

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
001	R1	Network Rail	Diane Clark / Steven Ruffley	Site Specific	<p>Site 0349, Southport Rear of 68 Lyton Drive</p> <p>1) Query as to why site 0349 has been identified for exclusion from the identified housing supply. Particular reference as to why the site is identified as 'owner not willing to sell' and queries the 'ecological constraints' present at the site.</p>	<p>1) The site was identified as 'owner not willing to sell' as it was brought forward for consideration through the 2003 Urban Housing Capacity Study, rather than the call for sites process. There were no indications at the time of the site visit that the land was available or for sale. The site is identified as falling partially within a SSSI, SINNCI and a Site of Local Interest which therefore indicates there are significant ecological constraints associated with the site. However, the respondent's comments are noted.</p>	<p>SHLAA site record amended to identify that 'owner willing to sell'. As a result, the overall site score increases from 63 to 68. However, the overall conclusion of the site appraisal is not altered.</p>
001	R2	Network Rail	Diane Clark / Steven Ruffley	Site Specific	<p>New Site, Southport 1) Requests that the Council considers an additional site – Redundant Lloyds Sidings. The site lies to the south of site 0349.</p>	<p>1) Site considered as part of SHLAA.</p>	<p>Considered as site reference 9536.</p>
001	R3	Network Rail	Diane Clark / Steven Ruffley	Site Specific	<p>New Site, Southport 1) Requests that the Council considers an additional site – Sidings at Hall Road Station.</p>	<p>1) Site considered as part of SHLAA.</p>	<p>Considered as site reference 9535.</p>
002	R4	Neil Dawson	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 6189, Aintree Land between M57 and Oriel Drive</p> <p>1) No consultation with the local community. Future policy investigation should more actively involve the local community.</p> <p>2) The site scores highly on access, but existing estate already busy – development will create a massive influx of traffic.</p> <p>3) Current owner has restricted the use and access to the land.</p> <p>4) Nearby schools are oversubscribed.</p> <p>5) Site is in a flood plain.</p> <p>6) Site adjacent to M57.</p> <p>7) Investment and regeneration is needed in Liverpool and Sefton, not urban extensions – more urban knitting where problem pockets are identified.</p>	<p>1) The site was considered in the SHLAA through the call for sites process. Public consultation was undertaken at the call for sites stages to identify sites. The latest public consultation exercise has been undertaken in order to elicit comments on these sites.</p> <p>2) It is consider that access to the site is an issue, but that it is likely that appropriate access could be achieved. Wider infrastructure capacity issues, including road networks, would also need to be investigated prior to any future development of the site.</p> <p>3) PPG2 advises that Green Belt boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because land has become derelict.</p> <p>4) Wider infrastructure capacity issues, including the provision of schools, would need to be taken into consideration were any development to take place in this location.</p> <p>5) It is noted that part of the site falls within Flood Zone 2.</p> <p>6) It is noted that the site is adjacent to the M57, but this need not preclude its suitability as a development site.</p> <p>7) It is also noted that investment and regeneration is also needed in other parts of the region, but this does not necessarily preclude development in Aintree.</p> <p>The site is excluded from the housing supply identified by the SHLAA, but the site may be given further consideration as part of a future Borough-wide Green Belt Review.</p>	<p>SHLAA site record amended so that the site scores '4' in terms of access to the site. It is recognised that there are issues surrounding access which would need to be resolved prior to the site's development. The site remains excluded from the identified housing supply due to its location within the Green Belt.</p>

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
003	R5	Edmund Kirby	Edward Landor	Site Specific	<p>New Site, Maghull</p> <p>1) Proposes that Land at James Page House / Kiffen Taylor House, Deyes Lane, Maghull be included within SHLAA. Currently two care homes and open Urban Greenspace. Considered to be previously-developed land although currently constrained by Greenspace designation in adopted UDP. States that the site is underutilised and could accommodate additional facilities without compromising the existing open character.</p>	1) Site considered as part of SHLAA.	Considered as site reference 9537.
003	R6	Edmund Kirby	Edward Landor	Site Specific	<p>New Site, Thornton</p> <p>1) Proposes land to the north of Lydiate Lane to be included within the SHLAA. 15.8ha greenfield site owned by Nuffield College. Urban extension to Thornton between Lydiate Lane and proposed Thornton to Switch Island Link Road. Site has good access to public transport and local community facilities.</p> <p>2) Respondent suggests that the study methodology is flawed and that the land at Thornton needs to be identified as a potential housing site to ensure an adequate supply of housing over the 15 year plan period.</p>	<p>1) Site considered as part of SHLAA.</p> <p>2) See response to representation R7 below.</p>	Considered as site reference 9538.
003	R7	Edmund Kirby	Edward Landor	Methodology	<p>Risk Assessed Housing Supply</p> <p>1) The risk assessed housing supply is estimated by reducing the yield of sites with planning permission and those identified by the SHLAA by a factor of 20%. In the setting of current market conditions, we consider that this is a gross underestimate. In recent appeal decisions, Inspectors have taken the view that only 40% of the total number of units on sites with planning permission will be built in the next 5 year period. Over 10 years, this percentage could be expected to increase, given that market conditions are likely to improve and any constraints on development resolved. It is clear that the risk assessed estimate of a housing surplus is grossly exaggerated. On this basis in the first 5 years, the risk assessed housing supply would yield 1,786 units representing a shortfall of minus 874 units. Combined with a predicted shortfall of minus 207 units in the 6-10 year period, the overall shortfall increases to minus 3,252 units.</p>	1) It is considered that the proposed risk assessment exercise is appropriate and that the methodology utilised in the study provides a cautious but realisable quantification of the housing supply. Further commentary and justification for the study methodology has been provided in the final report.	Additional commentary has been provided in the final report to provide further justification for the methodology that has been utilised in carrying out the study.
003	R8	Edmund Kirby	Edward Landor	Site Specific	<p>New Site, Netherton</p> <p>1) Proposes land to the north of Netherton Lane, Netherton to be included within the SHLAA. This is a greenfield site owned by Nuffield College. It lies to the south of the proposed Thornton to Switch Island Link Road providing a logical extension to the existing urban area with good access to public transport and community facilities.</p> <p>2) The respondent suggests that the study methodology is flawed and that the land at Netherton needs to be identified as a potential housing site to ensure an adequate supply of housing over the 15 year plan period.</p>	<p>1) Site considered as part of SHLAA.</p> <p>2) See response to representation R7 above.</p>	Considered as site reference 9539.
003	R9	Edmund Kirby	Edward Landor	Site Specific	<p>New Site, Sefton Village</p> <p>1) Proposes land to the south and west of Sefton Village to be included within the SHLAA. This is a greenfield site owned by Nuffield College. It would provide a logical consolidation of existing village form and is situated close to existing village amenities.</p> <p>2) The respondent suggests that the study methodology is flawed and that the land at Sefton Village needs to be identified as a potential housing site to ensure an adequate supply of housing over the 15 year plan period.</p>	<p>1) Site considered as part of SHLAA.</p> <p>2) See response to R7 above.</p>	Considered as site reference 9540.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
003	R10	Edmund Kirby	Edward Landor	Site Specific	<p>New Site, Sefton Village</p> <p>1) Proposes land to the south and east of Sefton Village to be included within the SHLAA. This is a 6ha greenfield site owned by Nuffield College. It would provide a logical consolidation of existing village form and is situated close to existing village amenities.</p> <p>2) The respondent suggests that the study methodology is flawed and that the land at Sefton Village needs to be identified as a potential housing site to ensure an adequate supply of housing over the 15 year plan period.</p>	<p>1) Site considered as part of SHLAA.</p> <p>2) See response to R7 above.</p>	Considered as site reference 9541.
004	R11	Prof. John Bungey	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 6126, Ainsdale Ainsdale Hope Learning Centre, Sandringham Road</p> <p>Notes that site has been withdrawn from the identified housing supply pending Green Belt Review, however:</p> <p>1) Access via Osbourne Road would entail use of Knowles Avenue and Harewood Avenue, both of which are quiet residential streets of limited carriageway width and thus may be unsuitable for potential traffic flows during construction and subsequently.</p> <p>2) No consideration has been given to increased traffic flows at nearby Ainsdale level crossing which is used to access to local facilities. The crossing is already heavily congested and there are existing safety concerns.</p>	1) & 2) Issues raised would need to be addressed as part of any future consideration of the site for development. The site has been excluded from the identified housing supply subject to the Green Belt Review.	No amendment.
005	R12	Persimmon Homes Ltd	Timothy Pegg	Site Specific	<p>Site 6222, Aintree Land at Mill Farm</p> <p>1) Propose that site should be extended to the south east to include full extent of Persimmon land ownership.</p> <p>2) Suggest that the 'Is site in active use?' field be recorded as 'no' rather than 'partially'. WYG Database comments note '...farmland is not in use and could be developed'.</p>	<p>1) The site boundary has been amended to accurately reflect the full extent of land in Permisson's ownership.</p> <p>2) It remains the case that this site is excluded from the housing supply pending a review of the Green Belt and the need for urban extensions. However, for consistency it is agreed that the database should be amended to record the site as not being in active use.</p>	<p>Site boundary amended.</p> <p>SHLAA site record amended to identify that site is not in active use.</p>
006	R13	Sefton MBC	Lee Payne	Site Specific	<p>New Site, Bootle</p> <p>1) Proposed land off Merton Road, Irlam Road and Carolina Road in Bootle to be included within the SHLAA. This is a 2.7ha brownfield site in five separate ownerships, although Sefton Council has entered into a partnership agreement with two other site owners to see that the site is marketed as a single opportunity. SPD for the area has been produced. It is estimated that there is capacity for 200 residential units.</p>	1) Site considered as part of SHLAA.	Considered as site reference 9543.
007	R14	Mr K Pickard	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 6126, Ainsdale Ainsdale Hope Learning Centre, Sandringham Road</p> <p>1) The site is the subject of access issues.</p> <p>2) Development would cause traffic problems on surrounding road network, with particular problems around the level crossing.</p> <p>3) Support for development at the Pontins site, but this will add to the increased traffic in Ainsdale Village.</p> <p>4) Whole infrastructure in area near to Ainsdale would be negatively impacted and there would need to be new services provided e.g. doctors, dentists.</p> <p>5) Several environmental issues affecting the site including the presence of red squirrels, natterjack toads and pygmy shrews.</p>	<p>1), 2), 4) & 5) Issues raised would need to be addressed as part of any future consideration of the site. The site has been excluded from the housing supply subject to the Green Belt Review.</p> <p>3) As of September 2009, no planning applications had been received for the Pontins site.</p>	No amendment.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
008	R15	Natural England	Andy Dixon	General	<p>Comments on Methodology</p> <p>1) General comments and guidance setting Natural England's approach to SHLAAs and LDFs.</p> <p>Three separate issues are raised in relation to the Sefton SHLAA study, these being as follows.</p> <p>2) Content with proposed methodology and encouraged that the document highlights the need to be sensitive to areas of Green Belt and the unique dune habitat of the Formby Coast.</p> <p>3) Encouraged by the assessment which has removed a number of proposed sites due to their proximity to sites of nationally and internationally important nature conservation.</p> <p>4) An indication of those sites which could contribute to Green Infrastructure would be of benefit.</p>	<p>1) The SHLAA is one of a number of background studies informing the LDF. Others include a Sustainability Appraisal, Strategic Environmental Assessment, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Habitats Regulation Assessment. These studies will also address the requirements set out in Natural England's comments.</p> <p>2) & 3) The support of Natural England in terms of the study methodology and the approach to site assessment is welcomed.</p> <p>4) With regard to Green Infrastructure, it has been assumed that a proportion of larger sites will not be built out for housing, but will instead contribute to the infrastructure requirements of the site and the overall community. Sefton Council is committed to preparing an Infrastructure Study within the next six months which will address the need for Green Infrastructure.</p>	Additional commentary has been provided in the final report to provide further clarity with regard to the study methodology and the fact that it has been assumed that larger sites will make a contribution to communities' general needs, including Green Infrastructure.
009	R16	Douglas Cullen	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 6126, Ainsdale Ainsdale Hope Learning Centre, Sandringham Road</p> <p>1) Respondent would be against any change in the site's designation as Green Belt.</p> <p>2) The site is the subject of access issues.</p> <p>3) Increased traffic flow on surrounding residential streets.</p> <p>4) Increased traffic flows at level crossing will considerably aggravate an already serious situation.</p>	<p>1), 2), 3) & 4) Issues raised would need to be addressed as part of any future consideration of the site. The release of land from the Green Belt is outside the remit of this SHLAA and the site has been excluded from the housing supply subject to the findings of the forthcoming Green Belt Review.</p>	No amendment.
010	R17	Mrs Margaret Barr	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 6126, Ainsdale Ainsdale Hope Learning Centre, Sandringham Road</p> <p>1) Access problems to site.</p> <p>2) Increased traffic flow on surrounding residential streets.</p> <p>3) Congestion at level crossing will increase existing problem.</p> <p>4) What consideration has been given to environmental impact and in particular protected species e.g. Natterjack Toads, Red Squirrels?</p> <p>5) What consideration has been given to the site forming part of sports and leisure strategy as such amenities are lacking in the north of the Borough?</p>	<p>1), 2), 3) & 4) Issues raised would need to be addressed as part of any future consideration of the site. The site has been excluded from the housing supply subject to the Green Belt Review.</p> <p>5) Sefton Local Plans officers advise that this site is not in an Urban Greenspace deficit area.</p>	No amendment.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
011	R18	J K Hounsell	Thornton Parish Council	Site Specific	<p>Thornton</p> <p>1) Parish Council agrees St Frideswydes Church (6098) is suitable for development.</p> <p>2) Parish Council agrees with removal of following sites from SHLAA: Nags Head (5205); Thornton Garage (5039); Rear of 10-50 Water Street (5181); Land south of Woodland View (6203); Land off Whinfield Road (5207); and Land adjacent to 71 Southport Road (6017).</p> <p>3) Parish Council advises that they will vigorously oppose any attempt to change the use of the beer garden at The Grapes (5051), which is believed to have listed status, and the bowling green at the Nags Head (5202).</p> <p>4) Following a report on the demise of the Village Green, the Parish Council intends to monitor closely any attempt to develop any Greenspaces for any use other than recreation. They are anxious to know what is going to happen to the Thornton Primary School site.</p>	<p>1) & 2) Support noted.</p> <p>3) The only site where the Parish Council does not support the findings of the assessment is site 5051 (The Grapes). However, WYG does consider that the site is under-utilised, offers realistic housing potential and should be retained within the identified housing supply. The site is included in the 6-10 year housing supply</p> <p>4) The Village Green and County Primary Schools sites have not been included in the SHLAA. The Parish Council will be consulted on any proposals to develop these areas that come forward in the future.</p>	No amendment.
012	R19	British Waterways	Richard Newton	Site Specific	<p>New Site, Bootle (See also representation R12 which addresses wider development site)</p> <p>1) Proposed new site at Carolina Street Basin. 0.3ha brownfield area forming part of site addressed by Coffee House Bridge SPD. Partnership now formed with landowners.</p>	1) Site considered as part of SHLAA.	Considered as site reference 9543.
013	R20	Rupert Clegg	-	Site Specific	<p>New Site, Southport</p> <p>1) Proposes that site at Pied Cottage, 886 Liverpool Road, Ainsdale in Southport should be included as part of the SHLAA. The 1.3ha site, which incorporates a property (886 Liverpool Road) and a paddock, is currently being marketed. Between 80-85% of the site is estimated to be greenfield land. There are no known constraints to development.</p>	1) Site considered as part of SHLAA.	Considered as site reference 9544.
014	R21	Mr A Gidman	c/o Jonathan Smith, Steven Abbott Associates LLP	Site Specific	<p>New Site, Maghull</p> <p>1) Proposes that following site at should be included in SHLAA: Heathfield Lodge, 22-24 Melling Lane, Maghull. The site is a residential home with a substantial curtilage and is located within an established residential area of Maghull. It is considered suitable for redevelopment to comprise up to 16 apartments. It is not listed, nor is it within a Conservation Area or flood risk area. The submission sets out in detail that the site scores highly in terms of suitability, availability and achievability. It is seen as contributing to the short term (5 year) housing supply for Maghull.</p>	1) Site considered as part of SHLAA. The yield suggested by the agent is considered at the upper end of what is achievable and a more cautious yield is proposed in the study.	Considered as site reference 9545.
015	R22	National Trust	Alan Hubbard	General	<p>Comment on Methodology</p> <p>1) Notes the importance of the caveat set out at end of paragraph 1.04.</p>	1) Support noted. This paragraph states that 'the inclusion of sites within this study should not be taken to imply that they will be allocated for development or that the Council will necessarily consider planning applications favourably.' This is fundamental to the methodology underpinning the SHLAA.	No amendment.
015	R23	National Trust	Alan Hubbard	Site Specific	<p>Site 1782, Formby Land belonging to 12 Larkhill Lane, Formby</p> <p>1) Support the conclusion that the site has no real potential and should be excluded from the housing supply. However, it should also be noted that the site adjoins National Trust land at Formby which is of particular nature conservation value (it is both a SSSI and SAC). It is requested that this additional constraint is added to concerns raised in relation to this site.</p>	1) Comments noted.	SHLAA site record amended to reflect adjacent designations.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
015	R24	National Trust	Alan Hubbard	Site Specific	<p>Site 1024, Formby Land adjacent to 31 Shireburn Road, Formby</p> <p>1) Site is separated from SSSI and SAC by the road, but development could have adverse implications for nature conservation. Whilst the Trust does not object to the inclusion of the site in the study (although it does share the opinion of DC officers that it has little real potential), it is requested that the nearby, significant nature conservation interests are recorded, including the fact that they could restrict the type and detail of any future development.</p>	<p>1) The site is in an existing residential area and is only identified as having the capacity for a single dwelling. The site is retained in the identified housing supply, with additional comments provided on the nearby nature conservation interests.</p>	SHLAA site record amended to record adjacent designations.
016	R25	Cllr David Tattersall	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 0314, Southport Land north of junction with Fell View, Banks Road</p> <p>1) Suggests that the site is located in the West Lancashire administrative area.</p> <p>2) Regarding flood risk, this area was the first area of human occupation in Crossens / Churchtown and is the highest point in this part of North Southport.</p>	<p>1) The site falls within the Sefton administrative area.</p> <p>2) Comment regarding flooding noted. However, the site is excluded from the identified housing supply in accordance with study methodology. (Site is excluded from housing supply as the part of it which lies outside Flood Zone 3 is not considered large enough to accommodate any dwelling houses.)</p>	No amendment.
016	R26	Cllr David Tattersall	-	Methodology	<p>Flood Zones</p> <p>1) Baffled by decisions based on flood risk. Generalised maps rather than actual height of land, defences and past history seem to have been used. Have the consultants used the Environment Agency's 'definitive' maps which don't tell the full story re defences and local knowledge of gradients? A more accurate check might suggest that more land for housing may be available. Queries why low lying coastal site Shellfield Road is not considered to be at risk but Causeway has a 'high probability of flooding' and part of Balmoral Drive is at risk?</p> <p>2) Request that a caveat be added to the SHLAA document to say that these flood risk comments are based on PPS25 / Environment Agency Flood Zones for river and tidal flooding and that as such they do not take into account the presence of flood/coastal defences. The caveat should also refer to the fact that these are general models, and that the flood risk comments do not give detailed consideration to height of sites above sea level, the presence of defences or information about risk of other sources of flooding such as surface water flooding.</p>	<p>1) Comments noted. The assessment of Flood Risk has been made using the Environment Agency Flood Maps. This approach is consistent throughout the study.</p> <p>2) Further explanatory text has been provided in the study report in terms of the flood mapping which has informed the study.</p>	Additional commentary has been provided in the final report to provide clarity with regard to the flood maps used in the study and the methodology in this regard.
016	R27	Cllr David Tattersall	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 0373, Southport Adjacent 14 Shellfield Road</p> <p>1) It is believed that this farm site is used to house cows which graze on nearby Marshside marsh (RSPB area).</p>	<p>1) Comments noted.</p>	SHLAA site record amended to accurately reflect existing use.
016	R28	Cllr David Tattersall	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 0396, Southport Mill Lane Tennis Club, Mill Lane Crescent</p> <p>1) Why was time/money spent looking at such recreational land which is clearly not available for housing, nor should it be?</p>	<p>1) The site was identified in Sefton Council's 2003 Urban Housing Capacity Study and was therefore considered by the SHLAA in line with good practice. The existing recommendation is that the site be excluded from the housing supply identified by the study.</p>	No amendment.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
016	R29	Cllr David Tattersall	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 5319, Southport Adjacent to Bartons Close</p> <p>1) Site has no difficult 'possible former use' and is not contaminated.</p> <p>2) Site was reserved for a future highway to replace the poor/dangerous Water Lane entrance to the town from the north.</p> <p>3) There were previous limitations on the sale/use of the land.</p> <p>4) Meols ward Councillors will oppose the development of any housing on site 5319.</p> <p>5) If adjacent Banks Road has been identified as 'flood risk', why is Bartons Close not similarly identified?</p>	<p>1) The phrase 'possible former use' in the database as has been used in reference to identifying the site as greenfield (i.e. any former use has now blended into the landscape). The SHLAA site record reflects that there are no known contamination issues on the site.</p> <p>2) & 3) Covenant on site for highways expires in January 2011 and Cabinet have resolved to dispose of the land for housing purposes.</p> <p>4) It is believed that the site provides a good opportunity and it is placed in the 6-10 year housing supply.</p> <p>5) In both the Banks Road and the Barton's Close site the same approach has been taken to flood risk – the net developable area has been identified as that which falls outside Flood Zone 3.</p>	Placed within identified 6-10 year housing supply.
016	R30	Cllr David Tattersall	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 6235, Southport St John's Parish Centre, Rufford Road</p> <p>1) The Parish Hall has now been sold and is occupied as the business headquarters of a local company. The vicar of St John's Church states that he has tried to get planning consent for a housing development, but efforts were rejected.</p>	<p>1) Comments noted.</p>	SHLAA site record amended to indicate that this is no longer a potential housing site.
016	R31	Cllr David Tattersall	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 6255, Southport Former Phillips Factory, Balmoral Drive</p> <p>1) Surprised that part of this site is included as 'flooding risk'. If accurate, why did the Council approve the large nearby The Mallards development which is on land much lower, close to the moss?</p> <p>2) Suggests that further thought is given to site for combination of employment/affordable housing – this part of Balmoral Drive has for many years had social/Council housing.</p>	<p>1) Area of flood risk identified by use of Environment Agency Flood Maps in accordance with study methodology.</p> <p>2) The site has been excluded from the identified housing supply due its location within the Primarily Industrial Area. This approach is consistent with the study methodology.</p>	No amendment.
017	R32	W V Noble	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 6246, Southport 6 Lancaster Road</p> <p>1) Site 6246 confuses the photographs, site map and details of 6 and 6a Lancaster Road, Birkdale with the address of 2 Saunders Street, Southport.</p> <p>2) Planning approval has now been received to convert the two existing flats at No.6 Lancaster Road to one single dwelling and to erect a house in the side garden. It will be marketed via a local estate agent in the near future.</p>	<p>1) The address is a data entry error.</p> <p>2) The details of the planning permission are noted and the site record has been amended to reflect the fact that the site is not considered likely to make a positive net contribution to the housing supply.</p>	SHLAA site record amended to correct address details. The site has been excluded from the identified housing supply.
018	R33	Aqua Cure Plc	Matthew Stafford, Fairhurst	Site Specific	<p>Site 0261, Southport Between 16 – 20a Hall Street</p> <p>1) Support inclusion within SHLAA short term supply and its scoring of 73. The site's continued position within the 5 year supply will better safeguard local resident's amenity and jobs by relocating the business to more sustainable employment premises in Southport.</p> <p>2) Housing yield of 14 in considered inappropriate. The site should be earmarked for 25 no. 2 and 3 bedroom units to make best use of a brownfield site in an edge of centre location.</p>	<p>1) Support noted.</p> <p>2) The yield proposed by the respondent equates to a site density of 110 dwellings per hectare. This is considered to be high and it will be for any future applicant to demonstrate by way of a planning application that such a quantum of development can be accommodated on the site. In the meantime, a yield of 14 dwellings is considered more realistic.</p> <p>3) The Regeneration Area designation no longer exists – area was previously identified for purposes of</p>	No amendment.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
					3) Refers to site being within Southport Housing Regeneration Area.	implementing previous Housing Restraint Policy which has now been relaxed.	
019	R34	Paul Withers	-	Site Specific	<p>Sites 0452, Southport Mill Road, Ainsdale</p> <p>Agree that the land should be considered for residential development and provides the following points of clarification:</p> <p>1) The landowners are prepared to consider disposal of the site.</p> <p>2) Although in active use, the tenancy allows for early possession for redevelopment.</p> <p>3) There are no known issues in terms of contamination.</p>	<p>1) & 2) Comments noted.</p> <p>3) As the site has previously operated as a petrol station, it is considered that there may well be some abnormal costs involved in remediation.</p>	SHLAA site record updated to reflect that the site is owned by a developer/owner who is willing to sell.
020	R35	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	General	<p>Significance of Review</p> <p>1) Respondent understands the need to undertake a SHLAA but is uncertain how it will translate into policy. No specific sites should be designated without further public consultation.</p>	<p>1) Paragraph 1.04 of the SHLAA report is clear in stating that, 'The inclusion of sites within this study should not therefore be taken to imply that they will be allocated for development or that the Council will necessarily consider planning applications favourably'.</p> <p>Allocations taken forward as part of subsequent LDF Development Plan Documents will be subject to full public/community engagement and Examination in Public.</p>	No amendment.
020	R36	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Methodology	<p>Validity of Scoring System</p> <p>1) Weightings assigned to the various categories are arbitrary and coarse grained and we are anxious that this attempt at quantification might give rise to unwarranted accuracy and reliability. The assessment of each site cannot be rated by a single composite number, but rather must depend upon a common sense interpretation of an accurate description of the site.</p>	<p>1) The scoring system has been used to inform the evaluation of sites, but does not override professional judgement on instances where it is evident that there were other factors influencing the likelihood of a site coming forward for residential use. The use of a scoring system is a recognised way of differentiating between sites during housing assessments completed under previous best practice guidelines.</p>	No amendment.
020	R37	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Methodology	<p>Calculation of Site Yield.</p> <p>1) Process of applying densities and multiplying by the area is appropriate for large sites, but seems suspect when applied to a small site which is likely to be strongly influenced by the shape of its perimeter, in such cases the calculated yield could well be an overestimate. When the site is in the garden of an existing dwelling, the area seems to be the total of the premises, in which case the true yield is the computed yield less one. Only partial recognition of this issue. If these concerns are correct there has been a significant overestimate of site availability.</p>	<p>1) The methodology used in assessing the potential of each site is set out in paragraphs 3.39 to 3.43 of the study report. The net developable site areas have been calculated using established good practice guidance. The density multipliers used on each site are those, in the opinion of WYG, best reflect the character of the area and the type or mix of housing that would be appropriate on the site. Particular care has been taken when determining the densities of smaller sites and those sites where it is evident that its shape or character suggests a particular density. For garden development the stated yield is the proposed net increase in dwellings on the site.</p>	No amendment.
020	R38	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Methodology	<p>Brownfield Sites</p> <p>1) The respondent is not opposed to housing development on brownfield sites (including residential gardens), provided current planning standards are maintained, including safe and easy access, acceptable presence in street scene, compatibility with local character, adequate amenity space, respect for existing TPOs, and strict observance of overlooking rules.</p>	<p>1) Comments noted and agreed.</p>	No amendment.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
020	R39	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Methodology	Urban Greenspace 1) Respondent is glad that in every case Urban Greenspace and community amenity space has been excluded from the supply, but alarmed that they were ever included in the study. Such spaces are essential to character of an area and make important contribution to quality of life of residents. They also have economic value by making area an attractive place to live. The thrust of current Greenspace policy documents is to increase the number, size and quality of such spaces, not develop them.	1) Urban Greenspace sites were considered as part of the study as they formed part of earlier land reviews (Urban Capacity Study/Borough Wide Survey) or were forwarded for consideration as part of the call for sites exercise. Accordingly, WYG was required to consider such sites in line with the study methodology.	No amendment.
020	R40	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Methodology	Long Term Sites 1) Many of the assessments of sites considered to have long term potential are excessively optimistic. There is insufficient reason to suppose that the factors which preclude their ability in the short term will change sufficiently over time.	1) It is recognised that predicting when each site is likely to come forward for development is not an exact science. Predictions also inevitably become less certain the further into the future a site is forecast to be developed. The Council's ongoing plan, monitor and manage program will provide the process for managing changes to this study's findings as time goes by. For the 11-15 year housing supply, sites have been included that would not be considered suitable for residential development at this moment in time. These sites either have significant physical factors that limit their development potential or will be the subject of policy which makes development less than straightforward. An amendment in policy or allocation may be required to facilitate the development of these sites. However, it is considered that all sites within this category offer genuine potential which can be realised over time. Indeed, the aim has been to take a relatively cautious yet realistic view, which recognises constraints and that there is a need to maintain or bring forward other land uses in the Borough.	No amendment.
020	R41	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Methodology	Green Belt Review 1) Reserves the right to comment on Green Belt sites when Green Belt policy is next reviewed, which according to UDP Policy GBC1 will not be before 2011.	1) Comments noted.	No amendment.
020	R42	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Site Specific	Site 1053, Formby 39 Freshfield Road 1) States that the site is denoted on map, but not referenced in site assessments. Subject to planning approval.	1) Due to the number of sites identified, it was decided that it was not cost efficient or methodologically advantageous to visit all sites less than 0.1ha. Instead a 10% sample of such sites has been undertaken in order to calculate their likely contribution to the overall housing supply. Site 1053 is not one such site, but the extant planning permission at the site is noted.	No amendment.
020	R43	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Site Specific	Site 1055, Formby 76 Freshfield Road 1) In assigning density it should be noted that this site is within an Area of Local Distinctiveness.	1) Comments noted. The proposed yield is relatively limited at 2 dwellings and the site comments note caution against over development of the site. It is considered that this is an appropriate approach.	No amendment.
020	R44	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Site Specific	Site 1063, Formby 35 Green Lane 1) Site is immediately adjacent to Green Lane Conservation Area and accordingly	1) Comments noted, but it is considered that this plot may be able to accommodate 2 dwellings.	No amendment.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
					special considerations apply.		
020	R45	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Site Specific	<p>Site 1090, Formby 81-83 Freshfield Road</p> <p>1) In assigning density it should be noted that this site is within an Area of Local Distinctiveness.</p>	1) Comments noted. The proposed yield is relatively limited at 2 dwellings and the site comments indicate that only a limited amount of development is likely to be acceptable. It is considered that this is an appropriate approach.	No amendment.
020	R46	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Site Specific	<p>Site 1781, Formby Open amenity space at Wicks Green</p> <p>1) Strongly agree with findings of site assessment – the site should never have been considered.</p>	1) Comments noted.	No amendment.
020	R47	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Site Specific	<p>Site 1796, Formby Land at end of Victoria Way</p> <p>1) Do not see any prospect that the present problem of access will have changed in 11-15 years. Remove from the identified housing supply.</p>	1) The issue with access is noted in the SHLAA site record. Although it was previously considered that the site was of sufficient size and attractiveness for difficulties to be overcome, it appears from further viewing of aerial photography that at least part of the site has been built out for development associated with Formby Golf Club. Accordingly, it is not considered that this site represents realistic housing potential and it is now excluded from the study for this reason.	SHLAA site record amended to exclude site from the housing supply.
020	R48	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Site Specific	<p>Site 5212, Formby Land off Ashdale Close</p> <p>1) Disagree with findings of the site assessment – land should remain community Greenspace.</p>	1) The potential of the site has been reviewed and it is considered that this wooded copse will likely remain as informal open space. Accordingly, it has been excluded from the identified housing supply.	SHLAA site record amended to exclude site from the housing supply.
020	R49	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Site Specific	<p>Site 5213, Formby St Lukes Church Hall, Kirklake Road</p> <p>1) Respondent does not believe that there are any grounds for including the site in the assessment. The building on this land plays a significant role in the community now and in the foreseeable future. It is an example of an excessively optimistic availability.</p>	1) It is agreed that as the site in use with no indication that it is available for development. Accordingly, it is now excluded from the identified housing supply.	SHLAA site record amended to exclude site from the identified housing supply.
020	R50	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Site Specific	<p>Site 5215, Formby Land off Ennerdale Road</p> <p>1) Strongly disagree with findings of site assessment – land should remain green amenity space.</p>	1) The potential of the site has been reviewed and it is considered that this site will likely remain as informal open space. Accordingly, it has been excluded from the identified housing supply.	SHLAA site record amended to exclude site from the housing supply.
020	R51	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Site Specific	<p>Site 5216, Formby Land behind 43 Bushbys Lane</p> <p>1) We do not see any prospect that the present problem of access will have changed in 6-10 years. The site should therefore be excluded from the identified housing supply.</p>	1) Site scores highly and has potential access via cul de sac to west of the site. It is considered that this can be achieved within 10 years and no amendment is proposed to the SHLAA site record.	No amendment.
020	R52	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Site Specific	<p>Site 5232, Formby Friars Walk/Redgate</p> <p>1) Strongly agree with findings of site assessment – the site should never have been considered.</p>	1) Comments noted.	No amendment.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
020	R53	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Site Specific	Site 5233, Formby Former Petrol Station, Liverpool Road 1) Is it correct that the owner is not willing to develop?	1) The site was identified for possible inclusion in the study by Sefton Council officers. At the time of survey, the site was vacant but did not appear to be actively marketed. Due to the site not being in use, it is considered to offer realistic housing potential in the short term.	No amendment.
020	R54	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Site Specific	Site 5236, Formby Buckfast Drive 1) Disagree with findings of site assessment – land should remain community Greenspace.	1) The potential of the site has been reviewed and it is considered that this site will likely remain as informal open space. Accordingly, it has been excluded from the identified housing supply.	SHLAA site record amended to exclude site from the housing supply.
020	R55	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Site Specific	Site 5237, Formby Land off Easby Close 1) Disagree with findings of site assessment – should remain community Greenspace.	1) The potential of the site has been reviewed and it is considered that this site will likely remain as informal open space. Accordingly, it has been excluded from the identified housing supply.	SHLAA site record amended to exclude site from the housing supply.
020	R56	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Site Specific	Site 5291, Formby Land of Gardner Road 1) Strongly disagree with findings of site assessment – land should remain green amenity space.	1) The potential of the site has been reviewed and it is considered that this site will likely remain as informal open space. Accordingly, it has been excluded from the identified housing supply.	SHLAA site record amended to exclude site from the housing supply.
020	R57	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Site Specific	Site 6047, Formby Land at Meols Lane 1) Strongly agree with findings of site assessment.	1) Comments Noted.	No amendment.
020	R58	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Site Specific	Site 6048, Formby Clarence House School, West side of West Lane 1) WYG statement that owner is ready to sell is in error. We are informed by Director of Nugent Care (the site owner) that neither he or his Chief Executive have indicated to Sefton Council that the site is available for housing development in the foreseeable future. The current intention is to invest further in the school. Site should be removed from the supply.	1) The site was promoted for development as part of the call for sites exercise. Nugent Care has confirmed that this site has long term development potential.	SHLAA site record amended to place the site in the 11-15 year housing supply.
020	R59	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Site Specific	Site 6049, Formby Clarence House School, E side of West Lane 1) As with site 6048 above, Nugent Care (the site owner) has no intention of selling any part of site in foreseeable future.	1) The site was promoted for development as part of the call for sites exercise. Nugent Care has confirmed that this site has long term development potential.	SHLAA site record amended to place the site in the 11-15 year housing supply.
020	R60	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Site Specific	Site 6097 Cricket Path, St Peter's Vicarage 1) Strongly agree with findings of the site assessment.	1) Comments noted.	No amendment.
020	R61	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Site Specific	Site 6219 8 Barkfield Lane 1) Agree with findings of the site assessment.	1) Comments noted.	No amendment.
020	R62	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Site Specific	Site 6223 Parkland adjoining 46 Liverpool Road 1) Strongly agree with findings of the site assessment – land should never have been considered.	1) Comments noted.	No amendment.
020	R63	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Site Specific	Site 9513 Land west of 99 Ennerdale Road 1) Disagree with findings of the site assessment – land should remain community	1) The potential of the site has been reviewed and it is considered that this site will likely remain as informal open space. Accordingly, it has been excluded from the identified housing supply.	SHLAA site record amended to exclude site from the housing supply.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
					Greenspace if possible.		
020	R64	Desmond Brennan	Formby Civic Society	Site Specific	Former Holy Trinity School 1) This site is of major importance to Formby. School is the property of the Church Commissioners, but land is property of the Council and is designated Urban Greenspace. We are surprised that it is not part of this review; we insist that any future plans for the site be the subject of wide public consultation.	1) The Former Holy Trinity School is not available for development and has therefore not been included in study.	No amendment.
021	R65	-	GD Yates (Agent)	Site Specific	Site 6079, Lydiate Land adjacent to Turnbridge Road 1) Under suitability, the 'Is the site affected by un-neighbourly uses?' field should score 8 'no' rather than 0 'yes'. Other sites adjacent to the canal in Lydiate have scored 8 on this criterion. 2) The report findings suggest that there will be an immediate shortfall of land in Lydiate, with only limited availability in years 6-10 and no available sites from 2018, at the latest. Therefore the future housing needs of Lydiate can only be met by releasing appropriate sites from the Green Belt. The site scores highest out of all sites in Lydiate, adjoins existing housing development and is a relatively small area and clearly if it was not in the present Green Belt would have been allocated for housing purposes. This site should be considered favourably when the Green Belt Review taken place.	1) Comments noted and agreed. 2) The Green Belt sites have been removed from the quantification of housing supply subject to the findings of a comprehensive Green Belt Review. The treatment of this site is therefore consistent with study methodology.	SHLAA site record amended to reflect that there are no un-neighbourly uses in proximity to the site.
022	R66	G H Johnson	-	Site Specific	Site 6126, Ainsdale Ainsdale Hope Learning Centre, Sandringham Road 1) Any housing development would be problematic in terms of access. There is very little parking in Ainsdale Village now and this would become impossible. 2) Site would be better used as an amenity for the Ainsdale residents as a park or for sports use.	1) Issues raised would need to be addressed as part of any future consideration of the site. The site has been excluded from the identified housing supply subject to the Green Belt Review. 2) Sefton Local Plans officers advise that this is not in an Urban Greenspace deficit area.	No amendment.
023	R67	Mr G Gribble	-	Site Specific	Site 6070 Land at Bridges Lane, Sefton Village 1) The land is not subject to flooding. 2) The land is overgrown with brambles and nettles but it is not densely wooded. 3) Whilst proximity to a primary school/medical centre within easy walking distance may be considered desirable, this has not been a problem for the housing development on adjacent land, nor has the frequency of bus services. 4) Part of land was formerly listed, but has now been delisted by English Heritage. 5) The land is for sale. 6) Respondent has previously taken the view that low density housing development would be most desirable but in light of the expected serious housing shortage it is accepted that there is an equally powerful case for greater densities. 7) Consultants findings are informed by limited or selective information and their own site visit was cursory – they admit to not even being able to locate the pond which is of significant area and clearly shown on all maps and plans. 8) Take issue with the consultants assertion that 'it is not considered (they do not say by whom) that this site has any realistic prospects whatsoever for housing', and I object to my call for sites submission being removed from the study. Please confirm that it has been reinstated.	1) The eastern part of the site falls within Flood Zone 3 and Flood Zone 2 of the Environment Agency's Flood Map. 2) Comment noted and agreed. 3) Accessibility to services is an important consideration in all site assessments. 4) The site falls within the Conservation area, is identified as protected Urban Greenspace and a Site of Local Interest. Part of site is Scheduled Ancient monument. 5) This is acknowledged in the study – site recorded as 'owned by a developer or owner willing to sell'. 6) Comment noted. 7) Whilst the pond is identified on OS plans, it could not be viewed from the public highway on the day of survey. 8) It is the view of the Consultant team and the initial view of Council Officers. Council Officers also anticipate that the site will continue to be designated as protected Urban Greenspace. Combined with the Scheduled Monument status and flooding issues it is considered unlikely that the site would be developed.	SHLAA site record comments have been amended from 'site contains quite dense wood land...' to 'site contains several trees and dense vegetation'.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
						The site therefore remains excluded from the housing supply identified by the study.	
024	R68	Stramongate Properties Ltd (c/o Peill & Co)	Allan Booker, Hamilton Booker Associates	Site Specific	<p>Site 6201, Crosby Land and premises at Carnegie Avenue</p> <p>1) All leases on this site will be concluded within 3 years when control of the site will revert to the owners. Owner will be exploring the prospect of residential development, prior to these leases coming to an end. This should be reflected in the site record 'land ownership issues' field.</p>	1) Comments noted and agreed.	SHLAA site record amended so that site availability score ('Is the site subject to multiple or difficult land ownerships?') is '5' rather than '0'.
025	R69	W Cowell Property Management	Knight Frank LLP	Site Specific	<p>Site 2207, Maghull Land adjacent to St Andrew's Church</p> <p>Provides a summary of the site and planning policy context. Questions methodology as to the treatment of Urban Greenspaces and seeks clarification on the following issues:</p> <p>1) How was the Council's response provided on the quality or development potential of sites allocated as Urban Greenspace? Was it by an individual officer or following a decision by the Council's Planning Committee?</p> <p>2) Is it considered reasonable to dismiss Urban Greenspace sites on this basis, given the wording of relevant policies (UDP Policies G1 and G2)?</p> <p>3) On what basis does the site score highly in the Greenspace Audit?</p> <p>4) On what basis is this site a 'high quality wildlife site'?</p> <p>5) Why is the conclusion to the assessment unclear? Is the site to be removed or does it have potential, subject to meeting policy criteria?</p> <p>6) Recognised that site does have some policy restrictions, but given its excellent location close to local amenities and public transport links it should not be discounted without proper consideration. Perhaps only limited residential development could take place on this site, with remainder being made publically accessible, even additional land being provided to the nearby Scout Hut, without having a material affect on the character of the area.</p>	<p>1) Planning Officers provided the Council's response on this issue. A consistent approach was taken in line with the UDP policies and Greenspace quality audits.</p> <p>2) Whilst it may be acceptable in some cases to permit an element of housing on Greenspace sites, this will principally have to be tested through more detailed discussion with Officers and ultimately through the submission of a planning application at a particular site.</p> <p>3) Quality of sites was determined by the Greenspace Audit carried out in 2007. This particular site is part of a Greenspace system and green corridor. It is also within a Conservation Area.</p> <p>4) WYG understands that Sefton MBC will bring to the respondent's attention the relevant information regarding the designations which apply to the site.</p> <p>5) Comment noted.</p> <p>6) The site has been considered by the SHLAA in a manner which is consistent with the methodology and good practice guidance.</p>	<p>SHLAA site record amended so that the comment '...is currently designated as a high quality Urban Greenspace' is amended to read '...is designated as Urban Greenspace and is considered to be a high quality example'.</p> <p>SHLAA site record conclusion amended to clarify that the site makes no contribution to the identified housing supply.</p>
026	R70	Veronica Frear		Site Specific	<p>Site 6126, Ainsdale Ainsdale Hope Learning Centre, Sandringham Road</p> <p>1) Access to site copes with present traffic, but not suitable for an increase. Access will be major problem.</p> <p>2) The site's development would add to already severe problems at level crossings.</p> <p>3) The use of Green Belt for housing development in an area where there are no parks is not beneficial for local residents.</p> <p>4) The creation of a park on this site would protect rare species, such as natterjack toads, sand lizards, red squirrels, bats.</p> <p>5) The playing field has been underused for years. Some of building and playing fields should be put to community use.</p> <p>6) What can Sefton offer the Olympic Games? Are there any grants available to develop use as field for training for event?</p>	<p>1), 2) & 4) Issues raised would need to be addressed as part of any future consideration of the site. The site has been removed from the SHLAA subject to the Green Belt Review.</p> <p>3) & 5) Council officers advise that this is not in an Urban Greenspace deficit area.</p> <p>6) The availability of funding for sports facilities is outside the remit of this study.</p>	No amendment.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
027	R71	D Lenton Esq.	Justin Paul, J10 Planning	Site Specific	<p>Site 6188, Maghull Land to west of A59, Maghull</p> <p>1) Query net developable area as challenge the extent of the Flood Zones. The previously developed area of land that lies within the Primarily Residential Area extends to 1.49ha which exceeds 0.83 ha net developable area.</p> <p>2) Previously developed area is presently occupied by uses that are still largely operational – planning policy encourages the re-use of the area for residential development.</p> <p>3) Council should view site as being phased, not one homogenous area.</p>	<p>1) Extent of Flood Zone is derived from Environment Agency Flood Maps and has been consistently applied throughout the study.</p> <p>2) The principle of the use of the non Green Belt element of the site is established by the Primarily Residential Area status, although this land is subject to flooding constraints.</p> <p>3) Detailed comments regarding phasing would be more appropriately addressed at planning application stage.</p>	No amendment.
028	R72	4NW	Ami Hardland, Regional Planning Assistant	Methodology	<p>Methodology</p> <p>1) Welcomes the study methodology which follows CLG guidance.</p> <p>2) It is useful that you have considered possible economic constraints in the changing market and in doing so have included a risk assessment of the sites (e.g. renegotiation of permission for apartments to include more family housing). It may be useful to use findings of the SHMA for contextual details.</p> <p>3) Useful that link has been made with the employment land and premises study.</p> <p>4) Assume that there has been consideration of surplus public sector land within the sources of supply.</p> <p>5) Acknowledges the way Green Belt has been dealt with.</p>	<p>1), 3) & 5) Comments noted.</p> <p>2) Comments noted. Reference to the context provided by the Sefton Strategic Housing Market Assessment has been provided.</p> <p>4) Surplus public sector sites were submitted through the call for sites process.</p>	SHLAA report has been amended to provide appropriate reference to the Sefton Strategic Housing Market Assessment and to provide clarity on the study's consideration of surplus public sector land.
029	R73	David Tyson	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 6126, Ainsdale Ainsdale Hope Learning Centre, Sandringham Road</p> <p>1) If school demolished then there would be no site for a secondary school – this does not seem right, particularly as the population would increase as a result of development.</p> <p>2) If the development of this site combines with the proposed rebuild of Pontins then it would cause chaos for Ainsdale.</p>	<p>1) Children's Services department has advised that the site is highly unlikely to be used as a school again.</p> <p>2) Issues raised would need to be addressed as part of any future consideration of the site. The site has been removed from the SHLAA subject to the Green Belt Review.</p>	No amendment.
030	R74	Bellway Homes	Simon Artis	Methodology	<p>Methodology</p> <p>Provides clarification of Bellway's current live sites within the area.</p> <p>1) Clear shift away from building apartments which reduces existing site commitments. Applying a risk factor of less than 1/3 to Sefton's existing stock of commitments is therefore seen as conservative and we recommend applying a factor of at least 34% or thereabouts.</p> <p>2) Suggests existing commitments made up of significant number of apartments and also townhouses which prove difficult to sell in a strong market, so are especially vulnerable in the current climate. This would support an even higher discount rate of 37.5%.</p> <p>3) Same cautionary approach is advocated for new sites. Higher densities should not be applied in the short term, and should only apply with caution beyond 5 years. The yield from the sites will therefore reduce. Recommended that this be discounted by at least 34%</p>	<p>1) & 3) Comments noted, but the study has been undertaken in the context provided by the current housing market. The assumed density applied to each site is considered to be a cautious estimate of what can be achieved and therefore the approach taken to risk assessment is considered appropriate.</p> <p>2) Whilst it is accepted that some existing commitments may not be built out in accordance with any extant planning permission, the proposed 20% risk assessment is considered appropriate for the reasons provided in the study report.</p> <p>4) A very cautious approach has been utilised with respect to small sites, whose development may be marginal in the current market. The number of dwellings that the study suggests may be achieved</p>	Additional explanatory text has been provided to more fully set out and justify the study methodology which has been utilised.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
					<p>4) Should be clear in terms of what the small sites contribute to the SHLAA – current allowance may be optimistic as these sites may not be commercially attractive and credit restrictions will also impede their delivery.</p> <p>5) Support the inclusion of Urban Greenfield Sites within the SHLAA.</p> <p>6) Pressure for new sites is also likely to increase in Liverpool.</p> <p>7) Given the points above, there will be a clear need for Green Belt land. With a 'realistic' risk factor applied, this is likely to be sooner rather than later. Support Green Belt Review and continue to seek opportunities to work with Council and others to deliver this. Recommend pro-active approach to this – RSS does not prevent smaller scale review prior to 2011.</p>	<p>on such sites is somewhat less than has been historically and is considered to be a realistic estimate.</p> <p>5), 6) & 7) Comments noted.</p>	
031	R75	Phillips Electronics UK Ltd	King Sturge, Frazer Sandwith	Site Specific	<p>Site 6255, Southport Former Phillips Factory, Balmoral Drive</p> <p>1) Phillips is seeking to promote the redevelopment of the site for residential or residential led mixed use development.</p> <p>2) Site and premises are not suitable for continued or future economic reuse and redevelopment and remodelling to the site for employment development would not be viable without gap funding or significant enabling residential development.</p> <p>3) There are a number of significant sustainability and regeneration benefits that could arise, the most important being the retention of employment uses and environmental benefits of demolition, remediation and reduction in transport, noise and visual impacts arising from the existing site.</p> <p>4) Concerns that representation to Employment Land Study has not been taking into consideration in the SHLAA report as previously requested.</p> <p>5) Support acknowledgement of potential on site, but not its removal from SHLAA due to location in PIA. Request retain in SHLAA with development at 40-50 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>6) SHLAA score should be revised upwards to reflect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over 70% of site is vacant. The site is owned by Phillips on 10 year lease. Owner also pursuing mixed use development. Owner is willing to sell. <p>7) Request that the SHLAA has regard to the wider regeneration benefits, including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for retaining employment space. Removing environmental problems (noise, traffic, visual). Bringing vacant and underused site back into use. Potential to provide a form of development which minimises energy consumption. Potential for affordable housing. Provision of community facilities sport and recreation facilities, children's play areas and open space and whether these could be provided on site or off site contributions. <p>8) Location of the site within Zone 2 and 3a of Flood Risk Area should not preclude residential development on the site.</p>	<p>1), 2) & 7) Comments noted.</p> <p>3) & 5) Comments noted. The approach to this site is consistent with the methodology utilised throughout the study. Whilst this site has been excluded from the identified housing supply due to its existing use and designation as a Primarily Industrial Area, this does not preclude the future use of the site for residential purposes. It will be for the respondent to demonstrate that appropriateness of the site for housing by way of a planning application or by seeking the residential allocation of the site through the LDF process. The suitability of the site for housing will be dependent on, <i>inter alia</i>, the loss of employment land being satisfactorily addressed.</p> <p>4) The Employment Land Study has been taken into consideration in the undertaking of the SHLAA. However, sites have been considered in a consistent manner and it is thought that, whilst this site offers some potential, this should be more comprehensively demonstrated by way of a planning application or through the LDF process.</p> <p>6) SHLAA site record amended to reflect that the site is in single ownership and that the owner is willing to sell.</p> <p>8) In accordance with the study methodology and advice provided by PPS25, that part of the site which lies within Flood Zone 3 has been excluded from the indicative net developable area noted on the SHLAA site record.</p>	SHLAA site record has been amended to reflect the fact that the site is in single ownership and that the owner is willing to sell.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
032	R76	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Andrew Thornley	Methodology	<p>Methodology</p> <p>1) Para 3.36: broad locations for growth at least need to be assessed for years 11-15.</p> <p>2) Para 3.41: gross net percentages are unlikely, especially given the demise of the apartment market.</p> <p>3) Para 5.01: housebuilders would not be 'content' to land bank sites as clearly we have to pay holding costs. If a site remains undeveloped, it is due to development continuing to be an unviable proposition.</p>	<p>1) Such an assessment is outside the scope of the SHLAA but will be addressed by Sefton MBC as part of the wider LDF.</p> <p>2) The gross to net multipliers used are derived from previous good practice guidance and are considered to be a cautious estimate of the proportion of each site which may be able to accommodate dwelling houses.</p> <p>3) Comments noted and the wording of this paragraph has been amended.</p>	SHLAA Report amended so that Paragraph 5.01 of main report now refers to the fact that 'a developer may 'landbank' sites until the housing market recovers sufficiently to ensure that development is viable.'
032	R77	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Andrew Thornley	Site Specific	<p>Site 6212, Maghull Farmland adjacent to M58</p> <p>1) Site should be identified within the SHLAA process. It is suited to being allocated as a strategic housing land allocation due to proximity of services and facilities together with the physical containment of the site, which divorces the site from the open countryside.</p> <p>2) The site is available for development and could be delivered within the next 5 years and following benefits of site are identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development will assist in meeting RSS and LDF housing requirements. There is a need for greenfield allocations within the LDF. The site is a sustainable location for residential development being located on the edge of Maghull urban area and surrounded by development on all four sides. The site is easily accessible to Maghull town centre for a wide range of facilities and employment. Secondary schools and health services are also a short distance away. Development would not harm the principles of the Green Belt The site will form a sustainable urban extension. The site will provide a range of housing to meet the needs of the community. The proposed development can be served by non car modes of transport. There are no known physical constraints preventing the delivery of this site. 	<p>1) Exclusion from the housing supply identified by the SHLAA does not preclude the site being considered as a future allocation, depending on the findings of the Green Belt Review and LDF Core Strategy. All sites which would lead to an urban extension in the Green Belt have been treated in a consistent manner, pending a review of the Green Belt and the need for urban extensions.</p> <p>2) Comments noted.</p>	No amendment.
033	R78	Jackie Sherrington	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 6085, Lydiate Sandy Lane</p> <p>1) There is no active use on the site. The path shown on the map has not been in use for over 40 years and the small outbuilding shown on the border of the map no longer exists.</p>	1) Comments noted.	SHLAA site record amended to reflect that the site is not in active use.
034	R79	Environment Agency	Stephen Sayce	Methodology	<p>Green Belt Sites</p> <p>1) Notes that sites within the Green Belt have been removed. If Green Belt boundaries are revised in the future, then several of the sites may have other environmental constraints that would need to be resolved. Some allocations also have constraints that would need to be resolved prior to their reallocation through the LDF process.</p> <p>2) Raises the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site allocation for residential land use should be compliant with PPS25. Sites adjacent or in close proximity to canals/reservoirs may be subject to unknown level of flood risk. Where main rivers flow through or adjacent to the site, consent of the Environment Agency will be required in order to develop. Where there is an ordinary watercourse through or within a site, Environment Agency consent required. 	<p>1) Comments noted. The SHLAA report is clear in advising the inclusion in SHLAA does not imply that land will be allocated or planning applications will necessarily be considered favourably.</p> <p>2) Comments noted and full consideration of such issues will need to be given during the determination of any a planning application at any of the identified housing sites.</p>	No amendment.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of site with aquatic habitat value or contamination will require further investigation. 		
035	R80	James Byrne	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 1021, Formby Car park to rear of 54-90 Harrington Road</p> <p>1) More parking at the front of the shops on the large paved area would free up the rear car park for housing provision. Parking for the new housing can be accommodated at the south and the rear of the car park. Delivery access would be maintained.</p>	1) Comments noted, but it is still considered that this remains a problematic site where residential development is unlikely to be achieved.	No amendment.
035	R81	James Byrne	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 1022, Formby Victoria Road grassed area</p> <p>1) Important green site providing relief from endless line of housing plots – visual and ecological break. Also a wildlife corridor and should be kept as a green link.</p>	1) The site has been excluded from the identified housing supply due to there being an extant permission on the site.	No amendment.
035	R82	James Byrne	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 1023, Formby RAFA Club, Victoria Road</p> <p>1) Possible redevelopment of the rear of the car park for small scale development. Car parking could be rearranged. Sub-station could be relocated.</p>	1) RAFA Club remains in use so this is considered highly unlikely to come forward. Site remains excluded from the identified housing supply due to it not being available. To include such sites that are unlikely to come forward would overestimate the potential supply in the area.	No amendment.
035	R83	James Byrne	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 1025, Formby Harrington Centre</p> <p>1) An active community centre which should be kept outright. One of only a handful in the area. Also provides Greenspace for everyone's enjoyment.</p>	1) Comments noted. The site is excluded from the identified housing supply for this reason.	No amendment.
035	R84	James Byrne	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 1027, Formby Site of 26 Jubilee Road</p> <p>1) Areas of low density housing should not be removed from the study. Some low density housing will need to be replaced by higher densities if we wish to keep the public Greenspace. We cannot take the easy option of cherry picking new sites and not considering developed land that has potential for improvement.</p>	1) The site is not likely to come forward for redevelopment due to it being occupied by existing housing in multiple ownerships. It is not available for development. TPOs also restrict the redevelopment of the site. To include such sites that are unlikely to come forward would overestimate the potential supply in the area. It is therefore considered appropriate that the site be excluded from the identified housing supply.	No amendment.
035	R85	James Byrne	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 1037, Formby Land at 88 Church Road</p> <p>1) Incentive scheme for purchase of properties like this to provide what is really needed for the community. We should not dismiss the potential of rental leases on such land to provide accommodation which can provide an income for the landowner.</p>	1) The site is not likely to come forward for redevelopment due to it being occupied by a business use and there is no indication that it will be available for redevelopment. To include such sites that are unlikely to come forward would overestimate the potential supply in the area. It is therefore considered appropriate that the site be excluded from the identified housing supply.	No amendment.
035	R86	James Byrne	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 1052, Formby Land at 3 Cross Green</p> <p>1) Additional land at the front of this property could provide a small number of flats with a view to expansion once the old building becomes redundant.</p>	1) The site is not likely to come forward for redevelopment due to it being occupied by a business use and there is no indication that it will be available for redevelopment. It is not be considered appropriate from a design perspective to locate flats within the front curtilage of this building. To include such sites that are unlikely to come forward would overestimate the potential supply in the area. It is therefore considered appropriate that the site is excluded from the identified housing supply.	No amendment.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
035	R87	James Byrne	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 1071, Formby 35-51 Old Mill Lane</p> <p>1) Good site, access can be widened at northern part of site by taking some garden space off the properties to the north of the plot. Incentives can be used to ease this process.</p>	<p>1) This site is heavily constrained by land assembly issues and access. It is considered very unrealistic that all land owners will agree to sell at any given time. To include such sites that are unlikely to come forward would overestimate the potential supply in the area.</p> <p>It is therefore considered appropriate that the site is excluded from the identified housing supply.</p>	No amendment.
035	R88	James Byrne	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 1078, Formby 29 Southport Road</p> <p>1) Very suitable for flats or apartments when market picks up.</p>	<p>1) Property is already in use as a dwelling. Plot small with very limited potential and considered unlikely to come forward.</p> <p>To include such sites that are unlikely to come forward would overestimate the potential supply in the area. It is therefore considered appropriate that the site is excluded from the identified housing supply.</p>	No amendment.
035	R89	James Byrne	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 1085, Formby Rear 11-53 Gardner Road</p> <p>1) Access from cul-de-sac is appropriate for this site. Leaves reasonable garden sizes. Suitable for small secluded retirement flats or apartments.</p>	<p>1) This site is heavily constrained by land assembly issues and access. It is considered very unrealistic that all land owners will agree to sell at any given time. To include such sites that are unlikely to come forward would overestimate the potential supply in the area.</p> <p>It is therefore considered appropriate that the site is excluded from the identified housing supply.</p>	No amendment.
035	R90	James Byrne	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 1086, Formby Rear 4 Wicks Lane</p> <p>1) Joint ownership arrangement of drive means that more than one dwelling is possible.</p>	<p>1) Comments noted.</p>	No amendment.
035	R91	James Byrne	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 1105, Formby Land to rear of 113 Church Road</p> <p>1) Site is too large to be refused on the grounds that it is not easily accessible. It is not public Greenspace and yet it is large enough for a number of dwellings. Should be seriously considered for development.</p>	<p>1) Site is a large maintained private garden with difficult access. There is no indication that it is available. To include such sites that are unlikely to come forward would overestimate the potential supply in the area. It is therefore considered appropriate that the site is excluded from the identified housing supply.</p>	No amendment.
035	R92	James Byrne	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 1780, Formby Bus turning area</p> <p>1) Waste of valuable space. A turning route could be incorporated instead which frees the north of the site for development. Other new development could be incorporated in the south west corner, continuing the current building line.</p>	<p>1) Site was removed due to unavailability of site and presence of TPOs. Given the existing use of this site, this is considered appropriate. To include such sites that are unlikely to come forward would overestimate the potential supply in the area.</p>	No amendment.
035	R93	James Byrne	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 5212, Formby Land off Ashdale Close</p> <p>1) Open space with potential for footpath through from Kirklake Bank Mansion. Has been wooded copse for over 150 years and was once part of the Kirklake Bank Mansion (provides map from 1894). It is cultural and ecological asset and not suitable for housing.</p>	<p>1) The potential of the site has been reviewed and it is considered that this wooded copse will likely remain as informal open space. Accordingly, it has been excluded from the identified housing supply.</p>	SHLAA site record amended to exclude site from the housing supply.
035	R94	James Byrne	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 5215, Formby Land off Ennerdale Road</p> <p>1) Not suitable for housing. Site is on a slope and is an important Greenspace enjoyed by many rail commuters and local residents. Also an important habitat. It provides a break from the bridge and housing and provides buffer between fumes</p>	<p>1) The potential of the site has been reviewed and it is considered that this site will likely remain as informal open space. Accordingly, it has been excluded from the identified housing supply.</p>	SHLAA site record amended to exclude site from the housing supply.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
					and local housing.		
035	R95	James Byrne	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 6011, Formby Land bordered by former bypass and Liverpool Road</p> <p>1) This Green Belt area is far too important to develop. It acts as buffer between dual carriageway and Formby. Any development would spoil route into Formby – every town needs its own identity. To fill in such spaces between communities ignores the purpose of Green Belts, i.e. to maintain distinct communities rather than continuous ribbon development. The northern part of the site could possibly be used for housing as still maintaining visual break between housing and road.</p>	1) Comments noted. Site has been excluded from the housing supply due to its location in the Green Belt (pending future Green Belt Review).	No amendment.
035	R96	James Byrne	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 6015, Formby College Avenue</p> <p>1) Ideal for row of flats running east-west with small garden spaces and parking adjacent to College Lane to the east of the new development.</p>	1) Site is recognised as having redevelopment potential but as unlikely to result in net gain of dwellings, it has been removed from the SHLAA. Apartment development is not considered to present a realistic opportunity on this site.	No amendment.
035	R97	James Byrne	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 6039, Formby Land south of Liverpool Road</p> <p>1) This area should not be developed. It would lay the foundation for future erosion of Green Belt land. Development must be kept within footprint of town. We must densify the current town with great care and not be tempted to use virgin land to the east of the bypass.</p>	1) Comments noted. Site has been excluded from the housing supply due to its location in the Green Belt (pending future Green Belt Review).	No amendment.
035	R98	James Byrne	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 6067, Formby Land adjacent to Kentonwood Stables</p> <p>1) Though preferable to site 6039, this is again virgin land. These areas must be a last resort for development and not a serious consideration at the present time.</p>	1) Comments noted. Site has been removed from the SHLAA due to its location in the Green Belt (pending review of Green Belt and need for urban extensions).	No amendment.
035	R99	James Byrne	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 6097, Formby St Peters Vicarage, Cricket</p> <p>1) Well used amenity for local youth groups. It is one of the only fields where groups can camp in safety on the town centre. The area should have never been on the list in the first place.</p>	1) Site is partially designated Urban Greenspace and has been removed from the SHLAA following assessment. Site was put forward for consideration through the Call for sites process and has therefore been assessed in accordance with the SHLAA methodology.	No amendment.
035	R100	James Byrne	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 6245, Formby Land at Rose Farm Stud Farm</p> <p>1) Area is a beautiful buffer zone between Southport Old Road and the bypass. Ensures the 'moss' to the east of the bypass remains separate from the town. It should never be developed.</p>	1) Comments noted. Site has been removed from the SHLAA due to its location in the Green Belt (pending review of Green Belt and need for urban extensions).	No amendment.
035	R101	James Byrne	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 6248, Formby Sandy Wood, Andrews Lane</p> <p>1) This is a realistic site for development but should be considered when all appropriate infill development has been exhausted. If developed it will increase ribbon development.</p>	1) Comments noted. Site has been removed from the SHLAA due to its location in the Green Belt (pending review of Green Belt and need for urban extensions).	No amendment.
035	R102	James Byrne	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 9513, Formby Land to the West of 99 Ennerdale Road</p> <p>1) Pleasant Greenspace. Should be kept as amenity and be planted with trees or at worst incorporated in any development as a landscaped communal garden space.</p>	1) The potential of the site has been reviewed and it is considered that this site will likely remain as informal open space. Accordingly, it has been excluded from the identified housing supply.	SHLAA site record amended to exclude site from the housing supply.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
036	R103	Turfland Ltd	Strutt & Parker LLP, Neil Culkin	Site Specific	<p>New Site, Southport Land adjacent to Hodge's Farm to the south of Crowland Street</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 22ha site within the Green Belt. 2) Northern boundary adjoins Blowick Business Park which is allocated as industrial development site and an industrial improvement area. 3) Hodge's Farm to west is highlighted as strategic park and ride site (2002 planning approval) and there has also been an application for 3 wind turbines on the site. 4) Permissions of note within Blowick Business Park include the gasworks (north). 5) Would support use of site for holistic masterplanning and consider it ideal for a wider regeneration scheme inclusive of Blowick Park, the park and ride. A mixture of retail, housing and commercial would be preferable. 6) Approach would aid local employment/regeneration and create an economic planning giant for the wider Sefton area. 7) As site is naturally landlocked by Boundary Brook, it would create a logical extension to the existing settlement area with no further scope for future encroachment into the Green Belt. 	Site considered as part of SHLAA. Comments noted.	Considered as site reference 9546.
037	R104	Hallam Management Limited	-	Methodology	<p>Methodology</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) SHLAA undertaken in environment of an increased annual housing requirement which no longer a maximum ceiling, but instead a minimum target. 2) Note that development industry has not been involved in actual assessment of sites and that Council Officers did not survey any land within the Green Belt. 3) Notes content of paragraph 5.07 relating to realistic potential of employment sites for alternative uses and therefore the supply in Table 5.1 is likely to be overstated by up to 896 dwellings (non allocated employment sites), and not just the 20% discounting factor. Urban greenfield supply (1103) will also require fine judgement – possibly all sites could be allocated as Urban Greenspace in LDF, i.e. not available for residential development. 4) SHLAAs are not supposed to include windfall allowance. Not including provision for an estimation of the likely capacity on small sites (under 0.1ha para 3.55 of report refers) is simply a windfall allowance by another name. This element should also be excluded from the supply. 5) On the basis of the above exclusions, a worst case scenario would be a shortfall of 614 in years 1-5, 1,510 in years 6-10 and 2,489 in years 11-15. 6) Study base date is 2008 – LDF Core Strategy is unlikely to be adopted for at least 18 months / 2 years and will need to address a period 15 years from adoption, but will be three years into the SHLAA first 5 years. 7) By excluding Green Belt sites the SHLAA has demonstrated a woefully inadequate land supply. This also means distribution of housing through the Borough will be governed by the location of existing commitments and previously-developed land which will limit the options in making policy judgements in the LDF Core Strategy in respect of housing land distribution. 8) Summary and conclusion downplay impact of undersupply, but agree with conclusion that study needs to be extended and include Green Belt sites. 	<p>1) & 8) Comments noted.</p> <p>2) WYG has significant experience in the appraisal of housing development sites and in securing residential planning permissions. Furthermore, two separate stakeholder events and a significant public consultation exercise have been undertaken in order to ensure that site appraisals are accurate and informed by commercial considerations.</p> <p>3) & 5) Both of these sources of supply have been reviewed and the identified supply in each category has reduced considerably as a result. The text of the final report provides additional clarity with regard to the methodology employed in this regard and it is considered that the approach adopted provides a relatively cautious estimation of supply.</p> <p>4) In accordance with practice guidance, the study does not incorporate a windfall allowance. The 'small site allowance' relates to individually identified sites which have been assessed through representative sample. Further justification for the methodology is provided in the final report</p> <p>6) Comments noted. It is assumed that the findings of the study will be reviewed and rolled forward at regular intervals.</p> <p>7) Comments noted. It will be the Council to consider the need to provide an appropriate distribution of housing sites across the Borough during the LDF process.</p>	<p>Explanatory text added to final report in order to clarify in report the approach taken to Urban Greenspace and employment sites, and to provide further justification for the 'small site allowance'.</p>

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
038	R105	John McNamara	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 6126, Ainsdale Ainsdale Hope Learning Centre, Sandringham Road</p> <p>1) Grounds and school building could become valuable social amenity – beneficial for 2012 Olympics.</p> <p>2) Part of site could be used as a Healthy Living Centre.</p>	1) & 2) Issues raised would need to be addressed as part of any future consideration of the site. The site has been excluded from the housing supply subject to the Green Belt Review.	No amendment.
038	R106	John McNamara	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 6191, Ainsdale Burnley Road</p> <p>1) Plan of site submitted for consideration which offers a site central to Ainsdale village. All amenities, shops, library and schools within walking distance. Would promote social and economic life of Ainsdale.</p>	1) This site, submitted during the call for sites process, was considered in the SHLAA (Site 6191). The site incorporates multiple ownerships of dwellings and rear gardens and is considered highly unlikely to come forward for development.	No amendment.
039	R107	Michael & Gaynor Pickard	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 0847, Southport Lancaster Road</p> <p>The apparent high score achieved by the scoring criteria does not fully justify development of the site.</p> <p>1) Score of '8' for physical constraints is incorrect. Site is substantially lower than surrounding area and would need extensive drainage/pumping operation. Both developments on Granville Road and nearby 'Westbourne Gardens' need such a system.</p> <p>2) No score for the development being 'un-neighbourly' itself. A negative scoring system should be adopted. A yield of 87 dwellings is by far highest number of units in an area that is surrounded by other residences and would have a negative impact in surrounding area.</p> <p>3) Contest that site is located in a strong residential market. Houses in area can take over 12 months to sell and this was before current market stagnation. In Bootle site 6062 has score of 0 for residential market and associated comment. Contest the relevance of the score relating to residential market. Thought the purpose of the exercise was to build affordable housing in Sefton – by definition this housing is in a different category to the housing in the area of Birkdale, therefore there should be no correlation between marketability of the proposed site and that of the local area.</p> <p>4) Contest the point that there are no abnormal costs including demolition etc however the site comments mentions 'more modern extensions for demolition.' Grade II listed building would also have to be maintained at a cost. A score of zero in this category should only apply to completely empty sites.</p> <p>5) 87 dwellings would considerable increase traffic. There are already problems with existing capacity at junctions.</p> <p>6) Site is noted as being 'adjacent to a Site of Local Biological Interest and European Nature Site'. Argues that the field and borders are themselves nature sites which must be maintained. If they were removed then there may be 'bleed through' into these sites themselves. The large expanse of trees to the south west of the site are home to many nesting and migratory birds and also offer canopy and border to adjacent sites.</p> <p>7) SHLAA advises that the site is within a Conservation Area and therefore any proposed building must be in keeping it the area. A noticeable characteristic of</p>	<p>1) The site is not considered to have any significant constraints which would likely dissuade a developer from redeveloping for housing use. Accordingly, the site record is considered accurate in this respect.</p> <p>2) Residential development is considered appropriate to residential areas. The proposed net developable area and yield is, after reviewing the site, considered likely to be excessive and has been revised accordingly.</p> <p>3) West Birkdale is considered to be an attractive location, with strong ongoing demand for housing. This is reflected in the housing prices achieved. The purpose of the study is to identify suitable, available and achievable housing land. It is not for this study to prescribe the type of housing which will be appropriate to certain sites. In this context, the assessment of the site as being appropriate for residential development is considered correct.</p> <p>4) The costs associated in demolishing and removing these modern buildings are not perceived to be abnormal in relation the development potential of the overall site.</p> <p>5) & 7) The proposed site yield has been reassessed.</p> <p>6) The playing field is designated Urban Greenspace, but is not subject to any further protective designations. Such considerations may need to be addressed at site allocation or planning application stage.</p>	SHLAA site record amended to reflect amended net developable area and lower yield (40 dwellings).

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
					the area is that the dwellings are well spaced apart with expanses of garden around them. Difficult to see how 87 dwellings would have this characteristic. A major feature of the building is the imposing vista of the main building.		
040	R108	Sefton Police	-	General	<p>Secure by Design</p> <p>1) Request Sefton Police Architectural Liaison Officer be consulted at the concept and design stage of all future housing developments and that such development achieve 'Secure by Design' certificate.</p> <p>2) Response provides summary of Secure By Design scheme and principles.</p>	1) & 2) Comments noted and brought to the attention of Sefton Council.	No amendment.
041	R109	United Utilities	David Hardman	Site Specific	<p>Various Sites</p> <p>1) Comments made by respondent relate to sites greater 1ha only (excluding Green Belt sites). It must be recognised however that on smaller sites United Utilities apparatus may still cross the site or sites may be at risk from sewer flooding, which may challenge the viability of the site for development.</p> <p>2) In general there are no water supply resource issues in the Borough. There may be a requirement for extensive off-site mains at the developer's expense to support the supply in some of these areas.</p> <p>3) United Utilities would always prefer that surface water is separated and disposed separately.</p> <p>4) The respondent has provided a schedule of sites that one or more of the above issues relate to.</p>	1), 2) & 3) Noted. 4) Comments noted and brought to the attention of Sefton Council. The comments are considered to be relevant and appropriate to the development of each site, but do not materially impact upon how each site has been assessed in terms of its contribution to Sefton's housing supply. Accordingly, it will be for the Council to ensure that the comments are taken into proper consideration during the future negotiation of any planning application for residential development on any of the sites.	No amendment.
042	R110	Friends of the Earth	Yvonne Irving	Methodology	<p>Methodology</p> <p>1) Sites identified are very variable and not all are acceptable. Those that are industrial sites and unused commercial premises are fine, but to target peoples back gardens as suitable for houses are not. Back gardens important for supporting many species, growing fruit and veg, leisure and children's play.</p> <p>2) No future site should involve loss of trees.</p> <p>3) Report says north of Sefton is a popular area to live - this is obviously because it still has space and fresh air. Over half of the Borough is built on, so for this rather small land mass there really isn't that much countryside. That which is left should remain as a valuable enhancement for the whole community. Green Belt provides barrier between different settlements – once built on it is lost forever. Note that 375.4ha of Green Belt land is being considered for development – a very worrying large amount of land. Hopes that the Council will act with responsibility and refuse to let this happen.</p> <p>4) Not opposed to brownfield sites or vacant lots and barren areas being developed, but is against small valuable areas of nature value being built on and erosion of the Green Belt and especially loss of back gardens.</p> <p>5) Reluctantly accept that many more houses need to be built, but surely it can be done in a way that does not spoil the attractiveness of an area or create a new urban sprawl.</p>	<p>1) Large gardens in urban areas have been identified in line with previous established guidance on urban capacity studies.</p> <p>2) Issue of tree removal may need to be addressed as part of any future consideration of specific sites. Any site which is specifically the subject of a Tree Preservation Order has been identified and this will need to taken into proper consideration in the design of any future residential proposal.</p> <p>3) It is important to note that whilst the study provides an indication of the Green Belt sites assessed, they have been excluded from the overall SHLAA supply. A future review of the Green Belt is required to address this matter.</p> <p>4) & 5) In accordance with national and regional guidance, the Council gives priority to the redevelopment of previously developed land and buildings over greenfield sites.</p>	No amendment.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
043	R111	Countryside Properties	Jane Aspinall	Site Specific	<p>Site 6212, Maghull Land adjacent to M58</p> <p>1) Agree that SHLAA is important part of LDF evidence base and will assist in delivery of RSS housing requirements. PPS3 makes clear that LPAs should, in their LDDs, address delivering the level of housing provision and identifying broad locations and specific sites for at least 15 years from date of adoption.</p> <p>2) As the Council will be unable to identify a 15 year supply through the Core Strategy, we urge them to immediately undertake a further study to identify suitable broad locations where future growth can be accommodated. We believe that this needs to include a review of the Green Belt.</p> <p>3) In this regard, Countryside Properties/Persimmon Homes have an interest in site 6212 which is believed to provide a suitable strategic opportunity for sustainable and mixed development.</p>	<p>1) Exclusion of a site from the housing supply identified by the SHLAA does not necessarily preclude the site being considered as a future housing allocation, depending on the findings of the forthcoming Green Belt Review and LDF Core Strategy.</p> <p>2) All sites which would lead to an urban extension in the Green Belt have been treated in a consistent manner, pending the review of the Green Belt. The Council has committed to undertaking such a study and further details will be provided in the near future.</p> <p>3) Comments noted.</p>	No amendment.
044	R112	Elizabeth Foggin	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 0847, Southport Lancaster Road, Birkdale</p> <p>1) Site is designated Urban Greenspace and is home to an abundant supply of wildlife including natterjack toads. Used as a nesting ground for migratory birds. Report merely notes that the site is adjacent to a site of local biological interest and European Nature Site. Any proposed development would require full ecological study.</p> <p>2) Site is below the sewerage mains. 11 properties built in 2001 by Countryside Properties has required a pumping station to accommodate waste disposal due to the topographic lie of the land. Pumping station incurs problems due to it being a dual phase electrical supply rather than tri phase supply, which was not possible due to infrastructure issues.</p> <p>3) Site is Grade II listed, Vista of Grade II property must be retained.</p> <p>4) Therefore suitability should be given a score of 0.</p> <p>5) Recession aside, property in this affluent area takes at least 12 months to sell despite being marketed at values significantly below market averages. This clearly shows the site is not a strong residential area. New properties located at the junction of Grosvenor Road and Waterloo Road remain unsold, despite being on market for 5 years.</p> <p>6) Any development needs to be suitable and sympathetic to character of environment, especially conservation area. Character of the area is not intensely developed, but report states site suitable for 87 properties.</p> <p>7) Affordable homes in this location are not indigenous to the surrounding area and would undermine its character and protected conservation status. There is not a sufficient market for the number of appropriately suited homes for the area.</p> <p>8) Cannot understand why no significant abnormal costs have been identified yet in the site survey comments it identifies that modern extensions require demolition and that the building is listed.</p> <p>9) A full ecological study would be required and measures put in place to protect</p>	<p>1), 9) & 13) The playing field is designated Urban Greenspace, but is not subject to any further protective designations. Such considerations may need to be addressed at site allocation or planning application stage.</p> <p>2) The site is not considered to have constraints so significant that they would dissuade a developer from redeveloping the school buildings for housing use.</p> <p>3) Noted that the property is listed and would need to be taken into consideration if the development of the site was to be progressed.</p> <p>4), 10) & 11) The site is considered to have been scored appropriately.</p> <p>5), 7) & 14) The purpose of the study is to identify suitable, available and achievable housing land. It is not for this study to prescribe the type of housing which will be appropriate to certain sites. In this context, the assessment of the site as being appropriate for residential development is considered correct.</p> <p>6) & 12) Comments noted. The proposed site yield has been reassessed.</p> <p>8) The costs associated in demolishing and removing these modern buildings or converting the existing listed buildings are not perceived to be abnormal in relation the development potential of the overall site.</p>	No amendment.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
					<p>and preserve the species utilising the site.</p> <p>10) The score awarded is therefore inappropriate as the site incurs abnormal costs.</p> <p>11) In view of comments above the total score for the site should be reduced by 23 resulting in a score of 60.</p> <p>12) The site does merit redevelopment of the original Grade II listed building. It is beginning to fall into disrepair and should be placed on the "at risk" register. Development should also be considered on the brownfield sites of the modern extensions (former classrooms) however the Grade II building should be retained and encroachment of the Urban Greenspace should be limited considerably.</p> <p>13) Encroachment of the Urban Greenspace significant environmental studies and consultation would be required.</p> <p>14) Local market would not sustain intensive redevelopment.</p>		
044	R113	Elizabeth Foggin	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 0453 Southport 55a Segars Lane</p> <p>1) It is preposterous to suggest the relocation or closure of the Southport YMCA gym club. The gym club is actively used by hundreds of children every week and is heavily supported by local residents from a wide geographical area. Closure would not be an option. The club requires dedicated space to keep its equipment including bespoke sprung floors. The site has other obstacles, including access and the need for demolition.</p>	1) It is noted that the site is in use and there is apparently no indication that it is to relocate to alternative premises.	SHLAA site record amended to exclude site from housing supply due to it apparently not being available for redevelopment.
044	R114	Elizabeth Foggin	-	General	<p>Methodology</p> <p>1) Fail to understand why certain commercial properties have been discounted when the sites are clearly viable for housing development following the relocation (displacement) of existing businesses to more appropriate locations e.g. currently disused business areas which are unsuitable for residential development. Sefton has the opportunity here to proactively address a cohesive approach to setting out business and residential districts.</p> <p>2) Considers that the consultation for the draft report has taken place over a short time period (consultation at Southport Visitor Centre on 25 September 2009, with consultation closing date less than 1 week away). Lack of publicity has made further comment unviable.</p> <p>3) Has Sefton considered the prime site of the former Pleasureland for housing development? The appropriate change of use of this site would be better than decay.</p>	<p>1) Sites in existing commercial use have been included in the study where it has been brought to our attention that the use is seeking to relocate is open to this prospect. Other sites may offer housing potential, but without any indication that this is going to be realised it is generally considered correct to exclude these from the quantification of housing supply.</p> <p>2) The consultation on this phase of the SHLAA lasted for a period of 6 weeks and was advertised as such in the local and sub-regional press, including the Southport Visitor (20 August 2009).</p> <p>3) The former Pleasureland site is not included in the assessment as there is some uncertainty over the long term plans for the site. Initial thoughts for the site are that it would be used for a high quality leisure use linked to the tourist industry. Any development is likely to be visitor-based, rather than housing. Including the site in the assessment may prejudice both the redevelopment of the site for other uses and regeneration plans for the wider area, although this is not to say in the future that housing may not form part of any development.</p>	No amendment.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
045	R115	Liverpool & Chester Property Company	Jo Wright, Smiths Gore	Site Specific	<p>New Site, Melling Land off Spencer's Lane</p> <p>1) Agricultural land which is immediately available, well contained and strategically located adjacent to existing urban areas and with close proximity to the highways network and main services and facilities. Suitable access can be achieved from Spencer's Lane (drawings included). Although currently lies in Green Belt, the site is a suitable location for a sustainable urban extension to the built up area. The land is considered to be of poor environmental quality, with fly-tipping and unauthorised motorbike use. It is noted that part of the site to the south lies within the flood zone and a pylon is located within the northern boundary of the site. No other constraints are identified.</p>	1) Site considered as part of SHLAA.	Considered as site reference 9547.
046	R116	Mr D Ney & Ms E Moss	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 6048, Formby Clarence House School</p> <p>Object to the inclusion of site:</p> <p>1) It would have negative implications for flora and fauna and an adverse impact upon character of the area.</p> <p>2) It would impinge on privacy of homeowners on surrounding roads and create traffic incompatible with the local infrastructure.</p> <p>3) Site is also a valuable recreation area for local football team and removal of this facility would be detrimental to social cohesion.</p> <p>4) Impact upon right to privacy and quiet of existing residents, many of which are elderly.</p>	1), 2) & 4) The site raises a number of detailed planning considerations which would be given further examination should the site be identified as a potential allocation or should a planning application be submitted. Inclusion of the site in the SHLAA does not necessarily imply that it will be allocated for development or that the Council will necessarily consider planning applications favourably.	No amendment.
047	R117	Bleasdales Estates	Urban Roots, Murray Graham	Site Specific	<p>Site 6221, Melling Land at Brewery Lane</p> <p>1) Documentation submitted in support of this site by Planning Design Solutions should be read as a whole and not just be the subject of a proforma tick box exercise. Whilst scoring of site is standard procedure, it should not be seen as the only mechanism for assessing locations. The submission centres on the creation of a sustainable community which requires a creative approach. The assessment by WYG does not fully recognise the long term nature of the site. It is not attached, nor adjacent to, any settlement, but is well placed between Melling, Maghull and Aintree. It makes no assessment of sustainable construction and provision of services such as schools, health, employment facilities. It would not jeopardise strategic gap created by Green Belt, but would bring together the dispersed dwellings in the area into a coherent sustainable settlement.</p>	1) Comments noted. It is important to note that whilst the study provides an initial indication of the factors which are of relevance in assessing Green Belt sites, all such sites have been excluded from the overall SHLAA supply in a consistent manner. A future review of the Green Belt will determine the likelihood of sites such as this one being suitable for housing development.	No amendment.
048	R118	Cerberus Properties Ltd	Savills	Methodology	<p>Housing Supply</p> <p>1) Notes PPS3 requirements to enable continuous delivery of housing for at least 15 years and refers to RSS targets and the SHLAA report Table 4.1 and notes shortfall and risk assessed shortfall. Insufficient detail is provided as to how 20% discounting figure has been arrived at and may overestimate the number of dwellings likely to come forward.</p> <p>Level of discount may need to be increased due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • completions over next few years likely to be significantly reduced due to recession. • pipeline supply includes large number of flats which are often no longer viable for developers and alternative schemes will therefore 	1) It is considered that the proposed risk assessment exercise is appropriate and that the methodology utilised in the study provides a cautious but realisable quantification of the housing supply. Further commentary and justification for the study methodology has been provided in the final report. It should also be noted that the densities ascribed to sites included in the identified housing supply are significantly lower than those that have been achieved over recent years in Sefton and the study methodology is considered to be realistic but cautious in this regard.	Additional commentary has been provided in the final report to provide further justification for the methodology that has been utilised in carrying out the study.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
					<p>need to be submitted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> will take time for market to gear up again following recession, so assumption that all sites with pp will be delivered in next 5 years seems unrealistic. 		
048	R119	Cerberus Properties Ltd	Savills	Site Specific	<p>Site 6255, Southport Former Phillips Factory, Balmoral Drive</p> <p>1) Cerberus Properties Ltd is freehold landowner of the former factory and associated units and has aspirations to bring it back into beneficial use. States that the site is not in multiple ownerships and the owner is willing to sell. Availability score should therefore be 20/25. States that the local environment is attractive and that achievability score should be 20/25.</p> <p>2) Although located in Flood Zone 3a, the site does benefit from existing sea defences and could also satisfy the PPS25 exceptions test. Part of the site is in Flood Zone 2 which allows for more vulnerable uses than Zone 3. Accordingly flooding issues should not be a significant impediment to redeveloping the site.</p> <p>3) Disagree with approach to retain as employment land as in PIA. See also Savills response to Employment Land Review concerning forecast demand for employment space and suitability of this site. No prospect of site being used for B1, B2 or B8 uses without substantial redevelopment. As there is no demand for such uses, the site could only be used for low grade employment uses.</p>	<p>1) Comments noted. It is accepted that the site is in single ownership and available for development. It is also accepted that the local environment is attractive and the SHLAA database record has been amended in all of these respects.</p> <p>2) In accordance with the study methodology and advice provided by PPS25, that part of the site which lies within Flood Zone 3 has been excluded from the indicative net developable area noted on the SHLAA site record.</p> <p>3) The Employment Land Study has been taken into consideration in the undertaking of the SHLAA. However, sites have been considered in a consistent manner and it is thought that, whilst this site may offer some potential subject to satisfactorily addressing the issue of loss of employment land, this should be more comprehensively demonstrated by way of a planning application or through the LDF process.</p>	SHLAA site record amended to reflect accurate ownership details, the fact that owner is seeking to dispose of site and to reflect that the site is located within an attractive local environment.
049	R120	Hourwatch Ltd	Clark Planning Consultants Ltd	Site Specific	<p>New Site, Hightown Former Railway Goods Yard</p> <p>1) Previously developed site, with no buildings. Unsure as to land contamination and land stability. No other known constraints. Suggests capacity of 12/15 dwellings.</p>	1) Site considered as part of SHLAA.	Considered as site reference 9548.
050	R121	Mr & Mrs Seddon	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 6126, Ainsdale Ainsdale Hope Learning Centre, Sandringham Road</p> <p>1) Extremely valuable wildlife asset including five protected species and other species. 2) Hope that documentation will be sent to CPRE. 3) Proposed access route is ridiculous. 4) Accept need for affordable housing but there are over 100 brownfield sites that need utilised. 5) School built on stilts due to toxic methane gas and also underground lake beneath the land. 6) Medical services and secondary schools in village are virtually full.</p>	<p>1), 3), 4), 5) & 6) Issues raised would need to be addressed as part of any future consideration of the site. The site has been excluded from the housing supply subject to the Green Belt Review.</p> <p>2) CPRE has commented as part of this consultation.</p>	No amendment.
051	R122	Mrs Cook	-	Site Specific	<p>Site 6126, Ainsdale Ainsdale Hope Learning Centre, Sandringham Road</p> <p>1) Oppose application to withdraw Green Belt status from the site. 2) Access not suitable. 3) Village would be destroyed by development of this site. Parking already difficult, where would increased traffic go? 4) Doctors, dentists and schools already at capacity.</p>	1), 2), 3) & 4) There is no current proposal to remove the site from the Green Belt. Issues raised by the respondent would need to be addressed during any future consideration of the site. The site has been excluded from the housing supply subject to the forthcoming Green Belt Review.	No amendment.
052	R123	Ms M J Joyce	-	Methodology	<p>Methodology</p> <p>1) Oppose identification by SHLAA of land in the Green Belt for further consideration for housing (para 4.24).</p> <p>2) Where are empty/vacant dwellings taken into account in the study – 7,652 vacant properties in 07/08 equivalent to 15.3 years supply at 500 dwellings per hectare. Sefton Council administrative area vacancy rate is 55% above overall</p>	<p>1) Green Belt sites have been removed from the SHLAA pending a future Green Belt Review.</p> <p>2) Comments noted. Additional explanatory text has been added to the final report to clarify the study methodology in relation to empty homes.</p>	SHLAA Report amended to provide further explanatory text setting out the approach with regard to empty homes. Additional text has also been provided in the final report to set

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
					<p>vacancy rate in the NW.</p> <p>3) RSS target to deliver 500 dwellings per annum should not be seen as target for mandatory delivery – what happened to monitor and manage and therefore adjust. Figure set in period of irrational exuberance and international migration that has now dissipated. Household projection is just over 3,100 for 2006 – 2032 for all 5 local authorities combined.</p> <p>4) The historic contribution of windfall sites should justify a contribution from this source in the study. Acknowledges the small sites contribution calculation but what is the difference? Clarification required.</p> <p>5) Para 4.22 – Bootle has ‘considerable number of vacant sites so...’ It also has a considerable number of ‘bad neighbour’ sites leading to very poor environmental conditions which is the real problem in Bootle with the existing housing stock. SHLAA should resolve this issue as a priority by allocation of old industrial legacy sites to housing land where immediately adjacent to residential areas e.g. Fernhill Road from Vaux Crescent to Aintree Road and from Burne Avenue to Aintree Road. This is regardless of what Employment Land document says.</p> <p>6) SHLAA should exclude allocation of housing land where the immediate environment does not provide an attractive sustainable environment (e.g. gas works site 4139).</p> <p>7) All open ground car parks and garaging in residential streets should be allocated to housing (e.g. Town Hall car park and sites 4214 & 4215).</p> <p>8) Bootle’s land use should be critically reviewed to consolidate and expand predominantly residential areas at the expense of industrial legacy land.</p> <p>9) Provides comments on the suitability of a significant number of housing.</p>	<p>3) The target housing figure has already been set out by RSS and is outside the remit of this study.</p> <p>4) Further explanatory text has been provided in the final report to set out the distinction between a small sites allowance and a windfall allowance.</p> <p>5) Reuse of industrial land in Bootle will be addressed through the emerging Core Strategy, but providing balanced communities requires the provision of both adequate housing and employment land.</p> <p>6) Housing schemes can often provide viable means of remediating and enhancing otherwise unattractive environments.</p> <p>7) & 8) Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPD will address sites to be allocated for housing.</p> <p>9) Comments noted and have been taken into consideration in reviewing the suitability of sites for housing at final report stage.</p>	<p>out the distinction between a small sites allowance and a windfall allowance.</p>
052	R124	Ms M Joyce		Site Specific	<p>Site Specific</p> <p>1) Provides comments on the suitability of a significant number of housing.</p>	<p>1) Comments noted and have been taken into consideration in reviewing the suitability of sites for housing at final report stage.</p>	<p>See individual site records.</p>
053	R125	Maghull Limited	Helen Forsyth, Barton Willmore	Methodology	<p>Study Methodology: Section 3</p> <p>1) Discrepancy between accessibility distances cited in draft report (para 3.31) and those set out in site assessment proformas. This discrepancy needs to be resolved.</p> <p>2) Concern that accessibility scores are ‘all or nothing’. More gradations should be included within the scoring system (e.g. see RSS examples of accessibility criteria scoring).</p> <p>3) RSS also includes scoring for cycle distances for some facilities.</p> <p>4) It is unlikely that many sites that may be suitable for housing will be within 400m of a railway station and an otherwise good site would score zero on this element. Should adopt same approach as RSS (i.e. 1km of railway station).</p> <p>5) 5000m to employment opportunities is not considered to be a reasonable walking distance, but is a reasonable cycling distance. Amend para 3.32 to make this clear.</p> <p>6) Policy judgements are made in relation to urban greenfield and Green Belt sites, removing them from the SHLAA. This conflicts with SHLAA guidance to provide an evidence base to support policy judgements and rather than making policy judgements. Therefore all sites in Green Belt should be assessed thoroughly, including ascribing a dwelling yield in order to gain an accurate picture of housing land availability.</p>	<p>1) Comment noted and the site assessment proformas have been corrected.</p> <p>2) The study methodology is considered appropriate and clearly does not preclude the development of sites which fail to be awarded the highest score for any one criterion.</p> <p>3) Comment noted.</p> <p>4) The study methodology is considered appropriate and clearly does not preclude the development of sites which fail to be awarded the highest score for any one criterion.</p> <p>5) Comment noted and the text of the final report has been amended accordingly.</p> <p>6), 13), 14) & 15) All Green Belt sites have been excluded from the identified housing supply pending the undertaking of a review of the Green Belt and the need for urban extensions. In advance of such a review it is not considered appropriate to ascribe dwelling yields to Green Belt sites.</p>	<p>Site assessment proformas amended in order to record the correct distances used in judging sites’ accessibility.</p> <p>The text of the final report has been amended to refer to cycling distance.</p>

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
					<p>7) Para 3.38 also makes a policy judgement about only permitting housing development on employment sites where no unacceptable loss of employment occurs. Paragraph should be removed. Study methodology: Section 4 8) Amend paragraph 4.04 from '2,297 sites with planning permission' to '2297 dwellings with...'</p> <p>9) Discrepancies within Section 4 text and numbering of tables.</p> <p>10) Para 4.09 – it is unlikely that all extant permissions will deliver the specified quantum of housing, particularly within 5 years. Recognition should be given to this and the likely deliverable supply of housing adjusted appropriately by assessing the deliverability of each site with planning permission for housing.</p> <p>11) Table 4.3. 16.5% of site identified on employment sites (large). If presumption in para 3.38 is in favour of retaining sites then would question suitability for housing. 21% of sites are from large urban greenfield sites. Queries the suitability of such sites for development. Therefore the suitability if 37.5% of the assessed supply may not be deliverable, which would have detrimental impact on 5 year supply.</p> <p>12) Even if all sites identified were to be delivered there is still a shortfall over 15 years. Suggests an alternative approach, such as a review of the Green Belt, should be considered.</p> <p>13) Paragraphs 4.23 and 4.24, which set out why no yield has been attributed to Green Belt sites, is in direct conflict with paragraph 21 of the SHLAA guidance. SHLAA must consider all potential housing sites, whether or not constrained by policies</p> <p>14) Accordingly, sites 6035 and 6036 should be ascribed a dwelling yield.</p> <p>Study methodology: Section 5 15) Supply figures indicate that there is a need for Sefton Council to review its Green Belt boundary in order to meet its housing requirements in the medium to long term.</p> <p>16) Support the approach 'Core Strategy – The Spatial Strategy' report. Would support approach to review the urban edge to see whether there are any non strategic areas of Green Belt that could be released around Maghull.</p> <p>17) Recommended that as part of work on Core Strategy, Green Belt is reviewed.</p> <p>18) Client is owner of 6035 and 6036 which achieve very good scores in the SHLAA assessment.</p>	<p>7) This approach is considered appropriate given the need to achieve a balance of development throughout the Borough. 8) & 9) Comments noted and reflected in the wording of the final report.</p> <p>10) The study methodology makes provision for such occurrences through the risk assessment which has been undertaken. No further amendment is considered necessary.</p> <p>11) The suitability of such sites for residential development has been further reviewed and the contribution these categories of land make to the identified housing supply is reduced.</p> <p>12), 16) & 17) The Council is committed to the undertaking of such a Green Belt review in the near future.</p> <p>18) Comments noted.</p>	
054	R126	Millers Bridge Tenants and Residents Association	Mrs F Patterson	Site Specific	<p>Site 6250, Bootle Douglas Place</p> <p>1) Strongly object. Playground has modern play equipment, in full use.</p>	<p>1) Site was promoted through call for sites. However, on reflection, given that the area is lacking in open space and play areas, it is not considered appropriate to develop the site for housing and it has been excluded from the identified housing supply.</p>	SHLAA site record amended to exclude site from the identified housing supply.
054	R127	Millers Bridge Tenants and Residents Association	Mrs F Patterson	Site Specific	<p>Site 6233, Bootle Open Land at Douglas Place</p> <p>1) Green next to playground is already allocated for bungalows. Green at bottom of Douglas Place should stay because it is only bit we have in the area. At present there is a gas main through site.</p>	<p>1) Site was promoted through call for sites. However, on reflection, given that the area is lacking in open space, it is not considered appropriate to develop the site for housing and it has been excluded from the identified housing supply.</p>	SHLAA site record amended to exclude site from the identified housing supply.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
055	R128	Lydiat Parish Council	Brian Beaven	Methodology / Site Specific	<p>Methodology and Sites 2158 & 2176</p> <p>1) All proposals relating to properties within the Green Belt be opposed pending the review.</p> <p>2) Objections are raised concerning sites 2158 Barnes Drive and 2176 St Gregory's Church as they are considered to be unsuitable for development.</p> <p>3) Concern regarding the lack of early notification to the Parish Council and the failure to inform property owners affected by the proposals.</p>	<p>1) All Green Belt sites have been removed from the study pending a future Green Belt Review.</p> <p>2) After reviewing both sites, it is considered that neither is suited for housing and both are now excluded from the identified housing supply.</p> <p>3) This consultation stage of the SHLAA has been the subject of a 6 week public consultation period.</p>	SHLAA site records amended to exclude both site 2158 and site 2176 from the identified housing supply.
056	R129	Mr D W Hulme		Site Specific	<p>Site 6189 Land between M57 and Oriel Drive</p> <p>1) Current owner of land has let the land go into scrubland so that can reclassify it as being unsuited for agriculture.</p> <p>2) Access is terrible at rush hour, lunch, Grand National. Access only achievable from Bradfield Avenue and Sedburgh Avenue, and not very good at all in case of Bradfield Avenue. Also isn't there a restriction on how close you can build to motorway.</p> <p>3) Flooding problems worst when drainage was damaged by land drains clogging up. Trees now use up water. New sewer put in to stop the water flooding down from Winchester Avenue to overflow the sewer outside our house is still flooding.</p>	<p>1) Comments noted. PPG2 advises that Green Belt boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because the land has become derelict.</p> <p>2) & 3) Comments noted. The site is excluded from the identified housing supply and shall be considered as part of the Green Belt review. These matters would be given further consideration should the land be subject to a planning application or further promoted for housing through the LDF process.</p>	No amendment.
057	R130	Formby Parish Council	Geoff Gaskin / Mike Coles	General	<p>RSS Targets</p> <p>1) Concerned about 10,000 new homes target to be built in Sefton demanded by central government. Population of Sefton is not expected to increase above 277,000 in the next 20 years and majority of new homes to be family, two bedroom and competitively priced. Conflicts with recent policies for Formby where flats and expensive properties have been built. Sefton MBC must reject pressure from neighbouring Councils and reject any of their demands as a matter of principle. The fact that Sefton has reused a good proportion of its brownfield sites for residential land and retail developments in recent years has only added to the problems of land shortage.</p>	1) The target housing figure has already been set out by RSS and is outside the remit of this study. Comments noted in respect of Sefton being able to accommodate the needs of neighbouring authorities.	No amendment.
057	R131	Formby Parish Council	Geoff Gaskin / Mike Coles	Methodology	<p>Methodology</p> <p>1) Understand that programme excludes Green Belt from the initial evaluation and therefore assume that the sites 6067, 6049 and 6247 are not to be released for building. Residents of Formby will do all they can to prevent building on these sensitive areas.</p> <p>2) Development of the Powerhouse site should be considered as part of these plans. Little Altcar PC may have expressed their views on this matter as it is part of the Green Belt area 6026. Suggest that if the matter is reconsidered, the allotment area close by is maintained and if possible expanded to meet increasing demand for these facilities</p> <p>3) It is considered that sites 6011 and 6038 could provide 200+ units – if at some time they are developed it must be sympathetic to the area and have a significantly improved infrastructure.</p> <p>4) Drainage and flooding are important issues in outer areas of north Formby.</p>	<p>1) Comments noted.</p> <p>2) The redevelopment of the built up part of site 6026 is considered appropriate and this site is therefore included in the identified housing supply.</p> <p>3) Comments noted. Both sites are situated in the Green Belt and are currently excluded from the identified housing supply.</p> <p>4) Comments noted.</p>	No amendment.
057	R132	Formby Parish Council	Geoff Gaskin / Mike Coles	Methodology	<p>Greenspace</p> <p>1) The Parish Council has been involved in the development of the Greenspace Strategy. Residents of Formby are keen to preserve and maintain the important environment along the coast and protect the sand dune system. A large part of this area is designated a SSSI.</p>	<p>1) Comments noted.</p> <p>2) Garden sites are identified as previously-developed in accordance with the definition provided by Annex B of Planning Policy Statement 3.</p>	No amendment.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
					2) 13 garden sites still identified in the study. Strongly object to them being classified brownfield sites. Concerned about any loss of Greenspace.		
057	R133	Formby Parish Council	Geoff Gaskin / Mike Coles	Methodology	Community Facilities 1) Opposed to reallocation of facilities such as Freshfield bus turning circle, RAFA club and any similar areas as important services for community. Formby PC has targeted and improved security, safety and general appearance of village and work will continue.	1) Comments noted. All sites mentioned do not make any contribution to the identified housing supply.	No amendment.
057	R134	Formby Parish Council	Geoff Gaskin / Mike Coles	Site specific	Sites not Surveyed 1) Intrigued that Holy Trinity has been excluded from SHLAA. Owned by Sefton Council and Liverpool Anglican Diocese. Noted that set aside for recreational issues, but believe that more use of the facility should be made for the wider community and we wish to reserve our position on this matter. 2) Also no mention of Embassy Buildings in Green Lane. This building is of some interest but it is not contained in the conservation area.	1) The school has been excluded as it is due to be rented out to a Soccer Skills Club who will also be leasing the adjoining playing fields. The school buildings are not Council owned. 2) This building is in use and we have had no indication that it is available for residential development. Accordingly, it is not included in the study.	No amendment.
057	R135	Formby Parish Council	Geoff Gaskin / Mike Coles	Site Specific	Site 6048/6049 Formby Clarence House School / School Building West Lane 1) A major option and strongly urge that any development is done in sympathetic way to immediate neighbourhood.	1) Comments noted.	No amendment.
057	R136	Formby Parish Council	Geoff Gaskin / Mike Coles	Site Specific	Site 1024, Formby Adjacent 31 Shireburn Road 1) Single, expensive option and makes little difference to purpose of the assessment and ought to be deleted from the plan as it simply replaces an existing property.	1) This site is within the curtilage of a dwelling house, but does not include the dwelling itself. The proposed yield of 1 is considered to be realistic and achievable within the timescale proposed.	No amendment.
057	R137	Formby Parish Council	Geoff Gaskin / Mike Coles	Site Specific	Site 1083, Formby Adjacent St Anne's RC Church, Timms Lane 1) Removal of this car park would cause serious congestion at busy times. Road is often a 'rat run' and has a curve made worse by bad parking. Any overspill would cause congestion. If site to be developed then look at access from Victoria Road.	1) Comments noted. It is accepted that only a portion of the site may be available for development and the proposed yield for the site now reflects this.	SHLAA site record amended to reflect a lower yield (4 dwellings).
057	R138	Formby Parish Council	Geoff Gaskin / Mike Coles	Site Specific	Site 5213, Formby St Lukes Church Hall, Kirkdale Road 1) Object strongly to the proposal to take away St Lukes Hall from the community.	1) Comments Noted. It is recognised that this site is in use and not available for development. It is now excluded from the identified housing supply.	SHLAA site record amended to exclude site from housing supply.
057	R139	Formby Parish Council	Geoff Gaskin / Mike Coles	Site Specific	Site 5215, Formby Land off Ennerdale Road 1) Development is impractical on its own – look at whole area close to Formby Station, Ennerdale Road, Freshfield Road and Kings Road. Car parking, access to shops, Duke Street Park and the bus services are major concerns for residents and business owners alike.	1) The potential of the site has been reviewed and it is considered that this site will likely remain as informal open space. Accordingly, it has been excluded from the identified housing supply.	SHLAA site record amended to exclude site from the housing supply.
057	R140	Formby Parish Council	-	Site Specific	Site 9525, Formby Land to south of 5 Marsh Brows 1) Would be better allocated for car parking in order to provide more access to the train station.	1) The site has been promoted for housing through the call for sites process and is considered have realistic residential development potential. Accordingly, although it may also be suited to other uses, in line with the study methodology it is included within the identified housing supply. Site is now the subject of planning application S/2009/1011 which seeks the development of the site for 12 dwellings.	No amendment.
058	R141	Alex Myles	-	Site Specific	Site 0453, Ainsdale 55a Segars Lane 1) Important youth sports facility and needs to be maintained as such. Vehicular	1) It is noted that the site is in use and there is apparently no indication that it is to relocate to alternative premises.	SHLAA site record amended to exclude site from housing supply due to it apparently not being available for redevelopment.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
					access to the site is very poor.		
058	R142	Alex Myles	-	Site Specific	Site 6228, Southport Cherry Road Playing Fields, Southport 1) Public recreation and amenity area and should be kept available for use by local inhabitants. Should be removed from the SHLAA.	1) It is accepted that the site well used Urban Greenspace is in use and that the development of the site for housing would not be appropriate.	SHLAA site record amended to exclude site from housing supply.
058	R143	Alex Myles	-	Site Specific	Site 6126, Ainsdale Ainsdale Hope Learning Centre, Sandringham Road 1) Site falls within Green Belt and has been removed from the list, pending future review. Green Belt sites should have been excluded from the assessment and we reserve the right to comment when the policy is next reviewed.	1) Comments noted.	No amendment.
059	R144	Mr G F O'Brien	GVA Grimley, Geraint Hughes	Site Specific	New Site, Altcar North End Farm (Lot 5) 1) Agricultural farm land. Identified as moderate risk of flooding. Immediately available.	1) Site considered as part of SHLAA.	Considered as site reference 9549.
059	R145	Mr G F O'Brien	GVA Grimley, Geraint Hughes	Site Specific	New Site, Altcar North End Farm (Lot 6) 1) Agricultural farm land. Identified as low risk of flooding. Immediately available.	1) Site considered as part of SHLAA.	Considered as site reference 9550.
059	R146	Mr G F O'Brien	GVA Grimley, Geraint Hughes	Site Specific	New Site, Altcar North End Farm (Lot 7) 1) Agricultural farm land. Identified as low risk of flooding. Immediately available.	1) Site considered as part of SHLAA.	Considered as site reference 9551.
060	R147	Sefton CPRE		General	Methodology 1) Government housing target for Sefton is fundamentally wrong – not based on hard evidence of current or predicted need. If target met in full would be unjustified increase in housing on 'green' sites. Fully accept there is a need for more housing but increasing supply of land will only have marginal impact on house prices and affordability. 2) Sefton has opportunity for far more rigorous research to identify and predict demand and differentiate between demand and desire. Sefton Council should be far more proactive and suggest the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive assessment of current and predicted levels of homelessness / overcrowding Forecast of the changing profile of the population over next 15 years Detailed survey of empty properties Develop a comprehensive housing strategy Ensure strategy reflects Sefton's 'Greenspace Strategy' and 'Greenspace Trees and Development' Establish a cross borough forum of all housing providers and developer to inform proves of housing development for next 15 years. 3) It is vital for protection of countryside and improvement of urban environment, that new housing is focused on areas where it will deliver most public benefit and cause least environmental harm. Forum referred to above should take hierarchical approach to all housing development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearer focus on making best use of empty property. Brownfield sites to be maximised. Less attractive and accessible Green Belt sites as long as other valuable land in brought into the Green Belt to replace that lost. 4) Impressed three assumptions have informed SHLAA:	1) The target housing figure has already been set out by RSS and is outside the remit of this study. 2) The Strategic Housing Market Housing Assessment provides a wider housing evidence base addressing several of these matters. Guidance on vacant homes is to be provided in the near future. The SHLAA has been subject to extensive public and stakeholder consultation including two call for sites exercises and two stakeholders workshops which a number of Housebuilders attended. The draft report itself has been subjected to an extensive public consultation. 3) One of the purposes of the SHLAA is to maximise the potential of urban brownfield sites. Green Belt sites will be addressed thoroughly through the upcoming Green Belt Review. 4) Support for study methodology welcomed. 5) Dunningbridge Road was not submitted through call for sites, but is assessed in the Employment Land and Premises Study. The Hall Road sidings site has now been submitted for consideration by Network Rail and contributes to the identified housing supply. 6) Green Belt sites put forward through CALL FOR SITES were assessed in line with good practice, but have generally been excluded from the identified	

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green Belt sites rejected. Respects in the main the need to protect Urban Greenspace. Certain sites in Conservation Areas have been rejected. <p>Significant reservations with methodology:</p> <p>5) Significant and new brownfield sites not identified (e.g. off Dunningsbridge Road / demolished railway sheds, Hall Road Station).</p> <p>6) Some Green Belt sites assessed.</p> <p>7) No allotments have been included for assessment.</p> <p>8) Some empty houses have been included, but substantial number of empty houses have been excluded.</p> <p>9) Substantial sites identified but not assessed (6064, 6065, 6069). Have sites been excluded where planning permission has already been granted?</p> <p>10) Well used and established commercial sites (5083, 5073) included whilst other commercial sites are rejected (5021).</p> <p>11) Sites which could be more urgently developed (4029) - local housing association has already indicated it is keen to develop this site.</p>	<p>housing supply pending the forthcoming Green Belt Review.</p> <p>7) No allotment sites were identified as being appropriate for development and there is a shortage in supply of allotments in Sefton.</p> <p>8) Empty homes have only been considered where there is an opportunity to increase the net housing yield of a site. Additional explanatory text has been added to the final report to clarify the general study methodology in relation to empty homes.</p> <p>9) Those sites which had an extant planning permission for residential development at 1 April 2008 are considered to be committed housing sites and their contribution to Sefton's housing supply has been properly accounted for.</p> <p>10) All commercial sites have been reappraised and those in use and with only moderate residential potential have been excluded from the housing supply identified by the study.</p> <p>11) The study recognises that this site has significant residential potential, but considers that it is correctly identified as part of the 6 to 10 year supply due to the lack of any current proposal to progress the development of the site.</p>	
061	R148	Highways Agency	Ian Tull	General	<p>Transportation Issues</p> <p>1) HA responsibilities are A5036, M57 and M58. Scope for developments to generate traffic which would directly impact junctions on Strategic Road Network (especially Junction 7 of the M57) and upon mainline flows as traffic disperses across wider network. LDFs should identify capacity issues and address appropriately.</p> <p>2) Highways Agency currently updating 'stress maps' to illustrate areas of pressure on SRN and happy to forward to LPA when completed.</p> <p>3) From Highways Agency perspective suitability of sites for housing will be established through consideration of access and highway infrastructure whilst broadening appraisal to consider wider linkages and land use planning matters, particularly sustainable development.</p> <p>4) Highways Agency welcomes criterion relating to transport within assessment and assessment of sites proximity to services. The Agency has prepared accessibility data across the Borough in a similar manner to that utilised by the study and there is the opportunity to utilise this data in the consideration of the identified SHLAA sites.</p> <p>5) As part of final SHLAA, Highways Agency would welcome a list setting out details of all sites and would welcome future topic papers to discuss how the residential proposals will interact with any long term transport proposals for the Borough. The wider evidence base will need to consider future allocations and infrastructure capacity requirements.</p>	<p>1), 2) 3) 4) & 5) Comments noted.</p>	No amendment.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
062	R149	Maghull Town Council	P McNulty	General	<p>Issues Relating to Maghull</p> <p>1) Support removal of sites that have been excluded from the SHLAA. Reserve the right to comment in detail if this decision is changed. Most sites fall with 6 to 10 year plan period and Town Council do not feel this has an immediate bearing on Maghull and the number of houses proposed is not considered to have a major impact on the Maghull area.</p> <p>2) Two sites are shown as being located within the Green Belt (6212 and 6035). The Town Council wishes to make very strong objections to any development on these sites and any proposed development that will compromise the Green Belt. Any change to the current decision for the sites to be removed from the SHLAA will be strongly opposed.</p>	1) & 2) Comments noted.	No amendment.
063	R150	Hightown Parish Council	David Warren	Site Specific	<p>Site 5122, Hightown Rear of Blundell Cottages, St Georges Road</p> <p>1) Site not suitable for housing as owned by Ince Blundell Estate and subject to long term lease.</p>	1) It is noted that the site is the subject of a long lease and that there is no indication that the site is available. It is also accepted that the site is constrained in terms of access.	SHLAA site record amended to exclude site from housing supply.
063	R151	Hightown Parish Council	David Warren	Site Specific	<p>Site 5169, Hightown</p> <p>1) Council owned site (not submitted by Estates Department). Recently subject to planting funded by the Parish Council. Not a realistic housing site.</p>	1) Comments noted. After reviewing the site, it is considered that its alignment and contribution to informal open space means that it is poorly suited to residential development. Accordingly, the site has been excluded from the identified housing supply.	SHLAA site record amended to exclude site from the identified housing supply.
063	R152	Hightown Parish Council	David Warren	Site Specific	<p>Site 5117, Hightown Adjacent 19 Elmcroft Lane</p> <p>1) Land owned by Ince Blundell Estate and currently leased for archery. Highly unlikely to come forward – remove from supply.</p>	1) Comments noted. Given the apparent lack of availability of the site it has now been excluded from the identified housing supply.	SHLAA site record amended to exclude site from the identified housing supply.
063	R153	Hightown Parish Council	David Warren	Site Specific	<p>Site 5121, Hightown Land adjacent to Green Ridges, St Georges Road</p> <p>1) Site suitable for housing and previously granted planning permission for 5 elderly persons' apartments. Suggest place in 6-10 year supply.</p>	1) Comments noted. The site has been reviewed and in accordance with the respondents' comments and the study methodology it has been placed in the 6-10 year housing supply.	SHLAA site record amended to place the site in the 6-10 year housing supply.
063	R154	Hightown Parish Council	David Warren	Site Specific	<p>Site 5124, Hightown Land adjacent to Presbytery, Sandy Lane</p> <p>1) Site is owned by church and in active use. Subject to covenants stating it will revert to Ince Blundell Estate if ever surplus to Church requirements. Highly unlikely to deliver in next 15 years.</p>	1) Comments noted. The site has been reviewed and in accordance with the respondents' comments and its lack of availability, it is excluded from the identified housing supply.	SHLAA site record amended to exclude site from housing supply.
063	R155	Hightown Parish Council	David Warren	Site Specific	<p>Site 5216, Hightown Adjacent The Croft, Thirlmere Road</p> <p>1) Well maintained garden. Suggest 6-10 years supply is overly optimistic and should be in 11-15 year supply.</p>	1) Comments noted, but it is considered that the site has realistic potential to be developed within 10 years.	No amendment.
063	R156	Hightown Parish Council	David Warren	Site Specific	<p>New Site</p> <p>1) Urban Greenspace off Kerslake Way (adjacent to railway line) would be a suitable site for residential redevelopment.</p>	Site considered as part of SHLAA.	Considered as site reference 9548.
064	R157	Little Altcar Parish Council	Patricia Starkey	Site Specific	<p>Site 6026, Formby The Powerhouse</p> <p>1) Site should be retained in SHLAA. Existing building is an eyesore and is dangerous. Previous discussions regarding conversion to flats but so far nothing done. Concerns over traffic this might generate and traffic calming measures would be required. Development to be restricted to existing footprint of building with no more land from Green Belt released.</p>	1) Comments regarding the identification of the site in the housing supply are noted. Details regarding traffic would need to be addressed at a planning application stage should the site come forward for development.	No amendment.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
064	R158	Little Altcar Parish Council	Patricia Starkey	Site Specific	<p>Site 6251, Formby Lighthouse Public House, Liverpool Road</p> <p>1) This is a viable business and provides rooms that can be hired for private functions etc. Parish Council has not received any complaints concerning the venue and feel it should remain as an amenity for local residents and others.</p>	1) The site was submitted for consideration through the call for sites exercise and it is therefore considered to be available for redevelopment.	No amendment.
065	R159	-	Richard Lomax	General	<p>Green Belt and Sites in Employment Use</p> <p>1) Concerned about Green Belt/Greenspace between Crosby and Waterloo being used for housing and impact on existing local services and traffic congestion.</p> <p>2) Unclear why some existing industrial sites/workplaces in residential areas have been identified (e.g. 5074) where there is no evidence that the owner is willing to sell, whereas other areas with much larger potential, e.g. Gladstone Docks, Alexandra Docks, have not been investigated.</p>	<p>1) Green Belt site have been removed from the housing supply identified by the SHLAA pending a future Green Belt Review. Sefton Council has provided advice as to the reuse of Urban Greenspace sites and the potential from this source has been considered carefully.</p> <p>2) Both dock sites are located within the Port Operational Area. The Port has given no indication that it has surplus land available for development. In any event, this area is highly unlikely to provide an acceptable residential environment given the neighbouring uses. Site 5074 has been reappraised (along with all commercial sites) and is now excluded from the identified housing supply. All commercial sites in use and with only moderate residential potential have been excluded from the housing supply identified by the study.</p>	No amendment.
066	R160	Melling Parish Council	J E McLaren (Clerk)	General	<p>Green Belt</p> <p>1) Members are concerned that Green Belt sites may be brought into use for housing in the future and, whilst the issue is not immediate, wish to convey their strong objection to any such change and to any development within flood zones.</p>	1) Comments noted. Green Belt sites have been removed from the housing supply identified by the SHLAA pending a future Green Belt Review. It will be for the Review to assess the merits of such sites.	No amendment.
066	R161	Melling Parish Council	J E McLaren (Clerk)	General	<p>Site 2250, Melling Bus Depot / Storage Yard, Spencers Lane</p> <p>1) Site is still in use as a bus depot. Concerned that photo is of site already being developed.</p>	1) It is acknowledged that the site is still in use, but WYG's site survey indicated that the site may be under-utilised. Given the neighbouring uses, the site is considered to have realistic housing development potential over the medium term and has been placed in the 6-10 year housing supply. The photo used is taken from public highway and has now been cropped so as to better illustrate the site under consideration.	Site photograph amended.
066	R162	Melling Parish Council	J E McLaren (Clerk)	General	<p>Site 2235, Melling Land to the Rear of Spencers Lane</p> <p>1) Site is still in use as a bus depot.</p>	1) WYG's site survey and aerial photography suggests that the majority of the site is open land, which does not appear to be utilised. The western edge of the site only appears to be used for storage purposes. Accordingly, the site is considered a realistic development prospect over the medium term and has been placed in the 6-10 year housing supply.	No amendment.
066	R163	Melling Parish Council	J E McLaren (Clerk)	General	<p>Site 9526, Melling Car Park at Horse and Jockey Public House</p> <p>1) Members agree with the comments in respect of this site.</p>	1) Support welcomed and noted.	No amendment.
066	R164	Melling Parish Council	J E McLaren (Clerk)	General	<p>Site 2100, Melling 10 to 12 Hayes Drive and Adjacent Land</p> <p>1) That part of the site which is at the junction of Hayes Drive and Satinwood Crescent should be retained as amenity land to benefit the village environment.</p>	1) The net developable area of the site has been reduced in accordance with the Parish Council's comments.	Net developable site area reduced.

Respondent Ref	Response Ref	Respondent	Contact	Type of response	Summary	Response to Representation	Amendment to Report
066	R165	Melling Parish Council	J E McLaren (Clerk)	General	<p>Site 2138, Melling Land to the Rear of 28-48 Beldale Park, Melling</p> <p>1) Site is remote from other residential developments and is adjacent to Green Belt. It should be regarded as Green Belt.</p>	<p>1) The site has been assessed on its merits in accordance with the study methodology. It is not within the remit of this study to consider the Green Belt boundary and the site is considered to offer realistic housing development potential in the short term.</p>	No amendment.