspect of open spaces to the health and wellbeing of communities.

The Turnbridge Road site is in the Green Belt. The NPPF states that the main aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl and that the essential characteristics of Green Belt is "openness" and "permanence". Building 40 homes on Green Belt land will destroy these characteristics forever. Contrary to statements made in the site assessment form, building on this site would have a severe impact on the existing gap between the settlements of Maghull. This area of Green Belt constitutes the only remaining gap along the canal between Maghull and Lydiate.

We wish to preserve the village character of Lydiate and the character of Maghull as a small town. Building on the scale proposed and encroachment on to the green belt would be seriously detrimental to the character of the listed buildings in Lydiate and Maghull. [List of the 9 Grad II Listed Buildings in Maghull and 12 Grade II and 2 Grade II* Listed Buildings in Lydiate is attached]

Other historical buildings near site MN2.27 -

- Old Gore Farmhouse (Grade II) Altcar Lane, Great Altcar, Lancashire (just down Bells Lane)
- Upper Gore Farmhouse (Grade II) Altcar Lane, Great Altcar, Lancashire (Just down Bells Lane)
- Fir Grove Estate, Bells Lane - not listed but historically important
- Running Horses Public House, Bells Lane. Built for the canal trade, and building dates back to 19th century.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.27	Other Documents
Policy MN2.27	Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull	
Respondent No 716	Response Ref 20	Representor Name Robert Swift
Organisation Name Robert Swift and family		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull (Site MN2.27) - The Sustainability Appraisal concluded that development of the site will result in the loss of Greenfield land and Grade 2 agricultural land and result in a negative impact on the rural economy. The development of the site will also result in a detrimental impact in terms of landscape and balance between built up areas and countryside. It is also considered that the site has the potential to result in urban sprawl and as there are numerous ownerships there is uncertainty if the site is deliverable in the future. There are access constraints associated with the site, as the Proforma states that access will be taken over Turnbridge Road, however there is a brook which runs within the entrance of the site which would be difficult to overcome. Access to the settlement from the site is via a single track bridge, which would create further highways issues. The site should be discounted.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull (Site MN2.27) should be deleted from policy MN2.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.27	Other Documents
Policy MN2.27	Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull	
Respondent No 740	Response Ref 32	Representor Name
Organisation Name Formby Residents Action Group		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

We wish to rely on the representation of Mr John Williams [Rep No. 1026] for flood risk issue on this site.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.27 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.27 **Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull**
Respondent No 763 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Tess Atherton
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Developers have proposed to build on Turnbridge Road Maghull which is on green belt, this sort of development is totally inappropriate for the area. The site has major limitations and constraints and would create havoc to the existing residents during building works. The site has major access problems and lorries would not be able to use the canal bridge on to Bells Lane, the alternative route would be through Green Link/Green Lane which is already used as a 'rat run' to avoid the major traffic on Liverpool Road. With two schools in the immediate area the traffic congestion is considerable and this would increase significantly, with noise and disruption for local residents who already have to contend with the traffic and parking problems.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.27 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.27 **Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull**
Respondent No 765 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Terry Atherton
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Developers have proposed to build on Turnbridge Road Maghull which is on green belt, this sort of development is totally inappropriate for the area. The site has major limitations and constraints and would create havoc to the existing residents during building works. The site has major access problems and lorries would not be able to use the canal bridge on to Bells Lane, the alternative route would be through Green Link/Green Lane which is already used as a 'rat run' to avoid the major traffic on Liverpool Road. With two schools in the immediate area the traffic congestion is considerable and this would increase significantly, with noise and disruption for local residents who already have to contend with the traffic and parking problems.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.27 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.27 **Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull**
Respondent No 766 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** J Atherton
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Developers have proposed to build on Turnbridge Road Maghull which is on green belt, this sort of development is totally inappropriate for the area. The site has major limitations and constraints and would create havoc to the existing residents during building works. The site has major access problems and lorries would not be able to use the canal bridge on to Bells Lane, the alternative route would be through Green Link/Green Lane which is already used as a 'rat run' to avoid the major traffic on Liverpool Road. With two schools in the immediate area the traffic congestion is considerable and this would increase significantly, with noise and disruption for local residents who already have to contend with the traffic and parking problems.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.27	Other Documents
Policy MN2.27	Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull	
Respondent No 767	Response Ref 4	Representor Name J Avery
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Maghull Brook runs alongside the proposed site, MN2.27, land at Turnbridge Road. In October 1994 a culvert carrying water from the brook underneath the canal collapsed at this precise location sending 2 million gallons of water, mud and sludge from the canal into neighbouring properties and fields. This caused devastating damage to homes, health and wildlife. The site assessment form describes the flood risk as minor and as having susceptibility to ground water flooding with only a residual risk coming from canal failure. It ignores the historic context and the specific risk of building new homes on the site of a previous catastrophic failure of a watercourse. This is contrary to NPPF planning practice guidance which advocates a thorough assessment of the risk of flooding including the use of historical records. "A site specific flood risk assessment must demonstrate that the development will be safe for its lifetime and without increasing flood risk elsewhere" (NPPF)

Concreting over an area of land that currently acts like a sponge will lead to an increased risk of flooding elsewhere. Homes in Greenbank Avenue which back on to this site already experience surface water at times of high rainfall.

Development at MN2.27, land at Turnbridge Road would effectively close the last gap remaining between Maghull and Lydiate on the Leeds/Liverpool canal.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.27	Other Documents
Policy MN2.27	Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull	
Respondent No 769	Response Ref 4	Representor Name D Avery
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Maghull Brook runs alongside the proposed site, MN2.27, land at Turnbridge Road. In October 1994 a culvert carrying water from the brook underneath the canal collapsed at this precise location sending 2 million gallons of water, mud and sludge from the canal into neighbouring properties and fields. This caused devastating damage to homes, health and wildlife. The site assessment form describes the flood risk as minor and as having susceptibility to ground water flooding with only a residual risk coming from canal failure. It ignores the historic context and the specific risk of building new homes on the site of a previous catastrophic failure of a watercourse. This is contrary to NPPF planning practice guidance which advocates a thorough assessment of the risk of flooding including the use of historical records. "A site specific flood risk assessment must demonstrate that the development will be safe for its lifetime and without increasing flood risk elsewhere" (NPPF)

Concreting over an area of land that currently acts like a sponge will lead to an increased risk of flooding elsewhere. Homes in Greenbank Avenue which back on to this site already experience surface water at times of high rainfall.

Development at MN2.27, land at Turnbridge Road would effectively close the last gap remaining between Maghull and Lydiate on the Leeds/Liverpool canal.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.27	Other Documents
Policy MN2.27	Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull	
Respondent No 843	Response Ref 1	Representor Name J Hutchings
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

We strongly object to the Local Plan to build houses in and around Green Lane in Maghull. This is excellent agricultural land and a wonderful open space for local residence to enjoy the countryside in a predominantly urban area. If you build on it there are no additional facilities, such as schools, doctors, transport links etc to satisfy the influx of residents.

There are alternative brown field sites which are more suitable and would not be so detrimental to the area.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.27	Other Documents
Policy MN2.27	Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull	
Respondent No 956	Response Ref 2	Representor Name N and J West
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

With regard to Turnbridge road a single entry to this development lead by narrow and crowded roads will create problems for the fire, ambulance and police services.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.27	Other Documents
Policy MN2.27	Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull	
Respondent No 957	Response Ref	Representor Name Irene Webster
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Increased volume of traffic, especially regarding the proposed 40 new houses at the end of Turnbridge road. All building traffic will be routed through Green Park as the existing swing bridge has a weight limit. Obviously the planners have not done their homework as Green Park has two primary schools attached to it and excessive building traffic will create a dangerous risk to school children and residents alike. Also the recent poor LED lighting upgrade will increase the risk of accidents with increased traffic.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.27	Other Documents
Policy MN2.27	Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull	
Respondent No 960	Response Ref 2	Representor Name I R Vaudrey
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

The access route for the proposed site in Turnbridge Road is not suitable - all construction vehicles would have to either cross through a housing estate or pass two infant/junior schools.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.27	Other Documents
Policy MN2.27	Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull	
Respondent No 961	Response Ref 2	Representor Name M Vaudrey
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

The access route for the proposed site in Turnbridge Road is not suitable - all construction vehicles would have to either cross through a housing estate or pass two infant/junior schools.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.27	Other Documents
Policy MN2.27	Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull	
Respondent No 976	Response Ref 2	Representor Name J Lammond
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

The access (especially, to the Turnbridge Road intended estate) will not only be insufficient but it will use havoc in the surrounding area i.e. Green Lane, The bridge at Green Lane Green Park and there has to be more than one way into an estate which will not be available. The fire engines etc will have no way of reaching these houses if needed.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.27	Other Documents
Policy MN2.27	Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull	
Respondent No 977	Response Ref 2	Representor Name JE Lammond
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

The access (especially, to the Turnbridge Road intended estate) will not only be insufficient but it will use havoc in the surrounding area i.e. Green Lane, The bridge at Green Lane Green Park and there has to be more than one way into an estate which will not be available. The fire engines etc will have no way of reaching these houses if needed.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.27 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.27 **Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull**
Respondent No 985 **Response Ref** **Representor Name** Valerie Jukes
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The access route for the proposed site in Turnbridge Road is not suitable - all construction vehicles would have to either cross through a housing estate or pass two infant/junior schools.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.27 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.27 **Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull**
Respondent No 986 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** B Jukes
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The access route for the proposed site in Turnbridge Road is not suitable - all construction vehicles would have to either cross through a housing estate or pass two infant/junior schools.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.27	Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull
----------------------	---

Respondent No 993	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Helen Jones
--------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------------

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to object to Sefton Council's Local Plan and in particular to their plans to build "affordable" housing on the Green Belt in Lydiate and Maghull —Site MN2.28 (Turnbridge Road Maghull/on border with Lydiate) and Site MN2.27 Liverpool Road, Lydiate.

The proposed development of both these sites will greatly impact on the unique character of Lydiate village and will add pressure to local services. These are my objections.

1. Loss of Green Belt for housing. Brown field sites should be considered first. Green belt was designed to prevent towns and villages merging into one another. Development on Turnbridge would start to merge Lydiate village with Maghull town.
2. Loss of valuable agricultural land for housing. Turnbridge site is approximately 70% Grade 1 and 2 "best and most versatile," agricultural land according to the Sefton. Agricultural Land Study 2012 (Figures from Sefton council website). Liverpool Road site is also Grade 2/3 agricultural land. Our agricultural land here in Lydiate and all over Sefton should be protected and safeguarded to sustain future generations and ensure locally produced food is available.
3. Building more houses on Green Belt land in areas such as Lydiate will put a premium on them which will clearly make them unaffordable, not "affordable housing."
4. Increased risk of flooding to existing properties. Parts of both sites are at risk from surface water flooding. Turnbridge is, "susceptible to ground water flooding and there is a residual risk from canal failure." (from Sefton MBC website). The canal has burst its banks twice in my life time, flooding surrounding fields and houses.
5. Increased pressure on local services/ infrastructure. If more "affordable housing," for families is built this will greatly increase pressure on local services such as doctors, dentists, hospitals, especially on local schools which may have insufficient places. The impact on local roads and traffic, and also canal bridges and canal traffic heading towards Liverpool/ Burscough which uses the swing bridge at Green Lane and Bells Lane.
6. 'Impact on Local Heritage. Lydiate is a village and tries to preserve its village character. More housing would impact on this. Turnbridge is near to several Grade 11 listed buildings also Fir Grove House and estate (19th Century) on Bells Lane is directly opposite the proposed development. The Running Horses Pub built in 19th century is next to it also. The local website [www. Lydiateworld .com](http://www.Lydiateworld.com) has many testimonials/ messages about the unique character of Lydiate.

To protect our historic village I object to any developments which would change the character of Lydiate as a village. Therefore I wholeheartedly object to the Sefton Local Plan and in particular to building on the Green Belt in Turnbridge Road, Maghull (bordering on Lydiate) which I feel would have a detrimental effect on the unique character of Lydiate.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.27	Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull
----------------------	---

Respondent No 1016	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Robert Ketchell
---------------------------	-----------------------	---

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The access route for the proposed site in Turnbridge Road is not suitable - all construction vehicles would have to either cross through a housing estate or pass two infant/junior schools.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.27 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.27 **Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull**
Respondent No 1017 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Norma Ketchell
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The access route for the proposed site in Turnbridge Road is not suitable - all construction vehicles would have to either cross through a housing estate or pass two infant/junior schools.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.27 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.27 **Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull**
Respondent No 1026 **Response Ref** 14 **Representor Name** John Williams
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

This site has several problems relating to development:-

- 1) The ground itself is frequently saturated to a very high level due to its very close proximity to the Leeds Liverpool Canal
- 2) There are already flooding problems upstream of this site caused by the existing watercourse having difficulty in firstly getting under the canal and secondly traversing the current site boundary
- 3) The watercourse crossing this site takes a significant area on the other side of the canal
- 4) A watercourse under the canal very close to this site collapsed in recent years and caused significant flooding to low lying properties in the vicinity. It should be noted that with the age of the canal, it is more likely than not that this type of event will happen again and may very well be induced by building new houses on this estate
- 5) There are even foul drainage flooding problems caused by the surface water system overflowing in a road very close to this site
- 6) The site is within 250m of a potential source of flooding, and current real world flooding problems, so may have difficulty getting flood insurance.
- 7) It would therefore be deemed as logical that this site should be discounted on grounds of NPPF Ch10 Para.100

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.27 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.27 **Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull**
Respondent No 1041 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** W Wilkinson
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I'm writing to log my opposition to the potential development adjacent to Green Park estate AS12. Also I object to any green belt land being used for development, all Brownfeild sites should be used first. The area of Green Lane is already heavily congested with traffic without adding to it. Also I don't think public services/shops/schools/GPS would be able to cope with any increase in more housing.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.28 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.28 **Land north of Kenyons Lane, Lydiate**
Respondent No 30 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** E Billington
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

On returning from a walk on Wednesday 21st.Jan. at about 2.00pm and turning into Kenyons Lane from the A59 I find a 30 ton vehicle parked outside Morton's Dairy and a people carrier opposite leaving no room for any vehicle to pass. The effect was dramatic with cars going West/East doing three point turns over the grass/mud verges to return to Liverpool Rd. or A59 in an attempt to get to Robins Island. Chaos reigned and if schools had been out total chaos would have reigned.

Please accept that the existing situation is not suitable for the proposed developments.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.28 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.28 **Land north of Kenyons Lane, Lydiate**
Respondent No 72 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** L Wilcock
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Below are some good reasons why this land should not be used for building on:

1. It is prime farm land.
2. Erosion of the green belt, once built on will be lost for future generations.
3. Infants school / congestion of traffic
4. Loss of jobs for the employees in the dairy.
5. Added volume of traffic on Liverpool road, which already suffers from increased use by lorries, buses and cars coming off Northway at Robins Island.
6. Access to the site? Which it is evident would have to be either Kenyons Lane/Liverpool Road? Causing more problems.
7. Wild life.

I am of the age to remember when everyone was encouraged to dig for Britain!! Even allotments are becoming popular again. So why use good farm land, when there – are plenty of sites which would benefit everyone if they were cleaned up?

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.28 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.28 **Land north of Kenyons Lane, Lydiate**
Respondent No 90 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Helen Bromfield
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Having seen the plans for development in Maghull and Lydiate I would like to register my objections to any planned development at this location. This area is part of the countryside that local people have enjoyed for many years and would like to continue to do so. It is prime greenbelt land.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.28	Other Documents
Policy MN2.28	Land north of Kenyons Lane, Lydiate	
Respondent No 91	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Gary Dunn
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I am objecting to plans for the development of green belt land in Lydiate bordered by the A59 Northway, Kenyons Lane and Liverpool Road boundaries. I object in principal to building on green belt land when there are numerous brown belt alternatives. The field is referred to locally as, "Tyson's Field." This was because Tysons Builders had bought the land and have been cynically holding on to it simply waiting for a relaxation in planning permission, all the while watching their 'nest egg' constantly increase in value as house prices have risen. The whole process is wrong, these people who live in ivory towers should not be allowed to profit like this off the backs of causing established people grief. The message should be sent clearly to such developers that their game is up. Do not hand them big profits on a plate. I would like to see a 'Brown Field First' in the local planning policy.

Insufficient infrastructure, local schools already over subscribed. Only two local medical centers which are both heavily subscribed.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Brown Field First Policy.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.28	Other Documents
Policy MN2.28	Land north of Kenyons Lane, Lydiate	
Respondent No 228	Response Ref 2	Representor Name G Yates
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

When will not only the Local Authority but Government as a whole realise the importance of feeding one's own nation as far as it is possible? We are continually seeing an uncontrolled expanding nation and increasing attempts to reduce Green Belt. The latter should be illegalised now and all Green Belt suitable for agriculture, particularly the better grades (1 and 2) should be protected from development both now and in the future.

Summary of Suggested Changes

The two proposals MN2.46 and MN2.28 should be removed completely from the plan as there is no justification whatsoever in proposing to build on good agricultural land when there is a shortage overall in the country to provide food for its population. Once built on Green Belt is lost forever. In addition the number of proposed new builds in these areas would place an unbearable pressure on the already overburdened infrastructure and facilities of the town. Please acknowledge receipt of this submission.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.28	Other Documents
Policy MN2.28	Land north of Kenyons Lane, Lydiate	
Respondent No 406	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Peter Richards
Organisation Name West Lancashire Borough Council		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

West Lancashire Borough Council (“the Council”) have concerns over the soundness of policy MN8 and the allocation of land to the north of Maghull / Lydiate at sites MN8.1 and MN2.28, in that the policy on safeguarded land and the allocations do not appear justified in the context of a Local Plan that is committed to an early review when the two allocations in question have such a harmful impact on the Green Belt.

Sites MN8.1 and MN2.28, if removed from the Green Belt and allocated, would, by Sefton Council’s own admission (see relevant site assessment forms), close the strategic Green Belt gap between Maghull and Aughton Village in West Lancashire by around 40%, reducing the gap to approximately 1 km. In addition, coupled with the Ashworth Hospital site further east (which, while previously developed, is also earmarked to be removed from the Green Belt), the release of this land from the Green Belt would create an area of Green Belt land between the A59 and the Ormskirk-Liverpool rail line that would ultimately become enclosed on three sides by the Maghull built-up area. As such, the new Green Belt boundary to the north of Maghull would not be a strong one, and, for the area of Green Belt remaining, would leave it very vulnerable to any proposals in the future to amend the Green Belt boundary. As such, by allocating sites MN2.28 and MN8.1, the Local Plan would effectively be facilitating the long-term (post-2030) expansion of Maghull northwards, significantly closing a strategic gap to settlements in West Lancashire.

The Council recognise that Green Belt boundaries are not sacrosanct and that, if exceptional circumstances exist, there can be justification for a Green Belt release such as that described above. However, the Council do not consider that such justification exists at this time given the fact that the Sefton Local Plan commits to an early review. Given this context, it is not necessary to include safeguarded land in this Local Plan, as the early review (carried out in the context of a wider Liverpool City Region evidence base and strategy on development needs) would be the better time to consider what land might be required after 2030 for development in Sefton.

Therefore, were policy MN8 to be deleted, site MN8.1 would immediately be removed from the Local Plan (allowing it to remain in the Green Belt), and site MN8.2 could be re-allocated as a housing allocation to replace site MN2.28, allowing MN2.28 to be removed from the Local Plan (and so remain in the Green Belt). This would be a far more satisfactory solution to the Council, given the limited harm to the Green Belt that site MN8.2 has, compared to MN2.28. The Council notes Sefton’s concerns regarding market saturation were MN8.2 brought forward for development in the Plan period (see site assessment for MN8.2) but it is the Council’s view that MN8.2 would create no greater competition than MN2.28 given that both are in the Maghull / Lydiate housing sub-market.

Were Sefton Council or the Inspector appointed to examine the Local Plan not to agree with the Council’s suggestion to delete Policy MN8 entirely, the Council would, at least, respectfully suggest that site MN2.28 could be swapped with site MN8.2 so that both the sites that the Council consider cause most harm to the Green Belt are only allocated as safeguarded land (while MN8.2 would become a full housing allocation), meaning that their status for development could still be reconsidered at the Early Review stage.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Policy MN8 should be deleted from the Local Plan, together with site allocations MN8.1 and MN2.28. Site allocation MN8.2 should instead be re-allocated as a housing allocation under Policy MN2 to replace MN2.28.

Alternatively, if Policy MN8 is to remain in the Local Plan, MN2.28 should become a safeguarded site and MN8.2 should instead be re-allocated as a housing allocation under Policy MN2 to replace MN2.28.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.28	Other Documents
Policy MN2.28	Land north of Kenyons Lane, Lydiate	
Respondent No 433	Response Ref 10	Representor Name Eric Haworth
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

The NPPF declares that: "Our natural environment is essential to our wellbeing, and it can be better looked after than it has been. Habitats that have been degraded can be restored. Species that have been isolated can be reconnected. Green Belt land that has been depleted of diversity can be refilled by nature – and opened to people to experience it, to the benefit of body and soul".

However, Development site MN2.28, better known to local Lydiate residents as Highway Farm, or "Tysons Triangle" is targeted within this Local Plan, and not only is it within the Greenbelt but it is actually classified as "Best and most versatile agricultural land": Land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification. This working farm has been contributing to essential national food production for generations, on some of the finest quality agricultural land in the UK. However, this is despite what appear to be cynical attempts since the onset of this planning process from the Core Strategy stage to compromise its Agricultural Land Classification. At the point when this farm was first identified as a potential development site, contaminated spoil was deliberately "dumped" on the southern end of the farm, and this area, which is approx. 30% of the total farm remains uncultivated to this day. This was not only reported to the Sefton Planning Department, but also to their Environment Department, and the Environment Agency, together with accompanying photographs of the actual "dumping". However, no subsequent action was taken by any of the relevant parties despite the fact that this was an illegal act. Unsurprisingly, many of the local residents sided with the conspiracy theorists that this was deliberate sabotage to enhance the chances of the site being released for development. Coincidence? I'll leave it to the Planning Inspector to judge for him or herself. But it's hard to argue against the conspiracy theorists now that it is one of the development sites identified in the development plan, and destined to be concreted over for circa 350 houses that Lydiate neither need nor want.

Furthermore, the NPPF refers to: "Birds and Habitats Directives: European Directives to conserve natural habitats and wild fauna and flora".

Yet, site MN2.28 is home to roosting Bats and this site is officially registered as such with the Bat Conservation Trust. This was previously drawn to the attention of SMBC in a previous submission at the Core Strategy stage, and during the intervening years they've still failed to undertake a Bat survey. In England and Wales, Bats are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) (as amended); the Countryside and Rights of Way Act, 2000; the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (NERC, 2006); and by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010). Yet, SMBC have chosen to develop a site that is not only home to a protected species, but also farmland that is classified as Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land. It's bordering on vandalism of the worst kind.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.28	Other Documents
Policy MN2.28	Land north of Kenyons Lane, Lydiate	
Respondent No 438	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Liam Pritchard
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I am objecting against the building of more houses in the Sefton area, particularly Kenyons Lane in Lydiate. The loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land as well as farming communities and food production for the future just cannot happen. The openness of the countryside will be eroded and if this build goes ahead, large areas which are natural flood plains will be built on, increasing the risk of flooding to existing properties.

The Council will be responsible for more wetlands, swale ditches and verges on the new sites which they will have to adopt. This will have a financial implication on services that are already being cut. I think this will only lead to a rise in the cost of council tax and cuts on services.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.28 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.28 **Land north of Kenyons Lane, Lydiate**
Respondent No 440 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Sarah Moyes
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am objecting against the building of more houses in the Sefton area, particularly Kenyons Lane in Lydiate. I do not see the need to build on greenbelt when there is so much brownfield sites available.

Surely they should be utilised first? I don't think the area could take such an influx of people - everything would be affected. Local services such as Hospitals, Doctors, Dentists, and Schools could not accommodate. The roads are already very busy and congested, an increased volume of traffic will only make things worse and increase pollution and carbon emissions.

I do not view the Local Plan as compliant, sound or justified because housing figures do not give "special circumstances" for building on the greenbelt. There is also a lack of infrastructure planning for additional housing.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.28 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.28 **Land north of Kenyons Lane, Lydiate**
Respondent No 488 **Response Ref** 26 **Representor Name** Ian Brodie Browne
Organisation Name Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

For context and background information we attach our previous submission [dated 7 Aug 2014] because much of what we said in it still applies: [SR4.48 referred to below is allocated as site MN2.28]

Sites AS12 and AS14 - These two huge sites to the west and east of Lydiate/Maghull fall within a similar category to site AS17 in that they are both high grade agricultural land that is presently being farmed. To turn them over to housing is unthinkable in environmental sustainability terms. AS14 is right next to SR4.48 (Tyson's Triangle) which Sefton Council has already designated as a 'reserve' site for development in its own draft Local Plan. Bearing in mind that a further and much larger 'reserve' site (SR4.47) is the other side of SR4.48 this would have the effect of vastly increasing the size of Lydiate's population. Just developing the two reserve sites will increase Lydiate's size by 35%! What's more AS14 will develop Lydiate right up to the West Lancashire (Aughton) boundary and we are aware that West Lancs Council already have concerns about the two 'reserve' sites for this very reason. Taking the 3 sites together Lydiate would be subject to an urban extension of considerable proportions.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter	Plan Order Site MN2.28	Other Documents
Policy MN2.28	Land north of Kenyons Lane, Lydiate	
Respondent No 537	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Edward Landor
Organisation Name Property Collateral Ltd		
Obj/Sup/Com Support		

Summary of Main Issues

The site MN2.28 is 9.7 hectares in extent and has an identified capacity of 295 dwellings. It is a proposed housing allocation in the deft Local Plan. The proposed allocation is suitable, available and deliverable for housing development. It is situated in a sustainable location with good access to a range of local services, schools and public transport links. This representation is submitted on behalf of Property Collateral Ltd, acting for the owners of the site, Orchard Co-operative.

The site is located approximately 1km to east of Maghull District Centre and to the west of the A59 connecting Maghull and Ormskirk. The site is totally enclosed by the existing road network and residential development and represents a rounding off and consolidation of Lydiate. Part of the south of the site incorporates Mortons Dairies Ltd, which occupies approximately 1 hectare of the site. To the extreme north of the site is Highway Farm which incorporates a large number of agricultural sheds. The allocated site is therefore part brownfield and part greenfield.

The design proposals for the site identified a housing mix including market housing, affordable housing and a facility for extra care accommodation. The broad principles indicate 161 dwellings for market housing; 69 affordable dwellings and 60 extra care units. This represents a total site capacity of 290 to be provided in a mix of 3, 4 and 5 bed houses. The extra care accommodation would be primarily 1 and 2 bed units Appendix 8 provides evidence of market interest in extra care provision in this location. The indicative development proposal indicated a net developable area of 80% of the site and 20% for major open space and habitat enhancement.

Summary of Suggested Changes

None needed.

Evidence Submitted

Appendices 1 and 2- Planning statement and GIS Site Mapping Study (2010); Appendix 3 - public consultation response; Appendix 4 - Transport Study, Appendix 5 - Site Plan including proposed access; Appendix 6 - Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey; Appendix 7 - THI Healthcare correspondence

Policy MN2.28

Land north of Kenyons Lane, Lydiate

Respondent No 600

Response Ref 1

Representor Name Enid Cumberlidge

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

You have obviously reneged on the decision made that this site was only made Reserved - now it seems it is a real possibility- and this I am objecting to.

I have already written to the 5 Labour Councillors. Have the Councillors been up to the site or just relying on the Planning Committee members. Particularly between 7 and 9 am the traffic from Ormskirk direction on Northway to Switch Island is non stop using both lanes and on return journey too.

There are 1735 houses to be built on three sites. The one I am particularly concerned about will be built on Green Belt Land - most of the occupiers will need cars - only a run around bus - no direct one to Liverpool etc. The service is inadequate. Kenyons Lane is a very narrow road (even worse now we have two sets of bollards down the centre!) Also each household will require a General Practitioner - Dentist - places in School for children - etc. etc. all which can come under the title of Infrastructure - although the Councillor I spoke to said that the site comes first and then the Infrastructure will follow. Once the site has been decided upon - the needs of the occupiers appear to take second place.

My opinion is that the Infrastructure must be upper most because to my mind the decision you are to take is just "back to front" I was very interested in the letter in the Opinion column of the Liverpool Echo this week, who certainly had done his "homework" that being, that it all comes down to "money" and by now changing from your original plan the Council will be able to obtain a certain amount from the Government, particularly if Green belt land is used.

Originally I was informed that the Council had no choice but to use Green Belt Land as it was a directive from the Government. Since then it would appear that the Council have much to gain. But my last question is- are all the Councillors aware of all the above difficulties that yes vote will be causing or will they just be voting because being a Labour Councillor member that is what will be expected of them regardless of the consequences - and even so, "it isn't in my back yard".

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.28	Other Documents
Policy MN2.28	Land north of Kenyons Lane, Lydiate	
Respondent No 699	Response Ref 8	Representor Name P O'Hanlon
Organisation Name Maghull and Lydiate Action Group		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

Green belt/agricultural land: This site is within the green belt and serves 4 out of five of the purposes of green belt land [1st, 2nd, 3rd and 5th bullet points in NPPG para 80]. Any development here would erode the gap between Maghull and Aughton. The Sefton Local Plan Site Assessment warns that development of this site would have "significant impact", as "the site would narrow the gap between this part of Lydiate and Aughton Village by around 40% at its narrowest point."

The proposal is contrary to para 87-89 of the NPPF and does not comprise 'very special circumstances' which 'clearly outweigh other considerations.' National Planning Practice Guidance confirms this: states: "The Government has re-affirmed the importance of Green Belt protection and ensuring its robust safeguards are not undermined when assessing unmet housing need", and is made even more explicit in paragraph 034, which states: "Unmet housing need is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the 'very special circumstances' justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt."

The site is mostly in agricultural use and comprises "best and most versatile arable land". Recent research indicates an impending crisis for food production in the UK. Research from the National Farmers' Union (reported in national newspapers including the Independent, 24th February 2015) suggests that the UK's self-sufficiency is in a 30-year downward spiral, with the proportion of our food needs met by produce from farms in the UK falling at an alarming rate. The NFU Vice-President warned that less self-sufficiency should ring alarm bells. The loss of any productive agricultural land, and especially this high-grade land, would seem both short-sighted and foolhardy.

Flood risk/drainage/sewerage: The site is in Flood Zone 1 (fluvial flooding) and has medium risk from surface water flooding, but is adjacent to land in Environment Agency flood zone 3 or with both surface water and fluvial flooding (east of A59). Considerable existing drainage problems, particularly with nearby Suddell Brook - has led to properties downstream experiencing drainage problems.

Developing this site could therefore increase the risk of flooding to existing properties. Development would be contrary to NPPF paragraphs 99 – 100. United Utilities has already indicated that it can cope with only a further 30 houses per year in Maghull. Sefton Council's site assessment acknowledges that "Waste water network upgrade might be required."

When viewed in conjunction with other proposed developments in Maghull/Lydiate (total 2005 houses over 18 years, i.e. an average of 111 houses per year assuming a constant buildrate), it becomes clear that the development of this site would throw further strain on a system which is already stretched to capacity, and poses serious questions about the ability of that system to cope with the increased demand.

The following is drawn from Sefton Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Regeneration and Environmental Services) Infrastructure Working Group Final Report (December 2014): "Following a presentation from United Utilities, the question was raised as to whether the local drainage system can cope with the erection of so many new houses. United Utilities advised that the key issue was that surface water run-off should not go into the sewerage system, as this could cause very high flows linked to rainfall. There was an acknowledgement of some existing problems and the need to ensure that new developments do not make the situation worse." The use of Community Infrastructure Levy to reduce flood risk was mooted. Elsewhere in the report, however, it is acknowledged that the CIL could put some developments at risk due to viability issues, and that "the Council could be flexible with regard to CIL/Section 106 requirements". If it is considered necessary to raise funds to pay for infrastructure improvements though measures such as CIL and yet doing so may render proposed developments un-viable, this would seem to cast doubt on any realistic prospect of the necessary improvements being delivered.

West Lancashire Borough Council is proposing the erection of 250 dwellings near the Sefton boundary, and that these dwellings would also connect to Sefton's local drainage systems.

Traffic congestion/pollution:

There are three schools in the immediate vicinity of this site: Lydiate Primary School, Lambshear Lane; St. Gregory's, Sandy Lane, and St. Thomas's Church of England school (directly abutting on the site itself). The surrounding roads are narrow and, at peak times, already congested and frequently at gridlock, completely impassable for buses, service and refuse lorries and (potentially) emergency vehicles. The impact of 295 additional houses (and therefore probably at least 300 more cars on the road) would add significantly to this congestion. Sefton Council's Site Assessment concedes that this issue constitutes a "moderate" constraint and recognises that the "cumulative effects with other proposed sites in Lydiate and Maghull would need to be assessed".

Publicity for the Local Plan, the Council stated its intention to "restrict (land) uses that have a negative impact on health, e.g. those that cause pollution and result in high traffic levels in sensitive areas - such as residential areas, schools..." Development of this site

would seem to fly in the face of these stated intentions.

Access:

The site is also constrained by access issues. Part of the site is adjacent to the A59 a busy dual carriageway. Considerable additional infrastructure development would be needed if development of this site were to go ahead. According to the Sefton Local Plan Site Assessment, multiple points of vehicular and pedestrian access would need to be provided, and it is likely that it will be necessary to widen Kenyon's Lane to provide a two-lane approach to the Northway (A59). A 4-way light-controlled junction on Liverpool Road is also suggested. All this would significantly increase the disruption and ultimate visual and environmental impact of the development.

Education:

There are three schools in the immediate vicinity of this site: Lydiate Primary School, Lambshear Lane; St. Gregory's, Sandy Lane, and St. Thomas's Church of England school (directly abutting on the site itself). Working on the basis of 32 children per 100 households, the proposed development on this site could result in a demand for around 100 more places in local schools, where places are already limited.

[Heritage:]

We wish to preserve the village character of Lydiate and the character of Maghull as a small town. Building on the scale proposed and encroachment on to the green belt would be seriously detrimental to the character of the listed buildings in Lydiate and Maghull. [List of the 9 Grad II Listed Buildings in Maghull and 12 Grade II and 2 Grade II* Listed Buildings in Lydiate is attached]

Other historical buildings near site MN2.28

- Forests Mill, Liverpool Road. Now a residence but of historical importance (built 1768)
- Mill Villas, Liverpool Road-not listed but historically important. – 19th century.
- Oakhill area - bowling green with original gates to OakhilFarm

Conclusion:

For all the reasons listed above, we feel that this is not a suitable place for development and object to this site being included in the Local Plan [see photo in full representation of site MN2.28, which shows crops growing in the fields].

Summary of Suggested Changes

This is not a suitable place for development and we object to this site being included in the Local Plan.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.28	Other Documents
Policy MN2.28	Land north of Kenyons Lane, Lydiate	
Respondent No 703	Response Ref 22	Representor Name Jackie Copley
Organisation Name CPRE Lancashire		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

We are opposed to the redesignation of this Green Belt site for residential development on the grounds that it would consolidate the sprawl of a substantial built-up area, would mean encroachment into the countryside, and an unacceptable narrowing of the gap between Lydiate and Aughton, contrary to par. 80 of the NPPF. It would also entail the loss of high quality landscape, visible from the A 59 trunk road.

Apart from the regrettable strip development on Liverpool Road, the north-eastern boundary of Lydiate is well defined by Sandy Lane, Lambshear Lane and Kenyon's Lane; the seed of strip development strip on one side of Liverpool Road should not be allowed to grow into a major northeast spur, which might later be allowed to enlarge even further into the open space South of Moss Lane. We attributed considerable importance to the fact that part of the site consists of best and most versatile agricultural land. We also set value on the continuing existence of the existing mature hedgerow boundaries.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.28	Other Documents
Policy MN2.28	Land north of Kenyons Lane, Lydiate	
Respondent No 716	Response Ref 33	Representor Name Robert Swift
Organisation Name Robert Swift and family		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

Land north of Kenyons Lane, Lydiate (Site MN2.28) is a relatively contained site however the SA concludes that it is not required to meet Maghull's requirements and will require the relocation of Moreton's Dairy. No further details have been provided on whether this is a viable option. There is also accessibility constraints associated with the site and it is a SPA area. A density of 30 dph has been applied.

Summary of Suggested Changes

The indicative capacity of Site MN2.28 should be reduced from 295 to 218.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.28	Other Documents
Policy MN2.28	Land north of Kenyons Lane, Lydiate	
Respondent No 740	Response Ref 33	Representor Name
Organisation Name Formby Residents Action Group		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

We wish to rely on the representation of Mr John Williams [Rep No. 1026] for flood risk issue on this site.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.28	Other Documents
Policy MN2.28	Land north of Kenyons Lane, Lydiate	
Respondent No 767	Response Ref 5	Representor Name J Avery
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

Sefton's Local Plan emphasises its relationship with Merseyside and the Liverpool City Region yet virtually ignores the fact that most of its boundary around Lydiate is with West Lancs. West Lancs have voiced concerns about the proposed development, MN2.28 closing the gap between Lydiate and Aughton. Development at MN2.28, land north of Kenyons Lane, Lydiate would erode the gap between Lydiate and West Lancs.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.28**Land north of Kenyons Lane, Lydiate****Respondent No** 769**Response Ref** 5**Representor Name** D Avery**Organisation Name****Obj/Sup/Com** Objection**Summary of Main Issues**

Sefton's Local Plan emphasises its relationship with Merseyside and the Liverpool City Region yet virtually ignores the fact that most of its boundary around Lydiate is with West Lancs. West Lancs have voiced concerns about the proposed development, MN2.28 closing the gap between Lydiate and Aughton. Development at MN2.28, land north of Kenyons Lane, Lydiate would erode the gap between Lydiate and West Lancs.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Policy MN2.28

Land north of Kenyons Lane, Lydiate

Respondent No 993

Response Ref 1

Representor Name Helen Jones

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to object to Sefton Council's Local Plan and in particular to their plans to build "affordable" housing on the Green Belt in Lydiate and Maghull —Site MN2.28 (Turnbridge Road Maghull/on border with Lydiate) and Site MN2.27 Liverpool Road, Lydiate.

The proposed development of both these sites will greatly impact on the unique character of Lydiate village and will add pressure to local services. These are my objections.

1. Loss of Green Belt for housing. Brown field sites should be considered first. Green belt was designed to prevent towns and villages merging into one another. Development on Turnbridge would start to merge Lydiate village with Maghull town.
2. Loss of valuable agricultural land for housing. Turnbridge site is approximately 70% Grade 1 and 2 "best and most versatile," agricultural land according to the Sefton. Agricultural Land Study 2012 (Figures from Sefton council website). Liverpool Road site is also Grade 2/3 agricultural land. Our agricultural land here in Lydiate and all over Sefton should be protected and safeguarded to sustain future generations and ensure locally produced food is available.
3. Building more houses on Green Belt land in areas such as Lydiate will put a premium on them which will clearly make them unaffordable, not "affordable housing."
4. Increased risk of flooding to existing properties. Parts of both sites are at risk from surface water flooding. Turnbridge is, "susceptible to ground water flooding and there is a residual risk from canal failure." (from Sefton MBC website). The canal has burst its banks twice in my life time, flooding surrounding fields and houses.
5. Increased pressure on local services/ infrastructure. If more "affordable housing," for families is built this will greatly increase pressure on local services such as doctors, dentists, hospitals, especially on local schools which may have insufficient places. The impact on local roads and traffic, and also canal bridges and canal traffic heading towards Liverpool/ Burscough which uses the swing bridge at Green Lane and Bells Lane.
6. 'Impact on Local Heritage. Lydiate is a village and tries to preserve its village character. More housing would impact on this. Turnbridge is near to several Grade 11 listed buildings also Fir Grove House and estate (19th Century) on Bells Lane is directly opposite the proposed development. The Running Horses Pub built in 19th century is next to it also. The local website www.Lydiateworld.com has many testimonials/ messages about the unique character of Lydiate.

To protect our historic village I object to any developments which would change the character of Lydiate as a village. Therefore I wholeheartedly object to the Sefton Local Plan and in particular to building on the Green Belt in Turnbridge Road, Maghull (bordering on Lydiate) which I feel would have a detrimental effect on the unique character of Lydiate.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.28 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.28 **Land north of Kenyons Lane, Lydiate**
Respondent No 1026 **Response Ref** 15 **Representor Name** John Williams
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

This site has several problems relating to development:-

- 1) The ground itself is frequently saturated to a very high level due to watercourses in the area not discharging properly
- 2) There are already surface water flooding problems internally of properties around this site and land that this site drains into
- 3) Watercourses crossing this site take a significant area upstream of the site, around the site and then discharges to another watercourse that also has significant problems
- 4) The site is within 250m of a potential source of flooding, and current real world flooding problems, so may have difficulty getting flood insurance.
- 5) It would therefore be deemed as logical that this site should be discounted on grounds of NPPF Ch10 Para.100

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.29 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.29 **Former Prison Site, Park Lane, Maghull**
Respondent No 384 **Response Ref** **Representor Name** Stephen and Clare Jones
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I understand that unused land on the old Maghull Hospital site has been identified to be developed for housing? This is a good use of under developed, prior used space.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.29 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.29 **Former Prison Site, Park Lane, Maghull**
Respondent No 488 **Response Ref** 13 **Representor Name** Ian Brodie Browne
Organisation Name Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group
Obj/Sup/Com Support

Summary of Main Issues

For context and background information we attach our previous submission [dated 7 Aug 2014] because much of what we said in it still applies. Some small Green Belt compromises are possible: We do realise that some land that technically falls within Green Belt can sensibly be developed because it is often not high quality agricultural land.

[Other sites] including the presently vacant Ashworth South prison site in Maghull are examples of sites where a reasonable compromise can be made. Ashworth South is a clear example of a site which has previously been built upon to some extent and therefore lend themselves to being developed. This approach can take the pressure off building on high grade agricultural land. However, such reasonably developable sites within the Green Belt are few.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.29	Other Documents
Policy MN2.29	Former Prison Site, Park Lane, Maghull	
Respondent No 661	Response Ref 5	Representor Name
Organisation Name PSA Developments		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

PSA Developments Ltd object to the proposed release of the former Prison Site, Park Lane, Maghull (Site MN2.29) from the green belt and its allocation for housing in the Sefton draft Local Plan. It is being promoted for release to accommodate 357 dwellings. The 13.61 hectare site sits due north of the larger allocation (MN2.46 - land east of Maghull), and the two sites combined are suggested to be catering for 23.8% of the planned homes within the whole of Sefton borough for the Local Plan period.

The council's rationale for considering site MN2.29 is based in the fact that the site is not agricultural land, has a low chance of unknown archaeological remains, little ecological value and "a low impact on the openness of the green belt" due to its brownfield nature as well as Ashworth Hospital being adjacent to the site. Ground conditions and potential flooding are deemed to have little impact on any future development. It is also suggested that the site would help complement the massive proposed development of site MN2.46 to the immediate south.

We contend that this is not a good housing site. It is isolated from the main built up area, and it is hardly an ideal location for family homes (adjacent to a secure facility such as this). The only change in circumstances would appear to be the 'comprehensive spending review' that now results in this becoming a good housing site when it has not been previously. None of that is a good planning reason to allocate this site for housing. We also question the statement that development of this site would "limit its impact on the openness of the green belt". If this site is developed for housing, that will have just as big an impact on the openness of the green belt as would housebuilding on almost any other undeveloped Green Belt site. The site should be retained as green belt, and our client's site at Bulls Bridge Lane [AS19] allocated as a more appropriate alternative.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Delete site MN2.29 from the allocated housing sites in policy MN2.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.29	Other Documents
Policy MN2.29	Former Prison Site, Park Lane, Maghull	
Respondent No 716	Response Ref 21	Representor Name Robert Swift
Organisation Name Robert Swift and family		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

The site has planning permission for 370 dwellings and the creation of a new station. As the site has planning permission it should not be included as a proposed site allocation and has been discounted on this basis.

Summary of Suggested Changes

The Former Prison Site, Park Lane, Maghull (Site MN2.29) should not be allocated under policy MN2 as it has planning permission.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.29	Other Documents
Policy MN2.29	Former Prison Site, Park Lane, Maghull	
Respondent No 725	Response Ref 9	Representor Name Paul Daly
Organisation Name Sport England		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

This site includes disused playing field land and a cricket pitch (and ancillary facilities such as spectator stand) that is in use. It is understood that the disused playing field land has been mitigated for as a result of a previous scheme that was granted planning permission and part implemented. However, the allocation of this site for housing or employment would also result in the loss of the cricket pitch and ancillary facilities.

Paragraph 74 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Sport England's playing field policy seek to protect playing fields (and other land and buildings used for sport) from development unless specific criteria are met. Sport England oppose the allocation of any site that would result in the loss or redevelopment of existing buildings and/or land used for sport unless it could be demonstrated that they are genuinely surplus to requirements or they would be replaced to an equivalent quantity and quality in a suitable location in line with the requirements of paragraph 74 of the NPPF and Sport England's planning policy objectives.

In the case of playing fields, Sport England would look to an up to date, robust playing pitch strategy to demonstrate that a specific site was not required to meet current and future needs. Whilst it is positive that Sefton has commenced production of a playing pitch strategy, the findings of the assessment and the strategy for addressing the issues it identifies have not yet been produced. It is therefore premature to assume that sites last used for sport will not be required to meet current or future need.

In the case of sites with other types of sports facilities, Sport England would expect an assessment that complies with our guidance ('Assessing needs and opportunities guide for indoor and outdoor sports facilities - How to undertake and apply needs assessments for sports facilities') to demonstrate that they were surplus to requirement. The said guidance was produced to support paragraphs 73 and 74 of the NPPF and is referenced by National Planning Practice Guidance.

No evidence has been provided that the proposed allocation meets any of the exceptions set out in Sport England's playing field policy, or those set out in paragraph 74 of the NPPF. Sport England therefore opposes the allocation of the sites. The loss of the sites is not justified by evidence to showing them to be surplus to requirements, and is therefore considered contrary to paragraph 74 of the NPPF. It is also considered contrary to the objectives of proposed policy NH5 of the Local Plan which seeks to protect playing fields.

This allocation could become acceptable if the site specific requirements in Appendix 1 make clear that the cricket pitch on this site (and ancillary facilities) would need retaining or require replacement. A scheme for redevelopment of this site has come forward for outline planning permission which included onsite re-provision as a possible option so there is a reasonable degree of certainty that for this site replacement or retention is possible.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.46 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.46 **Land East of Maghull**
Respondent No 47 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Robert Snowden
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I have written once to the Council leader, twice to Sefton and once to my local M.P. as well Mr Eric Pickles. TAll those comments should be forwarded to the Inspector.

Nevertheless I will express my concern in reduced form. When I have written before I have expressed that I understand the need for homes but it is the scale of the proposal for the development along Poverty Lane etc to which I object. To expect one community to undergo such a massive change is in my opinion unreasonable and demonstrates the both the planners and local council have little consideration for the people of this community.

I have witnessed this country slowly be affected by poor housing developments both private and those produced by local councils. Estates with cramped housing, and little in the way of trees and thoughtful landscaping. In my opinion neither planners or councils are ever held to account for the awful developments that have been produced.

A reasonable proposal may have produced a reasonable response but I find the scale of the proposal for this land too large for the nature of this community. I have much more to say and have said it before. If as an Inspector you read my comments and would like to visit me so I can show you the area rather than simply look at a map I would be happy to discuss this further.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.46 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.46 **Land East of Maghull**
Respondent No 55 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Fergus Molloy
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The proposed development to the east of Maghull will result in the loss of good quality agricultural land, in contravention of paragraphs 112 and 143 of the NPPF. The size of MN2.46 is disproportionate, representing a scale of development in Maghull which is the biggest for over half a century. Because it is disproportionate it is also not justified as is specified in paragraph 182 of the NPPF.

Infrastructure to support such a large development will not be forthcoming despite Sefton Council's statement in the Aintree and Maghull Champion [4th February 2015] that 'the necessary infrastructure can be provided at the right time to accommodate the level of development proposed through this plan'. Experience shows us [for example the Switch Island to Thornton link road is still not in service after it was first proposed] that such assurances are simply not credible.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Site MN2.246 should be retained as agricultural land.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.46	Other Documents
Policy MN2.46	Land East of Maghull	
Respondent No 77	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Maureen Webb
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I protest in the most strongest possible terms against the proposed plan for MN2 46 Land East of Maghull, 1400 houses and Business Park. This equates to the population of a small town and therefore should be built outside of Maghull. Maghull is a residential area and you are planning a Business Park?

This land is top grade Agricultural growing land desperately needed now and even more so for the future to provide food for the ever increasing population of our small Island. Concreting over this land will cause flooding, no matter how you provide services to cover this!!! Maghull cannot and will not cope with all this plan brings with it, Schools, Doctors, Dentist, Hospital, Roads extra traffic, public Transport.

From looking at the overall plan at other proposed sites, that outside of Maghull the highest total of houses is Formby with 319. Whereas Maghull has another site MN2.29 total 370 also MN2.28 total 295. This gives a total of 2105 houses for Maghull. Why and how on earth was this decided, would it be milking the cash cow that is Maghull a desirable area to live?

All this equates to a unhealthy environment impacting on the residents of Maghull.

These proposed 1,400 homes and Business park need to be built in an area that needs developing and improving, giving a better life to all concerned.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.46	Other Documents
Policy MN2.46	Land East of Maghull	
Respondent No 85	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Colin Leatham
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I oppose building on the land opposite Moss Side Hospital for extra housing. Maghull and Lydiat have enough houses and don't need any more. This is getting built on farm land, and we need every bit in the modern world. Why do planners want to join with the rest of Liverpool, I don't want to be merged in with the rest of Liverpool.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.46	Other Documents
Policy MN2.46	Land East of Maghull	
Respondent No 212	Response Ref 5	Representor Name Angela McIntyre
Organisation Name Maghull Town Council		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

The plan proposes that Maghull contribute over twice the amount of its own housing need to the local plan this fact indicates that the proposals for [Green Belt parcel] S129 [allocated as site MN2.46] fail 4.6 of 'The updated Housing Requirement Study' which suggests that the future housing requirement should be split on a proportionate basis.

The Maghull Town Council survey indicates that residents believe that alternatives exist and that these should be explored. Proportionality was cited as an important aspect of Sefton's Local Plan, in this respect the Plan fails in one of its own key objectives.

Residents believe that any reduction in population estimates should result in sites on the scale of [Green Belt parcel] S129 [allocated as site MN2.46] being taken out of the Plan.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

1. The Town Survey, which was conducted in July 2013, was submitted to Sefton MBC following their publication of the Plan at the Preferred Option stage. (Appendix 1)
2. The Additional Sites response which was submitted following the consultation on the proposed additional sites in 2014. (Appendix 2)
3. The Infrastructure Working Group recommendations. Following examination by Sefton Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Regeneration and Environmental Services) an Infrastructure Working Group was set up to look at the issues and concerns regarding infrastructure which had been raised by the Plan. The recommendations of the group were submitted to Cabinet and approved at the meeting held on 15th January 2015. (Appendix 3)

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.46	Other Documents
Policy MN2.46	Land East of Maghull	
Respondent No 212	Response Ref 4	Representor Name Angela McIntyre
Organisation Name Maghull Town Council		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

32% of those questioned in the Maghull Town Centre survey were opposed based on the key issue of loss of Green belt. Approximately 10% of those in favour with reservations cited loss of Green belt as a key concern.

Within the Methodology for selecting green belt sites there appears to be quite serious inconsistencies and inaccuracies in its application. For example S125 has been ruled out because of the high cost of infrastructure (glass houses on site) when there is a large area of derelict glasshouses on [Green Belt parcel] S129 [allocated as site MN2.46] . The analysis goes on to claim that the owners (smallholdings) have no intention of selling the land for development, this is not true, as several of the landowners when surveyed clearly were very keen to sell their land for development. S111 appears to have been ruled out because of poor access over the Leeds/Liverpool canal, 'Traffic and Access - Amber Access across Leeds Liverpool Canal is constrained. It is not possible to develop S110, S111 and S112 without overloading highway network' this is clearly not the case, as there is a large road bridge connecting this area to the Central Square. Further. the survey results suggest that overloading of the road network would be far worse if [Green Belt parcel] S129 [allocated as site MN2.46] is developed. On the face of it these issues, we question the robustness and accuracy of the consequences study.

The survey results seem to suggest that [Green Belt parcel] S129 [allocated as site MN2.46] has been chosen because it is one of the most profitable sites in Sefton for mixed use, generating enough funding to underwrite some mitigation. However, the residents seem to feel that there may be viable alternatives to [Green Belt parcel] S129 [allocated as site MN2.46] , that are developable, and will have a lesser impact on the town, albeit that alternatives may take a little more imagination and be less attractive to developers and landowners.

The survey poses questions such as why was this ([Green Belt parcel] S129 [allocated as site MN2.46]) site ruled in when Paragraph 112 of the Framework states where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality. On the face of it there is poorer quality scrub land locally available, such as the site behind Oriel Drive in Aintree which could be developed and would spread the burden of development more equitably. Other less damaging sites such as this scrub land by the ASDA Supermarket could be made accessible. This site is also on Floodplain 1 whereas [Green Belt parcel] S129 [allocated as site MN2.46] is on floodplain 2 and 3.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

1. The Town Survey, which was conducted in July 2013, was submitted to Sefton MBC following their publication of the Plan at the Preferred Option stage. (Appendix 1)
2. The Additional Sites response which was submitted following the consultation on the proposed additional sites in 2014. (Appendix 2)
3. The Infrastructure Working Group recommendations. Following examination by Sefton Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Regeneration and Environmental Services) an Infrastructure Working Group was set up to look at the issues and concerns regarding infrastructure which had been raised by the Plan. The recommendations of the group were submitted to Cabinet and approved at the meeting held on 15th January 2015. (Appendix 3)

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.46	Other Documents
Policy MN2.46	Land East of Maghull	
Respondent No 212	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Angela McIntyre
Organisation Name Maghull Town Council		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

General observations on infrastructure comments: Residents were concerned that the scale of the development and its position would make effective mitigation extremely difficult because of the cost and the arterial road infrastructure, making the plan unsound and unsustainable. Concerns about inadequate infrastructure were the main issue, e.g. those who made comments were totally opposed and those who were in favour with reservations.

Infrastructure: Roads: If over 2,000 new homes are built on this site it will result in approximately an additional 4,000 cars spilling onto existing roads which are already very busy. Majority of arterial roads in this area are essentially country lanes. Which cannot be widened. Main thoroughfares such as Deyes Lane are already near capacity, residents have to park their cars on grass verges, already ruining the aesthetics of the area. The area is used as a rat run for large lorries going to and from the M58, this will worsen if the development goes ahead as planned. The junction of Poverty Lane and Foxhouse Lane is already a potential accident spot with 6 lanes of traffic intersecting at a junction with poor lateral visibility.

Mitigating these problems will be nearly impossible without whole scale redesign of the internal/arterial road network in the immediate area. The roads are essentially narrow two way winding country lanes with poor forward visibility, particularly between Poverty Lane and Hall Lane. Although the area will be a 20mph zone this will not be adequately policed and the potential for accidents will inevitably increase, e.g. around Maricourt School which is very busy with pupils darting across the road as they go into and leave the school premises. Pressure will inevitably increase on this road due to increased traffic flow toward Hall Lane.

Another serious concern with this stretch of road relates to parents taking their Children to St Georges Primary School (the only Catholic Primary in the area), this is only accessible via a single lane canal bridge which is already a pressure point with four lanes of traffic converging at the bridge, currently resulting in traffic backing up down Hall Lane toward Northway and backing up along Hall Lane toward Station Road. The increase in traffic will exponentially increase this problem at the Hall Lane bridge.

With congestion around St Georges School (Dennett Close), a large increase in traffic due to the 'school run', which is inevitable, will potentially result in gridlock around Hall Lane, Old Hall Road and Dennett Close. Residents who live on the estate opposite the school who already struggle to get out of the estate at busy time will find it even more difficult.

The Methodology for selecting green belt sites cites that Traffic and Access are assessed as being Green for the [Green Belt parcel] S129 [allocated as site MN2.46] and that the development of this site can provide significant infrastructure and accessibility improvements, including the provision of Maghull North station and the southbound spurs onto the M58 motorway. Whilst the latter two points may be credible, the survey results question the robustness and rigour of the consequences study in relation to the wider impact on the arterial road infrastructure of 'Greater Maghull'.

The survey results indicate that the residents believe the proposals fail the methodology for building on the Green Belt because 'The road network is at or near capacity in a number of areas which could preclude or limit the amount of development either singly or cumulatively, because mitigation is not possible'.

Infrastructure: Schools: Inadequate research and evidence of planning to deal with a large increase in school numbers. The Local Plan mentions the potential expansion of Summerhill Primary School. However there doesn't appear to be any factual research on the numbers and scale of any increase in demand for primary and secondary school places and there is little concrete evidence of robust planning to adequately deal with the inevitable increase in demand for school places. At the moment it is estimated that a large percentage of school places in Maghull are taken by pupils from outside the area. If the current plan goes ahead the likelihood is that these children will be crowded out. If this happens it will mean that fewer children will be travelling to school by public transport and many more will be dropped off by car as part of the school run, exacerbating the very serious congestion that happens at the moment. The roads to majority of schools are almost gridlocked now, the situation will inevitably worsen and there is no clear evidence in the plan how this serious issue will be dealt with.

Infrastructure: Medical services: Inadequate detail on how the medical needs of the increased population will be met. The existing medical services are stretched. It is difficult to get a doctor's appointment and the current dental provision will be woefully inadequate if the plan goes ahead as currently proposed.

Infrastructure: Railway Bridges: The new estate is bordered by what are essentially two country lanes and the only way in to what the survey refers to as 'Greater Maghull' is via two small railway bridges. These bridges are narrow and were never built to deal with the current levels of traffic. An increase in traffic on the scale predicted will exacerbate the problem at busy times potentially leading to traffic backing up down the length of Poverty Lane over the railway bridge to the intersection with Foxhouse Lane and

potentially beyond the cross roads into Eastway. It is difficult to see how these problems can be mitigated. Building an additional entrance to the M58 will not alleviate the traffic going into 'Greater Maghull'.

Infrastructure: Retail: The current shopping centre is not adequate and in need of modernisation. However if the proposals go ahead as planned it will dramatically increase traffic flows between Deyes Lane and Central Square, causing an increase in traffic congestion and in pollution levels through standing traffic. The parking in Central Square and its environs would be inadequate putting additional strain on the surrounding roads such as the Leighton and Towers Avenue area, where recent changes in the car parking regime resulted in large scale disruption for local residents.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

1. The Town Survey, which was conducted in July 2013, was submitted to Sefton MBC following their publication of the Plan at the Preferred Option stage. (Appendix 1)
2. The Additional Sites response which was submitted following the consultation on the proposed additional sites in 2014. (Appendix 2)
3. The Infrastructure Working Group recommendations. Following examination by Sefton Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Regeneration and Environmental Services) an Infrastructure Working Group was set up to look at the issues and concerns regarding infrastructure which had been raised by the Plan. The recommendations of the group were submitted to Cabinet and approved at the meeting held on 15th January 2015. (Appendix 3)

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.46	Other Documents
Policy MN2.46	Land East of Maghull	
Respondent No 212	Response Ref 3	Representor Name Angela McIntyre
Organisation Name Maghull Town Council		
Obj/Sup/Com Objection		

Summary of Main Issues

Residents commented that the [Green Belt parcel] S129 [allocated as site MN2.46] site floods and the methodology for building on Green belt (paragraph 5.10) cites that many of the sites will also need additional survey work and assessments (e.g. site specific flood risk assessments and ecological assessments) before any planning application is submitted to develop the site. Residents are concerned that this will not happen if the site is given the green light for development.

Large areas of this site are in Flood Zones 2 and 3 or at risk of other types of flooding. The drains in Maghull are in a poor state of repair and United Utilities admit that there is a major problem with Hydraulic failure in Maghull, causing backups which result in raw sewage leaking out of the drains. If an additional 2,000 homes are somehow connected to the existing system there is a real danger that this unacceptable situation will get much worse. Although Sefton has a flood defence plan it seems to have no power over United Utilities whose lack of remedial action could create very serious problems in the event of any future flood where various water courses may coalesce, this may then have an impact on any flood defence or control mechanisms installed on [Green Belt parcel] S129 [allocated as site MN2.46], which Sefton Council may ultimately be held legally responsible for.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

1. The Town Survey, which was conducted in July 2013, was submitted to Sefton MBC following their publication of the Plan at the Preferred Option stage. (Appendix 1)
2. The Additional Sites response which was submitted following the consultation on the proposed additional sites in 2014. (Appendix 2)
3. The Infrastructure Working Group recommendations. Following examination by Sefton Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Regeneration and Environmental Services) an Infrastructure Working Group was set up to look at the issues and concerns regarding infrastructure which had been raised by the Plan. The recommendations of the group were submitted to Cabinet and approved at the meeting held on 15th January 2015. (Appendix 3)

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.46 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.46 **Land East of Maghull**
Respondent No 218 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Andrea Webster
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Objection to the allocation of land for 1,400 homes to the east of Maghull. This is not a well thought out proposal.

1. Total number of new homes for this area is greater than the total for the rest of Sefton. There is insufficient infrastructure. There will be months of disruption and delays with roadworks at Switch Island and the proposal for increased access to the port. The road network at Switch Island is insufficient to cope with increased traffic and will impact on road safety.
2. Maghull is a popular residential area based on the fact that there is surrounding land not built on. This increased number of homes will devalue the area and the property already in this area. There are a variety of house prices in this area that provide sufficient choice
3. Waiting times at GP surgery. No walk in centre in the area.
4. Schools and public health. Outdoor play areas at schools help long term health and wellbeing. We do not want to see play areas constructed on, as has been the case with Birkdale Primary School.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.46 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.46 **Land East of Maghull**
Respondent No 220 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Beryl Ashcroft
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the Sefton local plan to build on green belt land in the area. This area will not sustain the amount of people or traffic that development will bring to the area. This greenbelt area East of Maghull yields fresh crops in the area year after year. There are plenty of brown field sites and other areas that could be built on. To take away this wonderful farmland is a silly idea when the Government want us all to pull together to be self sufficient. I would like to Object to this Plan.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.46 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.46 **Land East of Maghull**
Respondent No 221 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** George Ashcroft
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to object to the Sefton Local Plan to build on Green belt land in any area. The Green belt area to the East of Maghull is grade A land producing crops every year. This is helping Britain to be self sufficient, as for buildings, this land is also a flood area during the winter months, and is a point for migrating birds that settle every year. This area will not take the influx of people and traffic that this plan proposes. I object to this plan.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The Local Authority and Government as a whole must realise the importance of feeding one's own nation as far as it is possible. We are continually seeing an uncontrolled expanding nation and increasing attempts to reduce Green Belt. The latter should be illegalised now and all Green Belt suitable for agriculture, particularly the better grades (1 and 2) should be protected from development both now and in the future. This is not only essential to enable us to feed the present and future generations but also in the case of Maghull and Lydiate to stop the urban sprawl from denuding our already over built town and removing all green spaces.

It is evident if you live in the Maghull area that the town has grown in an haphazard manner, each past development being passed without due regard to the overall picture and we now have a mis-match of construction. The continual increase in houses and as a result population has put an ever increasing strain on the towns infrastructure. Roads are inadequate for the number and size of vehicles - more and more bottle-necks are occurring and on some roads at certain times of day it is difficult for the traffic to flow smoothly leading to greater risk of accidents occurring.

The pavements in many areas are too narrow and with more and more vehicles taking to partially parking on them it becomes more precarious for pedestrians. Introducing a wide spread 20 mph speed limit in the area was a waste of money, it is ineffectual as it is not enforced. Vehicles continue to speed along Foxhouse Lane/Hall Lane in excess of 30 mph often past the railway station or school on Hall Lane where pedestrians congregate. It is perhaps worthy of note that on three fairly recent occasions vehicles parked near my home were seriously damaged by reckless driving.

Furthermore the facilities for residents of the area are already overstretched, parking at Central Square shops can be difficult and continues to be a problem. Appointments at local doctors surgeries are not always readily available because of over demand and alternative walk in centres are inaccessible to many. The ambulance service has been withdrawn from the town and the police are no longer stationed in Maghull. Again, any resources that are available would be unacceptably stretched by a growth in the population of Maghull that would be caused by development on sites MN2.28 and MN2.46. Please leave our Green Belt and spaces alone and restrict new build to areas that are nonagricultural.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Site allocations MN2.46 and MN2.28 should be removed completely from the plan as there is no justification in building on good agricultural land when there is a shortage overall in the country to provide food for its population. Once built on Green Belt is lost forever. The number of proposed new builds in these areas would place an unbearable pressure on the already overburdened infrastructure and facilities of the town.

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.46

Land East of Maghull

Respondent No 347

Response Ref 1

Representor Name Dave Billows

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am writing to object to the proposed construction of 1400 houses and a 20ha Business Park (MN2.46) on green belt land in Maghull.

My objection is due to a number of reasons. The scale of this development is massively disproportionate to the scale of all other developments proposed within the "Local Plan" across the borough of Sefton. This development is in fact, a small town, with a new train station promised for the use of its "thousands" of inhabitants! The roads in this part of Maghull are generally narrow, winding country lanes which could not withstand the volume of traffic that will arise from this number of dwellings and business premises. The area's water supply company, United Utilities, has said that it could only cope with the addition of an extra 30 to 50 new homes each year. In fact the area's infrastructure in general could in no way cope with the new demands placed upon it should this development go ahead and there are no plans within this proposal to improve any part of this infrastructure! A survey of almost 600 local homes in the area was carried out by the local council in 2013 and only 6% of those asked were in favour of these proposed developments.

This shows a complete disregard by the elected councilors, for the wishes of the people who elected them! At a meeting arranged for

local residents to meet the planners in Maghull town hall last year, I raised the point that there was no burgeoning housing crisis in the Maghull, Aintree, Lydiate or Formby areas and was told that these proposals were to ease the crisis in Bootle! There is enough Brownfield space in Bootle that could be built upon to ease these housing problems but I feel that this is something the local council seem to be loathe to do, or are at the very least, doing ineffectively or without any real focus or urgency. It seems that these local councilors would prefer to build the vast majority of any new homes in the most desirable and expensive parts of the borough! Something that I am sure would also be favoured by the developers, who would stand to make double or even treble the profits on these homes if they were built in Maghull, Formby and Lydiate as opposed to Bootle where they are needed and could be built! I vehemently object to this proposed development and hope my views will be taken into account.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Build homes in Bootle and remove MN2.46 as a propsoed allocation.

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to object to the local plan proposed by Sefton Council on the following general grounds:

The plan is not positively prepared. It does not meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements. There is no evidence of consultation with neighbouring authorities and it is not consistent with achieving sustainable development.

The plan is not justified. There is no evidence that it provides the most appropriate strategy, when considered against reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence.

The plan is not effective. It will not be deliverable over its period and there is no evidence that it is based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities.

The plan is not consistent with national policy. It will not enable the delivery of sustainable development in that it is destructive of the green belt and does not adequately provide affordable housing.

In particular:

1. In using the highest possible estimates of housing need, the plan is based on unrealistic assumptions of employment growth and inward migration.

2. The plan envisages building on large areas of green belt, much of which is good quality agricultural land. This is not sensible when the country is importing an increasing proportion of our food. Nationally we should be working to retain as much farmland as possible if we are to maintain food security. All local plans should bear this in mind.

3. The plan does not require developers to prioritise brownfield sites, of which there are many in Sefton. When this is viewed alongside an overestimate of housing need there is a strong possibility that developers will build initially on green sites and leave brownfield sites until later. Additionally it is clear that changing patterns

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove site as an allocation.

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

With reference to the above, I have read articles and have attended meetings in order to gather information on the above plan. Whilst I agree that there must be a plan for progress and provision should be made for the future of our area. These aims and objectives have become lost and residents have no voice.

1. I would have welcomed a small number of 1 and 2 bedroomed affordable houses to be built in the area between School Lane and Poverty Lane, but object to the scale of development; a distribution centre, 1,400 houses. Big business has taken over! What the ageing population of Maghull needs is for an area to be developed for its older residents with smaller properties and small gardens, which they can cope with in later life; not the continual building of communal retirement flats (e.g. Mayhall) or larger luxury houses. If this provision was made then we would see many 3 bedroom semi-detached family houses becoming available for younger families who want to live in this area. At the moment it would seem that there are a large number of these properties with only one person living in them. Sefton should consider the needs of its ageing population as part of the local plan; they have omitted to do this.

2. My property backs on to the above mentioned land; which is an area of natural habitat; trees providing homes for many species of wild life; birds, ducks, frogs, squirrels, an area which has been there hundreds of years; we must not just protect our green belt but protect our wildlife as well! I object to the destruction of this wildlife area.

3. The drainage issue on this land has not been considered. Whinney Brook runs through this whole area and in times of heavy rainfall our water table is high; properties further down Foxhouse Lane have flooded as a result, so where are the developers intending to dispose of the excess rainwater if the area is covered in concrete! I object to the problems this will cause.

4. The increased amount of traffic travelling at speed on Foxhouse Lane has long been causing problems for Maricourt High School; altering the speed limit to 20mph has proved ineffective and a waste of money as there is a lack of enforcement. 1400 homes on this proposed site with access from School Lane & Poverty Lane will add to the existing problems on Foxhouse Lane making it more dangerous both on the bend and by the school; I object to this.

5. It is impossible to get a routine doctor or dentist appointment without having to wait over a week to ten days. A new medical facility would be unlikely with the current NHS cuts. Further pressure would subsequently be put on our local hospitals and related services. I object to having to wait longer for medical care.

6. Maghull is mostly surrounded by fields, trees, hedges, ditches; its pleasant to drive into this area. As the council you should strive to keep it that way and not chip away at our perimeters with large building projects, we should ALL take pride in the appearance of our environment and not rush to fill up our green spaces and farm land with bricks & mortar. I strongly object to the Local Plan in its present form.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.46	Other Documents
Policy MN2.46	Land East of Maghull	
Respondent No 366	Response Ref 6	Representor Name Margaret Anne Hill
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

Increased volume of traffic. Maghull is a village; already overgrown into a town with significant traffic congestion. There is a small amount of traffic to and from the M58 but the vast majority of traffic movement is on village roads leading to the A59 route through the middle of, into and out of Maghull. The village roads are narrow, single lane and winding. 1/2 mile tailbacks to reach/cross the A59 are common now.

The proposal for massive increase in building in Maghull is not positively prepared nor justified. Site MN2.46 would result in enormous increase in traffic along School Lane to Deyes or Foxhouse Lanes and Poverty Lane. There is no room for other roads to the A59 without pulling down houses. I am told that Sefton Council say that there is no 'tipping point' in relation to the number of vehicles able to use roads. That is self-evidently not a sensible nor reasonable stance. There are now frequently close to gridlock situations in the Foxhouse Lane, Station Road area where there are narrow roads with frequent junctions, frequent road closures [trains] and single file traffic [canal crossing or Station Road].

Similar road difficulties occur near most of the greenfield and agricultural land areas proposed for development in Maghull. A proposed site has single route access which includes single file access across the Leeds Liverpool canal; a route which is frequently closed for 15 mins at a time while the canal leisure boats journey through. Surely a health and safety matter in relation to fire and ambulance access to the estate.

The excellent Merseyrail network with its large car park at Maghull station and bus interchange. However, the car park is full by early morning. Station Road is so narrow that traffic frequently has to stop to 'take it in turns' if there is a bus using the road. The 7 minute duration road closures every 15mins cause hold-ups and increase the flow of traffic along Poverty Lane; a boundary of MN2.46.

Poverty Lane is also a narrow winding single lane road, with a 20 mph speed limit, speed bumps and primary school; so single file traffic at the start and end of the school day. Should the school be increased in size, the road would become unuseable. Access to Poverty Lane from the Maghull East site would have to be close to the primary school because of the bridges over the railway and the motorway. You cannot pull down hundreds of houses to widen the roads [to build hundreds of houses on greenfield sites] to change the village road structure into an effective town road structure. Housing and industrial development must be within the capacity of the road structure to support it. The brownfield sites are located where there is a good road network.

The Maghull East site has been subject to flooding in recent years. Regarding flooding, the plan is neither positively prepared nor justified. The plan to build on Maghull East site is also contrary to national policy [being agricultural land] and earlier proposals to develop it were rejected by Sefton Council. The plan is not effective as it cannot deliver an effective road network in Maghull to support the massive development proposals.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.46	Other Documents Economic Viability Assessment
Policy MN2.46	Land East of Maghull	
Respondent No 421	Response Ref 5	Representor Name Colin Reader
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

A separate viability assessment has been undertaken for the large mixed-use green belt development proposed at Land East of Maghull has found the development to be viable. Paragraph 6.175 does not reveal the full picture. Significantly, it is not made clear until paragraph 9.23, that when the policy on 30% affordable housing is included in the assessments, this site becomes unviable.

The findings of the viability assessment (particularly para 9.23) may explain why Sefton Council introduced a last-minute policy amendment on 22 January 2015 to relax the policy requirement for 30% affordable homes on the Maghull East development. As Sefton's policies now stand, the large and apparently important Maghull East site will incorporate no specific requirements to address the key demographic challenges facing Sefton.

It is for reasons such as this, that residents of Sefton see the current Local Plan not as a blueprint for the sustainable and successful future development of the borough, but rather a charter for commercial development companies to build the sort of houses that they want in the sort of locations that will be most attractive in the market place – irrespective of the implications or impact on the borough as a whole.

The proposals for the development of Land East of Maghull will impact that town greatly. Maghull and Lydiate have evolved over hundreds of years, largely along the banks of the Leeds to Liverpool Canal. Very few crossings of the canal are to modern standards, with narrow wooden or stone bridges. Even if the money was found to modernise the crossings of the canal, privately owned properties lining the narrow lanes approaching these bridges would still act as a traffic bottle neck. The canal also acts as a barrier to other forms of infrastructure, with careful consideration needed before sewers, gas mains etc can be taken across and of course, the specialist design and construction implications carry an associated cost burden. These and other features of the town represent very real constraints on development at any scale. Sefton MBC appear to have only a preliminary understanding of the infrastructure requirements or the associated costs.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.46	Other Documents
Policy MN2.46	Land East of Maghull	
Respondent No 468	Response Ref 2	Representor Name David Scott
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I object to this development on the farmlands between the M58, the railway line and School Lane to Junction 1 M58. It is not proportionate to the size of the settlement of Maghull. I have concerns about its effects on the highway, social, drainage and educational infrastructure of the area. Clearly there is a need to provide more housing, but does so much of it have to be in Maghull and are the housing figures completely justified anyway?

No doubt during the public examination there will be calls for change to this proposal and perhaps a more moderate result will be achieved and the necessary infrastructure provided.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.46 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.46 **Land East of Maghull**
Respondent No 477 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** B J Fenerty
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We object to the proposed massive development on this Green Belt which is high grade agricultural land. As this Local Plan allows, developers will rush to build here (they have been trying to do so for decades) and they will see no urgency for more difficult development on brownfield sites which is really what should happen first.

Government ministers have repeatedly said green belt , particularly high grade agricultural land, should be protected where ever possible.

At the the most, the site mentioned should be earmarked as ' Safeguarded land ' and should not be even considered for development until the bulk of the brownfield sites have been utilised . The projected housing demand in Sefton, with it's falling population, may, in any event, prove to be too high but, as things stand, it would then be too late to save this valuable,high grade, greenbelt agricultural land.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.46 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.46 **Land East of Maghull**
Respondent No 488 **Response Ref** 7 **Representor Name** Ian Brodie Browne
Organisation Name Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Maghull (New Town) – It's far more than an urban extension!
Maghull and Lydiate are to see a huge amount of development via this Plan which is totally out with the housing needs of these two communities. Sites MN2.46/MN3.38 are to add a vast (New Town type) extension to the east of Maghull and this on some of the 2% highest grade agricultural land in England! We continue to argue that this is not environmentally sustainable development and that it is totally out of scale with the housing needs of this part of the Borough.
Lydiate too is to see significant development, again on high grade agricultural land and the semi-rural nature of this community is clearly being put at risk. There is every danger here that the scale of development will see the erosion of the Green Belt between Lydiate and Aughton Civil Parishes.

For context and background information we attach our previous submission [dated 7 Aug 2014] because much of what we said in it still applies:

Urban Extensions:

The potential size increases of some communities, e.g. Maghull to increase by nearly 25% and Lydiate by 35% will fundamentally change the character of these parishes. The Local Plan process was supposed to prevent such significant increases and we feel that the scale of the proposals is therefore unacceptable.

To illustrate our concerns we have conducted a review of the proposals for the East Parishes part of the Borough because it sadly details our concerns only too well. Whilst there are of course 'additional sites' across Sefton that land owners want to concrete over this part of the Borough is clearly being targeted by developers. Should they get their way the impact on the East Parishes communities could be catastrophic.

Sites in and around the East Parishes communities – Maghull, Aintree Village, Lydiate & Melling:

There are some truly vast sites here that developers wish to see built upon and a real danger that communities will merge into one another and lose identity if the proposals are taken forward.

Conclusions(part):

Translating the sites to a map of the East Parishes communities quickly leads you to the conclusion that semi-rural nature of these separate villages and the Town of Maghull will all but be lost by the Council's draft proposals. To add in the majority of the 'additional sites' would simply stick the final lid in the coffin of these separate, proud and semi-rural communities.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.46 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.46 **Land East of Maghull**
Respondent No 493 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Michael Jones
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

We object to the Sefton Local Plan [as it stands] For 1400 houses to be built in Maghull[East Parish] plus a Business Park and a Distribution Centre.Plus other smaller areas in Maghull and Lydiate. The building of 370 houses on the old Moss Side/ Park Lane Hospital is enough for the area to cope with i.e. Doctor's, roads, schools ect.and now a Medium Secure unit. We feel this Local Plan is being driven by party politics and not a notion of fairness or common sense. Building on 'Greenbelt' is not the way forward and a Brown field policy should be employed by Sefton. The Local Plan will destroy what is left of the character of Maghull. We hope the Government Inspector at a Public enquiry, will realise how bad this is for Central Sefton especially Maghull and Lydiate. We request that the council go back to the drawing board and most importantly listen to the residents of Maghull and Lydiate and consider fairness; not enviromental vandalism.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.46 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.46 **Land East of Maghull**
Respondent No 551 **Response Ref** **Representor Name** Stephen Sayce
Organisation Name Environment Agency
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The council has not undertaken a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment or site specific Flood Risk Assessment for Land East of Maghul. In light of the above we consider that the Council have not been able to satisfactorily apply the exception test as required by the NPPF. Sefton Council are aware of our requirements on the above points and we are working very closely with them to ensure the correct information is submitted.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.46 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.46 **Land East of Maghull**
Respondent No 553 **Response Ref** 3 **Representor Name** Alex Naughton
Organisation Name Merseytravel
Obj/Sup/Com Support

Summary of Main Issues

Development should be focused in areas that are presently well-served by existing, sustainable transport and the need to travel should be minimised, so as to allow walking and cycling to become much more prominent forms of transport within the city region and Sefton. There should also be an expectation that developers should contribute to cost of providing adequate public transport access in areas that are not well served by existing public transport services. This is especially important for the major housing sites (100 units or more) which should be served by a half hourly bus service to a District Centre. This is also very relevant for the major employment sites which should be served by a regular bus service particularly at times of peak demand (e.g. shift changes etc). The example of the "Land East of Maghull" is a good example of the sustainability ethos we wish to see replicated elsewhere. It is noted that an emerging challenge in the context of the Merseyside's LTP3 is that both traffic volumes and distances travelled are forecast to grow over the next 15 years (on a "do nothing" scenario). The importance of a focused spatial development strategy is particularly important to address this challenge, so as to reduce the distance between work and employment/leisure.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.46

Land East of Maghull

Respondent No 581

Response Ref 1

Representor Name Frank Vaughn

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The proposal to build a minimum of 1400 homes plus a Business park and Distribution centred on the farmland bordered by School lane/Foxhouse lane/Poverty lane, and also the 295 homes along Kenyons lane, cannot be justified. There is no case locally for such a large increase in Maghull housing. Councillors should be fighting for the interests of the people of Maghull rather than for the destruction of our environment.

The farmland surrounding Maghull is some of the best in the country and to concrete over the large area of land between School lane and Poverty lane would be unforgiveable. It will mean the loss of farming communities, wildlife and habitats. A source of ever more valuable food production will also disappear. All lost forever and replaced by more urban sprawl with its attendant problems.

Maghull's infrastructure will be unable to cope with such a large increase in population, especially in one area, and the absence of any published plans to cater for the increase is disturbing. To expect the surrounding Schools, Shops, Roads, Doctors, Dentists and Public Utilities to cope with a likely minimum of 5,000 new residents on one Estate is unrealistic.

On the same land there will also be the Business park and Distribution centre bringing with them the largest of H.G.V.s and other commercial vehicles. These and perhaps 2000 additional private cars will then appear on our local roads causing damage and reducing road safety.

The Local Plan should be based on a Brownfield First policy and we cannot understand the absence of such a basic principle in the Plan. The council did not carry out meaningful consultation and disregarded public questions and the Maghull Town Council Resident Survey. If this Plan proceeds in it's present form, East Maghull will change beyond recognition and no longer be a pleasant place to live.

Summary of Suggested Changes

A Brownfield First policy should be adopted and all such available land be used for housing. Should this source becomes exhausted small developments could be considered but ensuring that the general environment and character of the affected area are not changed. We should protect our farmland at all costs. We will need it in the future

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2.46

Land East of Maghull

Respondent No 661 Response Ref 6 Representor Name

Organisation Name PSA Developments

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

This large site is being promoted for mixed use Development, with the aim to accommodate a business park and 1,588 dwellings [in the Preferred Option. This is the largest number of dwellings of any site allocated throughout Sefton. The LPA suggest that, in view of its size, the site presents a number of benefits, chiefly the possibility of the provision of significant infrastructure, including a new Maghull North railway station and southbound spurs onto the M58 (which it is suggested will also act as a well-defined boundary for the site); the chance to provide a 'local centre' to serve the new community alongside a new 25 hectare business park; and, due to its size, there is no need to release any additional green belt sites for local need in Maghull, apart from the prison site to the north.

The site assessment [at the Preferred Option stage] rated the site 'green' in only four categories out of the nine assessed. Not an impressive 'score' when contemplating the release of such a massive site on the edge of a relatively modest settlement. PSA Developments Ltd objects to the allocation of this site. Its size means that it will not be fully developed within the plan period. It notes that the large infrastructure projects such as Maghull North station are only "objectives" at this time, which raises the question as to whether this is the most appropriate site to be released if it is to address the considerable shortfall in housing supply. The extent of infrastructure suggested can only be delivered at massive cost and is likely to take many years to plan and bring forward, with likely delays, cost increases and technical / environmental challenges along the way. There are therefore serious questions about the deliverability of these homes.

We also question whether Maghull is of sufficient scale and infrastructure to support such a massive land allocation. Maghull is a relatively modest settlement, and we consider it is not well served to accommodate the extent of development proposed on this site.

There are better green belt sites to release that 'score' much better in the council's assessment, that have far fewer development constraints, and which could be brought forward in the short term with no massive infrastructure burdens and the delays that will almost certainly flow from that. The site at Bulls Bridge Lane (Site AS19) is a prime example, and should be released in advance of this site and all of its intrinsic risks, constraints and undeniably weak justification for release.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Delete site MN2.46 from the housing allocations in policy MN2.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.46	Other Documents
Policy MN2.46	Land East of Maghull	
Respondent No 699	Response Ref 7	Representor Name P O'Hanlon
Organisation Name	Maghull and Lydiate Action Group	
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

The proposal to build a minimum of 1400 houses plus distribution centres and various community needs, a veritable "Newtown", encapsulates everything that is wrong about Sefton's ill-conceived Local Plan. The use of this site is not driven by an inflated housing requirement but mainly on the need to build on this site at any price to the local community, as proven when the requirement for affordable housing was withdrawn the day before Planning Committee to prevent the developers "running away" due to lack of profit.

Sefton Council want to build here so that developers will pay towards a new station and the extension to the M58 junction. The huge new homes built bonus will benefit a cash-strapped council, plus over £2m in Community Infrastructure Levy alone. The amount of building that Sefton Council have planned is too high and fuelled by greed and with no thought whatsoever for the residents of Sefton'. We strongly object to this "so called" plan that hasn't been planned at all but cobbled together by Sefton Council and their partners — the developers'. Funding large projects which are not required is not a reason to build large number of houses on green belt and does not qualify under the NPPF as "exceptional circumstances" for release of green belt land.

The site is not only in the greenbelt but is entirely high quality "most versatile" agricultural land in the top 2% in the country and has been farmed every year for the past 40 years. The proposed development destroys part of the countryside buffer around Maghull. Local resident observes that such land will be needed in future to feed a growing population.

2 well-used public footpaths cross the site. If retained as urban paths the opportunity for pleasant local walks will be lost. Site bordered by railway and M58. It's only access is by two narrow roads, one already subject to traffic humps and 20 M.P.H limits, both of these roads are heavily congested at most times and with plans to build a station, 370 houses on another site opposite and a new clinic at Ashworth, all serviced by one of these roads (School Lane). The construction of a further 1400 houses is sheer madness. The planners have no plans to address these problems until after construction has started. They state that "there will be no tipping point" no matter how much traffic or pollution there will be.

United Utilities according to Sefton's own Scrutiny Committee have only budgeted for 30 new houses per year for the whole of Maghull, which leaves the use of S.U.D.S. the only option and the same committee reported S.U.D.S "Have a limited capacity to cope". This is not good for a site which has a tendency to flood each year.

Part of the site contains Whinny Brook, hedgerows and mature trees. Potential habitat for wintering birds. Invasive species recorded on this site. It is known locally that the area is a haven for bat roosts. In conclusion, any further development of this area is unjustified and unnecessary and will result in devastation of the local environment. Building homes in an area already awash with similar houses for sale will result in large amounts of unoccupied property. This land is a natural flood plain. We experience problems in wet weather with blocked and overflowing drains which cause terrible flooding on the lane. Building another 1400 houses plus will make flooding worse and affect residents further away.

Local resident observes 'Not many dentists and doctors in the area. Thousands more people will make matters worse as apparently no plans for more dentists, doctors, nurseries or shops etc'... ' "Local Plan" has been rushed through without any thought to the infrastructure, or the residents who already live here'. The developers should be made to build on brownfield sites.

Summary of Suggested Changes

This is not a suitable place for development and we object to this site being included in the Local Plan.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.46 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.46 **Land East of Maghull**
Respondent No 716 **Response Ref** 47 **Representor Name** Robert Swift
Organisation Name Robert Swift and family
Obj/Sup/Com Support

Summary of Main Issues

Land East of Maghull (Site MN2.46) - site promoted by developer. There are 4 housebuilders involved in the promotion of this site – Charles Church, Persimmon, Taylor Wimpey and Countryside, which will build at an average of 100 dwellings per annum (combined) over a 14 year period. RSL will also be involved. We agree with the Council's indicative capacity on this site.

Summary of Suggested Changes

None requested.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.46 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.46 **Land East of Maghull**
Respondent No 750 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Joan Gore
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I object to the proposed plan to build a new town land east of Maghull with a minimum of 1400 homes, two distribution centres and a business centre. Loss of prime agricultural land, the best in Britain, is unacceptable. We need to remember why we have Green Belt in the first place. We must not concrete over this. We also have a problem in the area with flooding. The loss of wildlife including geese, hares, pheasants, sparrowhawks, owls and different species of birds is also concerning.

There are only two ways out of this 'new town' - School Lane/ Deyes Lane, which are already very congested, very small roads. We just cannot take any more traffic. They are also planning a new station here. We already have Park Lane Hospital, Kennett Prison entrance and exit onto School Lane/Deyes Lane.

Maghull and Lydiate already at saturation point. We struggle now to get a doctor's appointment and dentists. The local schools are already full so where are all the children going to go. If the children want to go to a RC school [Maricourt High School] - there are narrow roads, children have been knocked over.

St Georges Primary - narrow roads over a canal bridge down Hall Lane/Old Hall Lane, again small winding roads, people who live nearby are complaining about people parking over driveways. Impossible to drive around Maghull at school times. Deyes High, St Andrews both on same road again at breaking point. Roads near schools very busy.

This new town east of Maghull with an additional 4000 cars on the road, lorries going to the distribution centres, cars going to a business centre will be a nightmare!

Regarding the emergency services, we have no police station, ambulance station or fire service. To build this new town would a strain on all our services. We have one A&E dept in Fazackerley which is under pressure and Ormskirk A&E is only for minor injuries. Where will all these people go?

There is no need to build on this land as there are plenty of brownfield sites available. Sefton has a declining population. There are 400 homes for sale in Maghull at this moment in time. I think this is pure greed from Sefton Council as they get a new housing bonis from the government. They are not listening to the people of Maghull and Lydiate.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.46 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.46 **Land East of Maghull**
Respondent No 752 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Winifred Cox
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I would like to register my objection to the proposal to build a large number of houses in this area [particularly on the Green Belt land bordering Poverty Lane/Deyes Lane/School Lane/Foxhouse Lane]. I object on the basis that there is no adequate provision for the extra traffic on already busy roads, in particular Deyes Lane.

I wrote to the Council last July concerning a zebra/pelican crossing on Deyes Lane. I was informed that this could not be justified. I am concerned as many people need to cross this road and think how much worse the situation will be with hundreds of extra vehicles using this road.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.46 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.46 **Land East of Maghull**
Respondent No 753 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Ray Cox
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I object to the proposed plan to build houses on prime agricultural land on the Foxhouse, School and Poverty Lanes. I have walked across this farmland for 44 years and know very well the produce these fields produce in a year. There really can't be any viable excuse for building on such land.

Planners have no idea of the volume of additional traffic this will add on an already over stretched road system. As a non-driver, trying to cross Deyes Lane between 7.30 to 9.00 is a problem. A crossing is badly needed. Another nightmare is cars parked on double yellows and pavements.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.46 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.46 **Land East of Maghull**
Respondent No 767 **Response Ref** 3 **Representor Name** J Avery
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Building 1400 homes and a business park on the MN2.46 site, land east of Maghull as well as the homes being built on the old prison site will effectively lead to the creation of a new town in Maghull and the final death knell for Maghull Town Square which has suffered from under investment for years. It is inconceivable to think that the new intended population of Maghull living on the proposed Sefton east site will do their shopping at Maghull Square or Morrisons supermarket. Instead they will drive to a large retail park elsewhere. This will not benefit our small businesses in the Square. The Development at MN2.46, land east of Maghull would erode the gap between Maghull, Melling and Knowsley.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name**Obj/Sup/Com** Objection**Summary of Main Issues**

Building 1400 homes and a business park on the MN2.46 site, land east of Maghull as well as the homes being built on the old prison site will effectively lead to the creation of a new town in Maghull and the final death knell for Maghull Town Square which has suffered from under investment for years. It is inconceivable to think that the new intended population of Maghull living on the proposed Sefton east site will do their shopping at Maghull Square or Morrisons supermarket. Instead they will drive to a large retail park elsewhere. This will not benefit our small businesses in the Square. The Development at MN2.46. land east of Maghull would erode the gap between Maghull, Melling and Knowsley.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

The Local Plan for Sefton, 3.15 states, Climate change can be adapted to by steering development away from areas at greatest risk of flooding

I've enclosed a map of the proposed development site together with a map from the environment agency flood map for planning and the Sefton council critical drainage map.

The proposed development MN2.46 is in a high risk flood area (environment agency map), as well as being in a critical drainage area, furthermore it is of high quality agricultural land in the greenbelt.

Sefton Council employed Capita Symonds to undertake strategic flood assessment, in it they state, 1.1.2, Specifically, new development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding. This is principally achieved through the application of a Sequential Test, which seeks to locate development first in areas of lowest risk, i.e. Flood Zone 1, and where that is not possible then to locate development in areas of moderate risk, i.e. Flood Zone 2, in preference to areas of high risk, i.e. Flood Zone 3. Development in Flood Zone 3 is only acceptable where there are no suitable locations within Flood Zones 1 or 2. they go on to state "a number of areas shown to be at risk from a 1 in 25 annual probability event. These principally lie along the path of Whinney Brook, Melling Brook and Brooklea".

The proposed site MN2.46 breaches National planning policy as the Council have NOT offered any other sites for development in lower flood zones.

Local plan for Sefton 5.5 states, National planning policy also identifies areas where development should be restricted. These include sites protected under the Birds and Habitats Directives and/or sites designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (such as those along the Sefton coast); land designated as Green Belt, designated heritage assets; and locations at risk of flooding or coastal erosion.

The proposed site MN2.46 breaches National planning policy as stated in the Local plan 5.5. It is on a flood risk area and is also a critical drainage area AND is greenbelt high grade agricultural land..

NPPF Paragraph 87 states: As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

NPPF Paragraph 88 states: When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

The proposed site MN2.46 breaches National planning policy 87 & 88 above as the Council have not shown this development warrants "Very Special Circumstances"

Road Infrastructure, The plan sets out NO infrastructure improvements to the road system before the development starts. Thousands of truck movements will be required and the existing road infrastructure will not cope. There are funds allocated to improve Junction 1 M58 now (yr 2015/16) yet no junction improvements are required for at least 5 years. New barriers have only this week been finished on the Junction 1 roundabout. This shows there is no plan for doing the Junction Improvement anytime soon.

Nothing in the plan states that United Utilities can cope with 1400 extra houses to their infrastructure for drinking water and sewerage. Have they been asked if their infrastructure can cope with 1400 new homes ?

Nothing in the plan states that the Environment agency has the funding to deal with the increased flood risk lower down the river Alt, again have they even been asked if funds are available ?

Capita Symons also produced a report for Sefton Council in 2013, the final page of the report states, A number of locations appear to be at risk from a number of different sources and these 'hotspots' should be noted. Based on historical records, the Environment Agency's flood zone map, fluvial/flood risk modelling, surface water and sewer flood risk modelling and consideration of the influences and effects of groundwater, canal flooding and reservoir flooding there are hotspots of flooding at the following locations: Along Whinney Brook, particularly at Hall Lane and at Fouracres (Maghull);

This proposed development is located on the northern reaches of Whinney Brook and building on it will have a knock on effect of areas lower down the drain system which as pointed out above already suffer from flooding. The report says that United Utilities and Environment Agency are responsible for certain things BUT there are no mention if United Utilities are able to deal with 1400 homes, have the council even asked if the water and drainage system can cope with an extra 1400 homes. Is there funding available to the Environment Agency to improve the flood prevention as a result of increased flow into the Whinney Brook / River Alt, again no mention.

This is prime agricultural land, at a time when we are now approaching importing 50% of our food requirements is it wrong to build on land that can produce good quality food needed for the population.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Map of flood zones and critical drainage areas

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.46	Other Documents
Policy MN2.46	Land East of Maghull	
Respondent No 785	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Katherine Petrie

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I object to so many homes being built. Where will children from these 1400 houses get their education and medical care? The traffic on Foxhouse Lane and Poverty Lane is far greater now than it was in the 60s. Exiting Orchard Hey is now hazardous. The 20mph zone has had little effect. I have concerns over the loss of some of the best agricultural land in the country. Eventually none of our food will be produced in Britain.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.46	Other Documents
Policy MN2.46	Land East of Maghull	
Respondent No 931	Response Ref 2	Representor Name Philip Cassidy

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I object to the planned development in East Maghull and the loss of prime agricultural green belt land. The area is already gridlocked around our schools which could not cope with greater demand for places. The Foxhouse Lane area is already prone to flooding, and undoubtedly will be made worse with extensive development. Already it is difficult to get registered with a GP of our choice, it will be impossible in future. There seem to be many brownfield sites in West Sefton particularly in Bootle and Seaforth area, which should be prioritised?

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.46 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.46 **Land East of Maghull**
Respondent No 962 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** F and NP Thornton
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

Proposals for up to 1770 new homes in the East Maghull area will have a catastrophic effect on the local community. Shortage of Doctors, dentists, Increase in volume of traffic on roads, Increase in pollution and carbon emissions, loss of best agricultural land, loss of wildlife and habitats, countryside will be eroded, sewage systems unable to cope, Insufficient school places in areas where housing has been allocated and with the building of a business park and distribution centre, lorries on our roads 24 hours a day.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** Site MN2.46 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.46 **Land East of Maghull**
Respondent No 981 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Maureen Kinsella
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I object to the proposed plans for Maghull. The scale of the planned housing scheme is totally inappropriate for our area. The pressure on local amenities, schools, doctors, dentists, hospitals is unsupportable. The plan to build 1200 new houses and a business park in the Poverty Lane area will cause traffic congestion as the roads are narrow and already become very busy at certain times of the day. All over Maghull there are small narrow bridges across railway and canal. Anyone who uses these regularly can vouch for the bottlenecks which already occur-to add all the extra traffic would be madness. The drainage situation in this area is already a matter of concern, Please do not make it worse!

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 3 **Plan Order** Site MN2.46 **Other Documents**
Policy MN2.46 **Land East of Maghull**
Respondent No 1021 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name**
Organisation Name The 'Consortia' at Maghull East
Obj/Sup/Com Support

Summary of Main Issues

The principal landowners in respect of site MN2.46 'Land east of Maghull' support the overall objectives and vision of the Local Plan in relation to meeting local residents needs through the delivery of appropriate infrastructure, housing development and development that secures economic growth.

The principal landowners also support the LPA's decision to acknowledge the strategic importance of the site that will enable the delivery of a high quality sustainable urban extension to Maghull through the Local Plan

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.46	Other Documents
Policy MN2.46	Land East of Maghull	
Respondent No 1026	Response Ref 16	Representor Name John Williams
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

This site has several problems relating to development:-

- 1) The ground itself is frequently saturated to a very high level due to the watercourses on the site having difficulty discharging
- 2) There are already flooding problems around this site to such an extent that the main watercourse in this site, Whinney Brook, causes flooding problems to properties on Foxhouse Lane at the far western side of this site
- 3) The watercourses crossing this site takes significant areas of land
- 4) The site is within 250m of a potential source of flooding, and a current real world flooding problem, so may have difficulty getting flood insurance.
- 5) It would therefore be deemed as logical that this site should be discounted on grounds of NPPF Ch10 Para.100

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order Site MN2.46	Other Documents
Policy MN2.46	Land East of Maghull	
Respondent No 1042	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Frank Vaughan
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I object to the proposal to build a minimum of 1400 homes plus a Business park and Distribution centre on the farmland bordered by School lane/Foxhouse lane/Poverty lane, also the 295 homes along Kenyons lane, cannot be justified. There is no case locally for such a large increase in Maghull housing and Councillors should be fighting for the interests of the people of Maghull rather than being party to the destruction of our environment.

The farmland surrounding Maghull is some of the best in the country. To concrete over the huge area between School lane and Poverty lane would be unforgivable. It will mean the loss of farming communities, wildlife and habitats. Also a source of ever more valuable food production will disappear. All lost forever, and replaced by more urban sprawl with its attendant problems.

Maghull's infrastructure will be unable to cope with such a large increase in population, especially in one area, and the absence of any published plans to cater for the increase is disturbing. To expect the surrounding schools, shops, roads, doctors, dentists, and public utilities to cope with a likely minimum of 5,000 extra residents on one estate is unrealistic. There will also be the Business park and Distribution centre on the same land with the largest of H.G.V.s and other commercial vehicles plus a likely extra 2,000 private cars on local roads.

The Local Plan should be based on a Brownfield First policy and the absence of such a basic principle in the Sefton Plan is incomprehensible. However when viewed along with the lack of meaningful consultation, failure to answer public questions and the disregarding by Maghull Town Council of its own 2013 Residents Survey (only 6% of 556 Households were in favour of development) perhaps one shouldn't be surprised. If this Plan proceeds in it's present form I fear that East Maghull will change out of all recognition and no longer be a pleasant place to live.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Aintree/Melling Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Ain/Mell **MN2 Aintree/Melling sites**
Respondent No 19 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Steven Williams
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I object to any building in melling and I object to any building on green belt land. Leave Melling the way it is.

Summary of Suggested Changes

No building on green belt land in Melling I object to any building in Melling.

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Aintree/Melling Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Ain/Mell **MN2 Aintree/Melling sites**
Respondent No 68 **Response Ref** 2 **Representor Name** Stephen Leonard
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Support

Summary of Main Issues

As a local resident in Aintree village I think that the acceptance of these proposed plans would put an unacceptable strain on the local infrastructure with increase volumes of traffic on roads around these proposed sites. The miniroundabouts in the area of School lane and Altway and Wango lane are already an accident waiting to happen. With an increase in the population comes and increase in vehicles and this will only add to an already strained road network.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6 **Plan Order** MN2 Aintree/Melling Sites **Other Documents**
Policy MN2 Ain/Mell **MN2 Aintree/Melling sites**
Respondent No 130 **Response Ref** **Representor Name** Lynn Macadam
Organisation Name
Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I strongly object to the Local Plan to build a minimum of 1400 homes with a business park and distribution centre in the areas of Melling, Maghull, Lydiate and Aintree. I understand the need for more houses but not at this grand scale. Our roads and other infrastructure just cannot support this level of expansion. This will destroy our existing communities including farming and food production for the future. Once green belt land is build upon it is lost forever and it sets a precedent for future development in Maghull and Lydiate. Sefton should be opting for "brown field first" sites.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Aintree/Melling Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Ain/Mell	MN2 Aintree/Melling sites	
Respondent No 135	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Fiona Kinsella
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I raise an objection as I do not think that the houses being built are/will be the affordable housing stock for our young people ,but rather an attractive opening to profit hungry developers getting access to our green space. The roads around Aintree are already congested making it difficult and time consuming to travel especially at weekends. Aintree village Doctors already have to manage their patient load across their alternative surgery in Orrell Park. More patients will only increase the pressure. The school class sizes are already too large and available places can be limited. There will be little separation between our borders, causing urban sprawl and loss of identity.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Remove Green Belt Housing Allocations from the plan

Evidence Submitted

Chapter 6	Plan Order MN2 Aintree/Melling Sites	Other Documents
Policy MN2 Ain/Mell	MN2 Aintree/Melling sites	
Respondent No 147	Response Ref 1	Representor Name Rachel Hudson
Organisation Name		
Obj/Sup/Com	Objection	

Summary of Main Issues

I have already objected to the plan on the previous two consultation periods and remain opposed. Melling does not have the amenities and infrastructure to cope with any further development.

My objections are based on the following:

I have a young family and am aware of the pressure on the primary school system a further 245 homes in Melling would put a massive strain on the limited places available.

Melling also has poor public transport meaning people have to use cars. There is only one road through the village the excess traffic would make getting into and out of Melling horrendous.

Apart from the lack of school places and transport Melling has no other amenities we share limited resources with Aintree which does not have a huge amount especially now the library has been closed by the council.

The impact on the environment is of great concern the proposed sites support local wildlife including bats, development would be detrimental to the local ecology.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Ain/Mell **MN2 Aintree/Melling sites**

Respondent No 169 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Albert McDonnell

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Support

Summary of Main Issues

As a resident of the Bull Bridge Lane end of Altway I am concerned at the level of development proposed for the above sites between Melling and Aintree.

We already suffer horrendous traffic problems during peak periods and wish to report this as a problem for the area. There are just not enough main roads in Aintree as it is. If the proposals at Bull Bridge Lane/Spencers Lane goes ahead these 94 houses would produce another 100 to 150 vehicles and quite frankly I don't think the infrastructure can handle it. Plus there will be a serious traffic accident at the mini roundabout one day.

I would like to ask if the areas suggested are flood plains or main land drainage areas, because if they are, have we learned nothing from Somerset?

I know the Local Plan additional sites are only proposals at this stage but we have already been leafleted by PSA Developments so they are showing confidence that the outcome will be in their favour. I have expressed my concerns to the Company and received a reply that it would be noted.

You are about to destroy further countryside. Local people can enjoy this area even without lots of amenities and to me it priceless in that respect.

Please consider the infrastructure before considering the proposals and build on Brownfield sites which already have some services built in. More roads are needed now not later!

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Ain/Mell MN2 Aintree/Melling sites

Respondent No 177 Response Ref 1 Representor Name David Hayes

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to object to the Sefton Council Local Plan on the following grounds.

I believe Sefton Council should explore a Brownfields first policy in the Local Plan and their decision to increase the Housing figures does not give "special circumstances" for building on the greenbelt.

The loss of greenbelt in Sefton would result in creating an urban sprawl which has already occurred in the Borough. It is my understanding that the Local Plan is a living document and this would allow Sefton Council to go back and revisit the green belt boundaries in the coming years.

If as it would appear this is the case nominated Additional Sites AS17,18,19,21, and AS 22 situated to the west of the M57 Motorway could in the future be used for housing and this coupled with the proposed application by Peel Holdings to operate a storage area to the east of the M57 near to Switch Island would create a nightmare situation for the residents of Aintree and Melling.

I have lived in Aintree for over 40 years and during this time I have seen a dramatic increase in traffic due to the creation of the Business Park on Ormskirk Road and as a consequence at times the main arterial roads Altway and Aintree Lane are gridlocked. Any additional housing built west of the M57 would dramatically increase the problem as most households have at least one car and any alteration to the timing on the traffic lights at the junction of Aintree Lane/Altway with Ormskirk Road would have little or no effect and I believe the traffic situation would only get worse.

Without doubt an increase in housing west of the M57 and the use of land east of the M57 as a storage yard would also increase the air pollution. In addition any additional housing would put severe pressure on Doctors ,Dentists and Schools etc who are already struggling to cope.

I trust that you will consider the points that I have raised before you make a decision regarding the Local Plan.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN Melling **Melling Response Sheet**

Respondent No 200 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** Ian Thomson

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I am writing to show my objections to the proposed new Building sites by Peel Enterprises in the MELLING area. I am a long term resident of the Old Roan estate having lived in the area for 74 years. I have watched our own estate grow over the years and now there is nowhere left to build in this area. Melling expanded about 10 years ago with a large housing estate in the Waddicar area. With this estate and the growth in traffic it is almost unbearable for me to use my vehicle at weekends, such is the flow of traffic from Altway and Aintree Lane.

You will understand that the A 59 Ormskirk Road is a very busy Road with a heavy volume of traffic at all times. If I wish to use my vehicle to travel to the Asda Supermarket of the Racecourse Trading Estate from my home address I have to exit from either Altway or Aintree Lane. Altway merges into Aintree Lane at a very busy junction just prior to the Traffic Lights at Ormskirk Road. There is a yellow box junction set in the middle of this junction to try and prevent the whole system fouling up.

When the Traffic signals at Ormskirk Road change to Red in Aintree Lane a maximum of 15 vehicles can get out of Altway to wait the change of Lights. Vehicles in Aintree Lane are held by a Red Light at this stage to allow movement from Altway. When the Traffic Lights change to Green for traffic in Aintree Lane, Aintree Lane is held back until the 15 vehicles clear. Vehicles wishing to emerge from Mostyn Avenue and the Tesco Car Park try and force their way into the traffic on Aintree Lane, causing further delays.

With such a short run of traffic and the need for traffic to move on Ormskirk Road, traffic builds on Aintree Lane and Altway. This Creates a tailback as far as Athol Crescent near to Saint Giles Church and to Winchester Avenue near to the Methodist Church. Drivers coming from the Melling area are at this stage starting to use the residential road of Mostyn Avenue, in an attempt to shortcut the very large queue on Aintree Lane.

After 11.00 hours on Saturdays and Sundays all year long if I wish to travel to Asda or the Racecourse Retail Park I walk. The situation is unbearable now and I have to make my objections to these plans as the increase in traffic is not acceptable. I do not know what impact the proposed building sites will make on the local traffic in Maghull but I am sure there will be issues there.

Please invite Traffic Management from Merseyside Police to comment on these proposals as I am sure they must be aware of the present situation without making matters worse.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Policy MN2 Ain/Mell **MN2 Aintree/Melling sites**

Respondent No 282 **Response Ref** 1 **Representor Name** A A Gillett

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

I wish to protest against Sefton Council's Local Plan. Any additional housing built in the Aintree Village/Melling area will be detrimental to that area. The GP surgery waiting list for appointments is already over full and the local schools are over-subscribed. Traffic levels are already causing gridlock on Aintree Lane.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted

Organisation Name**Obj/Sup/Com** Objection**Summary of Main Issues**

I object to Sefton Council allocating housing sites on prime A1 agricultural land. I object to the scale of proposed development around Maghull, Lydiate, Melling and Aintree and the huge increase in population this will bring.

I feel the council hasn't been open about specific issues and the work they have undertaken, keeping local residents in the dark. Affordable housing is being promoted solely to generate money for the council.

The borough lacks infrastructure and services to accommodate an influx of new residents (GPs, schools etc). I do not see how Sefton's current road network can be adapted to handle such increases in traffic, they are already heavily congested in places. Pollution is a key concern here, and living along a main road I would be personally affected.

I believe the Plan in its current form will destroy Sefton's countryside, damage habitats and wildlife and limit recreational opportunities. When the green belt is lost, it's lost forever.

Other concerns include a decrease in house prices due to oversupply and increased crime levels as a result of an increase in population.

The council should focus on regenerating its 3,000 empty properties and foremost, utilise brownfield sites.

Summary of Suggested Changes**Evidence Submitted**

Policy MN2 Ain/Mell MN2 Aintree/Melling sites

Respondent No 285 Response Ref 1 Representor Name Stephen Gent

Organisation Name

Obj/Sup/Com Objection

Summary of Main Issues

In summary, I am totally opposed to further housing and business development upon Sefton's 'green belt' and agricultural land.

My principle objections, as detailed below, are in respect of the proposed developments affecting Aintree Village and those which will have a consequential impact upon the residents of Aintree Village due to their proximity to the Village, particularly those in Melling and Maghull.

I must question the validity of the Council's housing needs projection which suggests that some 11,070 homes are required. Given the number of empty houses across the Borough (as of September 2014 this stood at c5,800) I do not agree that there are 'special circumstances' at play to justify the use of greenbelt for development purposes. I'm also concerned whether developers will actually provide the affordable / sustainable housing which the Local Plan suggests would be required.

Brownfield First

We have precious little open green belt and agricultural land left as it is. The loss of our greenbelt reduces the openness of the countryside and essentially leads to 'urban sprawl', resulting in our local communities losing their unique sense of identity and distinctiveness.

There will be a detrimental and everlasting impact on our wildlife as their habitats will be destroyed (or at best reduced as a result of relocation), our ability to produce food will also be reduced which will impact future generations, we cannot after all 'eat concrete'.

We should therefore protect what we have and explore all other alternatives such as the utilisation of (mostly redundant) brown field sites. I would therefore urge the Council to put forward a Brownfield first policy.

Infrastructure

Roads - The existing local infrastructure of roads would not cope with the number of additional vehicles the proposed developments would bring, if one assumes an average two cars per household that is an additional 2,000 cars on our roads for every 1,000 properties built.

Should the Melling developments be progressed with Aintree Village will inevitably bear the brunt of the additional traffic which this would bring about. A number of years ago when Melling saw a number of new housing estates built the amount of traffic which added to Aintree Village's roads rose significantly. I live on Aintree Lane and know that the tail-backs can be quite lengthy, this all adds to the amount of pollution, both air and noise, which we are forced to endure on a daily basis.

Public transport - I note that there is a requirement for a second rail station to serve Maghull on the Merseyrail Liverpool-Ormskirk line which I'm sure would be very much in demand given the significant number of new homes which will be built both in Maghull and in the neighbouring villages of Lydiate and Melling. However, there is no mention of whether the capacity of the line has been tested to see if it would cope with increased passenger numbers as trains are already increasingly overcrowded at peak times (i.e. would additional carriages and/or trains be provided?)

Doctors / Schools - I fear that our local services, such as schools and doctors' surgeries would not cope with the significant increase in the local population. I'm concerned that the increase in the population of Melling will adversely impact the schools and doctors surgery within Aintree Village.

I presently serve as a 'Community Governor' at Aintree Davenhill and I am very mindful that this school is not in a position to meet a sudden and significant rise in the school roll, I would imagine the same would apply at Holy Rosary (Aintree Village) and schools in neighbouring Melling, Maghull and Lydiate.

Community Resources - It should be noted that Sefton Council no longer directly runs any community services within Aintree Village or Melling, the Council having withdrawn from the Aintree Youth Centre and Aintree Library.

'Fracking' Fear - There is a serious concern that a developer could exploit our natural resources by introducing 'fracking' which would have a most detrimental impact upon the lives of those who live in and around that particular sites(s).

Summary

In summary, should the Local Plan receive approval from the Inspector, then the loss of the green-belt and agricultural sites earmarked for development would prove to be to the detriment of those who live in Sefton and in particular those within the Sefton East parishes who, it would appear, are once again bearing the brunt.

I do not consider that the Council has engaged in meaningful consultation over the last 2-3 years reference the Local Plan, the various consultation exercises have resulted in the same questions being raised by residents which have gone largely unanswered. There appears to be a general disregard for the views and wishes of residents.

I would consider the development of our green belt and agricultural land to be sheer vandalism. I therefore strongly urge the Inspector to rule that Sefton's Local Plan is 'not' sound and for the Council to revisit its Local Plan to reflect the views of the people who live and work within the Borough.

Summary of Suggested Changes

Evidence Submitted