

INSPECTOR’S MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS

These are the questions upon which the Inspector now invites comment. Many can be answered simply and briefly. All current representations will be taken into account and should not be expanded or repeated. Representors should only answer those questions relating to the subject of their original representation, but the Council should answer all the questions.

Many of the questions relate to the National Planning Policy Framework soundness criteria which require the Plan to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. All parties are asked to respond in a positive fashion – if modifications need to be made to ensure a sound and legally compliant Plan, then please suggest them.

Matter 1 LEGAL COMPLIANCE AND PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Issue 1a: Whether the Council has satisfied the 'Duty to Co-operate' requirements of the Localism Act 2011 in the preparation of the Plan.

- 1.1. The joint Liverpool City Region (LCR) studies undertaken in the early stages of Sefton Local Plan (SLP) preparation established that most authorities' strategic needs could not be met within the urban area. Rather than preparing joint strategies, plans or policies to address these issues at a sub-regional level, Sefton and all neighbouring Councils decided to plan to meet their own needs, albeit based on certain joint evidence base studies. Does this demonstrate effective collaborative working by Sefton Council to address strategic priorities?
- 1.2. Does the recognition that an early review of the SLP is necessary to accommodate (1) the emerging Liverpool Superport proposals and (2) unmet housing need, signal a failure of effective co-operation in plan preparation?
- 1.3. Given the apparent slow progress in reaching agreement on a LCR Statement of Co-operation, is there a firm commitment among the LCR authorities to undertake the joint work now necessary before the SLP review can take place? Is agreement being sought at member level, either through a Memorandum of Understanding or by some other means? Is there a realistic prospect that LCR co-operation will be capable of delivering agreed outcomes across local authority boundaries?

Issue 1b: Whether the Plan complies with the legal requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the 2012 Regulations.

- 1.4. In light of public concern about matters such as the adequacy of the consultation process, the booking system for public events and the complexity of the representation form, has adequate community engagement has taken place? Is the SLP in general accordance with the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement?
- 1.5. Has the SLP emerged from an open and transparent process that demonstrates how and why the preferred strategy was selected from the alternative options, in consultation with the public and other stakeholders? Given the strong public opposition at an early stage to any loss of Green Belt land, how can the Council claim to have listened to residents’ concerns when the submitted SLP maintains substantial Green Belt releases?
- 1.6. Has the SLP been influenced by, and had satisfactory regard to, the Council’s Sustainable Community Strategy?
- 1.7. Has the SLP been the subject of suitably comprehensive and satisfactory Sustainability Appraisal, Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment?
- 1.8. Has the SLP been prepared in accordance with the Local Development Scheme?
- 1.9. Does the SLP address the Regulation 8(5) requirement relating to superseded policies in the adopted development plan?
- 1.10. Does the SLP meet all of the legal requirements under section 20(5)(a) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the 2012 Regulations?

Matter 2 SPATIAL STRATEGY AND GREEN BELT

Issue 2: Whether the strategy of promoting development within the urban areas and in Green Belt locations when necessary to meet the needs of the borough is a sustainable approach to growth which pays sufficient regard to the environmental and other constraints of the area.

- 2.1 A key objective of the Plan is to meet in full the diverse needs of the borough as close as possible to where they arise. In principle, is this objective based on a sound assessment of the socio-economic and environmental characteristics of the area? Is the chosen spatial strategy the most sustainable of the three main development options (1-urban containment, 2-meeting needs, 3-optimistic growth)?
- 2.2 Does the release of land from the Green Belt comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)? Is the spatial strategy

consistent with the need to promote sustainable patterns of development (NPPF paragraph 84)? Does the use of Green Belt land for development satisfy the “exceptional circumstances” test of national policy and if so, on what grounds?

- 2.3 Overall, does the spatial strategy achieve an appropriate balance between the three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental (NPPF paragraph 7). If the strategy is considered unsound, what alternative strategy should be pursued, and why? Is there compelling evidence that the growth sought in the SLP could be achieved *without* requiring Green Belt releases?
- 2.4 Is the methodology set out in the Green Belt Study robust and does it provide an appropriate mechanism for assessing individual parcels against the purposes of the Green Belt set out in the NPPF? Has the methodology been consistently applied?
- 2.5 Is the approach to Green Belt site identification (causing least harm to Green Belt purposes, having fewest constraints, providing most benefits) justified? This approach implies that the Green Belt sites selected are the best sites but not necessarily the only sites that are potentially available. Has there been a capacity study (or similar) to establish whether or not the constraints amount to a bar on other Green Belt sites coming forward?
- 2.6 Does policy MN7 provide an appropriate local interpretation of the circumstances in which new buildings and other development are permissible in the Green Belt?
- 2.7 Do the longer term needs of the area justify the identification of safeguarded land (policy MN8) to ensure that Green Belt boundaries will endure beyond the Plan period, as sought by national policy?
- 2.8 What provision has been made in the SLP and associated documents for alternative strategies to be implemented if development does not come forward as envisaged? Do the policies include sufficient flexibility and contingencies to take account of unexpected changes in circumstances?
- 2.9 Is the commitment to an early review of the Plan to address port expansion and, potentially, the residual housing need (paragraphs 4.42-4.44) given sufficient prominence? Should it form part of a policy?
- 2.10 Are the principles of sustainable development identified in policy SD2 appropriate and do they reflect the particular circumstances of Sefton? If not, how should they be amended and why?

Matter 3 HOUSING NEED AND PROVISION

Issue 3a: Whether the evidence base (including the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and latest population and household projections) provides a sufficiently clear and thorough understanding of the full objectively assessed housing needs of the Plan area.

- 3.1 What is the baseline estimate of housing need derived from demographic projections? Is the analysis of the components of population and household change (particularly migration trends) in the Council’s July 2015 Update report (document HO.1) sound?
- 3.2 Are there specific sub-regional factors which led to the greater than expected migration into Sefton in the 2000s, and are these likely to continue over the plan period? Is there agreement among sub-regional authorities over future migration patterns and the implications for household growth in the LCR authorities?
- 3.3 Does the 2014 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) provide a robust assessment of the need for affordable housing over the Plan period?
- 3.4 Is it appropriate to assume an unchanged proportion of vacant dwellings when adjusting the baseline demographic projection of household need for vacancies? Is it appropriate to adjust the baseline projection to take into account historic trends in household formation, and if so, is the scale of the adjustment sound?
- 3.5 Is the adjustment made in response to market signals (including trends in house prices, rents, affordability, overcrowding and rate of development) sound and based on appropriate time periods? Overall, is the demographically-driven figure of 690 dwellings per annum in the July 2015 Update justified?
- 3.6 What is the relationship between economic growth and household growth? How robust are the employment-led scenarios of dwelling need, particularly in light of some significant changes between recent projections (December 2014 (HO.2) and July 2015 (HO.1))? Should a direct relationship between changes in the number of jobs and dwelling need be assumed?
- 3.7 Have the implications of changes in commuting patterns and economic activity/unemployment rates been assessed? The July 2015 Update refers to such changes as policy choices for the Council – is this appropriate?
- 3.8 In determining the objectively assessed housing need, is there a robust case for attaching greater weight to a figure at the upper end of the 710-1,290dpa economically driven range, as suggested in the July 2015 Update report?

Issue 3b: Whether the evidence of housing capacity and delivery is sufficiently robust to give confidence that the development of a minimum 11,070 new homes will be achieved by 2030.

- 3.9 Is the capacity of sites identified in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) based on a thorough testing of each site’s suitability, availability and achievability? Is there compelling evidence that the assessed yield from certain sites is unlikely to be delivered (or may be exceeded)?
- 3.10 Are the site assumptions and discounts applied to the identified supply in the SHLAA realistic? Is the SHLAA’s assertion of compelling evidence to justify the windfall allowance based on a sound analysis of windfalls?
- 3.11 Is the variation in the annual delivery of dwellings in policy MN1 (500 dwellings pa to 2017 and 660 pa thereafter) justified?
- 3.12 The SHLAA refers to the publication of a separate document setting out the assessment of the 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites, as required by NPPF paragraph 47. Does this document satisfy national policy? Should a 20% buffer for persistent under-delivery be applied and, if so, how should this be calculated?
- 3.13 Should the Plan include a phasing policy which requires brownfield land to be developed before Green Belt allocations? Would this be consistent with the provision of a 5 year supply of housing sites?
- 3.14 Should the Plan include a housing trajectory which illustrates the expected rate of housing delivery over the plan period, as sought by NPPF paragraph 47? Should there be a contingency in place in case the trajectory is not delivered, and if so, what should this be?
- 3.15 Should the Plan address the demand for self or custom build homes?

Matter 4 EMPLOYMENT NEED AND PROVISION

Issue 4a: Whether the evidence base provides a sufficiently clear and thorough understanding of the objectively assessed employment needs of the Plan area.

- 4.1 Does the Employment Land and Premises Study (ELPS) provide a clear and robust assessment of the full objectively assessed employment needs for the Plan area? Is the preference for the higher historic land take-up model over the lower employment-based model justified?
- 4.2 Under the historic land take-up model, the ELPS baseline employment land requirement over the plan period is 54.72ha. To this it is proposed that a buffer is added to reflect a choice of sites,

and an allowance is made for losses to other uses. Are these adjustments appropriate? How is the 84.5ha employment land requirement in policy MN1 calculated?

- 4.3 Should the objectively assessed employment need be adjusted to take into account abnormal factors such as the major growth associated with Liverpool Superport? Is it appropriate to defer consideration of this to a review of the Plan after completion of a sub-regional study?

Issue 4b: Whether the SLP is sufficiently effective and robust to ensure the timely delivery of the objectively assessed employment needs of the Plan area.

- 4.4 Does the ELPS study provide a robust assessment of the amount of employment land currently available in Sefton?
- 4.5 The ELPS study identifies a 17.24ha surplus of employment land by 2030, the end of the Plan period. In these circumstances, is the allocation of 35ha of employment land on Green Belt sites justified? Do all three Green Belt Strategic Employment Allocations meet the “exceptional circumstances” test of national policy?
- 4.6 What is the rationale behind the distribution of Strategic Employment Locations across the borough? Is there an identified need for the two Green Belt employment sites at Formby?

Matter 5 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, REGENERATION AND RETAIL

Issue 5a: Whether the proposals for main employment areas and regeneration areas are positively prepared, effective and consistent with national policy.

- 5.1 Does the strategy for the port and maritime zone (policy ED1) provide sufficient detail about the consequences of port expansion beyond the port, and sufficient assurance that these consequences will be adequately mitigated? Is the policy sufficiently robust to ensure that any expansion of the port onto Seaforth nature reserve will comply with the Habitats Regulations?
- 5.2 Is the identification of Primarily Industrial Areas in policy ED3 and on the Policy Maps soundly based on current uses, with particular regard to Birkdale Trading Estate?
- 5.3 Does policy ED5 provide sufficient clarity about the types of tourism development that is supported? Are there other important tourist locations that warrant being added to the four areas identified?
- 5.4 Is the identification in policy ED6 of former sports grounds in Bootle as Regeneration Opportunity Sites based on a rigorous assessment

of the open space and recreation needs of the area which demonstrates that the requirements of NPPF paragraph 74 are met?

- 5.5 Do the policies for Southport Central Area (ED7) and Southport Seafront (ED8) give sufficient recognition to the importance of the historic environment and its conservation?
- 5.6 Is policy ED9 sufficiently specific and proactive in supporting the comprehensive regeneration of Crosby Centre?

Issue 5b: Whether the SLP is sufficiently clear and effective to protect the vitality and viability of centres in the retail hierarchy.

- 5.7 Policy ED2 refers to “Primary Shopping Areas” which are defined in Figure 7.2 by street address. The Policy Maps refer to “Primary Retail Frontages” and include a reference to policy ED2, but the policy does not mention “Primary Retail Frontages”. Paragraph 7.18 refers to “Primary Retail Areas”, but these are not subsequently mentioned in the SLP. Is there sufficient clarity in the Plan’s approach to primary shopping areas, and is there consistency with NPPF paragraph 23 (3rd bullet point) and the definitions in the Glossary?
- 5.8 Is there sound justification for the floorspace thresholds set out in policy ED2 for the impact assessments required for retail and other town centre uses proposed outside existing centres? Is it clear how the impact test will be applied, insofar as part 2 of policy ED2 seems also to require consideration of impact to be given to all out-of-centre proposals, whatever their size?
- 5.9 UDP policy R9 sought to direct out-of-centre retail proposals which satisfy the sequential and impact tests to established retail parks in preference to other out-of-centre locations. Should such a provision be included in policy ED2? What are the consequences of not giving retail parks this limited priority in the SLP?

Matter 6 HOUSING AND COMMUNITIES

Issue 6: Whether the approach to the size, type, tenure and range of housing suitably reflects the housing needs and priorities of Sefton’s communities.

- 6.1 Are the proportions of affordable housing sought in policy HC1 justified by robust viability evidence? Has sufficient account been taken of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advice not to plan to the margin of viability?
- 6.2 What is the justification for the proportion of affordable housing to be measured by bedspaces rather than dwellings, and how does this relate to the assessment by dwellings in the 2014 SHMA? Has

the viability of this requirement been robustly tested and found to be deliverable?

- 6.3 Is the need for affordable housing in Bootle and Netherton justified by the findings of the SHMA? If it is, should policy HC1 reflect the need for smaller dwellings in these areas as identified in the SHMA?
- 6.4 Should a more flexible approach to the proportions of social rented/affordable rented and intermediate housing be built into policy HC1 to allow for area-specific variations in demand and in case later SHMAs identify a need for different tenure mixes?
- 6.5 Is the application of policy HC1 to residential conversions consistent with national policy, notably the introduction of vacant building credits?
- 6.6 Is it reasonable for policy HC2 to require certain proportions of market dwellings to be a specific size? Should the exceptions identified in the policy allow for the possibility that later SHMAs might require a different mix of dwelling sizes?
- 6.7 Given the high proportion of older persons in Sefton, which is projected to increase over the Plan period, is policy HC2 sufficiently positive and proactive in seeking to meet the specific housing needs of older persons (as set out in recent revisions to PPG)?
- 6.8 Is the reference to Lifetime Homes Standards appropriate following the move to national standards for housing and the introduction of Optional Technical Standards? Has the viability of providing 20% of all dwellings to meet Lifetime Homes Standards been fully assessed?
- 6.9 Is the provision for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in policy HC5 based on a sound analysis of the Traveller community’s needs?
- 6.10 Are the Gypsy and Traveller site allocations in policy HC5 consistent with Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, particularly Policy E: Traveller Sites in Green Belt? Are the sites suitable for Traveller pitches having regard to the impacts on the immediate locality and the wider area? Have the environmental and other constraints to development been properly assessed and, where necessary, can appropriate mitigation be achieved? Has the availability, viability and deliverability of each site been robustly assessed?
- 6.11 Is the reference in policy HC7 to retaining “the heritage characteristics of the site” consistent with the requirements of national policy? Should the clause permitting alternative uses of former education or institutional sites reflect the requirements of NPPF paragraph 74 if the site includes land or buildings once used for sport or recreation?

Matter 7 DESIGN, ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSETS

Issue 7a: Whether the policies relating to design and environmental quality are justified and consistent with national policy.

- 7.1 Policy EQ3 requires compliance with the Council’s parking standards, though these are not specified. Is there clear and compelling justification that such standards are necessary to manage the local road network, as required by the “Planning Update” Written Ministerial Statement of March 2015?
- 7.2 By requiring major development to incorporate at least one specified energy efficiency measure, is policy EQ7 consistent with the government’s streamlining of housing and construction standards? Does the text accompanying policy EQ7 merit updating to reflect recent changes to the housing technical standards regime and the non-implementation by government of the Allowable Solutions framework?
- 7.3 Is the approach to flood risk in policy EQ8 an oversimplification of, and therefore inconsistent with, national policy? Have the site-specific concerns of the Environment Agency been addressed?
- 7.4 What is the justification for seeking to prevent food and drink uses in residential areas and/or close to schools where they would “encourage unhealthy lifestyle choices... or harm the residential character of the local area”? Is this part of policy EQ10 effective and consistent with national policy?

Issue 7b: Whether the approach to protecting and enhancing the natural and built environment is justified and consistent with national policy.

- 7.5 Does policy NH2 adequately reflect the specific requirements of the Habitats Regulations?
- 7.6 What is the justification for designating part of the River Mersey as a Nature Improvement Area to which policy NH3 applies? Does the local planning authority have legal jurisdiction over marine assets? What are the implications of the policy for the operation of the port?
- 7.7 Is the reference to open space standards in policy NH5 appropriate given the move away from a standards-based approach to open space, to one based on specific needs and deficits? Is the policy consistent with the forthcoming open space studies?
- 7.8 Is the Plan correct in stating that Sefton has no known mineral resources likely to be commercially viable during the Plan period? Were the British Geological Survey maps consulted to determine the presence of such minerals? Do these maps show economic deposits of sub-alluvial sand and gravel in Sefton and, if so, should Mineral Safeguarding Areas be designated, as required by national

policy? Are deposits of silica sand also present in Sefton which the Plan should address?

- 7.9 Is the treatment of minerals at the port of Liverpool in policy NH8 appropriate and consistent with national policy in recognising the importance of mineral infrastructure?
- 7.10 Is policy NH9, which prevents substantial harm to, or demolition of, designated heritage assets, consistent with NPPF paragraph 133, which allows for exceptions in certain circumstances?
- 7.11 By not mentioning the ‘significance’ of listed buildings, conservation areas and registered parks and gardens, are policies NH10, NH11 and NH12 consistent with the approach set out in national policy?
- 7.12 In contrast to policy NH9, the approach to scheduled monuments in policy NH13 appears to be less rigorous than that set out in NPPF, which applies a consistent approach to all designated heritage assets that is proportionate to their importance. Does this part of policy NH13 comply with national policy?
- 7.13 Does the policy NH14 approach to development affecting non-designated heritage assets adequately reflect the ‘balanced judgement’ test sought by NPPF paragraph 135?

Matter 8 INFRASTRUCTURE, IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

Issue: Whether the SLP is positively prepared and effective such that there is a realistic prospect of timely delivery of its proposals and associated infrastructure.

- 8.1 Does the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) provide a thorough assessment of the costs of the different types of infrastructure required in association with the SLP’s development proposals, the funding sources, and a timetable for delivery? Has the need for any health facilities/services been determined yet?
- 8.2 Have all the costs identified in the IDP for specific policy MN2 allocations been factored into those sites for which detailed viability appraisal has been carried out in the Economic Viability Study?
- 8.3 Policy IN1 states that the IDP lists essential infrastructure required for implementation of the SLP strategy, but also allows for viability to be taken into account. What is the Plan’s approach if infrastructure essential to a particular scheme cannot be funded for viability reasons – is policy SD2 sufficiently robust to prevent development going ahead without the provision of essential infrastructure? Should policy IN1 explicitly require the provision of essential infrastructure?

- 8.4 Does policy IN2 set out a comprehensive framework for dealing with the transport implications of the Plan’s proposals, and is it consistent with national policy? Is it underpinned by a robust evidence base, as sought by PPG?
- 8.5 Should the approach to energy infrastructure (paragraphs 9.33-34) be modified to reflect the Written Ministerial Statement regarding onshore wind turbine development (entitled “Local Planning”, published 18 June 2015)?
- 8.6 Does the very brief Monitoring Framework (Appendix 3 of SLP) provide a robust and effective mechanism for measuring the timely delivery of the objectives and policies of the Plan?
- 8.7 In determining the Monitoring Indicators, has regard been paid to SMART objectives (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and time-bound) or some other system of setting and measuring targets? For certain key policy monitoring indicators, should the SLP set out specific targets and identify the remedial actions to be taken if policies are not being successfully implemented?

Matter 9 HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT SITE ALLOCATIONS

Issue 9: Whether the selection of sites for development and the site allocation policies are consistent with the spatial strategy and justified by the evidence.

A CROSBY, MAGHULL, MELLING, AINTREE, BOOTLE (Southern Area)

9.1 Housing Sites in Urban Area

The following questions apply (where relevant) to each of the policy MN2 housing allocations listed below

Would the housing allocation result in accessible and sustainable development? Have the environmental and other constraints to development and the implications for infrastructure been properly assessed and, where necessary, can appropriate mitigation be achieved? Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

- a. Aintree Curve Site, Ridgewood Way, Netherton (MN2.34)
- b. Former Z Block Sites, Buckley Hill Lane, Netherton (MN2.35)
- c. Former St Raymond’s School playing field, Harrops Croft, Netherton (MN2.36)
- d. Land at Pendle Drive, Netherton (MN2.37)

- e. Land at the former Bootle High School, Browns Lane, Netherton (MN2.38)
- f. Former Daleacre School, Daleacre Drive, Netherton (MN2.39)
- g. Former Rawson Road Primary School, Rawson Road, Bootle (MN2.40)
- h. Former St Wilfrid’s School, Orrell Road, Bootle (MN2.41)
- i. Klondyke Phases 2 and 3, Bootle (MN2,42)
- j. Peoples site, Linacre Lane, Bootle (MN2.43)
- k. Former St Joan of Arc School, Rimrose Road, Bootle (MN2.44)
- l. Former St Mary’s Primary School playing fields, Waverley Street, Bootle (MN2.45)

9.2 Housing Sites in Green Belt

The following questions apply (where relevant) to each of the policy MN2 housing allocations listed below

Is the selection of the site based on a sound analysis of the impacts on the Green Belt in terms of urban sprawl, coalescence of settlements and encroachment into the countryside?

Do the proposed boundaries to the Green Belt comply with national policy in terms of their intended long term permanence and the use of physical features that are readily recognisable?

Would the housing allocation result in accessible and sustainable development? Have the environmental and other constraints to development and the implications for infrastructure been properly assessed and, where necessary, can appropriate mitigation be achieved? Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

- a. Land at Hall Road West, Crosby (MN2.22)
- b. Land at Southport Old Road, Thornton (MN2.23)
- c. Land at Holgate, Thornton (MN2.24)
- d. Land at Lydiate Lane, Thornton (MN2.25)
- e. Land south of Runnell’s Lane, Thornton (MN2.26)
- f. Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull (MN2.27)
- g. Land north of Kenyons Lane, Lydiate (MN2.28)

- h. Former Prison Site, Park Lane, Maghull (MN2.29)
- i. Land east of Waddicar Lane, Melling (MN2.30)
- j. Wadacre Farm, Chapel Lane, Melling (MN2.31)
- k. Land south of Spencers Lane, Melling (MN2.32)
- l. Land at Wango Lane, Aintree (MN2.33)

9.3 Mixed Housing/Employment Site in Green Belt

Is the allocation of land to the East of Maghull (MN2.46) for housing and employment development based on a sound analysis of the impacts on the Green Belt in terms of urban sprawl, coalescence of settlements and encroachment into the countryside?

Do the proposed boundaries to the Green Belt comply with national policy in terms of their intended long term permanence and the use of physical features that are readily recognisable?

Would the mixed-use allocation result in accessible and sustainable development? Have the environmental and other constraints to development and the implications for infrastructure been properly assessed and, where necessary, can appropriate mitigation be achieved? Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Do the detailed requirements of policy MN3 provide a robust framework for the delivery of this mixed-use allocation?

9.4 Employment Sites in Urban Area

The following questions apply (where relevant) to each of the policy MN2 employment allocations listed below

Would the employment allocation result in accessible and sustainable development? Have the environmental and other constraints to development and the implications for infrastructure been properly assessed and, where necessary, can appropriate mitigation be achieved? Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

- a. Dunnings Bridge Road Corridor, Netherton (MN2.47)
- b. Switch Car Site, Wakefield Road, Netherton (MN2.51)
- c. Land at Farriers Way, Netherton (MN2.52)
- d. Former Lanstar Site, Hawthorne Road, Bootle (MN2.53)

- e. Land at Linacre Bridge, Linacre Lane, Bootle (MN2.54)

9.5 Safeguarded Land

The following questions apply (where relevant) to each of the areas identified as safeguarded land under policy MN8 (listed below)

Is the land safeguarded for development beyond the Plan period based on a sound analysis of the impacts on the Green Belt in terms of urban sprawl, coalescence of settlements and encroachment into the countryside?

Would the proposed boundaries to the Green Belt comply with national policy in terms of their intended long term permanence and the use of physical features that are readily recognisable?

Would development of the safeguarded land in the longer term result in accessible and sustainable development? Have the environmental and other constraints to development and the implications for infrastructure been adequately assessed?

- a. Land at Lambshear Lane, Lydiate (MN8.1)
b. Land adjacent to Ashworth Hospital, Maghull (MN8.2)

9.6 Omission Sites (Southern area)

Inspector’s Note: A few omission sites are new sites that were first proposed at Publication Draft stage. Consideration of these sites will be based on matters already in the evidence base – substantial new evidence will not be accepted at the examination.

The following questions apply (where relevant) to each of the sites listed below which are not allocated in the Plan

Is there compelling evidence that a site not selected is appreciably more suitable than a site or sites allocated in the Plan in terms of:

- Green Belt policy
- accessibility and sustainability considerations
- the environmental and other constraints to development
- the implications for infrastructure
- the scope for mitigation.

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

- a. Land at Edge Lane, Thornton (housing - AS10)
b. Land west of Maghull (housing - AS12)
c. Land east of A59 and north of Kenyons Lane, Lydiate (housing - AS14)

- d. Land south of The Crescent, Maghull (housing - AS15)
- e. Land at Switch Island, north of M57 (employment - AS17)
- f. Land at Oriel Drive, Aintree (housing - AS18)
- g. Land west of Bulls Bridge Lane, Aintree (housing - AS19)
- h. Land east of Bulls Bridge Lane, Aintree (housing - AS21)
- i. Land at Mill Farm, Aintree (housing - AS22)
- j. Land east of Aintree Racecourse (housing - AS23)
- k. Land at The Stables, Netherton (housing - AS25)
- l. Land at Damfield Lane, Maghull (housing - AS30)
- m. Land at Melling Lane, Maghull (housing - SR4.49)

B SOUTHPORT, AINSDALE, FORMBY, HIGHTOWN (Northern Area)

9.7 Housing Sites in Urban Area

The following questions apply (where relevant) to each of the policy MN2 housing allocations listed below

Would the housing allocation result in accessible and sustainable development? Have the environmental and other constraints to development and the implications for infrastructure been properly assessed and, where necessary, can appropriate mitigation be achieved? Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

- a. Bartons Close, Southport (MN2.1)
- b. Former Phillips Factory, Balmoral Drive, Southport (MN2.3)
- c. Land adjacent to Dobbies Garden Centre, Benthams Way, Southport (MN2.6)
- d. Former St John Stone School, Meadow Lane, Ainsdale (MN2.9)
- e. Land at Sandbrook Road, Ainsdale (MN2.10)
- f. Land at West Lane, Formby (MN2.13)
- g. Former Holy Trinity School, Lonsdale Road, Formby (MN2.14)

- h. Formby Professional Development Centre, Park Road, Formby (MN2.15)

9.8 Housing Sites in Green Belt

The following questions apply (where relevant) to each of the policy MN2 housing allocations listed below

Is the selection of the site based on a sound analysis of the impacts on the Green Belt in terms of urban sprawl, coalescence of settlements and encroachment into the countryside?

Do the proposed boundaries to the Green Belt comply with national policy in terms of their intended long term permanence and the use of physical features that are readily recognisable?

Would the housing allocation result in accessible and sustainable development? Have the environmental and other constraints to development and the implications for infrastructure been properly assessed and, where necessary, can appropriate mitigation be achieved? Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

- a. Land at Bankfield Lane, Southport (MN2.2)
- b. Land at Moss Lane, Churchtown (MN2.4)
- c. Land at Crowland Street, Southport (MN2.5)
- d. Land at Lynton Road, Southport (MN2.7)
- e. Former Ainsdale Hope School, Ainsdale (MN2.8)
- f. Land south of Moor Lane, Ainsdale (MN2.11)
- g. Land north of Brackenway, Formby (MN2.12)
 - Do the detailed requirements of policy MN6 provide a robust framework for the delivery of this housing allocation?
- h. Land at Liverpool Road, Formby (MN2.16)
- i. Land at Altcar Lane, Formby (MN2.17)
- j. Power House phase 2, Hoggs Hill Lane, Formby (MN2.18)
- k. Land at Andrew’s Close, Formby (MN2.19)
- l. Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown (MN2.20)
- m. Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown (MN2.21)

9.9 Employment Site in Urban Area

Would the Southport Business Park employment allocation (MN2.50) result in accessible and sustainable development? Have the environmental and other constraints to development and the implications for infrastructure been properly assessed and, where necessary, can appropriate mitigation be achieved? Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Do the detailed requirements of policy MN2 provide a suitable framework for development of the Southport Business Park?

9.10 Employment Sites in Green Belt

Is the selection of the site based on a sound analysis of the impacts on the Green Belt in terms of urban sprawl, coalescence of settlements and encroachment into the countryside?

Do the proposed boundaries to the Green Belt comply with national policy in terms of their intended long term permanence and the use of physical features that are readily recognisable?

Would the employment allocation result in accessible and sustainable development? Have the environmental and other constraints to development and the implications for infrastructure been properly assessed and, where necessary, can appropriate mitigation be achieved? Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

Do the detailed requirements of policies MN4 and MN5 provide a robust framework for the delivery of these employment allocations?

- a. Land to the North of Formby Industrial Estate (MN2.48)
- b. Land to the South of Formby Industrial Estate (MN2.49)

9.11 Omission Sites (Northern area)

Inspector’s Note: A few omission sites are new sites that were first proposed at Publication Draft stage. Consideration of these sites will be based on matters already in the evidence base – substantial new evidence will not be accepted at the examination.

The following questions apply (where relevant) to each of the sites listed below which are not allocated in the Plan

Is there compelling evidence that a site not selected is appreciably more suitable than a site or sites allocated in the Plan in terms of:

- Green Belt policy
- accessibility and sustainability considerations

- the environmental and other constraints to development
- the implications for infrastructure
- the scope for mitigation.

Has the availability, viability and deliverability of the site been robustly assessed?

- a. Land between Southport Old Road and Formby Bypass (housing - AS26)
- b. Land between Formby Bypass and Downholland Brook (employment - AS27)
- c. Land south of Liverpool Road/Altcar Lane, Formby (housing - AS28)
- d. Land at Shorrocks Hill, Formby (housing - AS29)
- e. Land south of Coastal Road, Ainsdale (housing - SR4.09)

Martin Pike

INSPECTOR

30 September 2015