

Slyne with Hest Neighbourhood Plan 2017 – 2031

Consultation Statement

August 2020



CONTENTS

Introduction and Aims.....	page 3
Consultation Timeline.....	page 4
How and who did we consult with	page 6
Consultation Statement.....	page 7
Residents' responses.....	page 13
Lancaster City Council.....	page 43
Other Statutory Bodies.....	page 53
Non Statutory Agencies.....	page 64

1. INTRODUCTION

This Consultation Statement has been prepared by Slyne with Hest Parish Council to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. Section 15(2) Part 5 of the Regulations sets out what a Consultation Statement and contains

- a) details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
- b) explains how they were consulted;
- c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted;
- d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.

This statement is submitted under Regulation 15 to support the draft Slyne with Hest Neighbourhood Plan.

2. AIMS

The aims of the Slyne with Hest Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Process were:

- a) to involve as much of the community as possible throughout all consultation stages of the Plan development in order that the Plan content was informed by their views from the start of the Neighbourhood Planning process.
- b) to ensure that community consultation events took place at critical points in the process
- c) to engage with as wide a range of people as possible, using a variety of approaches, communication and consultation techniques.
- d) to capture all comments and correspondence and record how consultation shaped the policies that emerged, and ensure that results of consultation were made available to all via the website, other media and meetings.

TIME LINE OF KEY CONSULTATION DATES IN THE DEVELOPMENT

THE SLYNE WITH HEST NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Designation Slyne with Hest Neighbourhood Plan Designation. March 2015

Consultation Report Area designation confirmed (06/03/2015)

Map

<http://www.lancaster.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/neighbourhood-planning>

- June 2015 First Public Meeting Steering Group formed from local volunteers
- February 2016 Consultation by Local Authority re the area of designation Approval of designated area by the local community and adopted by steering group in April 2016
- April 2016 Scoping Exercise – Community Coffee Morning
- May to August 2016
Initial Stage One Consultation with the local community and stakeholders commenced 500 Questionnaire Leaflets distributed via groups and key locations in the village
<http://www.slyne-with-hest.org.uk/np/docs/leaflet.pdf>
- August 2016
Stage One Consultation report completed and published on village web site and feedback at monthly Community Coffee Morning <http://www.slyne-with-hest.org.uk/np/docs/app4a.pdf>
- September 2016
Vision developed
Vision Aims and Objectives leaflet hand delivered to whole Parish
- October 2016
Stage two Consultation with local community commenced
- May 2017
Attended School May Fair
- July 2017
Attended Community Coffee Mornings
- October 2017
Information Day at the Memorial Hall
- December 2017
Stage Two Consultation report completed and published on the village web site
<http://www.slyne-with-hest.org.uk/np/docs/app4b.pdf>
- February 2018 2 September 2019
Meeting with Lancaster City Council re change of Plan emphasis from identifying sites to allocating sites for development.

- June 2018
Draft Outline of Plan submitted to Parish Council
- October 2018
Presentations by potential developers
- February 2019
Draft Plan approved by Parish Council
- April 2019- August 2019
- HRA and SEA Completed
<http://www.slyne-with-hest.org.uk/np/docs/sea.pdf>
<http://www.slyne-with-hest.org.uk/np/docs/hra.pdf>
- Other Regular Consultation/Information sharing events
- Regulation 14 consultation from Monday 2nd September to Monday 14th October 2019

Village web - site updated quarterly and at key points of the plan development.

Village newsletters - published quarterly

Steering group meetings - open session at the beginning of the monthly steering meetings

Lancaster City Council - Regular meetings and email contact with LCC

Local newspaper - advertising events and articles

Parish Council – Minutes of all steering group meetings sent to Parish Council and a representative of the Parish Council on steering group

Regular attendance of members of the steering group at Parish Council meetings

Parish Council - Plan considered and approved by Parish Council at key stages

Community Coffee Morning - displays and information provided on a regular basis

Notice boards and Posters - all notice boards in the village used to advertise key events

HOW AND WHO DID WE CONSULT WITH

The concept of providing the opportunity for all residents to participate in the consultation process, if they wished, was important to the group, and wherever possible barriers to participation were considered and removed when designing events and literature. The most used venue was the village Memorial Hall which was fully accessible and on a bus route. Various local groups were also visited.

Initial Consultation

See Stage One (a) and Two Initial Consultation (b) for a list of who was consulted and the range of participatory appraisal methods used to develop the plan.

<http://www.slyne-with-hest.org.uk/np/docs/app4a.pdf>

<http://www.slyne-with-hest.org.uk/np/docs/app4b.pdf>

Regulation 14 Consultation

A variety of methods were used to publicise the 6 weeks Regulation 14 consultation which provided a range of options for people to be informed about how to respond,

- A leaflet was hand delivered to every household, the leaflet provided
- The website address and links to the village website for responses via email.
- A postal address for responses
- A telephone number for queries or information
- Where a hard copy of the Draft Plan could be accessed
- An offer to provide and deliver a loan copy of the plan.
- Articles in the Village newsletter
- Slyne with Hest neighbourhood Plan Face Book Page
- Lancaster County Council Consultation web page
- Individual emails were sent to both statutory and relevant non-statutory bodies.
- Posters around the village including bus stops

<https://www.slyne-with-hest.org.uk/plan/planleaflet.htm>

REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION

<http://www.slyne-with-hest.org.uk/np/docs/reg14.pdf>

The Regulation 14 Consultation took place from Monday 2nd September to Monday 14th October 2019

- **Residents Responses**

Prior to the commencement of the process every household in the Parish was hand delivered a booklet explaining what the consultation was about and how to take part. <http://www.slyne-with-hest.org.uk/np/docs/leaflet1.pdf> In addition information was placed on the village web site, displayed at the community coffee mornings and on the Lancaster City Council web site

A total of 40 responses were received during the consultation period, most responses consisted of several points.

32 of these responses were from postcodes in the immediate area surrounding the proposed Sea View Development. i.e. Sea View Drive, Sea View Close and Raikes Hill Drive. A petition from some residents of the above addresses was also presented containing 59 signatures representing 46 households.

Summary of Feedback

The majority of the feedback to the Consultation of The Neighbourhood Plan related to the proposed development on land adjacent to Sea View Drive. A number of concerns were raised which were loosely collated into seven main themes.

- 1) Biodiversity and protecting endangered species
- 2) The integrity of the canal
- 3) Road infrastructure within the Sea View Drive estate and road safety.
- 4) Disruption caused by construction traffic, including road safety concerns.
- 5) Drainage, concerns re Pumping Station on Sunningdale Drive and conditions of drains within the estate.
- 6) Loss of Green Belt
- 7) Alternative sites.

Using the above themes, and to avoid duplication, the responses/actions have been given links to relevant responses; these changes should not be viewed in isolation but as part of the revised Plan.

Summary Response to themes

Ref	Response	Change to Neighbourhood Plan
1.		
Protecting Biodiversity and endangered species	<p>As part of any planning application, a developer would be required to undertake ecological assessments. This often initially takes the form of an Extended Phase One Habitat survey, which then if necessary, can lead to the need for further species specific surveys.</p> <p>If any endangered/protective species are identified during this survey then a developer must have specific surveys done and follow recommend guidelines, for example</p> <p>https://www.gov.uk/guidance/great-crested-newts-surveys-and-mitigation-for-development-projects.</p> <p>Further protection is offered in the Lancaster District Local Plan Policies, SP3, 7, 9 and Sg1, 7, 8 and 9 and the accompanying Development Management Plan DM27, DM43, DM44 DM 45 T2 and T3.</p>	<p>Policy 2 (b) now see BE1, NE3, HE2</p> <p>Policy NE3 (formerly Policy 8) amended to include; In addition to protecting the rich ecological environment at the coast, new development must also meet criteria set out by the UK Marine Policy Statement.</p>
2		
Concerns that the roads within the estate will not support additional traffic and could be dangerous	<p>Initial response from Lancashire County Council Highways Department. 14/11/19</p> <p><i>"I have reviewed the site off Sea View Close and it is considered acceptable in principle for residential housing allocation of up to 30 dwellings on the land bounded by the canal and Rakes Head Lane from a highways perspective."</i></p> <p>This is an in principle statement only and is all that is available at this stage.</p>	<p>Not within the remit of Neighbourhood Planning. Lancashire County Council Highways Department are responsible body. No change to Plan</p>
3		
Construction traffic Concerns re the disruption construction will have on local residents during any build process	<p>Response from Lancashire County Council Highways Dept 19/11/ 2019 If an application was submitted for this site we would request that a construction traffic management plan was submitted, prior to the commencement of any works, to ensure that the developer addresses the main issues which usually include the following:-</p> <p>i) The loading and unloading of plant and materials</p>	<p>Policy HE2, formerly Policy 2b amended to include a requirement that prior to the commencement of any works, developers should supply a Traffic Management Plan in line with that currently recommended by Lancashire County Council and organise a meeting with interested local residents to explain general arrangements for the construction period and measures to be taken to mitigate safety concerns and inconveniences to residents of the Sea View</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii) The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors iii) The loading and unloading of plant and materials iv) The storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development v) The erection and maintenance of security hoarding vi) Wheel washing facilities vii) Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction viii) A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction ix) Details of working hours x) Routing of delivery vehicles to/from site 	Drive estate. (Criterion 13)
4		
<p>Canal Infrastructure Concerns re the impact any development would have on the canal and its users</p>	<p>The Draft Lancaster and District Local Plan has a policy which states how the canal and its infra structure will be protected.</p> <p>Policy T3 Lancaster Canal Development proposals which are adjacent to, or adjoining, the Lancaster Canal will be expected to address the following issues:</p> <p><i>I. Be of a high quality of design that enhances the character of the waterway and integrates the canal into the development in a way that generates sustainable waterway neighbourhoods, where waterway and waterside communities are combined and the waterway is treated as an area of usable space and where appropriate, a focus for public activity;</i></p> <p><i>II. Integrate the waterway, towpath and canal environment into the public realm in terms of design and management of the development;</i></p> <p><i>III. Improve access to, along and from the waterway for all users (where appropriate) and enhance / improve the environmental quality and green infrastructure of the waterway corridor in that area, providing a net gain in biodiversity;</i></p> <p><i>IV. Optimise views to and from the waterway and generate natural surveillance of water space through the siting, configuration and orientation of buildings, recognising that appropriate boundary treatment and access issues may differ between the towpath and the offside of the canal;</i></p> <p><i>V. Improve the amenity and character of the canal in that area. Development that would have an adverse impact on the amenity of the canal by virtue of noise, odour or visual aspect will not be supported by the Council;</i></p> <p><i>VI. Conserve and enhance, wherever possible, the distinctive industrial heritage of the canal and its associated assets; and VII. Seeking to maximise opportunities for</i></p>	<p>Policy HE2, formerly Policy 2b amended to state some houses should present their front aspect towards the canal to improve the visual appearance of the development from the canal and the canal towpath. (Criterion 4)</p> <p>Amended so that design will minimise potential impacts on the amenity of the existing canal moorings. (Criterion 7)</p> <p>Policy amended to include comments from the SEA, HRA and Canal and River Trust. (Criteria 5 and 7)</p>

	<p><i>reducing carbon emissions and building resilience, in particular investigating the potential for using the canal in relation to heating and cooling within new development.</i></p> <p><i>Development adjacent to waterways will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that it would not adversely impact on the structural integrity of the waterway or its related infrastructure and assets.</i></p>	
5.		
Pumping Station and flooding	<p>United Utilities are a statutory consultee. They were made aware of concerns about the capacity of the pumping station but no specific comment was made about this in their response to the Plan. United Utilities see response below:</p> <p>We can see that the Lancaster Canal is situated to the western boundary of the site, and it is important that the discharge of surface water to this watercourse is explored during the investigation of the surface water hierarchy. On this basis, we recommend the addition of a further point after point 5 of Policy 2(a) stating the following:</p> <p><i>6. Discharge of surface water to the Lancaster Canal must be explored as early as possible in the site design process, during investigation of the surface water hierarchy. Early consultation with the Canal and River Trust is recommended.</i></p> <p>Policy 5. Flooding</p> <p>With regards to the text in 'Policy 5. Flooding', United Utilities recommends additional wording to bullet point 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“New development should be designed to maximise the retention of surface water on the development site and to minimise runoff.</i> • The approach to surface water drainage should be considered in liaison with the LLFA, the public sewerage undertaker and where appropriate the Environment Agency.” <p>They recommend the following text is also included in section '3.13 Rationale for Policy 5':</p> <p><i>“Surface water should be discharged in the</i></p>	<p>Policy 2(b) amended to include recommendations of United Utilities HE2 (b)</p> <p>See Policy HE2, formerly Policy 2b (Criterion 5)</p> <p>Policy 4 - Design stipulates use of Sustainable Drainage Systems, using where possible, visually attractive water retention landscaping and permeable hard surfacing around new housing. See Policy HE2, formerly Policy 2b, (Criterion 5) and Policy BE1, formerly Policy 4, (Criterion 7) and NE1</p> <p>Policy 5 amended see NE1</p>

	<p><i>following order of priority:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An adequate soakaway or some other form of infiltration system. • An attenuated discharge to watercourse or other water body. • An attenuated discharge to public surface water sewer. • An attenuated discharge to public combined sewer. <p>No surface water will be expected to discharge to the public sewerage system. Applicants wishing to discharge to public sewer will need to submit clear evidence demonstrating why alternative options are not available as part of the determination of their application.”</p> <p>United Utilities also recommend the following text is removed from bullet point 3 of ‘Policy 5. Flooding’:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) should be implemented in accordance with the SuDS hierarchy unless deemed inappropriate 	<p>amended</p>
<p>6</p>		
<p>Green Belt</p>	<p>In order to accommodate the demands of the Local Plan for appropriate housing provision there is a need for housing development appropriate to the needs of the Village. Objectives 1 and 2 of this Neighbourhood Plan make it necessary to attach any development to the footprint of the Village to prevent sprawl and to keep the settlement as a discrete entity. There is no immediately available land inside the Village footprint and the need to prevent merger with Bolton-le-Sands to the North and ribbon development and sprawl to the South rule out other possible development plots. This is fully argued in Appendix 5. Plot 1 was identified for its scale, location, availability and achievability. The scale of the plot is important. A smaller development on a larger parcel of land demonstrates a precedent for and a willingness to develop that parcel further. It dramatically weakens the argument for defending that parcel in the future. This argument, in more detail, is now incorporated into the Rationale for Policy 2(a) and in Appendix 5, particularly in the section: Green Belt Status and the Green Belt Review 2016.</p> <p>The potential for realignment of the Green Belt boundary around Plot 1 was discussed at</p>	<p>See Rationale for Policy HE2, formerly Policy 2(a) and in Appendix 5, particularly in the section: Green Belt Status and the Green Belt Review 2016.</p>

	the Hearing Sessions with the Inspector of Lancaster City Council's Local Plan and the Inspector concluded that such boundary changes could be dealt with at a local level via a neighbourhood plan in the context of paragraph 136 of the 2019 NPPF.	
7		
Alternative site. Suggestion that Plot 5 (LPSA592) Would be a more suitable site for development.	<p>(LPSA592) Plot five This site has been reviewed in light of comments received, the assessment remains the same. This site has not been selected for the following key reasons</p> <p>The site is currently not on the open market as being available for development. This site cannot be taken out of green belt without the adjacent fields .(LCC Nov 2019) resulting in significant loss of green belt and all the area becoming available for a development of significant size The City Council does not support ribbon development which would be created by developing this site.. Developing this site would be in conflict with Objective 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan</p>	Not accepted - No change to Plan

Residents Response

N.B *Comments noted* -We are not in a position to offer a response to every comment, all comments have been considered and if appropriate the plan amended.

Consultation Responses

		Draft Plan	Residents Responses to Regulation 14 Draft Plan	
		Policy 1	Local Housing Need	
Ref	Post Code	Plan Reference if given	Submitted Comment	Response
8e	LA2 6HJ	3.5.1	I think this policy is important and welcomed in the current climate of building indiscriminately and in large numbers	Comment noted
8e	LA2 6HJ	3.5.3 & 3.5.4	It is agreed that a small number of new houses are needed in the Parish, however, it should be noted that this community will contribute to the District housing target with the strategic development at Beaumont and Hammerton Hall. The green fields between Slyne and Lancaster and Bolton le Sands and between Hest Bank and Morecambe must be retained to prevent irreversible ribbon development.	Comment noted
9e	LA2 6DA	Policy 1	For a village to remain sustainable it has to accept that it needs new homes, the only thing missing from this policy is although it recognises the need for affordable homes it has not, because of price of land and high property values, been able to deliver lower price or social housing.	Comment noted
24e	LA2 6BY		The Plan is very specific in the need for affordable housing. It states that bungalows are planned which is a very expensive use of land and therefore not be affordable More elderly people are releasing money from their homes and moving to other areas and SVD has seen the estate change from retirement homes to 4/5 family homes	Comment noted
		Policy 2a	Site for New Development	
Ref	Post Code	Plan Reference if given	Submitted Comment	Response
11l	Not given	Policy 2a 2.1.3	Highlighted in the NP (Policy 2A) the proposed plot is cited by Lancaster's Historic Canal, the situation of this plot is away from amenities such as the small village shop and the Memorial Hall. The envisaged people with mobility issues will not drive and are likely to find it challenging to access amenities. The NP (2.1.3) states that the local heritage and conservation areas will be preserved. Hest Bank lacks a focal point and is essentially just a suburb, the development on the land will only add to the suburb feel. If Hest Bank is to keep its identity, other areas of land could be considered such as along the A6 or Bay Gateway.	Comments noted Summary response 7 Alternative Sites
20e	LA2 6BY	Policy 2a Plot 1. 3.8.8	Holds various statements which are untrue. The area specified is continually waterlogged throughout the year. The height of the new-builds will be further increased for the	Comments noted

		Sect 3.8.11	need to ground fill the existing land to alleviate flooding. The plan identifies the need to maximise views for the new residents. No mention of existing residents whose view of the sea and bay area will be blocked. This is confirmed by other builds along the canal corridor which has decimated sea views for existing residents. Interesting to note that this build will be detrimental to "one of the finest stretches of canal".	Summary ref 1 and 2 Traffic concerns
		Sect 3.8.1	Note has been made in the plan to provide access for children going to the local school via Old Bobs Lane. This statement is False.	Comment noted
		Sect 3.8.9	The new build will increase road traffic in this area and raise the potential for road accidents at the junction of Sea View Drive and Hest Bank Lane. The increase in traffic through the village since the opening of the Bay Gateway and the increase in 'near-miss' traffic accidents is clear evidence of unsuitability This is in general but also specifically at school times. One child's life is more valuable than anything mentioned in this plan. The new build will not harmonise with existing estate. It will be a carbuncle on the landscape. This is PR speak and serves no thought to the actual issues. Sect 3.8.7 "which encourages enhancement of natural and environmental features and not just attempts at protection". This statement is PR speak. This build will damage the natural environment and its surrounds. This statement is a lie and serves to talk-up a dire situation. Local wildlife will be negatively affected. Canal Reed beds and the bird and animal population will be affected. (Site numbers from Lancaster City Council SHLAA 2018) 1. Land West of Sea View Drive (LPSA167) Initial Review Statements here are untrue. Access to this site is via Sea View Drive and Sea View Close. This is a narrow residential area with a narrow vehicle access. An increase in residential traffic would cause safety issues for local residents and children alike. Construction traffic will have difficulty accessing the build site and will cause severe disruption for local residents. The local infrastructure is not sufficiently robust to cope with this heavy usage	Summary ref 1 Biodiversity Summary ref 2 and 3 Traffic concerns
11l	Not given	3.5.8	Highlighted in the NP (see 3.5.8), the anecdotal evidence that people wishing to downsize is not convincing enough to spoil a beautiful area. The type of property, which is proposed, does not interest young families or those on a limited income.	Comments noted
8e	LA2 6HJ	2a	(a) This small parcel of land should be sensitively and appropriately developed to fulfil the identified housing needs of the Parish, i.e. bungalows for local people who wish to downsize but remain living in the village.	Comments noted
4e	LA2 6BY	Page 33	Slyne-with-Hest Neighbourhood Plan Comments on plan Page 33 Policy 2a Presumably land west of Sea View Drive was in the designated Green Belt area for a specific reason and to remove it from Green Belt protection to satisfy and implement 2b ignores the past priorities. (Therefore, what value are assurances being suggested under 2b i.e. single storey, roof lines not to be raised, parking spaces, tree heights etc.)	Comments noted
4e	LA2 6BY	Page 34	Rationale for Policy 2a Protecting the redesigned Green Belt boundary bearing in mind comments above (page 33 Policy 2a) is meaningless as it appears it can be redrawn whenever necessary – otherwise land west of Sea View	Comments noted

			Drive would still be protected.	
9e	LA2 6DA	Policy 2	To achieve the objective of keeping the village independent from other settlements and not grow into a large village Sea View Drive is the only logical place for any new development even if it gives up a small amount of green belt, Slyne with Hest is very lucky to have as much as it has.	Comments noted
11e	LA2 6EF		<p>I strongly object to the above proposal to offer this land for housing development. This area is not just part of the land in Hest Bank which is protected by Green Belt status but is undoubtedly part of the most attractive green belt area in the Parish. It is adjacent to the canal at a point where canal boats moor and is one of the few areas where fields on either side give a sunlit and open feel. In addition it is part of an area where swans and kingfishers and other wildlife can be found. At present the area is both attractive and tranquil. This habitat should not be compromised by an encroachment of houses in the adjacent field.</p> <p><i>See response from Canal and River Trust Summary ref 1 and 4 Biodiversity, Canal Infrastructure Policy T3: Lancaster Canal and T2 Cycling and walking Network of the Lancaster Local Plan provide added protection Summary response 6 Green Belt</i></p>	See response under comment
11e	LA2 6EF		<p>The Slyne with Hest Parish Councils responsibility in this case is not just to the local population but also to the wider community. The area near this field is a favourite spot for mooring canal barges because of its attractive nature. For the same reason it is popular with walkers and cyclists. We should be nurturing and protecting the area and fighting to preserve what we have got and not just give it away. I feel that we should not be willingly giving away any Green Belt land in Hest Bank. If we must give away green belt land there are areas in Hest Bank than the area proposed</p> <p><i>Summary ref 4 Policy T3: Lancaster Canal and T2 Cycling and walking Network of the Lancaster Local Plan provide added protection Summary response 6 Green belt</i></p>	See response below comment
11e	LA2 6EF		It is ironic that in the Consultation for the present Green Belt Local Plan, which took place some time ago, concern was expressed about the same area on the Western side of Sea View drive that the view of the field from the canal and Torrisholme Barrow could be impaired by the Sea View drive bungalows. Now the council wants to build more bungalows on the field! In short I feel that the Slyne With Hest Parish Council has got it wrong on this issue and should reconsider.	Comment noted
	LA2 6BX		<p>Many fear that disruption may be caused by construction traffic during the building stage.</p> <p>We feel that this could be managed at the planning stage to</p>	Summary ref 2 and 3 Traffic

			<p>impose restrictions to offsite traffic movements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicles over a certain weight escorted to and from the site to its junction with Hest Bank Lane. • A wash created for vehicles exiting the site and backed up by a road cleaning system. • All construction vehicles to be parked within the site. • A small body of residents to meet on a regular basis with the site manager to discuss matters arising from any disruption from the site during build stage. 	concerns
15I	LA2 6BY		<p>My biggest fear if the housing development is carried out on Sea View Drive (rather Than off the A6 opposite the Cross Key) is it is an accident waiting to happen. For the duration of the build there will be a constant flow of heavy goods vehicles down Hest Bank Lane passing the Primary School every day. At drop off and pick up times it is incredibly busy with parents and children trying to carefully negotiate getting back to their cars.</p>	<p>Summary ref 7 Alternative Sites</p> <p>Summary ref 2 and 3 Traffic concerns</p>
18e	LA2 6BX		<p>We support the plan and commend the hard work undertaken on behalf of the Parish Council by the forum members, who volunteered to undertake such a mammoth task in producing a neighbourhood plan in keeping with our green and pleasant sustained settlement, taking into account the many <u>wants</u> and <u>needs</u> for future development of our settlement.</p>	Comments noted
18e	LA2 6BX		<p>In order to protect our settlement from over development (that some of us don't want) and in line with many villages throughout England, a neighbourhood plan seems to be the way forward in thwarting changes that many of us don't want or find them totally out of keeping with our village lifestyle.</p> <p>It seems the forum has been tasked with providing up to forty new homes in line with distribution throughout the Lancaster area for providing some ten thousand new homes.</p> <p>Looking through the plan pockets of land have been identified as potential small scale development sites, which includes Sea View Drive area, this greenbelt strip of land has become the focal point for discussion albeit the development may be in line with the surrounding area, Bungalows only.</p> <p>Let's hope that if accepted this site will offer a more modern/open aspect footprint approach, rather than the grid system used in the building of Sea View Drive which has resulted in extensions to be built upwards and outwards.</p>	Comments noted
13e	LA2 6BZ		<p>We have a large wild life occupancy in the area which will be destroyed by the development in Hest Bank. Such as the Swans and their young, frogs, toads, water vole and Newts. Plus all the wild birds i.e. Kingfishers, Herons and the rare Peewit. Also we do not consider the site proposed for fills the quota of 40 houses as discussed in the last meeting. But the site near the Slyne Lodge will accommodate the full quota. The access proposed through the existing estate is poor and will struggle to accommodate large vehicles.</p>	<p>Summary ref 1 Biodiversity</p> <p>Summary ref 7 Alternative Sites</p> <p>Summary ref 2 and 3 Traffic concerns</p>

13e	LA2 6BZ		The field regularly floods at the Sea View Close end. In fact the field was flooded Sunday 29th September from the sewerage pumping station at the bottom of Sunningdale Crescent	Summary ref 5 Pumping Station
13e	LA2 6BZ		We do not consider there has been adequate advertising or information about the proposed development and it's only now that it has been finalised to the one site that we are hearing anything. <i>Sea View Drive was presented as a possible development site as early as the October 2016 information day. See Stage Two Consultation Document http://www.slyne-with-hest.org.uk/wp/docs/app4b.pdf and has featured at numerous events and publications</i>	.See comment reponse below comment
14e	LA2 6EF		Esther McVey MP, Minister for Housing and Planning stated recently that green-belt land could be re-classified if it was being used as a car park – This is not the case with regard to the land to the seaward side of Seaview Drive, Hest Bank. Robert Jenrick MP, Housing Secretary also stated recently that we do not need to build on green-belt land – the focus being on brown-field sites. It was with dismay and despair, therefore, that on reading the Proposed Full Plan for Slyne-with-Hest I realised that we had voted in Councillors who were prepared to destroy Hest Bank's green-belt and, in so doing, destroy land bordering on the canal, in an unforgivable act of countryside vandalism in an area of natural beauty on Morecambe Bay. The above-mentioned land, which borders the canal at Hest Bank is a haven for wildlife, whose habitat will be destroyed forever. This land is home to nesting swans and kingfisher; herons feed and ducks breed, not to mention the small mammals and amphibians who have their homes on this land. The butterflies have been more numerous this year, especially the 'painted lady' and dragonflies abound. It is an area where the sparrow hawk swoops for its prey and bats fly at dusk. It is part of a larger area of green-belt and wildlife corridors will be lost forever. To disrupt such a wildlife haven seems, to me, to show such a lack of thought and I strongly oppose the proposal to build on this irreplaceable green land.	Comments noted Summary ref 1 Biodiversity
17e	LA2 6AZ		Cannot believe the reasoning behind the proposed site as access is already congested with residential vehicles which is also made worst at peak times of the day especially school drop off & pick up. What is wrong with the more suitable site from the A6 between Slyne & Bolton le Sands which is mentioned as the preferred site in the plan	Comments noted Summary ref 7 Alternative Sites
25e	LA2 6BY		I do not agree with the proposed plan to build on the land on Sea View Drive. To build there will cause a major impact on the wild life and their habitat; this will have an effect on all the different kinds of birds that inhabit the canal. Also this will have an effect on tourism with all the narrow boats that stay on the canal for holidays throughout the year	Summary ref 1 Biodiversity
11	LA2 6BY		The general public understanding is the proposed development is in the Green Belt. Plot 1, LSPA 167 of Lancaster City Councils SHELLA 2018 but it will remove this development plot from the green belt to enable the proposed housing development. Is not the UK Government Green Belt Strategy intended to protect our countryside	Comments noted Summary response 6

			from the embraces of building planners? Yet Lancaster City Council casually remove this Green Belt Schedule simply to accommodate building planners	Green Belt
1l	LA2 6BY		This plot encompasses a section of the eastern bank of the Tewitt Field- Lancaster- Preston Canal. A stretch of outstanding natural beauty, a stretch home to several wildlife species through the breeding season, e.g. duck, water hen, coot and occasional swan. Popularly adopted by canal boat sailors as a quite haven for relaxing breaks	Summary ref 1 Biodiversity
1l	LA2 6BY		Importantly the great crested newt, an endangered species has been positively identified by an ecologist as originating from the swamp-canal area in the south-west corner of plot 11, this habitat of the great crested newt, through migration, is also identified in some Sea View Drive garden properties in the south west of the estate.	Summary ref 1 Biodiversity
4l	LA2 6BY		Although I am not in favour of vehicle access from the Sea View development to Sunningdale Crescent I would be in favour of cycle/footpath access, especially if it gave access to the canal via Bob's Lane	Comments noted
4l	LA2 6BY		I would not want any access onto Sunningdale Crescent which is a very narrow road	Comments noted
4l	LA2 6BY		I am concerned about how the land would be drained. Can the pumping station at the bottom of Sunningdale Crescent cope with the extra water? There are often flooding problems now without the extra houses	Summary ref 5 Plumping Station
5l	LA2 6DE		No objection in principal to field west of Sea View Drive as long as Sunningdale Crescent/Avenue is not used as access for traffic and sewage plant at the bottom of the road (pumping Station) is improved to cope with the 40 or so bungalows	Comments noted
25e	LA2 6BY		. I have a concern on the access onto Sea View Drive. The road itself is starting to subside and the drains will not cope with the weight of all the heavy vehicles that will be needed to transport all the building equipment for the construction. There is also a very steep camber at the junction of Raikes Hill. The entrance to Sea View close is also narrow. In my opinion there are two others sites that are more practical to build on. The first site is on Hest Bank lane on the right hand side just before the junction. The second plot is on Slyne road opposite the Cross Keys. This plot of land would be more suitable, because it would be made easier for the actual building work. By doing that it would cause less disruption in the village. Once built this would give better access for the residents that live there.	Summary ref 2 and 3 Traffic concerns Summary ref 7 Alternative Sites
27e	LA2 6DE		As a viewer of the field, we regularly see many wildlife using the field, this includes a kingfisher that nests in the trees between our house and the field, swans that nest in the bushes between the canal and field, the ground is damp, and we have seen newts within the field, along with many different bird species. It is an unspoilt beautiful area of green belt that should be left as it is for future generations to enjoy. As a mum that takes my daughter to the primary school, I have concerns about the increase in traffic volume that would use sea view drive, each school day cars park on both sides of sea view drive to safely drop children off at school, making it very narrow, and an increase in traffic/ increasingly in people taking children to school would only enhance this	Summary ref 1 Biodiversity Summary ref 2 and 3 Traffic concerns

		Policy 2b	Criteria for Development	
Ref	Post Code	Plan Reference if given	Submitted Comment	Response
10l	LA2 6AT		<p>I believe it is utter madness to consider development of the agricultural land on Hest Bank Lane and the A6 (plots 3 and 4) since it will exacerbate flooding to Slyne with Hest. The existing drainage in Slyne with Hest cannot cope with extensive rainfall and the direction of surface water drainage south west of the plots.</p> <p>Significant flooding has occurred in December 2015 and again in 2017. For 6 months Hest Bank Lane and the A6 were disrupted while an increased capacity drain was installed. It has had little effect and drainage is still inadequate.</p> <p>I cannot overemphasize the risk of flooding. As an example property on Rosegarth changed from this, where no flooding had occurred in the previous 20 years. <i>(photos of flooding supplied)</i></p>	Further correspondence was received from this resident which related specifically to a recent development in this area and the mistaken assumption that plots 2 and 3 were specifically identified for development in the plan, comments on file
7l	LA2 6BZ	3.6	3.6 of the neighbourhood plan mentioned an urban sprawl if housing was built elsewhere and Hest Bank would lose its distinct "village footprint" There is already urban "sprawl" along coastal Road and the housing development adjacent to the canal isn't attractive. Do we really want housing development like that at Hest Bank? The N.P. mentions gaps between the houses so that there will be some views maintained but this seems inadequate and woeful.	Comments noted
21e	LA2 6BD	ref.3.8 Page 35:	The outline for Plot 1(Policy 2(b) ref.3.8 Page 35: is reassuring, with its promise to preserve views with one storey dwellings and ensuring a wildlife corridor. One parking place per household is sensible and should make the development safe for pedestrians if use of these spaces is enforced.	Comments noted See comments below on parking amendments
4e	LA2 6BY	Page 33/4	<p>Page 33/34 Policy 2b Criteria 2 page 33 Even the building of single storey dwellings could block out views for existing Sea View Drive residents of the canal, the railway, Morecambe golf course and beyond (depends on the elevation of existing and new properties). As would tree planting as pruning seems not to be a council priority anymore</p> <p>Criteria 3 page 33 Roof lines at whatever height will indeed spoil and hinder the views of existing properties on Sea View Drive</p>	Comments noted Policy HE2, formerly Policy 2(b), Criterion 2 relates the scale and massing of new

				houses to those existing on Sea View Drive. Criterion 4 varies the aspect of buildings preventing a 'solid wall' effect.
6l	LA2 6BZ	Page 33	30-35 dwellings on proposed site wouldn't solve the plan for the total number of dwellings	Comment Noted There is no specific number in the amended draft of the Plan.
12l	LA2 6BZ	Page 33 (b)	Page 33. Policy 2 (b) The proposed development will not meet the total number of dwellings which are required (40) yet the site offers development for 30 dwellings at most. Where are the others going to be built and why are they not included in the whole plan?	See Rationale for Policy HE2, formerly Policy 2b , which discusses the numbers.
6l	LA2 6BZ	Page 34 Criteria 10	One space per dwelling Average car ownership in area seems two cars per dwelling so there could be access problems especially when considered with only one route in and out of the development	This comment is agreed This has been changed to two cars per dwelling.
6l	LA2 6BZ	Page 35 3.8.6	States that the dwelling would appeal to people with mobility problems/aging etc. Limited access one route in and out of the development on Sea View Close Large number of parked cars on Sea View Drive and Close can make driving difficult for all (especially older residents) Concerns over Emergency Service vehicles being able to access the development given conditions Cycleway and footpath proposal taking in Old Bobs lane. Extra work would be required to cope with increased footfall and no doubt would detract from the authenticity of the bridleway that has remained unchanged	Comments noted Summary ref 2 and 3 Traffic concerns
4e	LA2 6BY	Page 34	Criteria 8/9 page 34 Easy access and mobility issues indicates a likelihood of more road vehicles possibly larger in size to accommodate wheelchairs and mobility vehicles.	Comments noted
4e	LA2 6BY	Para 3.86	Criteria 8 and 9 – see comments under page 34 Criteria 8/9 above.*	Comments noted
10l	LA2 6BY	Page 33/34 10	Why only one parking space per property? Also these proposed bungalows would appear to be very small - people might want to downsize but they don't want a rabbit	Comments noted.

		B1 3.5.8 3.8.11	hutch. Population is shrinking in Hest Bank according to these figures. Although house building has increased. People with mobility problems - not sure that this site is suitable for people with mobility problems. It is not near local amenities (Londis, Chemist, Memorial Hall, Churches, etc.) and if they have mobility scooters the pavements are often unsuitable, the road narrow and with parked cars. As this is such a small site, presumably a second one will have to be added causing a second chunk of green belt being destroyed. This I wholeheartedly agree with as Raikes Head Lane has deteriorated so badly over the last ten years that it is almost un-walkable for most of the year - being a stoney mud track.	Comments noted
4e	LA2 6BY	Page 34	Criteria 10 page 34 One parking space is unrealistic in this day and age and particularly given the comments in Criteria's 8 and 9.	This comment is agreed This has been changed to two cars per dwelling
4e	LA2 6BY	Page 34	Criteria 14 page 34 Believe there would be potential safety issues on Sunningdale Crescent for pedestrians and cyclists due to significant number of parked vehicles, blind corners, cul de sac nature, reversing manoeuvres, and pavement and road widths. Accidents waiting to happen*	Summary ref 5 and 3 Traffic concerns
4e	LA2 6BY	Page 35 Criterion 3.8.1 Criteria 1	Rationale for each- So the residents of the new development should enjoy the outward views that characterise much of the existing village at the expense of those existing residents of Sea View Drive who have enjoyed those outward views for years.*	Comments noted
4e	LA2 6BY	Page 36 continued 3.8.11 Criteria 14	Rationale for each Criterion- How can walking up Sunningdale Crescent or Sea View Drive with the blind corners, narrow roads and paths, volumes of residential and commercial traffic, tight junctions onto Hest Bank Lane, Hest Bank Lane to cross etc. provide a traffic free route to the Primary School.	Comments noted Summary ref 2 and 3 Traffic concerns
6l	LA2 6BZ	Page 36 3.8.9	Wildlife corridors and softer more visually pleasing edge to canal. What will they look like? Areas of cut grass/hedge/meadows? Are these as affective as it would be leaving an area untouched? Will a softer edge canal really make up for loss of rural land	Summary ref 1 Biodiversity
6l	LA2 6BZ	Page 36 3.8.10	The canal as a tourism route and maintaining attractiveness of route How will building houses on the adjacent field maintain attractiveness? It is often one of the busiest stretches for boats- probably because it's one of the most attractive stretches. It feels rural and you're not over looked. Look at how it compares to canal stretches at Bolton le Sands	Summary ref 4 Policy T3: Lancaster Canal and T2 Cycling and walking Network of the Lancaster Local Plan

				provide added protection
6l	LA2 6BZ	Page 36 3.8.11 Criteria 14	Criteria 14 talks about a traffic free route to school How many children walk to school? Area around Sea View Drive and Raikes Hill gets very congested anyway without extra homes. Makes driving and general access very difficult	Comments noted
1l	LA2 6BY		Turning from Hest Bank Lane into Sea View Drive can be dangerous particularly as children are delivered to and collected from School Also cars are regularly parked within the entrance to Sea View Drive. This problem was notified to Lancashire County Council in April 2012, LCC are aware but declined action. Further the 20mph speed restriction is generally ignored. There are three acute turnings on Sea View Drive-90+degree. The Sea View Drive Estate was developed in the 1960's, an era when the car did not play such an important role in society. The road structure from the junction with Hest Bank Lane and round the estate was relatively narrow, each property had its own drive and purpose built garage. Property owners fortunate to possess a motor vehicle kept them garaged or on their individual private driveways when not in use, To drive around Slyne with Hest and contemplate scores if not hundreds heavy Construction vehicles provokes very serious concern	Summary ref 2 and 3 Traffic concerns
1l	LA2 6BY		There are today many households enjoy multiple vehicle ownership-cars/vans parked outside properties, part on road part on pavement. Part pavement parking courteously to minimise width restriction for passing vehicles, cars also trade vehicles. However new legislation under consideration by the Commons Transport Committee seeks to an outright ban on pavement parking on pavement across England, The consequence of such a ban will significantly affect the traffic logistics of the operation within SEA View Drive Estate. (Example) Kerb to Kerb road width max 15 feet Width, medium size, on road legally parked car – 6 feet 6inches Passing width, not overlapping pavement, to pass legally parked medium sized car required by; Typical Van- 7 feet 6 inches OK but tight Delivery Van – 8 feet 6in unsafe Building supplies truck – 10-11 feet Not possible Building contractors vans 8-9 feet Not possible	Summary ref 2 and 3 Traffic concerns
1l	LA2 6BY		To drive around Sea View Drive and contemplate scores if not hundreds of heavy construction vehicles provokes serious concern. Planners must seek guidance from Lancashire County Council, traffic management also Police Constabulary reference road safety and responsibility for direction of heavy construction traffic through Sea View Drive estate prior to considering planning approval	Summary ref 2 and 3 Traffic concerns
4e	LA2 6BY		It is believed that the sewerage pumping station is currently struggling to provide appropriate service at its maximum capacity. To further load another 30-35 dwellings onto this facility will undoubtedly cause unnecessary additional	Summary ref 5 Plumpping Station

			pressure and angst to the existing residents. Sewerage Pumping Station (Sunningdale Crescent 25014)	
12e	LA2 6BZ	Criteria 4	The fourth criteria is vehicular access to the site. Plot 1 cannot be demonstrated to have this access suitable for construction and residential traffic.	Summary ref 2 and 3 Traffic concerns
12e	LA2 6BZ	Criteria 7	The seventh criteria is the loss to the community of landscape and views. These are important for the wellbeing of the residents of Sea View Drive /Close.	Comments noted
12e	LA2 6BZ	Criteria 8	The eighth criteria is Green Belt status. Removal of this status should not be removed without considerable thought about what is being lost	Comments noted
12e	LA2 6BZ	Page 3	On page 3 it states that Plot 1 is one of the smallest and its removal would only make a small difference to the gap between the two settlements. Surely a stronger argument should be needed to remove this status than the size of the gap between settlements.	Comments noted
12e	LA2 6BZ	Page 7	On Page 7 it is noted that plans are progressing to build on this site and representatives of the Parish Council have met with the potential builder. Surely this is presumptive when it is not definite that Green Belt Status will be removed from this site	Neighbourhood Planning Guidance recommen s early engagemen t with developers.
12e	LA2 6BZ	Page 24/25	<u>Assessment of Parcel LPSA 167</u> Page 24/25 of this assessment says there are no known services and the service is deliverable. The system cannot properties that it now serves and is already overloaded. Two have experienced raw sewage backing up and have had non the 29th September 2019 flooding happened with United States. Hardly anecdotal evidence as suggested at the October Information Day. Photographs provide See Fig 1. In photo file Rainwater drainage is also problematic, i.e. our garage regularly floods during heavy rain. See Fig 2. & 3. <u>Conclusions to Assessment of LPSA 167</u> 1. Again it is stated that the road access point is adequate to the site without any evidence supplied to support this assumption. No mention is made of how the builders and associated wagons are going to negotiate the congested Sea View Drive/Close to try and access the site. Has anyone done a site visit to appreciate these difficulties or has it all been done off maps where the usummary eye would not recognise these problems? 2. The conclusion that the increase in traffic flow would not cause major inconvenience on Sea View Drive makes no mention of the inconvenience to Sea View Close. To suggest that it would not be a major inconvenience is arrogant and shows a total disregard for residents in this area.	constraints for sewage Sewerage Pumping Station properties in the Close Pumping Station attending again.
		Page 27	The final conclusion, on page 27, is that the development of bungalows is supported and recommended for inclusion in the plan. It appears that this site was your easiest option to recommend with the own Planning Guidance recommendations days about sewage/waste water, increased traffic volume and very poor access to the site have had no bearing on your decision. One wonders if your agency's engagement with this site was already cut and dried from the very beginning and what has followed is just a paper exercise.	Neighbourhood Planning Guidance recommen s early engagemen t with developers.

12e	LA2 6BZ		Deliverability of access for residents and building is through Sea View Close. This is a cul de sac with 6 properties. The approach would be problematic for a number of reasons. The width of the Close is only 4.85metres and already heavily congested. Sea View Drive is 5.50metres wide and also heavily congested. There is no mention of any involvement of qualified persons i.e. civil engineers as to the feasibility of attempting to use this access point, which if it is not possible renders Plot 1 not suitable for development.	Summary ref 2 and 3 Traffic concerns
12e	LA2 6BZ		The City Council's landscape consultant suggests this development is not appropriate due to the site's contribution to the wider landscape and yet the Plan contradicts this by saying the site is quite weak in its contribution to the characterful landscape. Do you not consider opinions from experts that do not fit your agenda?	Comment noted
13l	LA2 6BY	3.3.1	As a Sea View Drive resident I strongly object to the proposal to build on the field between Sea View Drive and the canal. This goes against your aims in the plan 3.3.1 to protect the environment, wildlife habitats, green spaces and views. The access to the site would be a problem due to the narrow uneven roads and the already high numbers of cars parked. Surely a site in the centre of the village would be more suitable for downsizing in bungalows where they could easily access buses, chemist, Post Office and shop, church and memorial hall. Where are the several areas of land in the parish that national builders currently hold options on? Why aren't these being considered?	Summary ref 1 Biodiversity Summary ref 2 and 3 Traffic concerns Summary ref 7 Alternative Sites
11l	LA2 6BZ	3.3.1 3.3.2	To obliterate this green space clearly does not adhere to the vision of the NP (3.3.1) as it states that it will protect wildlife and green spaces for generations. The land earmarked for development currently has amazing views across the bay and includes many habitats for local wildlife. Each year, swans are seen nesting and many birds are seen regularly in the field, including Herons and Cormorants. Each night, bats are seen feeding on their prey. Why can't we just appreciate the few natural spaces we have left to offer? Another aim of the NP (3.3.2) highlights that the parish will be 'a safer place to walk and cycle' The catchment area of the local school is continuously growing, children from Bolton-le-Sands, Skerton and even Morecambe are being enrolled. Therefore, many families are driving thus causing busy roads and congestion. Every morning more vehicles are being left along Sea View Drive, partially on the road and pavement. It is dangerous. Many families in the area have more than one vehicle and therefore are forced to leave their cars on the road. Despite all the cars, Sea View Drive is a narrow road, with many hidden bends and sharp turns. The development of these new homes will not make the parish a safer place to walk and cycle, it will lead to the	Summary ref 1 Biodiversity Summary ref 1 and 2 Traffic concerns Summary ref 6 Green Belt

			contrary.	
26e	LA2 6DA	Page 34, 3.6.1 Page 35, 3.8.6	This states that the "Boundary being the Canal the green belt will have enhanced protection" Building between Seaview and the canal will destroy wildlife (newts, kingfishers, herons, swans etc.) in this current green belt. If the other sites were to be considered, particularly the field opposite the Cross Keys, the A6 would also be a definitive boundary and less damaging to the environment. States "not specifically designed for older residents, will appeal to people with mobility issues" The new development is situated well away from bus routes and local amenities making it harder for older people and those with mobility issues to get to the heart of the village. However the other options are on us routes and easily accessible. I appreciate that much work has already been done by the planning committee, but fail to see how the other sites mentioned can be ruled out of serious consideration as proposed sites	Summary ref 1 Biodiversity Summary ref 7 Alternative Sites Comment noted
12l	LA2 6BZ	Page 36 3.8.11	The plan refers to a 'traffic free' route to school yet the development plan suggests the dwellings at Sea View would be suited for people with mobility problems. If this means elderly people, then why would they need a traffic free route to school??	Comments noted
12l	LA2 6BZ	Page 36 3.8.9	A softer, more visually pleasing edge to the canal. If the plan can make a value judgement like this, then can I suggest a far more visually pleasing edge to the canal is the one that is already there - a small field with natural edging with wildlife including foxes and all types of birds (and at least one Heron)	Summary ref 4 Policy T3: Lancaster Canal and T2 Cycling and walking Network of the Lancaster Local Plan provide added protection.
24e	La2 6BY		Development proposed of 30+ homes which could potentially increase accessing Sea View Drive and another 60 cars completely unsustainable. Road generally 5.00 metre wide and with lots of on road parking, impairs passage of traffic especially contractors vehicles which are up to 3.5metres wide much larger than the envisaged from the 60s plan creating a danger to many children who play on SVD Poor Access from Hest Bank Lane on offset cross roads compounded by immediate turning into The Knoll Modification to junction would make little or no difference. Bad visibility at junction especially from the north and bus stop immediately south also affects junction. Access used for collection and delivery of children twice a day for school. Plus area used by dog walkers and ramblers Condition of Sea View Drive is very poor in places especially manholes at the junction of Raikes Hill and junction of The Knoll	Summary ref 2 and 3 Traffic concerns

			Existing surface water for road and homes already drains into huge soakaway behind no 23 and floods regularly – no further capacity	Summary ref 5 Plumping Station
27e	LA2 6DE		We strongly object to the proposals to use the land at the bottom of Sea View Drive to build new houses for the following reasons: Outside our house on Sunningdale Crescent, it regularly floods when the rainfall is heavy, see attached photos (emailed as wouldn't attach). In the last few weeks, twice we have been unable to get to our driveways without water up to our calves. Along with this, the substation which is opposite our house overloads and sewerage pours out onto our road, and into neighbouring gardens. Photo's supplied showing flooding (photos attached)	Summary ref 5 Plumping Station
27e	LA2 6DE		Sunningdale Crescent is already crowded with cars due to the number of cars that each household has, as drives are not able to fit more than one car on, and most houses have two cars. It is narrow and tight for cars to come down, and therefore would be greatly concerned if used to access the field. If a footpath was installed, I would be very concerned about the safety of our property due to increased footfall of people walking past. As it stands we are at the bottom of a cull de sac and do not get walkers by and this was a selling point to the house when we bought it. another selling point was the view, we look onto the field from our kitchen and family room, it is unspoiled and a beautiful view, to build on this field, would have a massive impact on our privacy and the view of houses rather than a field, would devalue our house price, along with human element of not having a lovely view.	Comments noted
Policy 3 Sites for Potential Development in the future				
Ref	Post Code	Plan Reference if given	Submitted Comment	Response
21e	LA2 6BD	Policy 3 page 11 3.11	Plots which may be released in the future: Plot 8 is of concern to me as The Malthouse (which is 17th century despite the date stone of 1750, put up when the staircase tower to the rear was added) is directly opposite in the conservation area. I am reassured about building materials for future dwellings but am anxious about the contribution to flooding at the end of Bottomdale Road which substantial future development on this land might make.	Comments noted
8e	LA2 6HJ	Policy 3 (c)	Sensitive development of this land for housing would be welcomed and could be an attractive addition to the Conservation area	Comments noted
9e	LA2 6DA	Policy 3	Any building in the conservation area must be carefully planned and monitored can this policy be strengthened	Comments noted
Policy 4 Building Materials				
Ref	Post Code	Plan Reference if given	Submitted Comment	Response
9e	LA2	Policy 4	New building should not be at odds with its surroundings	Comments

	6DA			noted
8e	LA2 6HJ	Para 4.1	I support the proposal that the design and materials of new houses should be of high quality, good design and locally distinctive.	Comments noted
		Policy 5	Flooding	
Ref	Post Code	Plan Reference if given	Submitted Comment	Response
5e	LA2 6AT		I'm sorry to say that I find the paragraph on flooding 3.12.6 to be cursory and totally inadequate. Policy 2 does not address the impacts of development	Comments noted
9e	LA2 6DA	Policy 5	Everything possible should be done to protect existing and new homes from flooding, this policy goes some way to doing this but cannot combat climate change.	Comments noted
11e	La2 6EF		If we must give away green belt land there are areas in Hest Bank which are much less attractive than the area proposed. Areas prone to flooding should not automatically be excluded from consideration as potential housing areas. Appropriate drainage can be installed albeit at a cost. Potential developers would have to take that into consideration.	Comments noted Summary ref 4 Pumping Station
16e	LA2 6BY	Appendix 5	In appendix 5, the objections to development are not valid. They relate solely to a perceived flood risk, with a considerable volume of anecdotal evidence that is not supportable without further investigation. In fact, it may well be that LPSA592 is in fact a more sustainable option. During the meeting, the concerns of the committee were noted, in that consent for LPSA592 would give rise to a much larger development and would allow adjoining land to be developed. I therefore request that • a Pre-Planning meeting (as above) be held to ascertain the real and evidence based status of LPSA592 so that LPSA167 and LPSA592 are brought back to an equal footing (i.e. both with the benefit of pre-planning meetings and expert opinion) • the recommendation to proceed with LPSA 167 is withdrawn pending the above	Summary ref 7 Alternative Sites
22e	LA2 6AH	Appendix 5	Policy 5 Flooding. Page 41 of the NP document. While I realise that the document does cover in quite a lot of detail the areas in the parish which are at risk of flooding , I am not too clear about the following passage; <i>"Development proposals, in areas where flooding from either surface water or coastal flooding is a known issue, will be resisted unless suitable mitigation can be provided. Such mitigation must not exacerbate run off elsewhere and wherever possible seeks to provide a betterment. Development in these areas will only be considered, if no other land is available"</i> The topography of the village is such that with ever increasing rainfall from climate change, the likelihood of episodes of flooding will increase far beyond the extents indicated. I am concerned about who will decided the "mitigating factors "if developers want to move into the village in the future	Summary ref 4 and policy NE3
		Policy 6	Business Development	
Ref	Post Code	Plan Reference if given	Submitted Comment	Response

9e	LA2 6DA	Policy 6	Need to do anything that supports local business as without it the village will not be sustainable	Comments noted
		Policy 7	Views	
Ref	Post Code	Plan Reference if given	Submitted Comment	Response
8e	LA2 6HJ	Para 3.14	This policy is very important and supported.	Comments noted
9e	LA2 6DA		In planning terms I don't think anyone is entitled to a protected view from their own property so it essential that those views from the highways and byways should be protected	Comments noted
71	LA2 6BZ	2.1.3	In Policy it mentions that "the most attractive aspects of Slyne with Hest are the view from the village". "It is important to protect these in order to maintain the residents' quality of life!" How can we "nurture and protect (2.1.3 the distinct village identity when we are removing a valuable asset to people's wellbeing and replacing it with a housing development. The canal side here is the only remaining green space left between Hest Bank and Bolton le Sands. It's an area that we should be proud of. The fact that so many people use the canal path for a variety of leisure pursuits proves this.	Comments noted The proposed development would provide access to the canal from the site allowing all local residents to enjoy the views
		Policy 8	The coastline and development	
Ref	Post Code	Plan Reference if given	Submitted Comment	Response
8e	LA2 6HJ	Policy 8	No development should be permitted between the coastline and west coast main line, this area is inappropriate for further housing or business use due to its sensitive ecology, landscape and potential to flood	Plan amendment Coastal Road
9e	LA2 6DA	Policy 8	This policy can only be done in partnership with national agencies	Comments noted
		Policy 9	Non Designated Parish Heritage Assets	
Ref	Post Code	Plan Reference if given	Submitted Comment	Response
9e	LA2 6DA	Policy 9	A map of already designated assets would be useful in the plan which could be updated when new non-designated assets are identified and put up in the notice boards about the village	Agreed but not a planning issue. Refer to Parish Council.
11e	LA2 6EF		Slyne has been designated a Conservation Area and the open pasture which it is proposed that we surrender for housing is part of the land which enhances the area.	Comments noted. Proposed allocated

				site is not in or near the Slyne Conservation Area.
Policy 10 Signs and Footpaths				
Ref	Post Code	Plan Reference if given	Submitted Comment	Response
1e	LA2 6EF		Signs and footpaths Plus, information boards that identify local and national footpaths, canal towpath, cycle tracks and bridleways to increase awareness and usage Please note the above mentioned are becoming impassable due nettles, brambles, branches and general vegetation cover. I request if funds allow this be attended to, or ask civil minded people to help with cutting trimming and weed clearance	Comments noted
9e	LA2 6DA	Policy 10	Hope this policy is taken on by the developers but if not the Parish Council commit to a more proactive approach to signposting and information boards with in the Parish	Comments noted
6l	LA2 6BZ	Page 53 3.171	Mental Health and wellbeing are very important today-access to green spaces and time spent in them has real benefit The views from the canal to the Bay may not be affected by the proposed development site but there would be loss of a green belt area and that feeling of a rural village (which matters to the Parish) If people are going to be walking alongside houses for the entirety of the canal towpath then the distinct village boundaries will be lost- look at Bolton le sands. In terms of the canal, where does that village start and ours end? The canal is a popular stretch for all villagers and the loss of one of the most picturesque spots will be one place fewer villagers will probably want to go and walk to recharge their batteries	Summary ref 4 Policy T3: Lancaster Canal and T2 Cycling and walking Network of the Lancaster Local Plan provide added protection Comments noted
Policy 11 Community Facilities				
Ref	Post Code	Plan Reference if given	Submitted Comment	Response
8e	LA2 6HJ	3.18.2	For a village to remain vibrant and active, modern community facilities are needed where the community can come together in purpose built high quality spaces. I would like to see the redevelopment of the memorial hall incorporating the Scout Hut. Also, that the disused signal box at the Hest Bank railway crossing is acquired and converted into a community and tourist facility for bird watching and sunset viewing.	Comments noted
9e	LA2 6DA	Policy 11 and 12	For these to be sustainable the community needs to be more involved perhaps this policy does not clearly identify	Comments noted

			how this is to be done.	
Policy 12 Recreation Facilities				
Ref	Post Code	Plan Reference if given	Submitted Comment	Response
4l	LA2 6BY		To restore and maintain the wildlife pond in the recreation ground, enquire with RSPB or Wetland Trust	Comments noted
Policy 13 Road Safety				
Ref	Post Code	Plan Reference if given	Submitted Comment	Response
3e	LA2 6HQ	Para 3.20 Page 58-60	I read the Parish plan with interest. Your Ref: 3.20 pp58-60 But I was disappointed that there was no mention of reducing the speed limit on Coastal Road from the current 40mph to 30mph. I see no rationale for a limit of 40mph on Coastal Road. Bolton le Sands has a 30mph limit all along its entire A6 corridor. The Slyne section of the A6 is 30mph. Morecambe Prom is 30mph. So the 40mph limit is an anomaly to all local routes. Reducing the limit to 30mph would therefore not cause any congestion. Both sides of Coastal Road are clearly marked as being within the village boundary on the Neighbourhood Plan. If we are indeed part of the village why doesn't the Coastal Road have a speed limit of 30mph?	Lancashire County Council is responsible for Traffic regulations. This is not within the remit of Neighbourhood Plans. Road safety policy amended
8e	LA2 6HJ	3.20.2	A local campaign to encourage local people to drive at 20mph would help to enforce and encourage other road users, to observe the speed limit in the village. 3.20.4 - continued damage to the unique and historic canal bridges is unacceptable and repairs are too slow at being implemented by the responsible parties. With the construction of the Bay Gateway, HGV's should be discouraged from using Hest Bank as a cut through to Morecambe.	As above
9e	LA2 6DA	Policy 13	I suspect this will not be within the remit of the neighbourhood plan perhaps there needs to be an emphasis on the Parish Council being more proactive in getting this Policy done	Comments noted
2l	LA2 6DF		The speed of traffic through the village and amount of traffic if new homes are built	Comment noted
3l	LA2 6JE	Page 13	Illegal Parking preventing the bus passing through the village easily e.g. Manor Lane mobile home, lorries at the weekend. Problem with Ashworth Drive parking the home owner won't allow it.	Comments noted
Appendix 5 Identification and assessment of Building Land Methodology				
Ref	Post Code	Plan Reference if given	Submitted Comments	Response
19e	LA2 6JZ	App 5 Page 1	This site should definitely not be developed as it would contribute to urban sprawl along the A6. To take this site out of Green belt would severely threaten the Green Belt status of the fields on either side of it. Page 10 of the Slyne	Summary ref 7 Alternative Sites

		Appendix 5 Page 29	Conservation Appraisal (2009) identifies significant views including one from the A6 at The Cross Keys across this site and one from The Pinfold across the adjacent field. Building on this site would ruin these significant public views enjoyed by the residents of Slyne with Hest and visitors. Land North of Manor Lane (LPSA704). Summary point 4. Page 10 of the Slyne Conservation Appraisal (2009) identifies significant views including long views across the Lancaster Sand and Morecambe bay to the hills of Barrow-in Furness on the far side of the Lune estuary as shown on the map on page 23. Building on this site would ruin these significant public views enjoyed by the residents of Slyne with Hest and visitors.	Comments noted
2e	LA2 6BY	App A? (App 5)	We believe this to be flawed. The prioritisation of the land between Sea View Drive and the canal has two major defects:- 1. The land is currently designated as green belt for all the right reasons. 2. Only last year, Lancaster City Council in their SHLAA document determined that, with regards to this site "Development is not appropriate due to the site's contribution to the wider landscape character." This is a valid determination and nothing has changed within the last year to change that judgement. [Hopefully the City Council will reaffirm its judgement in respect of these two issues and will determine that the site is not suitable for development. It would seem to make much more sense to propose development solutions which have no such barriers and are capable of meeting with the council's approval and are therefore deliverable.	Summary ref 6 Green Belt
2e	LA2 6BY	App A? (App 5)	In the Conclusions To Assessment of LPSA 167 it is stated that "There would be an increase in traffic flow, but not enough to cause major inconvenience on Sea View Drive or on Hest Bank Lane." We feel that this is misleading. There are currently 51 properties on Sea View Drive/Close. The propose development could result in up to 35 new properties, which is an increase of 69% which is quite clearly a very significant factor. Sea View Drive is a very narrow access road with 4 tight bends. Already there are many cars which park on the road sometimes making manoeuvring extremely difficult (particularly near the bends). In addition, at school opening/closing times, a significant number of cars are parked on Sea View Drive as parents drop off/collect school children. At these times it is already very dangerous turning onto or off Sea View Drive as parked cars leave very little room for other vehicles to pass safely. Increasing the number of properties by 69% would have a major impact and could potentially lead to traffic accidents or personal injury. It seems strange that the assessment did not consider accessing this site via the strip of land which runs behind the rear gardens of 1 – 21 Sea View Drive and "Old Bob's Lane" which would then reduce the impact of traffic on existing properties.	Summary ref 2 and 3 Traffic concerns The strip of land along Old Bob's Lane has a different owner and is not currently available.
4e	LA2 6BY		Other general points about a possible development on land west of Sea View Drive Both Sea View Drive and Sunningdale Crescent are restricted areas with significant volumes of existing traffic, causing pinch points due to parking on roadside and pavements and served by tradesmen's and commercial delivery vehicles. The road	Summary ref 2 and 3 Traffic concerns

Comment [jw1]:

			space is already tight with little room to pass (consideration issues for emergency services). So, to generate more traffic by allowing further development which will have to use these roads for access seems incongruous. The junctions with Hest Bank Lane are tight for pulling in and out of given the restricted nature of the road layout. Also, the type and volume of the traffic on Hest Bank Lane including buses reduces road space even further. By nature of its name – Hest Bank Lane is a lane not a road. And a village lane at that. Overall access in to and off Hest Bank Lane, access around both Sunningdale Crescent and Sea View Drive, along with parked vehicles and restricted access for emergency vehicles already means this is a congested area without increasing volumes and movement. There is a big issue of children crossing safely (given the comments in the above two paragraphs) to and from the school.	
5e	LA2 6BY	App 5 Pages 6 and 7	<p>I would like to thank you for your thorough appraisal of the village's future plans. I do however, wish to raise objection to the conclusions to your initial assessment pages 6 and 7 for plot 1 (LPSA 167) I do not believe that you have properly considered the effect of siting dwellings to adjoin a canal towpath. This is currently Green-Belt land with a delightful rural towpath walk. Introduction of dwellings encroaching onto the canal will hugely detract from the rural feel of this much used walkway. (Canal towpaths with encroaching dwellings feel like paths through housing estates rather than country walks) I have also referred this application to The Canal and River Trust Richard Newton for consideration. Please see their statement below for reference. I hope you will take my feedback into consideration and I will follow the outcome of this with interest.</p> <p>Extract from Canal and River Trust Statement (We're a statutory consultee on planning applications. This means a local planning authority (LPA) must consult us on certain planning applications that are likely to affect our network. We've got a statutory duty to provide advice to the LPA.)</p>	<p>Summary ref 4 Policy T3: Lancaster Canal and T2 Cycling and walking Network of the Lancaster Local Plan provide added protection</p> <p>Summary ref 4 Policy T3: Lancaster Canal and T2 Cycling and walking Network of the Lancaster Local Plan provide added protection See also response from Canal and River Trust.</p>
24e	LA2 6BY		<p>The canal frontage west of SVD is only part within the actual village that has no housing and this should be safeguarded. Generally wildlife sanctuary due to lack of use by humans. 2/3 crops raised every year occasional grazing sheep.</p> <p>All foul sewage passes to pumping station in Sunningdale Drive which is already over capacity.</p>	<p>Summary ref 4 Policy T3: Lancaster Canal and T2 Cycling and walking Network of</p>

				the Lancaster Local Plan provide added protection Summary ref 5
18e	LA2 6BX		<p>In order to protect our settlement from over development (that some of us don't want) and in line with many villages throughout England, a neighbourhood plan seems to be the way forward in thwarting changes that many of us don't want or find them totally out of keeping with our village lifestyle.</p> <p>It seems the forum has been tasked with providing up to forty new homes in line with distribution throughout the Lancaster area for providing some ten thousand new homes. Looking through the plan pockets of land have been identified as potential small scale development sites, which includes Sea View Drive area, this greenbelt strip of land has become the focal point for discussion albeit the development may be in line with the surrounding area, Bungalows only.</p> <p>Let's hope that if accepted this site will offer a more modern/open aspect footprint approach, rather than the grid system used in the building of Sea View Drive which has resulted in extensions to be built upwards and outwards.</p> <p>Once again we offer our thanks to the forum in trying to secure limited housing development and producing a neighbourhood plan that is in keeping with the settlements instructions during the early consultation stages.</p>	Comments noted
23e	LA2 6BX	Appendix No1	5 <p>We realise that the Neighbourhood Plan has to recommend somewhere for new houses to be built in Slyne with Hest. We believe that the proposed development on Land West of Sea View Drive will cause traffic problems on Sea View Drive.</p> <p>If 35 bungalows are built, some will have two cars and they will generate more traffic on the narrow road of Sea View Drive. The first corner on Sea View Drive is a blind corner where there has been several "accidents. When the bungalows are being built a lot of heavy vehicles will have to negotiate Sea View Drive.</p> <p>We feel that 20 bungalows would be a more reasonable number for this piece of land and the access to it. We do appreciate that a lot of work has been involved in preparing the Plan.</p>	Comments noted Summary ref 2 and 3 Traffic concerns
COMMENTS RELATING TO THE BODY OF THE PLAN				
Ref	Post Code	Plan Reference if given	Submitted Comments	Response
91	LA2 6BY		<p>I have lived at the above address since 1966 when the estate was built. My property is on the lowest lying land on the estate and because of this a surface water soak away was installed by the builders on my land. This is for water from both the highway and footpaths. The pipe work and soak away are the responsibility of Lancashire County Council. In 1995-1997 I had problems with my garden flooding. After investigations instigated by my engineer, it was concluded that the pipes had been damaged and were</p>	Flooding Policy NE1 (formerly Policy 5) amended

			<p>partially blocked but most importantly that the soak away build by the builder was inadequate for the amount of surface water being encountered. The preferred choice to remedy this problem was to connect an outfall pipe to the canal, however LCC "met with insurmountable difficulties" when this proposal was put to British Waterways. Therefore, it was agreed by LCC and the landowner that a larger soak away was built behind by property in the field that it is now proposed to build dwellings. This soak away again has surface water entering it from the highway and footpaths via pipes running across my garden. Lancashire County Council is responsible for this new pipe work and soak away. Given the great concern regarding climate change and the impact this is already having on the management of flooding whether from rivers or surface water, I feel that great care has to be taken when considering building on this land. Over the years I have been observing how very wet the field itself is getting as is evidenced by the growth of and encroachment of the land by waterside vegetation. I do have all the relevant documentation regarding the works that were done on my property to deal with the surface water from the highway and footpaths and should you wish to have sight of copies of this I will be happy to supply them. In addition to the above I feel I must also point out that both my garden and the field under discussion are habitats of Great Crested Newts and have been for very many years. My daughters who are now in their 60's used to play with them, obviously long before these newts were given protection.</p>	<p>Summary ref 1 Biodiversity</p>
151	LA2 6BY		<p>Surely it makes more sense to build on the alternative site on the A6. Also it is a roomy site which has far better access straight onto the A6. Also it is a roomy enough to accommodate the 40+ house that are needed when in reality it will be impossible to fulfil the criteria on Sea View Drive. Disruption to the village will be far less if the site off the A6 is chosen and safety wise surely there is no comparisons.</p>	<p>Summary ref 7 Alternative Sites</p>
121	LA2 6BZ		<p>In general, placing another development on the end of the Sea View area will increase traffic use on what is only a service road. The proposed legislation prohibiting parking on pavements will make this situation even worse and I can for-see the increased paving-over of gardens altering the area (and certainly not enhancing it) and adding to flooding problems. Many other places (e.g. Garstang, Galgate and Poulton-le-Fylde) have carried out their development next to main roads (A6 and A586). Why is Hest Bank not doing similar?</p>	<p>Summary ref 2 and 3 Traffic concerns</p>
121	LA2 6BZ		<p>If I was a developer I would welcome the chance to build dwellings next to a canal with impressive views over Morecambe Bay. How much of an input has the developer had in the Slyne with Hest plan given that discussions have already taken place?</p> <p><i>Response. The land owner and the developer's agent have been actively seeking development on this site for a number of years prior to the commencement of the writing of the Neighbourhood Plan and have had NO input into the Neighbourhood Plan policies</i></p>	<p>See response below comment</p>
111	LA2 6BZ		<p>There is no current location for the development of more than 30 homes. There are alternative plots of land that can</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>

			<p>be used to meet the needs of the parish without obliterating green spaces. To my understanding, other places (such as Poulton-le-Fylde and Galgate) have carried out developments next to main roads. It remains unclear why Hest Bank is not doing similar?</p> <p>Before destroying another piece of land, the value of a green space certainly needs to be acknowledged before it is permanently gone from the map.</p>	
11l	LA2 6BZ		<p>The neighbourhood vision highlights that our plan will 'protect the environment and its green spaces'. The proposal of building new homes that would border the Parish Council would not protect the environment and green spaces, it will in fact, lead to obliteration of the environment and green spaces.</p>	Comments noted
12l	LA2 6BZ	<p>Page 8 2.1.2</p> <p>Page 8 2.1.3</p>	<p>The proposal would compromise the canal's contribution to the 'historical identity' by hiding it behind dwellings and for a popular mooring place,</p> <p>Planning to preserve the distinct nature of the 'village' seems to be at odds with Hest Bank which lacks a focal point as a village and is rather more of a dormitory suburb. Furthermore, maps show that development has been taking place since the 18th century with no concept of a village identity. This would mean other areas could be considered and extending towards Lancaster or Bolton le Sands cannot be dismissed on the grounds of 'preserving' the village identity. When future development occurs (and it will sometime) other areas such as along the A6 will be developed anyway.</p>	<p>Summary ref 4 Policy T3: Lancaster Canal and T2 Cycling and walking Network of the Lancaster Local Plan provide added protection</p> <p>Comments noted</p>
20e	LA2 6BY	<p>Section1 Fig 3</p> <p>Sect 2.16.4</p> <p>Sect 2.16.5</p> <p>Sect 2.16.7</p> <p>Sect 3. 6</p>	<p>Section 1, Fig 3.Land to the north/west of Sea View Drive is not within the village footprint. It is also designated as Green Belt.</p> <p>There is NO useful public transport. Buses are every hour through the village and are severely curtailed at weekends. Since the building of the Bay Gateway, the traffic through the village has increased and could now be regarded as a rat-run from the Gateway exit at Beaumont to Bare and the Morecambe promenade area.</p> <p>This is NOT a sympathetic building of a road bridge. It is an eyesore.</p> <p>The Local Village Plan MUST be specific in declaring Green Belt land as non-negotiable regardless of City Council pressure.</p> <p>The city council would build over every field if allowed. Current legislation allows them to de register Green Belt but it is local opinion and people power which will win out in the end. It generally does not consider local resident views and does what it wants. The Local Plan must defend the Green Belt. Once destroyed by concrete, it will never be regained in the future.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>Summary ref 6 Green Belt</p>
2e	LA2 6BY	<p>Environment al Para 2.19/2.20</p>	<p>Other Species And Habitat. The plan is silent with regard to the presence of a significant colony of great crested newts which breed on Sea View Drive and the surrounding fields. These newts are a protected species and, earlier this year, the owner of ■Sea View Drive had to have urgent works to her drains halted because of the presence of great crested newts. Work could only recommence under the strict supervision of an ecologist (which the owner had to pay</p>	<p>Summary ref 1 Biodiversity</p>

			for). Developing the land at Sea View Drive and the resultant increase in traffic would undoubtedly jeopardise the long term sustainability of this protected species.	
2e	LA2 6BY	Para 3.8.9	The report is again silent on how it is proposed to protect the great crested newts both during and after the building works (presumably because this is an impossible task).	Summary ref 1 Biodiversity
8e	LA2 6HJ	Para 2.1.2	2.1.2 The abundance, variety and maturity of trees in the village is an asset that should not be overlooked and measures should be implemented to plant trees locally for future generations to enjoy.	Comments noted
21e	LA2 6BD		First, the research which informs this plan is impressive. Due regard is given to the historic nature of the settlement and the contribution of new developments to the overall 'feel 'of the village is also acknowledged. I am delighted that 'The Keys' is once more 'The Cross Keys' and am pleased to note increased custom since the renovations.	Comments noted
6l	LA2 6BZ	Page 8 2.1.2 Page 8 2.3.3 Page 9 2.5.2 Page 10 2.5.4 Page 10 2.7.1 Page 10 2.2.8	<p>Open green spaces, enhancing historic identity? If these proposed development takes place adjacent to these sites then the natural environment and history would be lost</p> <p>Long views of open countryside are a distinct village identity. Why choose one of the best places for this as a site for new development Village residents value the views as part of the village identity yet with this proposed site views will be severely affected</p> <p>Why should the conservation Area simply include the old buildings along the Main Road (A6)?Do residents acknowledge the Conservation Area? Why do residents value views and consider them significant part of the village identity more than the buildings? Suggest the views are more important to residents</p> <p>Conservation area enhanced by open pasture Why would building on the proposed Sea View Drive development be seen as maintaining the conservation area and enhancing the natural environment which is what the Plan's objectives are</p> <p><i>Response The Conservation Area as referenced in this part of the Plan was first designated in 1981 by Lancashire County Council its main remit is to protect the built environment The appraisal of the area was done in 2009 and its area of designation is not the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan</i></p> <p><i>Proposed allocated site is not in or near the Slyne Conservation Area.</i></p> <p>Significance of canal to Hest Bank Surely maintaining the canal in its original and authentic state is important to the heritage of the village</p> <p>Historic buildings and bridges near Hest Bank Core Suggests the buildings are more important to protect instead of the canal as a whole. The whole section of canal</p>	<p>See updated Plan</p> <p>See updated plan</p> <p>See response below comment</p> <p>Summary ref 2 The integrity of the canal Policy T3: Lancaster Canal and T2 Cycling and walking Network of the</p>

		<p>Page 11 2.1.0</p> <p>Page 22 2.19</p> <p>Page 27 3.3.2</p>	<p>should be protected (especially the stretch alongside Sea View Drive) considering other canal stretches are being affected by development – to the north at Bolton le Sands and south towards Lancaster with the Bay Gateway</p> <p>Routes along public footpaths Openness of green spaces will be compromised by building work Our stretch of canal by Sea View Drive is one of the few left undeveloped between Lancaster and Carnforth surely that makes historically and environmentally more valuable.</p> <p>Raikes Head and Lancaster Canal have been acknowledged as having environmental significance How can building on the canal margins possibly improve the natural environment Objective 4 states the plan wants to improve the natural environment</p> <p>Protecting and enhancing local heritage and conservation areas including buildings and settings, canal and shoreline with its unrivalled views.</p> <p>The proposed development of Sea View Drive does nothing to meet the Objective 5 of the plan Unrivalled views and the canal are mentioned again yet protection of them comes into question with the proposed site for development</p>	<p>Lancaster Local Plan provide added protection</p> <p>Comments noted Summary ref 4 Policy T3: Lancaster Canal and T2 Cycling and walking Network of the Lancaster Local Plan provide added protection</p> <p>Comments noted</p>
12I	LA2 6BZ	Page 27 3.32	<p>Page 27 3.3.2 The proposed development of the Sea View site will contradict Objective 5 of the plan. Unrivalled views and the canal are seen as important in the plan, yet these are the very two things which will be affected by the Sea View development. Surely fields along the A6 would be a better alternative if the plan really is designed to protect and enhance local views and the canal.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>Summary ref 7 Alternative Sites</p>
7L	LA2 6BZ	3.3.2	<p>The proposal to build forty new homes in the field next to Sea View Drive is very surprising. The neighbourhood plans main objective to build new homes on this site will not address the housing issue as more homes will still need to be built elsewhere in the village. Meanwhile this piece of land will be lost forever, for very little gain. The objectives of the NP “ to protect and enhance.....conservation areas including... the canal and shoreline with its unrivalled views” 3.3.2 is not being fulfilled</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>
16e	LA2 6BY		<p>Further to the planning meeting on 9 September 2109. I would like to thank you all for your hard work. You will recall, I spoke on this occasion, to raise several concerns around the conclusions and recommendations. 1. LPSA167 Engagement with possible future developers and the perceived conflict of interest. In answer to your question, I would draw your attention to the guidelines in Local Government Association Probity in Planning document in the section</p>	<p>See response below comment</p>

		<p>concerning Pre-Application discussions. This advises that for a Pre-Planning meeting: • Officers (LCC planning officers) should always be present • Confirmation that a written note should always be taken (https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/probity-planning-council-d92.pdf) I refer to appendix 5 pages 6 and 7 of the Parish Plan "a meeting was subsequently held between the potential builder, Eric Wright, and representativesit should be identified as land possible to allocate for development" • The meeting with Eric Wright, the developers to whom you refer, and the Parish Plan Committee should have taken place with a Planning Officer present. • At the minimum, Minutes of this meeting should have been taken and should be made available for transparency. In summary, to expedite discussions in favour of development of LPSA167 some critical steps have been overlooked, and the excellent work of the Planning Committee may be undermined by this omission. To mitigate this I request that a new meeting is held with no reference to the previous meetings, with a (LCC) planning officer present, and with full minutes published. 2. LPSA592</p> <p><i>Response A Planning Officer was not required at the meeting as suggested, see LCC response The advice from Lancaster City re this guidance is as follows We think the representor is right in referring to the document below but has confused slightly the process that it is referring to. The link is referring to pre-application discussions whereby the City Council (the determining authority) meets a developer about a respective application. This is not the case here. Slyne with Hest, whilst preparing the Neighbourhood Plan are not the determining body in respect of planning applicationst his remains the role of the City Council.</i></p> <p><i>Contemporaneous notes were taken.</i></p>	
9e	LA2 6DA	I believe the plan as presented makes a good attempt to achieve the aims and objectives as listed in the plan	Comments noted
15e	LA2 6EF	<p>1) We know several people who are trying to sell their houses in the area and not finding it easy, despite the fact that they are not overly expensive, do we really need to build more houses?</p> <p>2) People seem to want new houses but are they entitled to build on new land when other houses are available? New houses will soon become old houses and become less desirable to the next generation of buyers and even more new houses will be required.</p> <p>3) Is affordable housing necessary in all areas? The combined area of Lancaster and Morecambe already provides low cost housing. My wife and I started off in a terraced house in Lancaster, as that was what we could afford irrespective of where we wanted to live. We worked for 30 years before we were able to afford a house in Hest Bank, it was a reward for a lot of effort.</p> <p>4) I feel strongly that the area between Bolton le Sands and Slyne with Hest should be kept free of housing and the identity of the separate villages maintained.</p> <p>I accept that we may have other plans imposed on us if we</p>	Comments noted

			do not produce our own but I would say any housing should be well designed, good quality building to match existing properties and not starter homes.	
26e	LA2 6DA	Page 3	As a resident of the Sea View Drive vicinity I feel I must object to the proposed site between Sea View Drive and the canal. PAGE 3 The plan says 40 houses are required by this plan, yet it is acknowledged that this could not be done on the proposed site. It would seem more logical to propose a site which could cater for the full requirements. In my opinion the other sites off Hest Bank Lane and the area across the road from the Cross Keys would offer better options. Particularly as the Sea View site has only one access road, which requires negotiating numerous tight bends through a residential estate.	Summary ref 2 and 3 Traffic concerns
		Page 7	This shows a map outlining the footprint of the village, but this map does not extend to the bottom of Hest Bank Lane where it joins the A6, however here there are many dwellings of different character and age situated. Therefore behind and within this site more suitable family homes could be built instead of the bungalows proposed at the Seaview site which would understandably attract elderly residents. The existence of the dwellings at the end of Hest Bank Lane where it joins the A6 are proof that the footprint of the village does extend to this point and road signage indicates this. These two other sites I have just mentioned would have far better road links for the developers and proposed residential traffic. To build on the Seaview site will be building outside the footprint of the village. This cannot be allowed as it will give the green light to further development and the absorption of rural Slyne-with-Hest into the Lancaster conurbation.	Summary ref 7 Alternative Sites
		Page 27 3.3.2. Objective 1,2,5,	States "sensitive to the character of the parish", objective 2 states "Scale of development proportional to the size of the existing village", objective 5 states "protect and enhance" - "canal and shoreline with its unrivalled views". Looking at the existing Sea View estate, if the scale and proportions of the proposed development were kept in-line with the existing estate, I feel you would struggle to get more than 20 dwellings on the site. Developing down to the canal edge does not seem to me to be protecting the area or the views. There are also the wildlife issues to consider. Flooding is also an issue, can the existing systems cope with extra volume? The rural nature of Seaview Drive would be ruined, not to mention the road safety issues at the junction with Hest Bank Lane. It is already chaos, especially at school drop off pick up times. Seaview Close is of tiny area and the building site process and consequent quality of life of residents will be intolerable.	Summary ref 6 Green Belt
				Summary ref 1 Biodiversity
				Flooding Policy amended
				Summary ref 2 and 3 Traffic concerns
24e	LA2 6by		Most towns and villages have built on the outskirts of villages i.e. The Kellets, Garstang and Kendal causing less impact on a village as a whole especially during the long construction process access being immediately of the A6. The land on the outer edges of the villages available would accommodate affordable housing, family housing and green areas and be aesthetically pleasing. The plan already states that Hest Bank Lane junction of the A6 very congested and Throstle Grove used as a short cut hence contractors deliveries etc. would use Shady Lane past	Comments noted
				Summary ref 2 and 3 Traffic concerns
				Summary ref 7

			school	Alternative Sites
7I	LA2 6BZ		The N.P. also does not address the needs of housing for younger people who have been born and brought up in the village and would like the opportunity to settle and live here	Comments noted
7I	LA2 6BZ		The access to and from the proposed site is already hazardous. Access onto Sea View Drive is already difficult due to the sharp turn off Hest Bank Lane. Another cause of concern is the blind bend, followed by another one which can also be difficult, made worse when cars are being driven in the middle of the road. Numerous cars parked on both sides of Sea View Drive and Sea View Close make manoeuvring a car difficult at the best of times, which will become worse with forty plus extra cars on the road if this housing development goes ahead. In addition, any emergency vehicles trying to access the site could be delayed if they are unable to access Sea View Drive quickly	Summary ref 2 and 3 Traffic concerns
7I	LA2 6BZ		Parking Space for one car will be inadequate too as many home-owners have more than one car. Where are cars going to go? Parking is already a huge problem	Summary ref 2 and 3 Traffic concerns
7I	LA2 6BZ		There is land available inside the "village" footprint, opposite the Cross Keys and extending to Throstle Grove, there is plenty of land that would address the need for extra housing. Forty houses could be built on this site and if further housing was required then the development can be extended. It would not spoil a beautiful piece of land adjacent to the canal so that the "attractiveness of the canal tourism route is not compromised" as already is at Bolton le sands (3.13.7)	Summary response 7 Alternative Sites
7I	LA2 6BZ		This N.P. needs to be looked at again as it will not settle the housing needs of the village. It will only be a sticking plaster until the issue of "extra housing" rears its ugly head again.	Comments noted
10I	LA2 6BY		Rather puzzled as to why this piece of land has been chosen. Lancaster in their SHLAA document stated that SP28 (which includes SWH03) made a strong contribution to the green belt. Document dated 2018	Comments noted
10I	LA2 6BY	Page 22 2,19 2,20	Land West of Sea View Drive (LPSA167) Has any ecological appraisal been conducted on this site into the presence of Great Crested Newts? - Map 7 - Amphibians & Reptiles does not show Great Crested Newts on this site. A survey by Greater Manchester Ecology Unit was undertaken on January 14 th 2015, but this survey was carried out on land to the north of Manor Lane. They recommended that Great Crested Newt surveys require 4 visits between mid-March and mid-June with at least 2 visits during mid season (mid-April - mid-May). As there are great crested newts in the gardens of SVD & SVC this site needs surveying (at the proper times). It would appear that the builder has not been asked about this. Also how would they be protected if this site was chosen? They don't sit still!	Summary ref 1 Biodiversity
10I	LA2 6BY	Page 26	Conclusions to assessment of LPSA167 - page 26 Access to this site will not be easy. The turn off from Hest Bank Lane is hampered by a bus stop and at certain times of the day by parked cars - parents taking/collecting their	Summary ref 2 and 3 Traffic concerns

			<p>children to/from school and also dog walkers. There are a further three bends. Sea View Drive is approximately 15' wide - Sea View Close is noticeably narrower and cars are often parked on the road reducing the width. Should the government bring in a law to prevent cars parking on the pavement this will increase the problem. As it is large vehicles frequently go over the pavement when manoeuvring round the corners.</p> <p>Not sure how they can say no major inconvenience of traffic when there could be 30/35 more properties - presumably with at least one car each.</p>	
14l	LA2 6EW		<p>That full understanding be given to the damage done by ivy to trees. In itself it does no harm - allowed to climb the trunk to the top of the trees kills them. So why say continually it does no damage. Understand the harm planning blight does to persons wishing to sell their private homes.</p> <p>Understand Hest Bank cannot support 1st time buyers. You graduate here - not begin here. Yes bungalows - understand why a bungalow is needed and not build 2 storey homes around them. Provide infrastructure first - Halton a prime example of what NOT to do.</p> <p>Thank you for doing this</p>	Comments noted
Comments relating to the SEA				
Ref	Post code	Report reference if given	Submitted Comments	Response
2e	LA2 6BY	Biodiversity Para 3.22	The report states that "There are priority habitats and species present both in and around the NP area. These need to be protected and enhanced in order to prevent the loss, fragmentation and deterioration of biodiversity in Slyne With Hest." However, there is no evidence of how this is going to be achieved, not just for the protected great crested newts, but the various rare species of wildlife whose habitat is potentially being destroyed.	Summary ref 1 Biodiversity
2e	LA2 6BY	Table 3.2 Framework For The Slyne With Hest NP	The SEA has a stated objective to "Achieve net gains in biodiversity through the protection and enhancement of wildlife habitats and associated species." As has been clearly demonstrated, the proposed development of the Sea View Drive site will result in the loss (not enhancement) of an important wildlife habitat and will significantly impact upon the sustainability of a protected species	Summary ref 1 Biodiversity
2e	LA2 6BY	Para 4.3.2 Summary of SA Proposals	The table identifies that, in respect of biodiversity, "The site is within 50 metres of a designated wildlife site and there is potential for significant effects." This in itself should be enough to dismiss any thoughts of development. The table also goes on to identify that more than 70% of the land is within flood zone 2/3, and that there is potential for "significant negative effects" on the historical environment. What more evidence is needed to dismiss any further consideration of this site?	Summary ref 1 Biodiversity
2e	LA2 6BY	Para 5.4	The report states "The site for allocation lies outside the	Comments

		Objective 1 Biodiversity	Special Area of Conservation and The Special Protection Area. However it is unknown whether it provides a supporting habitat.” We would have thought that one of the main functions of the SEA would be to establish the nature and extent of the supporting habitat. On a number of occasions residents have made members of the NP Group aware of the presence of great crested newts on this site, but the NP and SEA both remain silent on this important issue	noted Summary ref 1 Biodiversity
10I	LA2 6BY	Page 16 Table 3	Table 3.1 - Consultation response received - the SEA scoping report - page 16. Natural England & The Environmental Agency - no comment received. Presumably they are unaware of the presence of Great Crested Newts. I'm not simply considering the great crested newts but all the other wildlife whose habitat could be destroyed. Also I understand that this land has drainage problems.	Comment noted
10I	LA2 6BY	Scoping Report Page 38 5.7	Puzzled that it states that the field is not used for agricultural purposes. This field is used for silage and also for grazing sheep at times. 6. Land north of Manor Lane (LPSA704). This would appear a more suitable choice.	Comments noted Summary ref 7 Alternative Sites

Consultation Response Lancaster City Council

Ref No	Lancaster City Council Comments	Response	Changes to Plan
General Comments			
1.	Section 2.14 on Character Areas usefully sets the context for the local built environment and will help with the determination of planning applications in accordance with paragraph 127c of the NPPF.	Acknowledged	
2.	The Neighbourhood Plan needs to be accompanied with a Proposals/Policies Map which highlights allocations and designations – we can assist with the preparation of this map. As with the other maps within the document. Some of them, once printed, lose their clarity.	Agreed. Will produce a Proposals/Policies Map and take up offer of assistance with preparation of this map.	Proposals/Policies Map inserted.
3.	The Neighbourhood Plan would benefit from being more consistent with the structure of the wider plan. For instance, the way in which policies are labelled. A sub-heading before each policy to introduce the 'policy area' e.g. Housing or Historic Environment would be helpful, and where appropriate, group policies together under these titles e.g. policies 1, 2 and 3 all relate to 'Housing' (example inserted below from the Wray-with-Botton Neighbourhood Plan)	Agreed.	Comment noted
4.	It is worthwhile noting that the Figure 2: SG9 allocation boundary will need to be kept under review to ensure it is consistent with the Local Plan.	Agreed. Will keep SG9 allocation boundary under review and change Plan where appropriate.	Figure 2:SG9 allocation boundary amended to be consistent with Local Plan.
5.	Some sections make reference to the Core Strategy. This will need to be kept under review because once the District-wide Local Plan, which is currently being examined, is adopted, the Core Strategy will no longer be relevant	Agreed. Will remove references to Core Strategy.	Identify references to Core Strategy and remove.

4.2 List of Policies & Proposals Maps		Agreed. Will amend format.	Format amended.																																				
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Policy Name</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Reference</td> <td>OVERALL STRATEGY</td> </tr> <tr> <td>OS1</td> <td>DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY</td> </tr> <tr> <td>OS2</td> <td>LANDSCAPE</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>BUILT ENVIRONMENT</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BE1</td> <td>DESIGN</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>HOUSING</td> </tr> <tr> <td>H1</td> <td>HOUSING DEVELOPMENT</td> </tr> <tr> <td>H2</td> <td>HOUSING PROVISION</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>RURAL ECONOMY</td> </tr> <tr> <td>RE1</td> <td>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NE1</td> <td>CONSERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NE2</td> <td>LOCAL GREEN SPACE</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NE3</td> <td>HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>COMMUNITY</td> </tr> <tr> <td>COM1</td> <td>COMMUNITY ASSETS AND LOCAL SERVICES</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TRA1</td> <td>INFRASTRUCTURE FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>List of Policies and Proposals Map Suggested format</p>				Policy Name	Reference	OVERALL STRATEGY	OS1	DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY	OS2	LANDSCAPE		BUILT ENVIRONMENT	BE1	DESIGN		HOUSING	H1	HOUSING DEVELOPMENT	H2	HOUSING PROVISION		RURAL ECONOMY	RE1	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT		NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	NE1	CONSERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	NE2	LOCAL GREEN SPACE	NE3	HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT		COMMUNITY	COM1	COMMUNITY ASSETS AND LOCAL SERVICES		TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE
	Policy Name																																						
Reference	OVERALL STRATEGY																																						
OS1	DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY																																						
OS2	LANDSCAPE																																						
	BUILT ENVIRONMENT																																						
BE1	DESIGN																																						
	HOUSING																																						
H1	HOUSING DEVELOPMENT																																						
H2	HOUSING PROVISION																																						
	RURAL ECONOMY																																						
RE1	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT																																						
	NATURAL ENVIRONMENT																																						
NE1	CONSERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT																																						
NE2	LOCAL GREEN SPACE																																						
NE3	HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT																																						
	COMMUNITY																																						
COM1	COMMUNITY ASSETS AND LOCAL SERVICES																																						
	TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE																																						
TRA1	INFRASTRUCTURE FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT																																						
Section 1																																							
1.	Paragraph 1.2 states 'Lancaster City Council has told us that 40 new homes must be planned for in Slyne with Hest during the lifetime of the Neighbourhood Plan'. The Council hasn't specifically established this target anywhere. This was the number we proposed if the Inspector asked us to provide a target for each Neighbourhood Plan but he didn't. It is therefore probably best to not specifically state this.	Agreed.	Reference to 40 new homes removed.																																				
2.	In paragraph 1.3.3 perhaps mention that the purpose of the strategic allocation in policy SG9 is to meet "its evidenced <u>district-wide</u> development needs	Agreed.	Inserted reference to district wide development needs.																																				
Section 2																																							
1.	Paragraph 2.7.1 refers to Hest Bank as a hamlet?	Agreed Hest Bank was originally a hamlet but has now expanded and merged with Slyne to form Slyne with Hest.	Amended NP to reflect this.																																				

Section 3			
Policy 1			
1.	The first criteria of the policy is quite restrictive. Slyne with Hest is identified as one of a number of sustainable settlements under policy DM42 'Managing Rural Housing Growth' in the Council's adopted Development Management document. Its identification is continued under the emerging Policy SP2 'Lancaster District Settlement Hierarchy' of the submitted Strategic Policies and Land Allocations document. Under these policies, proposals for new housing within identified sustainable settlements will be supported. To state that new developments will only be only be supported where they contribute to the identified needs of the Parish is quite restrictive and not in accordance with the Local Plan's strategic policy. The policy would benefit from redrafting to set it in the context of a more positive framework 'New development for housing will be supported where'. The opening paragraph of the supporting text appears to recognise this, stating that the area still needs to assist the district in meeting the overall District needs, but Criteria 1 of the policy is at odds with this.	Agreed,	Policy amended.
2.	It is not clear how and who will define the identified needs of the Parish. If there is no evidence of what the identified parish need is then it's not a reasonable requirement of the policy.	Agreed	New data inserted
3.	The 2 nd criteria sets a requirement that any development of 15 or more houses must provide affordable homes in line with Local Plan policy. Firstly, are there any opportunities for development of over 15 dwellings within the Parish beyond that on Sea View Drive? Then secondly, if the Plan is to be read in conjunction with the wider Local Plan, then requirements of Policy DM3 will apply anyway. The requirement doesn't have to be simply repeated in the NP itself. Therefore we would suggest removing the words 'mixed' to ensure it applies to all residential developments and removing 'of 15 or more houses' to direct users straight to the Local Plan policy requirements.	Agreed	Plan amended to reflect LCC Policy DM3 figures
4.	The 3 rd criteria links to the 2 nd criteria only. It would benefit from rewording to make clear that it is the removal of on-site affordable housing that is being discussed and not the removal of the policy. It could also be reworded so that it is more positive 'affordable housing shall be delivered on site'.	Agreed	3 rd criterion amended as advised
5.	Paragraph 3.5.18 says 'Proposals for major housing development i.e. in excess of ten dwellings must include on site affordable housing provision' – yet Policy 1 refers to 15 houses? As suggested above, perhaps remove reference to a specific number and direct towards the policy within the Local Plan.	Agreed	Para 3.5.18 deleted
6.	We note the Neighbourhood Plan is looking for on-site affordable housing only and not a commuted sum and with very few opportunities to develop in that area, there is real justification for insisting on this.	Agreed	
Policy 2a/2b			
1	In relation to <u>2b</u> .1) If an application came forward in outline it may not include the level of detail within point 1. Development Management wouldn't usually be in a position to invalidate an outline application due to the lack of this level of detail. The policy could do with re-phrasing to ensure that the layout of a development includes green space (what type are you expecting?), planting areas to enhance biodiversity and surface water disposal, and ensures views through the site. What do you mean by maximising social interaction? Does this relate to the inclusion of a mixture of house	Agreed. Site design criterion will be rewritten.	Criterion replaced with need to produce Design and Access Statement

	types/sizes/M4(2) or does this relate to the layout and accessibility?		
2.	In relation to <u>2b) 2)</u> are you trying to ensure that the housing is of a similar scale to the adjacent housing? If this is the case, this needs to be made clearer. As technically a single storey dwelling could be higher than the adjacent properties, and how would the roof space be used?	Agreed.	Wording completely changed for increased clarity.
3.	In relation to <u>2b) 3)</u> It is unclear what is meant by this because it reads as though this would relate to future applications rather than the application for the development of the site. It would perhaps be better to cover this in a design policy. Policy 4 only relates to materials, it could be expanded to relate to ensuring design is in keeping with the context of the surroundings, including roof heights but also ensuring development does not replicate poor design.	Agreed. This criterion needs to be made clearer.	Criterion removed. Issue now addressed in Design Policy
4.	In relation to <u>2b) 4)</u> Is there a particular orientation of view you are seeking? What views are you seeking to protect, and why? If it is from existing houses this will place an onerous constraint on development and the planning system does not protect views from individual houses or private views.	Agreed. We are attempting to protect the appearance of the site from the canal towpath on the opposite side of the canal from the site.	Criterion changed after comments from Canal and River Trust.
5.	In relation to <u>2b) 7)</u> As the Local Plan has not yet been adopted, include the word 'draft' until adoption. 30% is supported by viability analysis and more appropriate than the adopted DM DPD requirement of 40%.	Agreed. Insert word draft until Local Plan adopted. Consider viability analysis.	'Draft' inserted until adoption of Local Plan.
6.	In relation to <u>2b) 8)</u> In order to ensure the proposed dwellings are suitable for the intended users, we would recommend that the NP requires that all properties meet M4(2) accessibility standards. The existing wording suggests this is what you are aspiring to, but it just could do with that bit more detail. Or is the intention to go above M4(2) The Local Plan emerging policy will only be seeking 20% compliance but there is justification for insisting on full compliance.	Agreed. We will require all properties to meet M4 (2) standards.	Criterion rewritten to require all properties to meet M4 (2) standards.
7.	Something you may like to consider is the dwelling sizes. When factoring the needs of older people, the internal space standards and design layouts need to provide flexibility. Our Housing Strategy Officer believes the addition of 2 bedroom bungalows to the existing social housing portfolio in that area would work very well. Recommending that all units should be a minimum of 2 bedrooms including the affordable element. This provides flexibility for people who require an overnight carer and have a lot of equipment.	Agreed. We will consider including a new criterion requiring all units to be a minimum of 2 bedrooms.	Policy HE2, formerly Policy 2b, (Criterion 2) supports bungalows and two bedroom homes.
8.	Whilst we support your intention to deliver a 30 unit bungalow scheme with a requirement that 30% needs to be affordable, it is important to gather as much evidence as possible to demonstrate and justify this need to make the policy as robust as possible. We are able to provide data on average house prices in the Slyne-with-Hest Parish, and so if you would like us to do so, we can provide this. It is important to consider what happens if the scheme cannot achieve this level of affordable units? Just so that you are aware	Agree we need to gather as much evidence as possible to demonstrate and justify affordability needs. Consider	Viability study under discussion.

	and to draw a recent example to your attention, in May 2018 Applethwaite submitted an application for a 32 unit bungalow scheme in Ellel (application reference: 18/00335/FUL) however the viability assessment concluded that 0% affordable housing could be provided as part of this scheme.	viability analysis.	
9.	In relation to <u>2b) 10)</u> , what is meant by one public parking space per dwelling? Does this mean visitor parking outside or inside a curtilage? Is this intended to be in addition to curtilage parking for each dwelling? Or are they just looking for one car parking space per dwelling in a communal/public parking area?	Agreed. We will rewrite this criterion to comply with relevant DM.	Criterion now complies with DM62 and Appendix E of draft DM DPD
10.	Regarding paragraph 3.8.11, should the plan be promoting children to walk along the canal to get to school? Has this been dis 3.8.11 Criteria 14. A route through the site will have amenity value for new and existing residents of the area, enabling access to the canal and other local footpaths, but more importantly, would provide a traffic free route to the Primary School for children on the new development.(Lancaster Local Plan DM29, X) cussed with Lancashire County Council?	Agreed. We will rewrite criterion omitting “but more importantly, would provide a traffic free route to the Primary School for children on the new development.	Unnecessa ry wording removed
11.	Paragraph 3.6.1 says “There is no immediately available land inside the Village footprint or around it large enough to be considered for a development of the scale needed”. This will have to be carefully worded because the GB4 land is available for development (that has been demonstrated by the Local Plan Examination) and small elements of the GB4 site have been considered to be deliverable via the SHELAA.	Agreed.	This section has been rewritten.
12.	Paragraph 3.6.3 Perhaps rephrase “The Green Belt wraps a protective layer around the village and keeps out predatory development” and “But the Green Belt should remain our barrier against housing sprawl.” in a more positive light, explaining what the purposes of the Green Belt are, referring to paragraphs 133 and 134 of the NPPF.	Agreed.	Rephrased in a more positive light referring to paragraphs 133 and 134 of the NPPF.
Policy 3			
1.	A map identifying the locations of these sites would be helpful. How has the number, size and type of dwellings been determined? i.e. how has it been decided that policy 3(b) would be suitable for social housing and what type?	Agreed.	Map included. Justification for social housing included.
2.	Paragraph 3.9.2 what does ‘but only after mitigation of water runoff from the site into lower areas’ mean? Which lower areas?	This phrase is now superfluous after inclusion of SuDS criterion in Design Policy.	Phrase deleted.

3.	<u>Policy 3(a)</u> : Evidence in favour of this site being allocated/suitable for development is not really demonstrated in the rationale.	This site has already received planning permission for 2 houses but no development has yet taken place.	
4.	<u>Policy 3(b)</u> 3.10.1: The neighbourhood plan can only positively allocate land for development if the site is available, deliverable and suitable. Issues of deliverability and suitability aside, the site is not currently available for development at the time of preparing the plan. Therefore it fails the test of the allocation. Whilst we would err against a formal allocation in the plan, or having a specific policy relating to the site, there is nothing stopping you setting out your support within the supporting text.	Comment noted. These are not allocations.	
5.	<u>Policy 3(c)</u> 3.11.1 – 3.11.2: Same issue to the above, if the site is not available then it cannot be formally allocated by the plan, again nothing stopping the plan setting out an in principle support for the development on the site. Wray-with-Botton Neighbourhood Plan has referenced a number of sites which, whilst not currently available, would be supported should they become available in the future.	Comment noted. These are not allocations.	
6.	The scale and nature of development which will be supported on these sites is not stated. It also looks as though there is no site-specific criteria which is considered necessary to govern any future proposals for the site?	Agreed, but the new Design Policy will provide criteria regarding materials and design.	Bedroom numbers inserted into Policy HE2, formerly Policy 2b. Policy BE1 includes housing density reference.
Policy 4			
1.	The principle of this policy would work well, but it needs a bit more clarity/re-ordering. Making reference to the Character Areas in the policy would make it more locally specific and better steer the sympathetic use of materials in each of these areas of the parish, as currently it is a list of all materials across the whole parish.	Agreed	This Policy now incorporated into a new Design Policy.
2.	Also clearer reference as to what would be expected of building materials in the Conservation Area (and setting of Listed Buildings) would be useful.	Agreed	Regulation of Heritage building and Conservation areas is well covered in the draft Local Plan, referred to in new Design

			Policy.
3.	It may be better expanded into a more general design policy.	Agreed.	Design policy in revised Plan.
Policy 5			
1.	With regard to the final bullet point, any local knowledge on flood matters must be tied to actual evidence and assessment to provide sufficient weight in a planning decision. It cannot be simply historical knowledge or matter of opinion. A good example of where such an approach failed was at the Coastal Road Appeal where Members defended their refusal based on local knowledge of flooding and drainage in the area. There was no specific evidence to back up those views. The Planning Inspector in that case upheld the appeal and allowed development to take place.	Agreed	Plan amended accordingly
2.	The wording for the policy is slightly incorrect. It implies that all development should be resisted in areas of flood risk unless mitigation is provided. The tests of the NPPF are different in that it categorises the vulnerability of development to flood risk, with those uses least vulnerable to flooding being more acceptable in higher risk areas. The approach here simply needs to be made more consistent with the approach in the NPPF and related pages of the NPPG.	Agreed	Plan amended to ensure consistency with the approach in the NPPF and related pages of the NPPG.
3.	3.13.1: Would be useful to show on a map where these 3 areas are.	Agreed	Map inserted into Plan
4.	Figure 11 doesn't show all areas of flooding referred to	Agreed	Updated Figure 11 showing all areas of flooding inserted.
5.	3.13.5: Information is presented in this paragraph but it is not clear where this has come from.	Agreed	"The underlying clay ...has long gone." Deleted.
6.	Figures 11 and 12 need to be of better quality.	Agreed	Better quality copies of figures 11 and 12 inserted.
7.	It would be useful to see what United Utilities and Lancashire County Council think about this policy.		See appropriate Regulation 14 Consultation responses.

8.	This policy should also be widened to relate to all development, not just where there is a problem.	Agreed	See updated plan
9.	There is the potential to go further to ensure that schemes include above ground surface water disposal and enhance biodiversity.	Agreed	See updated plan
Policy 6			
1.	Don't think there is a need to repeat the additional requirements, a statement could just be added to say they apply to all. Do you want to be promoting and supporting everyone who may want to work at home to extend their house? Do small storage/work units need to be defined a bit more specifically? i.e. what about for industrial use?	Agreed	Small scale extensions within existing residential premises will be supported.
2.	The approach must take into account that there are significant proportions of the area which are within the Green Belt where such a positive approach may not be consistent with national planning policy. The first paragraph of the policy may need to be tweaked to reflect this.	Agreed	Statement protecting Green Belt inserted.
Policy 7			
1.	Where these significant views are and why they are significant needs to be evidenced and described in the plan.	Agreed need to identify, evidence and describe significant views.	Policy NE2, formerly Policy 7 has additional evidence included on commonly agreed significant views.
Policy 8			
1.	Does this policy need to mention risk from flooding? Or at least in the justification text?	Agreed. Will investigate risk of flooding.	Policy amended to include evidence of flood risk in the rationale.
2.	The Policy would benefit from providing additional justification for the protection of this area. It is assumed that this area whilst not itself benefitting from designation, is by virtue of its proximity and character functionally linked to the protected areas. On this basis its continued importance and protection is recognised and supported.	Agreed. We will revisit the justification for the protection of this area.	Policy amended to provide additional justification for the protection of this area.
3.	The first criteria would benefit from rewording making reference to functionally linked land.	Agreed. Will reword to include reference to functionally linked	Policy amended to include reference

		land.	to functionally linked land.
4.	The third criteria should also be reworded. At present it looks like there might be a typo 'including local for wildlife...'	Agreed. Will reword to correct typo.	Typo corrected in Plan.
Policy 9			
1.	Whilst we welcome the aspirations of the policy to help the Council to identify local heritage assets, this isn't a planning policy. Unless there are any local aspirations for non-designated heritage assets that go beyond what is stated in the Local Plan policy, which could be set out as an accompanying policy to that of the Council?	Agreed. The Local Plan provides comprehensive protection for local heritage assets.	Policy 9 rewritten to indicate they are Community commitments/projects outlining the importance of identifying our non designated heritage assets and ways individuals and groups can assist in this process.
Policies 10, 11, 12			
1.	These policies (along with policy 13) are more community aspirations to seek improvements, as opposed to actual land-use policies. It is important to include these community aspirations in the Neighbourhood Plan. It may be worthwhile taking a look at how the Wray-with-Botton Neighbourhood Plan went about this.	Agreed	In addition to Policies COM 1 (formerly Policy 11) and COM 2 (formerly Policy 12) section added to indicate they are Community commitments/projects
Policy 13			
1.	What consultation has taken place so far with Lancashire County Council? How would this policy be achieved?		Policy 13 amended to reflect LCC comments Policy13 is

			now Community Commitments/projects rather than planning policy.
SEA and HRA			
1.	It should be noted that the preparation of the Local Plan has progressed since the assessments were undertaken. The hearing sessions closed on the 21 st May 2019. The Council has since received an interim letter from the Planning Inspector confirming the preparation and consultation on a number of proposed modifications to the plan. Consultation on which lasted for 8 weeks, concluding on Monday 7 th October.	Agreed	Plan amended
2.	A number of modifications may have implications for the presentation of some of the information within the assessments. For example Policy SP6 has been amended with new housing figures provided. It is recognised that these are only modifications and as such the current approach of presenting data as per the submitted plan is supported. This should be kept under review as further progress is made on the Local Plan.	Agreed	Plan amended
3.	It would also be useful to add in the something similar to the following wording 'The precise detail and/or the need for mitigation options will be reviewed at a project level as planning proposals are developed. Depending on the nature of these proposals, further project-level ecological assessments and/or HRA may be required.	Agreed	Plan amended

Consultation Responses

- **Other Statutory Bodies**

Statutory Consultees				
Ref No	Contact name and organisation	Comments	Response	Changes to Plan
1	Cadent Gas (formerly National Grid)	Your request has been received		
2	Environment Agency (Sustainable Places Team)	None received		
3	Environment Agency	None received		
4	Warren Hilton Highways England	Thank you for inviting Highways England to comment on the draft Slyne with Hest Neighbourhood Plan. There are no comments that we feel we need to make regarding the draft Plan, save for being kept informed regarding any development proposals within the vicinity of the M6 motorway that passes through part of the Neighbourhood Plan area.	Comment noted	
5	Emily Hrycan Historic England	Historic England is the Government's statutory adviser on all matters relating to the historic environment in England. We are a non-departmental public body established under the National Heritage Act 1983 and sponsored by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). We champion and protect England's historic places, providing expert advice to local planning authorities, developers, owners and communities to help ensure our historic environment is properly understood, enjoyed and cared for. Thank you for consulting Historic England on the above document. At this stage we have no comments to make on its content.	Comment noted	
6	Nicola Elsworth Homes and Communities Agency (HCA)	Consultation on the Slyne-with-Hest Neighbourhood Plan Homes England Response I would firstly like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Slyne-with-Hest Neighbourhood Plan. Homes England is the government's housing accelerator. We have the appetite, influence, expertise and resources to drive positive market change. By releasing more land to developers who want to make a difference, we're making possible the new homes England needs, helping to improve neighbourhoods and	Comment noted	

		grow communities. Homes England does not have any land holdings affected by the consultation and therefore we do not propose to make at representations at this point. We will however continue to engage with you as appropriate.		
7	Kelly Holt Highways and transport Lancashire County Council	Thanks for your email I have reviewed the site off Sea View Close and it is considered acceptable in principle for residential housing allocation of up to 30 dwellings on the land bounded by the canal and Rakeshead Lane from a highways perspective.	Comment noted	Plan amended
		<p>All development causes disruption to a certain degree to those living nearby and can be minimised by the management of the traffic and other measures to minimise the impact during the construction period. If an application was submitted for this site we would request that a construction traffic management plan was submitted, prior to the commencement of any works, to ensure that the developer addresses the main issues which usually include the following:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors ii) The loading and unloading of plant and materials iii) The storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development iv) The erection and maintenance of security hoarding v) Wheel washing facilities vi) Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction vii) A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works viii) Details of working hours ix) Routing of delivery vehicles to/from site <p>In terms of mitigation measures, we can only request works which are necessary and reasonable to make the development acceptable, as each development is presented to us. Although it is useful for us to know your aspirations and priorities for the parish, it will not always be possible to deliver these through development mitigation due to the strict planning tests described above.</p> <p>I would suggest that your list of highway works cannot be policy because speed limits, restrictions on weight of vehicles and warning signage is</p>	Comment noted	Plan amended

		<p>strictly controlled by the Road Traffic Regulation Act and the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions which are statutory instruments.</p> <p>Whenever speed limits are reduced they must comply with the guidance which states they must be evidence-led and self-explaining and for 20mph speed limits they must be self-enforcing. Currently the section of Hest Bank Lane which you mention is 30mph because it does not comply with the 20mph guidance. However if the land to the west is developed then this can be reviewed with an evidence based approach taking into account the new street-scene and road geometry which is likely to influence vehicle speeds.</p> <p>In terms of the pedestrian in road warning signage, these must only be provided where there is a known safety issue, otherwise a proliferation of signage dilutes their value.</p> <p>You haven't provided any locations which are of concern however I am happy to ask my colleague in the local traffic team to respond directly on these if you have a specific location in mind</p> <p>The large vehicles on the canal bridges is unlikely to be an issue for development, other than during the construction period and this can be controlled by the conditioning of a routeing plan. I understand that our Local Highways and Asset Team are planning to meet with Canals & Rivers Trust shortly with a view to developing further measures to reduce vehicle damage to canal bridges and additional signs are also being considered.</p>		
8	Marine Management	<p><u>Response to your consultation</u></p> <p>The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) is a non-departmental public body responsible for the management of England's marine area on behalf of the UK government. The MMO's delivery functions are; marine planning, marine licensing, wildlife licensing and enforcement, marine protected area management, marine emergencies, fisheries management and issuing European grants.</p> <p><u>Marine Licensing</u></p> <p>Activities taking place below the mean high water mark may require a <u>marine licence</u> in accordance with the <u>Marine and Coastal Access Act (MCAA) 2009</u>. Such activities include the construction, alteration or improvement of any works, dredging, or a deposit or removal of a substance or object below the mean high water springs mark or in any tidal river to the extent of the tidal influence. Local authorities may wish to refer to our <u>marine licensing guide for local planning authorities</u> for more detailed information. You can also apply to the MMO for consent under the Electricity Act 1989 (as amended) for offshore generating stations between 1 and 100 megawatts in England</p>	Comment noted	Comment noted

	<p>and parts of Wales. The MMO is also the authority responsible for processing and determining harbour orders in England, and for some ports in Wales, and for granting consent under various local Acts and orders regarding harbours. A wildlife licence is also required for activities that that would affect a UK or European protected marine species.</p> <p><u>Marine Planning</u></p> <p>As the marine planning authority for England the MMO is responsible for preparing marine plans for English inshore and offshore waters. At its landward extent, a marine plan will apply up to the mean high water springs mark, which includes the tidal extent of any rivers. As marine plan boundaries extend up to the level of the mean high water spring tides mark, there will be an overlap with terrestrial plans which generally extend to the mean low water springs mark. Marine plans will inform and guide decision makers on development in marine and coastal areas.</p> <p>Planning documents for areas with a coastal influence may wish to make reference to the MMO's licensing requirements and any relevant marine plans to ensure that necessary regulations are adhered to. For marine and coastal areas where a marine plan is not currently in place, we advise local authorities to refer to the Marine Policy Statement for guidance on any planning activity that includes a section of coastline or tidal river. All public authorities taking authorisation or enforcement decisions that affect or might affect the UK marine area must do so in accordance with the Marine and Coastal Access Act and the UK Marine Policy Statement unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise. Local authorities may also wish to refer to our online guidance and the Planning Advisory Service soundness self-assessment checklist. If you wish to contact your local marine planning officer you can find their details on our gov.uk page.</p> <p>The MMO is currently in the process of developing marine plans for the remaining 7 marine plan areas by 2021. These are the North East Marine Plans, the North West Marine Plans, the South East Marine Plan and the South West Marine Plans.</p> <p><u>Minerals and waste plans and local aggregate assessments</u></p> <p>If you are consulting on a mineral/waste plan or local aggregate assessment, the MMO recommend reference to marine aggregates is included and reference to be made to the documents below:</p> <p>The Marine Policy Statement (MPS), section 3.5 which highlights the importance of marine aggregates and its supply to England's (and the UK) construction industry.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</p>		
--	---	--	--

		<p>which sets out policies for national (England) construction minerals supply. The NPPF <u>Minerals Planning Practice guidance</u> which includes specific references to the role of marine aggregates in the wider portfolio of supply. <u>The National and regional guidelines for aggregates provision in England 2005-2020</u> predicts likely aggregate demand over this period including marine supply.</p> <p>The NPPF informed Minerals Planning Practice guidance requires local mineral planning authorities to prepare Local Aggregate Assessments, these assessments have to consider the opportunities and constraints of all mineral supplies into their planning regions – including marine. This means that even land-locked counties, may have to consider the role that marine sourced supplies (delivered by rail or river) play – particularly where land based resources are becoming increasingly constrained.</p>		
9	Lucy Bartley National Grid	<p>Slyne with Hest Neighbourhood Plan Consultation SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF NATIONAL GRID</p> <p>National Grid has appointed Wood to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regards to the above Neighbourhood Plan consultation. About National Grid National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (NGET) owns and maintains the electricity transmission system in England and Wales and National Grid Electricity System Operator (NGESO) operates the electricity transmission network across the UK. The energy is then distributed to the eight electricity distribution network operators across England, Wales and Scotland. National Grid Gas plc (NGG) owns and operates the high-pressure gas transmission system across the UK. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the UK's four gas distribution networks where pressure is reduced for public use. National Grid previously owned part of the gas distribution system known as 'National Grid Gas Distribution limited (NGGDL). Since May 2018, NGGDL is now a separate entity called 'Cadent Gas'. To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect National Grid's assets. Specific Comments An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines. National</p>	Comment noted	

		Grid has identified that it has no record of such apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan area. Please remember to consult National Grid on any Neighbourhood Plan Documents or site-specific proposals that could affect our infrastructure.		
10	Elizabeth Knowles Natural England	<p>Regulation 14 Consultation for Slyne with Hest Neighbourhood Plan Thank you for your consultation on the above dated and received by Natural England on 02 September 2019 Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. We have reviewed the following documents;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Slyne with Hest Neighbourhood Plan 2017 – 2031 (July 2019) <input type="checkbox"/> Draft Habitats Regulations Assessment (Aecom, Rev 0, April 2019) <input type="checkbox"/> Strategic Environmental Assessment (Aecom, V1, August 2019) <p>And have the following comments to make. As currently drafted the Neighbourhood Plan would fail to meet the basic conditions as set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 as applied to neighbourhood plans by Section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The Draft Habitats Regulations Assessment outlines additional wording to be incorporated into Policies 2, 3 and 12 in order to conclude no adverse effects on the integrity of internationally designated sites. However these changes have not been carried forward to the draft plan. As such, the making of the neighbourhood plan would not be compatible with EU obligations, namely the Habitats Directive, due to effects on Morecambe Bay Special Protection Area, Special Area of Conservation and Ramsar site. In addition, the plan would not be compliant with national policy in terms of enhancing and protecting the natural environment. The neighbourhood plan will also not conform to the adopted Lancaster Local Plan (Development Management DPD) Policy DM27 and emerging Lancaster Local Plan (Part One) Policy SP8 which protects the natural environment. This issue can be resolved by ensuring that the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan fully reflect the recommendations of the HRA. Other Comments The following comments would also help to strengthen the plan</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p>Will amend Plan to ensure all policies reflect the recommendations of the HRA.</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Plan amended to ensure all policies reflect the recommendations of the HRA.</p> <p>All reference to 'European' designated sites changed to 'Internationally' designated sites.</p> <p>Policy amended to include reference to recreational disturbance</p>

		<p>Local Plan</p> <p>We recommend that all reference to 'European' designated sites is changed to 'Internationally' designated sites. Policy 8 – This policy could also include some reference to recreational disturbance. Strategic Environmental Assessment Paragraph 3.2.1 regarding scoping out air quality impacts should refer back to the assessment already carried out in the Habitats Regulations Assessment as the justification for scoping out this impact (as the SSSI boundary is similar to the SAC, SPA, Ramsar boundary).</p>		
11	Diane Clark Network Rail	<p>Network Rail has the following comments to make.1.Network Rail is a statutory consultee for any planning applications within 10 metres of relevant railway land (as the Rail Infrastructure Managers for the railway, set out in Article 16 of the Development Management Procedure Order) and for any development likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway (as the Rail Network Operators, set out in Schedule 4 (J) of the Development Management Procedure Order).Network Rail is also a statutory undertaker responsible for maintaining and operating the railway infrastructure and associated estate. It owns, operates and develops the main rail network. Network Rail aims to protect and enhance the railway infrastructure; therefore any proposed development which is in close proximity to the railway line or could potentially affect Network Rail's specific land interests will need to be carefully considered. 2. The proposal area is adjacent to a section of railway line. Developments in the neighbourhood area should be notified to Network Rail to ensure that:</p> <p>a. Access points / rights of way belonging to Network Rail are not impacted by developments within the area. b.That any proposal does not impact upon the railway infrastructure / Network Rail land e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drainage works / water features • Encroachment of land or air-space • Excavation works • Siting of structures/buildings less than 2m from the Network Rail boundary / Party Wall Act issues • Lighting impacting upon train drivers' ability to perceive signals • Landscaping that could impact upon overhead lines or Network Rail boundary treatments • Any piling works • Any scaffolding works 	Comment noted	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any public open spaces and proposals where minors and young children may be likely to use a site which could result in trespass upon the railway (which we would remind the council is a criminal offence under s55 British Transport Commission Act 1949) • Any use of crane or plant • Any fencing works • Any demolition works • Any hard standing areas <p>For any proposal adjacent to the railway, Network Rail would request that a developer constructs (at their own expense) a suitable steel palisade trespass proof fence of at least 1.8m in height. All initial proposals and plans should be flagged up to the Network Rail Town Planning Team London North Western Route at the following address: Town Planning Team LNW Network Rail 1st Floor Square One 4 Travis Street Manchester M1 2NYEmail: TownPlanningLNW@networkrail.co.uk</p> <p>3. As development plans within the area come forward, Transport Assessments should include consideration of the impacts upon Level Crossing in the area. Councils are urged to take the view that level crossings can be impacted in a variety of ways by planning proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By a proposal being directly next to a level crossing • By the cumulative effect of developments added over time in the vicinity of a level crossing • By the type of level crossing involved e.g. where pedestrians only are allowed to use the level crossing, but a proposal involves allowing cyclists to use the route • By the construction of large developments (commercial and residential) where road access to and from the site includes a level crossing or the level / type of use of a level crossing increases as a result of diverted traffic or of a new highway • By developments that might impede pedestrians ability to hear approaching trains at a level crossing, e.g. new airports or new runways / highways / roads • By proposals that may interfere with pedestrian and vehicle users' ability to see level crossing warning signs • By any developments for schools, colleges or nurseries where minors in numbers may be using the level crossing • By any proposal that may cause blocking 		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>back across the level crossing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By any proposal which may see a level crossing impacted by the introduction of cycling or walking routes TA's should include consideration of an increase in volume <u>and</u> a change in the character of user 		
12	NHS – Morecambe Bay Clinical Commissioning Group	I can confirm that your email is receiving our attention and we hope to be in a position to respond to you within five working days. Thank you	Comment noted. No further response received. Assumed none needed.	
13	Office of Rail Regulation	None received		
14	Northern Gas	None received		
15	Architectural liaison officers Lancashire Police	Thank you for your e-mail. We will respond in due course (where relevant). Please note: this mailbox is not monitored 24/7 and will be checked each morning (Mon-Fri). Regards Lancashire Constabulary Designing Out Crime Officers	Comment noted. No further response received. Assumed none needed.	
16	Christopher Telford The Coal Authority	Slyne-with-Hest Neighbourhood Plan - Regulation 14 Thank you for consulting The Coal Authority on the above. Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on it. Should you have any future enquiries please contact a member of Planning and Local Authority Liaison at The Coal Authority.	Comment noted.	
17	United Utilities - LDF Assessor	<p><u>Slyne with Hest Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 14 consultation</u></p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>United Utilities works closely with Lancaster Council to understand future development sites so we can facilitate the delivery of necessary sustainable infrastructure at the appropriate time. It is important that we highlight that as the water and sewerage company for Lancaster Council, we have statutory obligations which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The right to connect domestic wastewater flows to the public sewer. This includes foul and surface water; and A domestic supply duty in respect of public water supply. <p>United Utilities seeks to work with Lancaster Council and Slyne with Hest Parish Council to ensure all surface water from new development is drained in the most sustainable manner, in line</p>	Comment noted.	United Utilities will be kept aware of any further development proposed within the NP area over and above the Council's allocations.

	<p>with the surface water hierarchy (see specific comments for more detail). We wish to highlight our free pre-application service for applicants to discuss and agree drainage strategies and water supply requirements. We cannot stress highly enough the importance of contacting us as early as possible. Enquiries are encouraged by contacting: Developer Services - Wastewater Tel: 03456 723 723 Email: WastewaterDeveloperServices@uuplc.co.uk Website: http://www.unitedutilities.com/builder-developer-planning.aspx Developer Services – Water Tel: 0345 072 6067 Email: DeveloperServicesWater@uuplc.co.uk Website: http://www.unitedutilities.com/newwatersupply.aspx</p> <p>It is important that United Utilities is kept aware of any further development proposed within your neighbourhood plan over and above the Council's allocations.</p> <p>Specific Comments Policy 2(a) Site for New Development We have noticed that in 'Policy 2(a) Site for New Development' of the Neighbourhood Plan, an additional site at Land West of Sea View Drive, Hest Bank has been allocated for 30-35 dwellings. United Utilities wishes to highlight that it owns assets in the area. Whilst the infrastructure is located outside the proposed red line boundary, all UU assets will need to be afforded due regard in the master planning process. We will need unrestricted access for operating and maintaining our assets 24 hours a day.</p> <p>We can see that the Lancaster Canal is situated to the western boundary of the site, and it is important that the discharge of surface water to this watercourse is explored during the investigation of the surface water hierarchy. On this basis, we recommend the addition of a further point after point 5 of Policy 2(a) stating the following:</p> <p>6. Discharge of surface water to the Lancaster Canal must be explored as early as possible in the site design process, during investigation of the surface water hierarchy. Early consultation with the Canal and River Trust is recommended.</p> <p>Policy 5. Flooding With regards to the text in 'Policy 5. Flooding', United Utilities recommends additional wording to bullet point 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "New development should be designed to maximise the retention of surface water on the development site and to minimise runoff. The approach to surface water drainage should be considered in liaison 		<p>Amendments included in Plan</p>
--	---	--	------------------------------------

		<p>with the LLFA, the public sewerage undertaker and where appropriate the Environment Agency.”</p> <p>We recommend the following text is also included in section ‘3.13 Rationale for Policy 5’: “Surface water should be discharged in the following order of priority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An adequate soakaway or some other form of infiltration system. • An attenuated discharge to watercourse or other water body. • An attenuated discharge to public surface water sewer. • An attenuated discharge to public combined sewer. <p>No surface water will be expected to discharge to the public sewerage system. Applicants wishing to discharge to public sewer will need to submit clear evidence demonstrating why alternative options are not available as part of the determination of their application.”</p> <p>United Utilities also recommend the following text is removed from bullet point 3 of ‘Policy 5. Flooding’:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) should be implemented in accordance with the SuDS hierarchy unless deemed inappropriate. <p>We have requested that the text highlighted in red is removed from the document as United Utilities are not aware of a SuDS hierarchy document.</p> <p>Summary Moving forward, we respectfully request that Slyne with Hest Parish Council continue to consult with United Utilities on all future planning documents. We are keen to continue working in partnership with you and Lancaster Council to ensure that all new growth can be delivered sustainably.</p> <p>In the meantime, if you have any queries or would like to discuss this representation, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>Kind regards, Ellie Levenson Assistant Town Planner</p>		<p>Plan amended</p>
--	--	--	--	---------------------

Consultation Responses

- **Non statutory Responses**

Non Statutory Consultees				
Ref No	Contact name and organisation	Comments	Response	Changes to Plan
1	Graham Love Smith and Love Planning Consultants Applethwaite Ltd	1. Smith & Love Planning Consultants is instructed by Applethwaite Ltd ("Applethwaite") to submit comments in response to the pre-submission Slyne-with-Hest Neighbourhood Plan ("PSWHNP") Regulation 14 consultation. 2. Applethwaite has been in constructive dialogue with the Steering Group regarding the development of the land it controls to the west of Sea View Drive, Hest Bank (ref. LPSA 167) since 2017, and has promoted it for a scheme of up to 35 no. age-restricted bungalows at each stage of the preparation of the Lancaster Local Plan 2011 - 2031 Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD. Applethwaite is therefore pleased that the PSWHNP proposes to alter the Green Belt boundary in this location and allocate the land for housing development, and is wholly supportive of draft Policies 2(a) and 2(b) in principle. 3. The following comments and suggested modifications are therefore provided to assist the Steering Group in preparing the final submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan so that the 'basic conditions' for neighbourhood plans are met in respect of the purpose and content of Policies 2(a) and 2(b), whereby; a) Policy 2(a) correctly relates to and is in general conformity with the Green Belt boundary proposals set out in strategic policy EN4 of the Lancaster Local Plan (on the basis the Local Plan must be adopted before the Neighbourhood Plan can alter the Green Belt boundary), so there is no discrepancy and/or misapplication of national policy relating to the alteration of Green Belt boundaries between the Plans; and, b) Policy 2(b) sets out clear and unambiguous criteria so that development is deliverable and which have regard to relevant national planning policy requirements. Policy 2(a) 4. The PSWHNP explains that the rationale for Policy 2(a) is; Paragraph 3.6.1 In order to accommodate the demands of the Local Plan for appropriate housing provision, there is a need for housing development appropriate to the needs of the Village. Objectives 1 and 2 of this Neighbourhood Plan make it necessary to attach any development to the footprint of the Village to prevent sprawl and to keep the settlement as a discrete entity. There is no immediately available land inside the Village footprint or around it large enough to be considered for a development of the scale needed. The NP argues that this is an 'exceptional circumstance' within the meaning of	We have not included a requirement for 'age-restricted' homes. The potential for realignment of the Green Belt boundary around Plot 1 was discussed at the Hearing Sessions with the Inspector of Lancaster City Council's Local Plan and the Inspector concluded that such boundary changes could be dealt with at a local level via a neighbourhood plan in the context of paragraph 136 of the 2019 NPPF.	No change to Plan to include a requirement for 'age-restricted' homes.

	<p>the Green Belt legislation (NPPF February 2019 Paragraph 136). The area of land referred to will provide for a sufficiently large development to fulfil housing needs. Furthermore, the newly formed boundary being the Lancaster Canal, the Green Belt here will have enhanced protection from such a firm boundary. 5. As a non-strategic document, it is not the task of the PSWHNP and it does not have the ability, to determine whether exceptional circumstances exist to justify an alteration of the Green Belt boundary. Paragraph 136 of the 2018 NPPF is clear that only the Local Plan can establish that position and the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan is limited to defining the detailed alteration of the Green Belt boundary on the ground. 6. On this basis, so that there is no discrepancy between the Neighbourhood Plan and Local Plan and so the land forming LPSA ref. 167 (Plot 1) can be properly allocated for housing development as the Steering Group intends, Applethwaite considers that paragraph 22.32 of the Local Plan must be further modified to make clear that a Green Belt alteration to the west of Sea View Drive, Hest Bank is justified and necessary, so there is clarity that exceptional circumstances exist in terms of altering the Green Belt boundary in that location to meet housing needs within (and closely related to) the village footprint. Policy 2(a) can then propose with certainty, the detailed new boundary the alteration should follow. 7. It was discussed during the Local Plan Examination hearings (Matter 2 / Question L) whether Policy EN6 (which is listed in Appendix C of the Local Plan as a strategic policy) should make explicit reference to an alteration of the Green Belt boundary to remove land west of Sea View Drive, Slyne-with-Hest so there would be no doubt that the PSWHNP is in conformity with the Local Plan strategic policies. 8. Applethwaite understood from the hearing session that a Main Modification would be made to the Local Plan to this effect however it was not included in the published schedule. The City Council has subsequently explained to Applethwaite that it considers a Main Modification is not required because paragraph 136 of the 2018 NPPF allows amendments to Green Belt boundaries to be made through non-strategic policies including neighbourhood plans. It says; Paragraph 136 Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified through the preparation or updating of plans. Strategic policies should establish the need for any changes to Green Belt boundaries, having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so they</p>	<p>Alteration of heading and text of Policy 2(a) agreed and accepted.</p>	<p>Policy HE2, formerly Policy 2(a) amended accordingly</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>can endure beyond the plan period. Where a need for changes to Green Belt boundaries has been established through strategic policies, detailed amendments to those boundaries may be made through non-strategic policies, including neighbourhood plans. 9. Applethwaite has therefore submitted a representation to the City Council in response to the Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications Consultation pointing this out. 10. If the Local Plan Inspector is satisfied that Policy EN6 of the Local Plan and its supporting text is fit for purpose in its current form, whereby the need for a change to the Green Belt boundary west of Sea View Drive, Hest Bank is established so that detailed alteration of the boundary can legitimately be made by the Slyne-with-Hest Neighbourhood Plan in accordance with paragraph 136 of the 2018 NPPF, then Applethwaite is content that no modification is required. 11. Applethwaite is not convinced that this is the case however and therefore proposed a further modification to the Local Plan Main Modification SPLA_MOD_46 on the basis that it fails to clarify that exceptional circumstances exist and clearly establish the need for a change to the Green Belt boundary west of Sea View Drive, Hest Bank. 12. Applethwaite suggests that corresponding modifications (i.e. deletions and clarifications) should therefore be incorporated into the PSWHNP so it is consistent with the Local Plan. Specifically, the PSWHNP must not set out why it considers exceptional circumstances exist. Proposed changes to Policy 2(a) and its supporting text 13. Applethwaite considers that the following changes are necessary; 1) Paragraph 3.6.1 Delete the whole of the sentence referring to 'exceptional circumstances' and replace it (or rewrite the paragraph) with wording cross referring to the existence of exceptional circumstances implied in the supporting text of Policy EN6 of the Local Plan (subject to any further Main Modification recommended by the Inspector following the representation submitted by Applethwaite). The wording should be discussed with the City Council. 2) Paragraph 3.6.2 Revise / rewrite to be consistent with changes made to paragraph 3.6.1 3) Paragraph 3.6.2 Revise / rewrite to be consistent with changes made to paragraph 3.6.1 4) Policy title This should be changed as follows; Policy 2(a) Alteration of the Green Belt boundary 5) Policy text This should be changed as follows; The Neighbourhood Plan proposes to alter the Green Belt boundary to the west of Sea View Drive, Hest Bank to facilitate future growth for residential purposes under Policy 2(b). The new Green Belt boundary follows the</p>	<p>Comments noted. The original wording of Policy 2(b) to be considerably amended as a result of Regulation 14 Consultation.</p>	<p>See updated plan Criteria in Policy 2(b) rewritten to include Design and Access Statement and relationship of site to topography and existing buildings. Design Policy refers to design of future extensions to proposed dwelling.</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>east bank of the Lancaster Canal and Rakes Head Lane. Policy 2(b) 14. Applethwaite does not object to the use and scope of the proposed development criteria in the policy in general. It has some concerns over the rationale for each criterion however and suggests that the wording of the supporting text in paragraphs 3.8.1 to 3.8.11 is revised to take account of the following proposed changes. Proposed changes to Policy 2(b) - housing development criteria 15. Applethwaite considers that the following changes are necessary; 1. A full site design shall be provided which shows green space, planting areas for shrubs and small trees and buildings positioned to maximise views through and over the site. Site design will maximise social interaction of residents; 2. The building of 30 - 35 age-restricted dwellings on the site to be single storey with gable roofs; 3. A condition removing permitted development rights will be attached to any planning permission/s granted for the development of the site to ensure that the rooflines of one storey dwellings are not raised above their original constructed height; 4. Aspects and placement of buildings to be varied in order to facilitate views through and across the site; 5. The ground profile of the existing site will be maintained as an even gradient down to the Canal; 6. Materials to be in accordance with Policy 4 of this Plan; 7. Affordable housing to be provided in accordance with Lancaster City Council's Development Management DPD, 2019 (Policy DM3) and relevant Government policy set out in the National Planning Policy Framework; 8. Dwellings to facilitate easy access into and around buildings for people with mobility issues; 9. Site design to encourage movement around the site for people with mobility issues by minimising street clutter, thoughtful placement of utility equipment and the use of lowered kerbs and ramps; 10. The site plan will seek to maximise green space for grass and planted shrubs and trees in public space and allow one public parking space per dwelling. This to be achieved by minimising space for front gardens; 11. Driveways and pathways attached to dwellings should be permeable, where technically feasible and subject to ground conditions, to allow infiltration of water in line with Policy DM34 of the Local Plan. 12. Site design will include provision of a wildlife corridor alongside the Canal and the retention of natural features and associated native animal and plant species on the site in accordance with Policies DM42 and DM43 of the Local Plan; 13. Appropriate landscaping adjacent to the canal should be provided to minimise potential impacts on the amenity of the</p>		
--	--	--	--

		existing nearby canal moorings; 14. Access points will be provided to enable scope for a footpath / cycleway through the site from Sunningdale Crescent in the North to Rakes Head Lane (commonly known as Old Bob's Lane) in the South, subject to Third Party land ownership.		
2	Mike Hughes Smith and Love Planning Consultants Oakmere Homes Ltd.	1. Smith & Love Planning Consultants is instructed by Oakmere Homes Ltd ("Oakmere") to submit comments in response to the pre-submission Slyne-with-Hest Neighbourhood Plan ("PSWHNP") Regulation 14 consultation. 2. Oakmere controls land to the east of Fulwood Drive, Torrisholme (forming the northern part of site ref. LPSA 712) which lies within Slyne with Hest Parish and the Neighbourhood Area, albeit it is annexed by the West Coast Main Line and is closely associated with the urban area of Morecambe. Oakmere has discussed this land with the Steering Group and has promoted it with a masterplan and detailed LVIA and technical evidence, for a scheme of up to 140 no. dwellings at each stage of the preparation of the Lancaster Local Plan 2011 - 2031 Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD. 3. Oakmere assumes the PSWHNP is intended to cover the whole of the Parish and designated Neighbourhood Area (as set out in paragraphs 3.2.2 and 3.3.1), but is unclear in respect of the references to the purpose and vision of the Plan in both of the Forewords in Section 1 which refer to protecting the 'core' historic village of Slyne with Hest and safeguarding its character, vitality and community facilities. Paragraph 1.3.4 explains that "parish" refers to the Neighbourhood Area and "village" is the footprint of Slyne with Hest village but this terminology is not used consistently in every policy. The remit of some development management policies appears to be limited to the "village" (for example Policy 1 at paragraph 3.5.4, Policy 4 and Policy 7) while others are clearly intended to apply on a "parish-wide" basis. The inference in paragraph 3.3.3 is that the spatial and development management policies of the Lancaster Local Plan will apply in the parts of the Neighbourhood Area where the PSWHNP is silent. Comments 4. The PSWHNP is silent on its physical and neighbourhood planning relationship with Morecambe, its housing needs and whether through cooperation between the Slyne with Hest Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Morecambe Town Council, any unmet housing need arising in Morecambe could be met within the Slyne with Hest Neighbourhood Area. 5. The land which Oakmere controls is on the western periphery of the Neighbourhood Area. It is physically and functionally part of Morecambe and	Comments noted. We have consulted Morecambe Town Council about this issue. Reply received. First of all our Steering Group has asked me to pass on to you their congratulations on having reached the milestone of publication of the Consultation version of your Neighbourhood Plan. Our Steering Group has studied the plan and has paid particular attention to those areas of your Parish which border our own Parish. Our Steering Group has in particular, taken account of Policy 1. which clearly addresses local housing need. We have noted the suggestion from Smith and Love Planning Consultants with regard to the need for that policy to be amended in order to meet "...the housing needs of Morecambe ...etc." Morecambe has no identified housing needs. Any suggestion that the land under the control of the clients of Smith and	

	<p>is physically and visually divorced and annexed from Slyne with Hest by the West Coast Main Line such that it has no relationship with the parish and especially the core village. 6. The PSWHNP does not contain policies relating specifically to the land controlled by Oakmere but depending on the interpretation of its intended coverage, Policy 1 may be designed to apply. 7. If this is the intention, Oakmere objects to Policy 1 as currently worded, on the basis that if future circumstances and the policies of the Lancaster Local Plan permit, there may be scope for housing development to the west of the West Coast Main Line on the northern part of site ref. LPSA 712 to meet the identified needs of Morecambe that cannot be accommodated within the very constrained built up area of the town and on surrounding land whereby its sustainable extension is prevented to the north, west and south. a) Proposed change to the PSWHNP - additional policy 8. Oakmere asks the Steering Group to give this matter further consideration and to include a specific policy or suitable reference in the final version of the Neighbourhood Plan, to give weight to its scope and potential to help meet Morecambe's housing needs by accommodating appropriate development on land within the Parish solely to the west of the West Coast Main Line, and/or to facilitate future development of the land in cooperation with Morecambe Town Council. b) Proposed change to Policy 1 - Local housing need 9. Alternatively, if the Steering Group considers that the Neighbourhood Plan should rely on the relevant strategic and site-specific policies of the Lancaster Local Plan to manage future development of land controlled by Oakmere in the northern part of LPSA site ref. 712, Oakmere asks that the wording of Policy 1 is slightly amended (on the basis it is intended to apply beyond the extent of the core village) to acknowledge the opportunity that may come forward in the future to accommodate appropriate development on the Parish boundary with Morecambe to help meet the town's housing needs. 10. Oakmere considers the following change is necessary; • New Developments will only be supported where they contribute to; - the identified needs of the Parish; or, - the housing needs of Morecambe which cannot be met within the Morecambe Neighbourhood Area and which could be accommodated on land within the Parish solely to the west of the West Coast Main Line. • Mixed residential developments of 15 or more houses must provide affordable homes in line with Lancaster City Council Local Plan identified ratio. • The option for the removal of this policy in</p>	<p>Love might at some time in the future be able to meet housing needs fails to take account of the fact that this land currently enjoys protection as Green Belt and should the Green Belt boundary be moved will still enjoy protection as designated Urban Landscape. It is clear that this land ownership is speculative given that the land is not designated as a housing opportunity site and is not to designated as such in the emerging plan. Your Steering Group is thus being asked to make provision within your plan for a speculative development and there can be no demonstrable or planning reason for you to do so. My Steering Group asks you to consider their views, as set out below, with regard to this parcel of land within your Parish and their thoughts with regard to the part of Morecambe which it adjoins. The road network is not considered suitable to service further dwellings on adjoining land and there is no facility for improvement of the road network.</p>	
--	---	---	--

		<p>exchange for a financial contribution to aid the delivery of affordable dwellings outside the Parish will not be considered. 11. In association with either alternative a) and b), the location of the land controlled by Oakmere as an identified opportunity to help meet the housing needs of Morecambe which cannot be met within the Morecambe Neighbourhood Area and which could be accommodated on land within the Parish solely to the west of the West Coast Main Line, could be shown on the map at Figure 2 of the PSWHNP with a suitable notation added to the key.</p>	<p>The land is very low lying and flood protection works are unlikely to be possible given the nature of the land and that the local drainage system does not extend beyond the existing urban area and already fails large sections of the surrounding community on a regular basis. Any development of that area would significantly reduce the quality of life of local residents which they currently enjoy as a result of the Green Belt status of the land and the possible future status of that land as designated urban landscape. Any such development would clearly be in contradiction of the NPPF imperative to avoid urban sprawl.</p> <p>In addition, our Steering Group notes the inference drawn in point 3 of the submission by Smith and Love with regard to paragraph 3.3.3 of the SWH NP which is reproduced below for your convenience.</p> <p><i>"The inference in paragraph 3.3.3 is that the spatial and development</i></p>
--	--	--	---

			<p><i>management policies of the Lancaster Local Plan will apply in the parts of the Neighbourhood Area where the PSWHNP is silent."</i></p> <p>It is the view of our Steering Group that the inference drawn is far too sweeping to be applied in any specific way and that Policy 1 should not be amended. Nevertheless, for the sake of clarity we would ask you to consider amending policy 2 (either 2a or 2b or possibly by the inclusion of a policy 2c) by the addition of a further point. Paras 3.6.3 to 3.6.6 refer to green belt and could support a further policy stipulation regarding the use of green land. Such a policy might state.</p> <p>"The further use of Green Belt or Designated Urban Landscape for housing will not be supported."</p> <p>I hope this submission is helpful to you and once again many congratulations on an excellent job.</p>	
3	Rachel Ford Bowcliffe	<p>Thank you for your email dated the 19th of September 2019 notifying Bowcliffe of the above publication and the chance to make representation.</p> <p>As you are aware, Bowcliffe have been actively involved in the promotion of the VVV Leisure Site at Hest Bank for release from the Green Belt. The site is now vacant, and we are now looking to</p>	<p>The NPPF allows for boundary changes only under 'exceptional circumstances'. The Steering Group are aware that no development which includes dwellings</p>	<p>Policy B1 (formerly Policy 6) amended to clarify future use options for the former</p>

		<p>secure its long-term use, to ensure that the site does not become vulnerable to vandalism or crime.</p> <p>We note that the current neighbourhood draft does not seek to remove this site from the Green Belt. We consider this a flaw in approach, especially, as the site performs poorly against the requirements of paragraph 134 of the 2019 NPPF. This was acknowledged by the acting local authorities Green Belt Review, dated 2016. This document has recently been examined by an Inspector as part of the local plan process, with the Plan at the advance stages of becoming formally adopted. The document can therefore be considered sound for informing the decision-making process.</p> <p>Bowcliffe have already issued a detailed development statement to the steering group on the above matter. The statement draws upon the conclusions of the Green Belt review to support its release. As previously noted, other policies regarding flood risk and ecology ensure that future development on the VVV Leisure site would remain controlled.</p> <p>We strongly request the steering group to reconsider the release of the site and residential units which adjoins the site from the Green Belt. This will help ensure the sites longevity, which is important given its gateway location into Hest Bank.</p>	<p>would receive planning permission on this site, which may be subject to inundation. We are very reluctant to move a Green Belt boundary, even to gain additional housing, so we cannot regard this as an exceptional circumstance.</p> <p>We are aware that other enterprises have started to use the former VVV facilities and that the current footprint of the existing building could possibly be re-used for future projects within a Green Belt context, but we would resist any development on a larger scale than the existing facilities.</p>	VVV site
4	Josh Plant Gladman Development s Ltd	<p>Dear Sir/Madam, Re: Slyne with Hest – Regulation 14 consultation This letter provides Gladman Developments Ltd (Gladman) representations in response to the draft version of the Slyne with Hest Neighbourhood Plan (SWHNP) under Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. This letter seeks to highlight the issues with the plan as currently presented and its relationship with national and local planning policy. Gladman has considerable experience in neighbourhood planning, having been involved in the process during the preparation of numerous plans across the country, it is from this experience that these representations are prepared. Legal Requirements Before a neighbourhood plan can proceed to referendum it must be tested against a set of basic conditions set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The basic conditions that the SWHNP must meet are as follows: (a) Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the order. (d) The making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable</p>	<p>Comments on the first three and a half pages noted.</p>	

	<p>development. (e) The making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area). (f) The making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations. (g) The making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. National Planning Policy Framework On 24th July 2018, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) published the Revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF2018). This publication forms the first revision of the Framework since 2012 and implements changes that have been informed through the Housing White Paper, The Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places consultation and the draft NPPF2018 consultation. This version was itself superseded on the 19th February 2019, when MHCLG published a further revision to the NPPF (2019) which implements further changes to national policy, relating to the Government's approach for Appropriate Assessment as set out in Paragraph 177, clarification to footnote 37 and amendments to the definition of 'deliverable' in Annex 2. National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. In doing so it sets out the requirements for the preparation of neighbourhood plans to be in conformity with the strategic priorities for the wider area and the role they play in delivering sustainable development to meet development needs. At the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread through plan-making and decision-taking. This means that plan makers should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change. This requirement is applicable to neighbourhood plans. The recent Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) updates make clear that neighbourhood plans should conform to national policy requirements and take account of and most up-to-date evidence of housing needs in order to assist the Council in delivering sustainable development, a neighbourhood plan basic condition. The application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development will have implications for how communities engage with neighbourhood planning. Paragraph 13 of the Framework makes clear that Qualifying Bodies preparing neighbourhood plans should develop plans that support strategic development needs</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing development and plan positively to support local development. Paragraph 15 further makes clear that neighbourhood plans should set out a succinct and positive vision for the future of the area. A neighbourhood plan should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency. Neighbourhood plans should seek to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, jobs and thriving local places that the country needs, whilst responding positively to the wider opportunities for growth. Paragraph 29 of the Framework makes clear that a neighbourhood plan must be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider area and plan positively to support the delivery of sustainable growth opportunities. Planning Practice Guidance Following the publication of the NPPF (2018), the Government published updates to its Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on 13th September 2018 with further updates being made in the intervening period. The updated PPG provides further clarity on how specific elements of the Framework should be interpreted when preparing neighbourhood plans. Although a draft neighbourhood plan must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted development plan, it is important for the neighbourhood plan to provide flexibility and consider the reasoning and evidence informing the emerging Local Plan which will be relevant to the consideration of the basic conditions against which a neighbourhood plan is tested against. For example, the neighbourhood planning body should take into consideration up-to-date housing needs evidence as this will be relevant to the question of whether a housing supply policy in a neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development. Where a neighbourhood plan is being brought forward before an up-to-date Local Plan is in place, the qualifying body and local planning authority should discuss and aim to agree the relationship between the policies in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, the emerging Local Plan and the adopted Development Plan . This should be undertaken through a positive and proactive approach working collaboratively and based on shared evidence in order to minimise any potential conflicts which can arise and ensure that policies contained in the neighbourhood plan are not ultimately overridden by a new Local Plan. It is important the neighbourhood plan sets out a positive approach to development in their area by working in partnership with local planning authorities, landowners and developers to identify their housing need figure and identifying sufficient land to meet this requirement as a minimum.</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>Furthermore, it is important that policies contained in the neighbourhood plan do not seek to prevent or stifle the ability of sustainable growth opportunities from coming forward. Relationship to Local Plans To meet the requirements of the Framework and the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions, neighbourhood plans should be prepared to conform to the strategic policy requirements set out in the adopted Development Plan. Slyne with Hest falls within the administration of Lancaster City Council and therefore will be tested against the Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD), which was formally adopted in December 2014. The Development Management DPD sets out a series of generic planning policies which will be used by us to determine planning applications, alongside policies relating to economic, environmental and social 2011-2031. Slyne is identified as a 'Sustainable Rural Settlement' where proposals for new housing will be supported, but it is noted that a new settlement hierarchy will be set out in the Land Allocations DPD. The Council are currently working on the Strategic Policies and Land Allocation Development Plan Document (DPD) (2011-2031) and Development Management DPD Review, these plans were submitted for examination in December 2017. Following hearing sessions and a report from the Inspector, the Council consulted on the proposed Main Modifications to the Local Plan between 12th August to 7th October 2019. Policy SP6 of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD sets a stepped housing requirement of 10,440 dwellings, as set out below: -2011/12 to 2018/19 – 400 dwellings per annum (DPA) -2019/20 to 2023/24 – 485 DPA -2024/25 to 2028/29 – 685 DPA -2029/30 to 2030/31 – 695 DPA Slyne is identified as a tier 3 'Sustainable rural settlement outside of areas of outstanding natural beauty'. It is noted that settlements contained within this category will provide the focus of growth for Lancaster district outside the main urban areas subject to the constraints of the protected landscapes where a landscape-capacity approach will be taken. It is likely that the Local Plan will be adopted prior to the examination of the SWHNP therefore the neighbourhood plan should be sufficiently aligned with the strategic policies of the emerging Local Plan, to avoid risk of the SWHNP failing at examination. Should this not be the case, policies within the SWHNP should be drafted with sufficient flexibility to ensure conflicts are minimised and ensure the SWHNP is capable of being effective over the duration of its plan period and not ultimately superseded by s38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which states that: "if to any extent, a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflicts with</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Policy to refer to successor documents to Local Plan.</p> <p>The potential for realignment of the Green Belt boundary around Plot 1 was discussed at the Hearing Sessions with the Inspector of Lancaster City Council's Local Plan and the Inspector concluded that such boundary changes could be dealt with at a local level via a neighbourhood plan in the context of paragraph 136 of the 2019 NPPF.</p> <p>Agreed</p>	
--	---	---	--

		<p>another policy in the development plan the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to be adopted, approached, or published (as the case may be).”</p> <p>Slyne with Hest Neighbourhood Plan This section highlights the key issues that Gladman would like to raise with regards to the content of the SWHNP as currently proposed. It is considered that some policies do not reflect the requirements of national policy and guidance, Gladman have therefore sought to recommend a series of alternative options that should be explored prior to the Plan being submitted for Independent Examination.</p> <p>Policy 1: Local Housing Need In principle, Gladman support the approach that new housing will be permitted as contained within the Lancaster Local Plan. However, the NPPF19 Paragraph 33 states that Local Plans should be reviewed at least once every 5 years. As such, it is important that the policy refers to any subsequent Local Plan to ensure that the policy remains up-to-date. Gladman is also concerned over the statement made in relation to affordable housing that, “The option for the removal of this policy in exchange for a financial contribution to aid the delivery of affordable dwellings outside the Parish, will not be considered”. Firstly, Gladman remind the Qualifying Body that it is not in the remit of the neighbourhood plan to determine planning applications as this is the sole responsibility of the local planning authority and recommend that this element of the policy is deleted or amended to state that the removal of affordable housing in exchange for financial contribution will not be supported. Secondly, Policy DM3: The Delivery of Affordable Housing within the emerging Development Management DPD Review states that, “Where compelling and detailed evidence demonstrates that the provision of affordable housing in accordance with the above requirements would have a disproportionate and unwarranted negative impact on the viability of a proposed development, applicants may, in agreement with the Council, provide fewer affordable dwellings than would ordinarily be acceptable, review the tenure or mix of dwellings, or provide a financial contribution in lieu of onsite provision. Such evidence must include an open book financial viability appraisal which will need to accord with guidance in the emerging Viability Protocol SPD”. Therefore, Gladman suggest that the wording of this section of Policy 1 be modified to align with the emerging Lancaster Local Plan.</p> <p>Policy 2(a) Site for New Development The above policy identifies land west of Sea View Drive, Hest Bank to be removed from the Green Belt to allow for the housing allocation of 30-35 dwellings (Policy 2(b)). Although Gladman support the fact that SWHNP sets out a positive approach to meet the development needs of the area, it should be</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Comments noted</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

	<p>noted that amendments to the Green Belt to facilitate housing development are a strategic issue. Therefore, as stated in Paragraph 136 of the NPPF, "...Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, through the preparation or updating of plans. Strategic policies should establish the need for any changes to Green Belt boundaries, having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so they can endure beyond the plan period. Where a need for changes to Green Belt boundaries has been established through strategic policies, detailed amendments to those boundaries may be made through non-strategic policies, including neighbourhood plans." Emphasis added It is view of Gladman where a neighbourhood plan seeks to detail the amendments to Green Belt boundaries the principle will have to be established through a strategic policy for the area. A neighbourhood plan should only then make minor changes to the detailed boundary identified through the strategic review i.e. to take account of green infrastructure/landscaping rather than amending the boundary to identify housing land as this would require a further a review of a Green Belt boundaries across the district. Gladman are not aware that the Council has sought to allocate the parcel of land that the SHWNP seeks to remove from the Green Belt. Therefore, to ensure the SWHNP is aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the adopted Development Management DPD and emerging Strategic Policies and Land Allocation DPD (2011-2031) and Development Management DPD Review, Gladman recommend that policies 2(a) and 2(b) are deleted. Policy 4: Building Materials The above policy sets out a range of design principles which development proposals should seek to meet. While the government has shown support for development to incorporate good design principles, Gladman would note that the Framework also states: 'To provide maximum clarity about design expectations at an early stage, plans or supplementary planning documents should use visual tools such as design guides and codes. These provide a framework for creating distinctive places, with a consistent and high-quality standard of design. However, their level of detail and degree of prescription should be tailored to the circumstances in each place and should allow a suitable degree of variety where this would be justified.'⁴ (NPPF – Paragraph 126). Whilst Gladman recognise the importance of high-quality design, in accordance with the requirements of the Framework above, design policies should not aim to be overly prescriptive and require some flexibility in order for schemes to respond to site specifics and the character of the local area. In essence. There will not be a 'one</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>size fits all' solution in relation to design and sites should be considered on a site by site basis with consideration given to various design principles.</p> <p>Policy 7: Views Policy 7 aims to maintain views from within and beyond the village, preventing any significant loss of views from any public right of way, footpath, cycle route or canal towpath. Gladman suggests that this is a subjective issue and the policy does not provide support for a decision maker to apply the policy predictably and with confidence. Identified views must ensure that they demonstrate a physical attribute elevating a view's importance beyond simply being a nice view of open countryside. The evidence base to support the policy does little to indicate why these views should be protected, other than providing a nice view of the surrounding fields. Gladman consider that to be valued, a view would need to have some form of physical attribute. This policy must allow a decision maker to come to a view as to whether particular locations contain physical attributes that would 'take it out of the ordinary' rather than selecting views which may not have any landscape significance and are based solely on community support. Gladman therefore suggest this element of the policy is deleted.</p> <p>Policy 8: The coastline and development Policy 8 states that, "New development or major alteration to existing properties between the sea and the West Coast railway line will be permitted only when it can be clearly demonstrated that;". Gladman reiterate the concerns that the Parish Council are not responsible for the determination of planning applications as this is the sole responsibility of the local planning authority. Policy 9: Non-designated Parish heritage assets In principle Gladman support the policy's attempts to protect and enhance the non-designated heritage assets within Slyne and Hest as set out in the Local Plan. However, the policy makes specific reference to DM37 of the submitted Local Plan in relation to non-designated heritage assets. Following amendments and Main Modifications to the emerging Development Management DPD, reference to non-designated heritage assets is now considered under Policy DM41. Therefore, it is suggested that the wording of the above policy is modified to align with the emerging Local Plan and ensure conflicts are minimised, alongside referring to any subsequent Local Plan to ensure the policy remains up-to-date. Conclusions Gladman recognises the role of neighbourhood plans as a tool for local people to shape the development of their local community. However, it is clear from national guidance that these must be consistent with national planning policy and the strategic requirements for the wider authority area. Through this consultation response, Gladman has sought to clarify the relation of the Slyne with Hest Neighbourhood Plan as currently proposed with</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>There is much agreement in the Parish about the fine views in the area, which can be witnessed by many entries in our consultation processes.</p> <p>Delete 'permitted' and insert "supported' in Policy NE3 (formerly Policy 8)</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>the requirements of national planning policy and the strategic policies for the wider area. Gladman hopes you have found these representations helpful and constructive. If you have any questions do not hesitate to contact me or one of the Gladman team.</p>		
5	<p>Tim Bettony-Simmons Canal and River Trust</p>	<p>The Canal & River Trust (the Trust) is a charity entrusted with the care of over 2000 miles of canals, rivers, docks and reservoirs in England and Wales. These historic, natural and cultural assets form part of the strategic and local green infrastructure network, linking urban and rural communities as well as habitats. Our waterways contribute to the health and wellbeing of local communities and economies, creating attractive and connected places to live, work, volunteer and spend leisure time. We own and manage the Lancaster Canal within the Neighbourhood Plan area and our following comments are focussed on ensuring that the importance and multifunctional nature of its assets are acknowledged and provided for in the policies and proposals of the Plan. Page 28 Paragraph 3.4.1. is noted in terms of not duplicating the Lancaster District Local Plan. Policy T3 of the draft Local Plan (Part One) Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD Modification Version August 2019 relates specifically to the Lancaster Canal and, when adopted, would apply to development in the area covered by this Neighbourhood Plan. We would however welcome a similar canal related specific policy given that the Lancaster Canal passes north/south through the heart of the Parish and through the village of Hest Bank or at least some recognition/reference of this policy. Page 33-34 Policy 2(a) and 2(b) is a site allocation at Land West of Sea View Drive and is adjacent to the offside (non-towpath) side of the Lancaster Canal. The canal is in a slight cutting relative to the site. The Listed Rakes Head Bridge is located to the south of the site. Firstly, the north-east section of the red edge of the site includes a sliver of land which, according to our records, is within the ownership of the Canal & River Trust. This should be removed, or notice served on the Trust when the application is submitted. Criteria 5 - We welcome the aim of criteria 5, we would want to ensure that any development on the site is set off the crest (top) of the cutting to ensure it is not surcharged or cause land stability issues. We would suggest that criteria 5 is re-worded to "Demonstrate that the structural integrity of the canal infrastructure would not be harmed." Land stability and the consideration of the suitability of</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>Suggested wording on structural integrity added in Policy HE2, formerly Policy 2b</p> <p>Local Plan Policy T3 referenced in this section</p>

	<p>development with regard to ground conditions are material planning considerations as set out in paragraphs 170 (e) and (f) and 178 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and that the responsibility for securing a safe development in terms of land stability rests with the developer (para 179). This is the subject of more detailed discussion in the National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). Criteria 12 and 13 – we welcome the aim of these criteria in terms of the landscaping/buffer to the canal. However, we would not want this to preclude the potential for an active frontage to the canal corridor. Our preference would be for the criteria to refer to emerging policy T3 of the Local Plan (Part One) to ensure a development which is appropriate to the canal corridor. Criteria 14 – We welcome the criteria and the potential for a pedestrian linkage to the south of the site and access to the canal via Rakes Head Bridge. Again we consider that emerging policy T3 of the Local Plan (Part One) could be referenced here in terms of promoting access to the canal corridor and the associated health and wellbeing benefits this would provide future residents. Page 48 Policy 7 – the policy relates to retaining views, including along the canal towpath. The policy suggests the negative effects of development on views could be mitigated by tree planting. Although tree planting may be suitable, this should perhaps be caveated as tree planting may not be appropriate in all circumstances. For example, shading of the canal can have a detrimental impact on aquatic species within the canal, this is especially important given that the Lancaster Canal is a BHS. We would welcome recognition of this within the supporting text to policy 7. Page 49 Policy 8 - We note paragraph 2.19.3 which refers to the canal as a Biological Heritage Site (BHS). The designation of the canal does not however appear to have been included within any of the draft policies. It may be appropriate to consider reference to the BHS within Policy 8. Although this policy primarily relates to the coastline. It is noted that, elsewhere within the Plan the coast and canal are considered together (e.g para 2.8). This may therefore be an appropriate place to reference the canal as BHS. Page 52 Policy 9 or para 3.16.2 - We consider that the Lancaster Canal should be added here to be regarded as non-designated heritage asset to which the policy applies. Page 53 Policy 10 – We support the aim of this policy and welcome the inclusion of the canal towpath and improving signage. The canal corridor can provide a key traffic-free route within the Parish. Page 56 Policy 12 – we welcome the thrust of policy in terms of</p>		<p>Written into Policy HE2, formerly Policy 2b</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>encouraging exercise and physical well-being. There is a clear linkage here with Policy 10 of the Plan. We consider that reference should be made to the Lancaster Canal within this policy. The waterways have a role to play in improving well-being, they are a free to access asset and can enable and support healthy lifestyles through providing access for walking, cycling and waterborne sports. They also provide public access to blue/green infrastructure. Waterways have a significant role to play in promoting health and social inclusion, particularly in tackling physical inactivity, obesity and reducing stress. Page 58 Policy 13 – we welcome the intention to prevent bridge strikes of the listed canal bridges and improved signage. However, is unclear what the mechanism for providing this signage would be and who would provide it. This should be made explicit within the supporting text of the policy. Any signage would also need to be appropriate to the setting of the listed bridge.</p>		
6.	Halton with Aughton Parish Council			
7.	Bolton le Sands Parish Council			
8.	Morecambe Town Council			
9.	David Morris MP Morecambe and Lunesdale	<p>As planning is devolved to Lancaster City Council, as the Member of Parliament it does not fall within my remit of responsibility. If there are any planning cases or reviews such as this where the opinion of one group of constituents is pitted against another, I do not think it is fair to comment. I have been contacted by constituents asking me to support the plan and asking me to oppose the plan and therefore I will be not making any comments on the plan.</p> <p>I will be encouraging any constituents who contact me to submit their views on the consultation and if you would like me to advertise the consultation in my local newspaper column I would be more than happy to do so, please let me know.</p>		
10.	Bursar Slyne-with-Hest Church of England Primary School			

11.	Stuart Morris County Councillor Bolton and Slyne			
12.	Malcolm Thomas City Councillor Bolton and Slyne			
13.	Keith Budden Thomas City Councillor Bolton and Slyne			
14.	J. Wild Thomas City Councillor Bolton and Slyne			
15.	Campaign for the Protection of Rural England			
16.	Lancashire Wildlife Trust			
17.	Brian Jones Ramblers Association			