

2017 Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) consultation

Consultation statement – Land East of Maghull SPD

The Council consulted statutory and other consultees on the draft Land East of Maghull in line with the approved 2011 Statement of Community Involvement (<https://www.sefton.gov.uk/sci>). The most recent consultation period ran from mid-March to 2nd May 2017.

Responses were received from:

- Countryside Properties / Persimmon Homes
- Environment Agency
- Hallam Land Management Ltd / Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (HLM/TW)
- Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service
- 3 members of the public.

The table below summaries the main issues raised by consultees ('summary of comments made'), and how these issues have been addressed in the SPD ('Council response').

Organisation	Summary of comments made	Council Response
	General Comments	
Countryside Properties / Persimmon Homes	Our clients and other landowners are committed to the delivery of the site.	Noted.
Environment Agency	We have no objection in principle to the document or the proposed allocation of the site. However, the SPD needs to contain further guidance regarding the risk of all forms of flooding and the steps that are required to demonstrate any proposed development does not increase flood risks on site or elsewhere at any stage of development and occupation for the entire allocation.	References to flood risk need to be strengthened. A new section (3.4) has been added to bring these requirements together.
Environment Agency	Developers should be aware that any assessment of flood risk should include, but not be restricted to, the following requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should take a sequential approach onsite and seek to avoid areas of flood risk; • Full topographical survey of the entire allocation; 	LEM4 and section 3.4 has been included in the SPD to ensure developers are fully aware of their responsibilities to mitigate flooding.

Organisation	Summary of comments made	Council Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed modelling be undertaken to identify the current risk of flooding from all sources, including the impacts of climate change (as per the new climate change scenarios); • Based on the modelling outputs, propose and provide suitable mitigation provided for all flood risks identified; • Identify access and egress requirements • Identify, establish and secure future management arrangements. • Any mitigation measures identified should be implemented and completed prior to the building of residential and employment units to ensure no increased risk of flooding, even for a temporary period. The Whinny Brook culvert underneath the railway embankment should be inspected as part of any assessment, however it should be noted that any upsizing of this downstream culvert would be unacceptable as it would cause a significant increase in flood risk downstream. 	
Ian Harvey John Short Maureen Webb (Members of the public)	Object to the proposed development on the following grounds: The scheme has not been thought through and is vague, irresponsible and confusing. There is no infrastructure to tackle flooding, drainage, traffic congestion and air pollution. A focus for housing on Maghull is not appropriate. Warehouses and jobs are not needed. The housing needs figures are incorrect, especially after Brexit. There is a lack of affordable homes. It is prime agricultural land. Do not care about existing residents. There are sufficient brownfield sites elsewhere.	The independent Local Plan Inspector has indicated support for the allocation of this strategic site in his initial findings. Local Plan policy MN3 sets triggers for the provision of infrastructure to support the development. This must be provided in line with other Local Plan policies such as EQ8 on managing flooding, IN2 on transport and EQ5 on air quality. All planning applications will be assessed against these (and other relevant) Local Plan policies and this SPD.
	Site and site context	
Environment Agency	Para 2.5.1 – change the paragraph to highlight the flood risk consideration that will be required (similar to that which has been done for the Ecology section). Flood risk is a key constraint requiring	LEM4 and section 3.4 has been included in the SPD to bring together all the advice relating to flood risk.

Organisation	Summary of comments made	Council Response
	careful consideration and assessment rather than a simple comment saying it can be safely mitigated. Flood risks and mitigation should be identified through production of a site specific Flood Risk Assessment and developers should be left in no doubt that detailed modelling will be required to identify the fluvial flood risks and assess the impacts of climate change. Ultimately the development should be safe without increasing the risk of flooding onsite or elsewhere.	
Hallam Land Management Ltd / Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd (HLM/TW)	Para 2.5.2 – Amend gas pipe easement from 9m to 8m as confirmed by Transco (in letter appended to representation).	All references have been appropriately amended.
	LEM1: Comprehensive Development Principles	
Countryside Properties / Persimmon Homes	LEM1 Part 3 - Object to the need for a <u>detailed</u> masterplan and the need to define <u>precisely</u> the location of specific uses. This is unrealistic at the pre-application stage, exceeds the requirements of any outline application and does not take account of the multiple land ownerships / developers involved. It will restrict the development potential and cause delay in delivery. An indicative masterplan would serve to inform future applications.	The Council must ensure that the site is developed in a comprehensive manner and that all the required elements will be accommodated. Without an agreed masterplan, there is a significant risk that this will not occur, and the infrastructure requirements will not be provided or they will not serve the development in a sustainable manner. It is therefore proposed to remove 'precisely' but retain 'detailed' in the requirements relating to the Master Plan.
Countryside Properties / Persimmon Homes	LEM1 requires a co-ordinated approach while LEM3 requires clearly defined character areas. This is a conflict of approach.	This is not contradictory as LEM1 sets out principles and LEM3 provides details. The requirement is intended to secure a cohesive development albeit with different characters in each neighbourhood within the site, and reflecting the fact that the site will be developed by a number of developers over a prolonged period. No change is proposed.
Environment Agency	We welcome LEM1 especially the commitment to an integrated approach to the management of flood risk in part 2. Part 3 should precisely identify where and/or what flood mitigation	An additional bullet point has been added to LEM1 Part 3 adding a cross reference to policy EQ8.

Organisation	Summary of comments made	Council Response
	measures will be provided based on a FRA for the entire (whole allocation) site because this could influence final development layouts.	
HLM/TW	LEM1 Part 3 – requires the masterplan to be agreed, but does not state with whom. Amend as follows: <i>'An agreed, single, detailed Master Plan for the development of the whole site <u>must be agreed between all landowners and</u> must be submitted with or prior to the submission of the first Planning application...'</i>	No change - This is necessary as the site will be developed by a number of developers on land owned by several people. The Master Plan will be agreed by the Council, so as to ensure the efficient determination of subsequent planning applications, but absence of agreement from one landowner should not prevent the site from being developed in a timely manner. The Local Plan Inspector has confirmed that the Master Plan can be submitted with the 1 st planning application, in accordance with Lp policy MN3 'Land east of Maghull'.
HLM/TW	Para 3.1.3 – amend as follows: <i>'Part 3 of Local Plan policy MN3 requires that a Master Plan <u>agreed by all landowners</u> is approved by the Council prior to or in tandem with <u>the</u> submission of the first application to develop the site...'</i>	As above.
HLM/TW	Figure 6 – delete land ownership plan as this is likely to change once the site is allocated for development in the Local Plan. If retained add Hallam Land Management to the parcel solely in Taylor Wimpey's ownership.	This map is included for indicative purposes only. A reference to Hallam Land Management has been added and the names of private land owners removed.
Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service (MEAS)	LEM1 title – delete 'comprehensive' as it adds little guidance	Agreed. 'Comprehensive' has been deleted from the title of LEM1.
MEAS	LEM1 Part 2 - 1st sentence – add after "should" the following "be informed by a range of technical evidence reports that are integrated and include: Flood risk assessment, Ecological Appraisal, Archaeological Desk Based Assessment, Transport Assessment" etc	This is more appropriate for the explanation to the policy and has been included in paragraph 3.1.4.
MEAS	LEM1 Part 3 - include here the existing bullet points from Part 2 and add to existing list in Part 3, and also add archaeological mitigation and watercourse realignment (see LEM5).	The need for archaeological mitigation would be difficult to show on a masterplan. This is included in the explanatory text (paragraph 3.1.4). A reference to watercourse

Organisation	Summary of comments made	Council Response
		realignment has been added as a bullet point to part 3 of LEM1 and as part 3 to LEM4.
MEAS	Add policy links such as NH2, NH13, N14, flood risk, transport etc.	All policy links to the Local Plan have been removed.
MEAS	Para 3.1.3 – Suggest the last sentence is much more directive, along the lines of “Any application must include a statement of conformity with the Master Plan.” For info, Liverpool does this.	This has been included to paragraph 3.1.5.
	LEM2: Design (previously LEM3)	
Countryside Properties / Persimmon Homes	LEM3 Part 4 - seeks submission of a Design Code prior to the submission of full planning or reserved matters, which is too prescriptive and is not a normal requirement. There is no landscape, historical or ecological justification for this departure. It implies design standards must be adhered to and gives little room for flexibility. Revise wording to state ‘General Design Principles’ rather than ‘Design Code’	It is normal to expect full design details with a full or reserved matters application. It would not preclude applicants from submitting a revised scheme should this be necessary at a later stage. A design code should be included in the Masterplan for the whole site. Moreover ‘General Design Principles’ could be confused with the title of LEM1.
Countryside Properties / Persimmon Homes	Figures 7 and 8 - are too prescriptive as they set out firm standards rather than principles. There is no justification for the standards given or appraisal of cost. The policy should be more flexible regarding building heights and locations.	Figure 8: ‘Illustrative street cross sections’ has been deleted. Figure 7 (now Figure 6) sets out the standards in the Sefton Street Design Guide Developers Pack and gives appropriate advanced information of what the Council would expect.
Countryside Properties / Persimmon Homes	LEM3 Part 7 - It is unclear why 40 dph are sought beyond accessibility to railway stations. No account is taken to other policy considerations. The issue of density should be left to the application stage.	LEM2 and LEM6 have been amended to reduce the emphasis on access to a railway station.
Countryside Properties / Persimmon Homes	LEM3 Part 8 - There is no justification for the requirement for the tree lined distributor road or the cost of providing it. Omit this requirement.	This has been a requirement in Sefton, set out in the Sefton Street Design Guide Developers Pack. No change.
Environment Agency	LEM3 Site layout and general principles should be clear that no inappropriate development shall occur within flood zones.	Agree. This has been added to LEM4 and new section 3.4 on flood risk.

Organisation	Summary of comments made	Council Response
Environment Agency	The onsite flood zones are yet to be modelled with consideration to the new climate change scenarios over the lifetime of development to inform climate change allowances on site. Any Flood Risk Assessment will need to look at Higher Central (35%) and Upper End (70%) scenarios. This may influence final design requirements, such as finished floor levels and the type of materials used to build properties.	A paragraph has been added to the new Flood risk section (3.4) to reflect this.
HLM/TW	Figure 7 – amend the general function of the primary distributor road as follows to reflect the role that it will fulfil in serving the development and not acting as a through road: <i>‘Strategic route serving the development carrying vehicular traffic through the site from and towards School Lane / Maghull Lane’</i>	Agreed, Figure 7 has been amended to reflect this.
MEAS	LEM3 Site layout and general principles - The 9m easement is not mentioned; yet this is both a constraint and an opportunity.	Appropriate reference to the easement is now made in para 2.4.7, in LEM1 and in LEM7.
MEAS	LEM3 Part 17 – suggest addition that it is not just tree planting that is required within the soft landscaping.	LEM2 part 17, LEM3 part 13 LEM5 part 7 and para 3.7.6 have all been amended to include a reference to other types of planting
MEAS	LEM3 Part 20 – “be well lit” – replace with “appropriately lit” – different lighting schemes in different parts of the whole development will be required.	LEM2 part 20, LEM3 parts 12 and 16 and LEM5 part 8 have all been amended accordingly.
MEAS	LEM3 Part 21 – along the M58 the 9m easement and a landscaped buffer that mitigates noise may be difficult to achieve. There is a need for flexibility here in type of noise buffer that may be required.	Para 2.4.7 states noise mitigation should be included in the proposals for the comprehensive development of the site.
MEAS	LEM3 Part 22 – delete “where possible” as this is guidance not policy.	This approach is used elsewhere. No change.
MEAS	Para 3.3.4 – design codes should include a wider range of provision for soft landscaping than trees and shrubs, particularly as these are not appropriate in SuDs and managing flood risk.	Other planting species are now included.
	LEM3: Highways and Accessibility (previously LEM4)	
Countryside Properties /	LEM4 Part 2 – support, to prevent the creation of a rat run through the development, but include provision of a ‘bus gate’ between the	A bus gate is not required as the bus will operate on the main distributor road through the development.

Organisation	Summary of comments made	Council Response
Persimmon Homes	north and south parts of the site. Include provision of a 'bus gate' between the north and south parts of the site.	
Countryside Properties / Persimmon Homes	LEM4 Part 5 - access to a 'limited number of dwellings' is unclear and restricts development. The numbers of dwellings would be determined by design and highway capacity. Omit this phrase.	This will be changed so that no more than 50 dwellings are served from any secondary access. Only the Local Distributor Road will be permitted to connect the north and south of the site, in order to prevent rat-running through the site in the interests of highway safety.
Countryside Properties / Persimmon Homes	LEM4 Part 14 - It is not necessary for the current alignments of footpaths no.11 and no.13 to be retained as this is restrictive. The development should in broad terms safeguard and provide for safe and attractive walking and cycling routes.	Agree. LEM3 part 15 and para 3.3.4 include appropriate diversion following the correct legal procedure is enacted.
HLM/TW	The highway proposals are not deliverable in their current form. For LEM4 evidence is provided to illustrate a deliverable access route into and within the site from the Maghull Lane/Villas Road junction and commercial and residential access through the site using one distributor road which will also support public transport. Further residential access routes are also shown. This approach will aid deliverability, minimise infrastructure and avoid multiple junctions onto School Lane/Maghull Lane.	The access points indicated in the SPD have been agreed with the Council's Highways service. Whilst the access point to the residential development from School Lane has been agreed, the proposed access to the Business Park has not yet been finalised.
HLM/TW	LEM4 Part 6 – amend as follows: <i>'The Distributor Road required in part 5f of Local Plan policy 'MN3 Land East of Maghull' should be located at the junction of School Lane / Maghull Lane with either Villas Road, Park Lane or from the roundabout on School Lane that provides access into site 'MN2.29 Former Prison Site, Park Lane, Maghull'. This will provide the main residential access to the site from the north. It should be designed so as not to create a rat run through the site.'</i>	We need to provide flexibility and avoid creating ransom strips. The route of the distributor road will be determined in the Masterplan. No change.
HLM/TW	Para 3.4.2 - omit reference to Park Lane and insert Villas Road in the third line.	There is no sound planning reason why the road would be at one of these locations or the other. The Council does not want to be overly prescriptive as to where the access is located at least until the Master Plan has been prepared.
HLM/TW	Figure 9 - Replace with proposed access strategy as outlined above.	As above

Organisation	Summary of comments made	Council Response
HLM/TW	Para 3.4.5 - delete from the explanation: 'or Park Lane junctions or from the northern end of the Distributor Road.'	As above
MEAS	LEM4 Part 8 – Need clarity on the number of bridge crossings needed. These need to be accommodated without damaging water vole habitat, which is statutorily protected.	Part 7 of LEM7 has been revised to indicate a number of bridges are required. The exact number will be determined through the preparation of the Master Plan. Paragraph 3.4.10 has been amended to ensure water vole habitat is considered.
MEAS	LEM4 Part 15 – Reference to appropriately lit routes is required.	LEM3 Part 15 has been amended accordingly.
	LEM4: 'Flood risk and surface water management'	
Environment Agency	This SPD is missing a paragraph on flood risk matters	Agreed. A new section (3.4) has been inserted to address this concern.
Environment Agency	Any proposed realignment of Whinney Brook will need to be supported by hydraulic modelling to demonstrate no increased flows or flood risk post realignment.	This is acknowledged in LEM4 part 3.
Environment Agency	LEM5 Part 5 indicates a possible watercourse realignment which we assume is for Whinny Brook. Whinny Brook at this location is an 'Ordinary Watercourse' and therefore falls within the consent remit of the Lead local Flood Authority. It falls within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and therefore we would be a statutory consultee for any planning application	This is now explained in para 3.4.5.
Environment Agency	LEM5 Part 9 - Any flood risk mitigation should also avoid gardens, drives, car parks etc. This is to avoid areas set aside for mitigation being lost to future development.	This point is covered in para 3.4.4.
	LEM5: 'Main Park'	
MEAS	Para 3.5.1 – Add 'should also conform with policy and other SPDs'.	Para 3.5.1 has been amended to refer to appropriate policies and SPDs.
Countryside Properties / Persimmon	The developers are concerned about the use of the term 'main park' in LEM5 as the definition significantly exceeds and overstates the purpose of this park. The mechanism for delivery is uncertain given	The function of a main park is set out in the Sefton Open Space and Recreation Study (2015). All parks in Sefton are classified according to their size and the function they

Organisation	Summary of comments made	Council Response
Homes	the multiple land ownerships within the site. It should be referred to as a 'park' or NEAP.	perform in the locality. The park on this site will meet the requirements of a main park by virtue of its size and the range of facilities it will provide. No change.
Environment Agency	LEM5 Part 1 states a minimum park size of 6 hectares. Our flood map shows the outline for Flood Zone 3 covers an area of about 8 hectares, much of this being functional floodplain. For flood compensation it is possible serious consideration will need to be made to flood depths and velocities to safeguard people's safety within the Main Park.	This will be considered when detailed designs are put forward. Additional wording has been added to part 9 and para 3.5.5.
Environment Agency	Para 3.5.6 - As the Main Park is proposed for flood mitigation it needs to be considered for safety during times of flood (including flood depths and velocity). It is strongly recommended that developers liaise with the Emergency Planners as ultimately it would be Sefton Council responsible for public safety during times flood.	New para 3.5.5 has been added to cover this.
MEAS	LEM5 Part 5 – This is the first mention of watercourse realignment and it is not clear why this might be required. Habitat creation and enhancement along the brook would become paramount in any realignment and may impact on what else can be delivered in the "Main Park". This requires more discussion with MEAS.	Reference to this has been removed, as it is not a policy requirement. If any realignment is proposed, it will be considered as part of any future planning application.
MEAS	LEM5 Part 8 - change "well lit" to "appropriately lit"	LEM5 Part 8 has been amended.
MEAS	Add more policy links e.g. NH2	Paragraph 3.5.6 refers to policy NH2.
MEAS	Para 3.5.6 – 1st sentence after habitats include "in accordance with policy NH2 and the emerging Nature Conservation SPD". Delete 2nd sentence and para 3.5.7 already covers.	Paragraph 3.5.6 amended.
	LEM6: Housing Type and Tenure	
Countryside Properties / Persimmon Homes	It is unclear in LEM6 part 2 why the location specified is required for the delivery of older persons housing as other parts of the site will be accessible by sustainable transport modes other than rail as working age families would also benefit from close proximity to the station. This should be left to the detailed design stage with one facility being required in the north and the south of the site.	LEM6 part 2 has been amended to reflect the older persons housing should be within 100m of a bus stop in the north-west and in the south of the site.
	LEM7: Business Park Requirements	

Organisation	Summary of comments made	Council Response
Countryside Properties / Persimmon Homes	LEM7 Part 5 - There is no justification for the proposed trigger of 500 dwellings, or explanation why this couldn't be higher. The requirements to install services and utilities and landscaping at a pre-emptive stage will restrict the type and character of employment uses and govern the footprint of buildings. Delivery of housing should be protected and restrictions should not be placed on business development.	This is to prevent only the residential development from coming forward. It is a requirement of the Local Plan policy MN3 'Land east of Maghull'.
HLM/TW	The retail and leisure provision is only focussed around serving the needs of the residential areas. 3,185 people that could be employed at the business park and users from the strategic highway network will also require services. HLM/TW can deliver a gateway development following analysis of market needs and delivery mechanisms if the amendments we propose to the SPD are achieved. These include to: LEM7 Add a Part 6 - and explanation to say: <i>'Retail and leisure economic development within Use Classes A1 – A5 and C1 is appropriate adjacent to the entrance to the business part in the north east corner of the site in order to facilitate a high quality gateway entrance to the site and deliver facilities that meet the needs of users of the business park, existing and future residents and users of the M58 motorway.'</i> <i>'The above land uses can also assist in delivering infrastructure works that can support the delivery of the development and will ensure that a sense of place is secured at this large-scale residential and commercial extension to the settlement of Maghull.'</i>	The location of any retail and leisure development is a matter to be considered at the planning application stage. This would need to be in the form of enabling development and conform to LP policy MN2 part 6. It would also need to pass the sequential and impact tests set out in Local Plan policy ED2 relating to 'town centre' development outside town, district and local centres. It would also need to compliment development in the proposed shopping provision.
HLM/TW	LEM7 Part 3 – Amend gas pipe easement from 9m to 8m as confirmed by Transco (in letter appended to representation).	LEM7 Part 3 has been amended accordingly.
MEAS	LEM7 Part 5 – add to last bullet point "which includes appropriate landscaping along the 9m easement"	No change – this is covered elsewhere in LEM7.
	LEM8: Local Shopping Provision and Other Ancillary Development	
Countryside Properties / Persimmon	Para 3.8.4 should be within the policy to provide for greater flexibility.	'Mix' in LEM8 part 3 has been replaced with 'range'.

Organisation	Summary of comments made	Council Response
Homes		
HLM/TW	LEM8 Part 5 – amend to read <i>‘A public house/restaurant, drive-thru, petrol filling station with ancillary retail uses, hotel, a small-scale leisure or fitness facility and other ancillary and appropriate development may be located adjacent to the shopping parade provided to support the Business Park. This should be located in the north east corner of the site adjacent to the boundary of the site with the M58.’</i>	LEM8 part 5 allows other ancillary and appropriate development. Any other facilities must complement the range of facilities provided in the local centre and must pass the sequential and impact tests set out in Local Plan policy ED2 relating to ‘town centre’ development outside town, district and local centres. It would also need to compliment development in the local centre.
HLM/TW	Para 3.8.5 – The planned location for the services and facilities adjacent to the shopping parade, to the west of the distributor road does not adequately serve the Business Park or recognise the attractiveness of the Business Park location to commercial occupiers who require visible and accessible sites. Evidence from the NPPF and case studies has been provided to support this.	The location of any retail and leisure development is a matter to be considered at the detailed design stage. This would need to be in the form of enabling development and conform to LP policy MN2 part 6. It would also need to pass the sequential and impact tests set out in Local Plan policy ED2 relating to ‘town centre’ development outside town, district and local centres. It would also need to compliment development in the local centre.
HLM/TW	Para 3.8.5 – amend policy explanation as follows <i>‘A public house/restaurant, drive-thru, petrol filling station and associated retail uses, hotel, a small-scale leisure or fitness facility and other ancillary and appropriate development shall be located on land adjacent to the entrance of the Business Park and other ancillary development such as a fitness centre also may be located adjacent to the shopping provision. This will help to attract people into the area and serve the new housing estates and Business Park that are planned in this area as well as recognising the strategic location of the site adjacent to the strategic highway network and the commercial requirements of potential occupiers. However, any development in the area must complement that existing and proposed in Maghull Town Centre.’</i> The additional advantages these changes will secure are set out.	No change for reasons above.
	LEM9: Infrastructure Contributions (formerly LEM2)	
Countryside Properties / Persimmon Homes	Policy LEM2 is not sufficiently clear in setting guidance for contributions from non-residential uses. Only passing reference is made to non-residential uses in relation to the construction and maintenance of the Main Park and landscaping of the Business Park.	Local Plan policy MN3 has been subject to main modifications at the Local Plan’s Inspector’s request and these modifications have been brought forward to LEM9 and associated text.

Organisation	Summary of comments made	Council Response
	<p>The supporting text in paragraph 3.2.3 makes clear the need for non-residential to make contributions. The SPD sets out no strategy as what is likely to be required from these non-residential uses, or how contributions required will be secured /delivered.</p> <p>The policy should be amended to provide clearer guidance for non-residential uses.</p>	
<p>Countryside Properties / Persimmon Homes</p>	<p>LEM2 Part 2 - Clarification is necessary in relation to contributions required towards Summerhill Primary School. Words such as “commencement” and “development” are ambiguous when referring to identified triggers. It is unclear whether the policy is referring to the development as a whole, a planning application, or phase.</p> <p>The triggers for contributions towards education infrastructure should be sought on disposal of new housing rather than commencement. New dwellings will not create a need for education provision until they are occupied. Monies raised from the development towards education must specifically be spent to expand capacity at Summerhill Primary School.</p>	<p>Unless payment is made on commencement the school places will not be available when the first homes are completed as Summerhill School is already operating at capacity.</p>
<p>Countryside Properties / Persimmon Homes</p>	<p>LEM2 Part 3 of the policy refers to the need to make contributions towards new (southbound) slip roads at Junction 1 of the M58. Paragraph 2.3.1 of the SPD confirms that funding has been secured. However, the slip roads, railway station and bus route will all benefit other developments and should be supported through CIL charges rather than s278.</p> <p>Amend the SPD to outline that contributions towards the slip roads will only be required if shown to be necessary and non-residential uses should also contribute.</p>	<p>The Council does not agree. The slip roads need to be in place before any development within the Business Park is occupied. They are therefore directly related to the development of the site and are a pre-requisite to the development of the Business Park. The s278 requirements are specific to this development and must be borne by the relevant developer.</p>
<p>Countryside Properties / Persimmon Homes</p>	<p>It is unclear when the 5 year period for the subsidy of the bus route will commence. It should be from 5 years of occupation of the first dwelling.</p>	<p>Local Plan policy MN3.4.c states the bus route must be operational when the distributor road linking School Lane and Poverty Lane is complete. This is required before the practical completion of the 251st dwellings on either side of the site.</p>

Organisation	Summary of comments made	Council Response
Environment Agency	LEM2 Part 4 para 1 – it is likely flood mitigation measures (certainly fluvial) may be required prior to the commencement of some building developments to ensure flood mitigation is provided and at no time will the site increase the risk of flooding onsite or elsewhere at any time prior, during or after development.	Agreed. This is covered in LEM4 and the supporting text.
Environment Agency	Para 3.2.7 - The decision on who should adopt, operate, manage or maintain public areas will also need to consider who will manage any flood management on site should any be needed.	Agreed. This is covered in LEM4 and the supporting text.
HLM/TW	LEM2 Part 4 – delete ‘and commercial development’ from the second paragraph for consistency with the first paragraph of part 4 and paragraph 3.2.6.	LEM9 has been amended to clarify who is required to contribute to what infrastructure.
MEAS	LEM2 Part 4 - this currently does not provide clear guidance on what and when. Can phased construction be practical and/or deliverable on flood risk?	Wording added to LEM2 Part 4 para 1 and para 3.2.5 to provide clarity that works to mitigate flooding may be required up front.
MEAS	Para 3.2.6 – It is not clear what this paragraph is trying to achieve.	This paragraph reinforces that developers must contribute financially to the construction (including flood risk mitigation), management and maintenance of the main park and simply donating land for the Council (or others) to set out and subsequently maintain is not acceptable. No change is proposed, although the paragraph has been moved to section 3.9.
MEAS	Para 3.2.8 – Why are infrastructure contributions not comprehensive at this stage?	This is to allow for unanticipated requirements to be built in at a later stage should this prove necessary. In addition CIL rates have not been set and schemes that CIL will fund have yet to be identified. No change is proposed.