

2017 Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) consultation

Consultation statement - Open Space SPD

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

Responses received, from:

- Barratt Homes
- Bellway Homes Ltd
- Canal and River Trust
- Environment Agency
- Historic England ('no comment')
- Marine Management Organisation ('no comment')
- Natural England
- Network Rail ('no comment')
- Sport England
- Taylor Wimpey UK

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

External Consultee	Summary of comments made	Council response
Barratt Homes	Support the principle, purpose and aim of the SPD.	Noted.
Barratt Homes	To ensure that the SPD is effective and does not impose an unnecessary burden on developers the SPD must not affect the deliverability and viability of new development, otherwise it will not achieve its objectives and will be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Cost of development (including open space) should still allow development to be viable and provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer (para 173 NPPF); authorities should take into account the cumulative impact of all existing and proposed standards and should not put implementation of the plan at serious risk (para 174 NPPF).	The question of viability is addressed in para 6.16 of the SPD. No change needed.
Barratt Homes	<u>Section 3, General design principles, paragraph 3.5 (site context, design, layout and access)</u> : The requirement for public open space to be at least 0.6 hectares in size to provide sufficient space for formal and informal recreation (part d) is not justified and contrary to the wider definition of open space in National Planning Policy Framework (glossary). In a large development it may be possible, and desirable, to supplement a large	The 0.6 ha is set out in para 10.71 of the explanation to policy EQ9 and is a local requirement. The SPD focuses on open space for recreational purposes and, in para 2.9 acknowledges space may be required for purposes other than recreation. Para 2.4

External Consultee	Summary of comments made	Council response
	<p>area of public open space (which exceeds 0.6ha) with smaller areas of high quality public open space for informal recreation or other public open space typologies, which other than in size would reflect the SPD's design guidance contained within the SPD. Such areas (which fall within the NPPF's definition of open space) may provide an important function and contribute positively to the overall quality of the development and the quality of life of residents. The SPD completely disregards their potential.</p>	<p>acknowledges that some new open space may be smaller than 0.6ha. No change needed.</p>
Barratt Homes	<p><u>Section 3, General design principles, paragraph 3.5 (site context, design, layout and access)</u>: Unnecessary for all public open space to be equipped, as sought by part e. NPPF definition of open space is wider than just equipped play areas. Areas of public open space for informal recreation may not be equipped but may still comprise high quality public open space.</p>	<p>Agreed. The Local Plan explanation in para 10.71 clarifies that the Council would generally expect an equipped play area when open space is provided on-site. Para 3.5 of the SPD has been amended also to say 'new public open space must generally be'. The threshold for provision of open space at 40 sq m per home for 150 homes to result in an area of 0.6ha. It is therefore reasonable to expect equipped play in developments of this size. The rationale for this is given in para 8.6 of the Open Space Study. However it still may be more appropriate to improve an existing park nearby. Consideration is always on a site-specific basis and is subject to the usual viability considerations as indicated in SPD para 6.16. Para 3.5 amended. No other change needed.</p>
Barratt Homes	<p><u>Section 3, General design principles, paragraph 3.8</u>: Support the clarification that public open space may offer multiple benefits, notably the explicit reference to reducing flood risk or increasing biodiversity. Consistent with NPPF (para 17) that some open land can perform many functions.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Barratt Homes	<p><u>Section 3, Formal Provision for Children and Teenagers</u>: The requirements of this part of the SPD are overly prescriptive, notably the requirement for minimum numbers of play equipment for particular age groups. These provide limited</p>	<p>Agreed. The word 'typically' has been added to what is now para 3.12 to allow for flexibility.</p>

External Consultee	Summary of comments made	Council response
	flexibility and do not take into account the specific needs in a particular location.	
Barratt Homes	<p><u>Enhancement of Existing Facilities:</u> The SPD recognises the benefits of improving facilities adjacent to development sites as a way of achieving the provision of high quality equipped public open space. Barratt supports this principle which may result in there being no requirement for equipped public open space on site while still achieving adequate local provision.</p> <p>The SPD also states that public open space provision may comprise a combination of on-site provision and enhancements to nearby, existing public open space. This is welcomed as it is a cost-efficient way to ensure that suitable public open space is provided. Potentially this offers wider benefits for the local community, as it is more likely to be close to / accessible by existing residents as well as to future residents.</p>	Noted.
Barratt Homes	<p><u>Appendix C, Minimum commuted sums, site MN2.17 'Land at Liverpool Road, Formby':</u> This is in Band 5 which is towards the upper end of the range of payments. The stated reason for the payment of commuted sums is <i>'for enhancements to off-site recreational open space under...or for replacement of existing open space'</i>. However, the reasoning given for a higher commuted sum being sought in respect of the land at Liverpool Road is that the site will include <i>'public open space with strong landscape structure and/or strategic path links, and includes designated flood risk / SuDS areas'</i>.</p> <p>These are all on-site features that will be under the auspices of a maintenance and management company (or equivalent organisation) which is responsible for them; the Council is not expected to adopt them. Commuted sums will not therefore be required for the provision and upkeep of these features.</p> <p>While it is accepted that for site MN2.17 it will be necessary to pay a commuted sum in respect of any improvements to the Alt Road playground, there is no justification for the minimum payment to be higher relative to other sites because of on-site features / characteristics.</p>	Agreed. Para 2.2 has been amended to clarify that on-site provision is developer funded and commuted sum payments do not apply. The commuted sum payments towards improvements to the Alt Road playground are acknowledged and have been recalculated and the rationale explained in a revised Appendix C.
Barratt Homes	<p><u>Appendix A, Summary of open space requirements for allocated housing sites, site MN2.17 'Land at Liverpool Road, Formby':</u> For this site Barratt support the requirement to locate public open space within the site and to retain and enhance the existing public footpath (Little Altcar No. 8 footpath) that runs across the site. Also Barratt Homes support the principle that some of the provision for this site is</p>	Agreed. The commuted sum payments towards improvements to the Alt Road playground are acknowledged and have been recalculated and the rationale explained in a revised Appendix C.

External Consultee	Summary of comments made	Council response
	through an extension and enhancement of the Alt Road playground, e.g. enhancements to the playground and its play equipment. However, any enhancements must be proportionate to the need generated by the proposed development and must not impose a greater financial burden on the developer than meeting the requirement through on-site provision as this would be contrary to the requirements of the NPPF and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations.	
Barratt Homes	<u>Maintenance and Management</u> (para 4.18): Support the recognition of the role of maintenance companies in ensuring the ongoing management and maintenance of public open space.	Noted.
Bellway Homes Ltd	The emerging SPD will impact upon Bellway's ability to deliver its sites as the level of assumed contributions in the SPD was not costed at the time of entering into the option agreements for these sites. This could affect the viability and deliverability of these developments.	Consideration is always on a site-specific basis and is subject to the usual viability considerations as indicated in the SPD para 6.16. Where the enhancement of an existing open space is preferable to on-site provision the requirement for a commuted sum is reasonable. The commuted sum payments have been recalculated and the rationale explained in a revised Appendix C.
Bellway Homes Ltd	Broadly welcomes the new approach to open space provision which provides developers with greater flexibility and ensure that public open space provided is functional and effective rather than piecemeal.	Noted.
Bellway Homes Ltd	<u>Para 4.16, Viability:</u> Bellway welcome the confirmation from SMBC that there is scope and flexibility to depart from the open space requirements as set out under Policy EQ9 where a financial assessment demonstrates that adhering to the open space requirement is not feasible on viability grounds.	Noted. Consideration is always on a site-specific basis and is subject to the usual viability considerations as indicated in the SPD paragraph 6.16.
Bellway Homes Ltd	<u>Appendix C, Minimum commuted sums:</u> There is little evidence within the document which confirms the rationale for the banding options and there is no comprehensive justification as to how the sum has been determined and the costings which this has been based upon. The current adopted [2008] SPG confirms a figure of £2,025 per dwelling whereas the proposed draft SPD indicates an uplift of 52% to £3,075 which is a significant increase. Although welcome the draft SPD's confirmation that there is scope to provide	Agreed. The commuted sum payments have been recalculated and the rationale explained in a revised Appendix C. It is acknowledged that the open space contributions are higher than Knowsley's, but as there are no national standards there are bound to be local variations based on

External Consultee	Summary of comments made	Council response
	<p>designs and alternative costs to justify a variance to the commuted sum figure, the commuted sums specified in the SPD are not reasonable or commensurate and thus do not comply with the planning obligations tests as set out in National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), para 204. SPD does not fully take account of NPPF para 205; <i>‘where obligations are being sought or revised, local planning authorities should take account of changes in market conditions over time and, wherever appropriate, be sufficiently flexible to prevent planned development being stalled’</i> .</p> <p>These figures are significantly higher than those in other Merseyside districts, e.g. Knowsley’s public open space contributions range from £1,461 to £1,663 per dwelling.</p>	<p>local needs. The approach in Sefton also acknowledges the need to mitigate for any impacts of additional recreational pressure from residents of new homes on the integrity of internationally important nature sites especially those on the Sefton coast.</p>
Bellway Homes Ltd	<p><u>Appendix C, Minimum commuted sums:</u> Commuted sum banding is too prescriptive at this stage and does not allow for flexibility or final design and location of features such as Sustainable Drainage Systems which may only be determined once all technical studies have been completed.</p>	<p>Agreed. The commuted sum payments have been recalculated and the rationale explained in a revised Appendix C.</p>
Bellway Homes Ltd	<p><u>Appendix C, Minimum commuted sums (including para C11):</u> There is no flexibility within the document which allows for circumstances where developers are proposing to create a management company to maintain the sites as opposed to the Council. In these instances, the commuted sum should be adjusted accordingly, thus negating the need for the establishment and maintenance costs as identified in para C11.</p>	<p>Agreed. Commuted sum payments are not required when the developer is responsible for providing and maintaining all of the open space required. Appendix C has been amended to reflect this.</p>
Bellway Homes Ltd	<p><u>Appendix A, Summary of open space requirements for allocated housing sites, MN2.30 – Land East of Waddicar Lane:</u> Too prescriptive and does not allow for flexibility or changes in the proposed development which may come about once all technical studies have been completed.</p>	<p>Disagree. No change required.</p>
Bellway Homes Ltd	<p><u>Appendix A, Summary of open space requirements for allocated housing sites, MN2.30 – Land East of Waddicar Lane:</u> Bellway welcome the principle that public open space provision can comprise off-site enhancements to Rainbow Park (rather than on-site provision). Bellway note the expectation of provision of an open space gateway and foot/cycle bridge across the existing watercourse/ditch.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
Bellway Homes Ltd	<p><u>Appendix A, Summary of open space requirements for allocated housing sites, MN2.30 – Land East of Waddicar Lane:</u> Bellway’s flood risk and drainage strategy for this site will provide for a suitable Sustainable Urban Drainage solution which is</p>	<p>Noted. This will be determined at the planning application stage.</p>

External Consultee	Summary of comments made	Council response
	unlikely to require the need for additional public open space, although the final design is still to be determined.	
Bellway Homes Ltd	<u>Appendix A, Summary of open space requirements for allocated housing sites, MN2.30 – Land East of Waddicar Lane:</u> support the principle of retaining the right of way (Melling no. 3) but consider that SPD is too prescriptive and inflexible in requiring enhancement along its existing alignment, rather than partial diversion if this better connects to the wider Melling area.	The SPD does not specify that the path should be retained along its existing alignment. Part 5 of policy EQ9 allows appropriate alternatives, and part 6 requires links to extensions to existing paths where they improve the accessibility of an existing community or development site. No change required.
Bellway Homes Ltd	<u>Appendix C, Minimum commuted sums, site MN2.30 – Land East of Waddicar Lane:</u> Commuted sum too high, not sufficiently justified and unreasonable, and so do not comply with NPPF para 204 and 205.	Agreed. The commuted sum payments have been recalculated and the rationale explained in a revised Appendix C.
Bellway Homes Ltd	<u>Appendix C, Minimum commuted sums, site MN2.30 – Land East of Waddicar Lane:</u> Commuted sum too high, e.g. Knowsley’s contributions range from £1,461 to £1,663 per dwelling., and are similar schemes to Waddicar, including for enhancements to existing public open space.	Agreed. The commuted sum payments have been recalculated and the rationale will be explained in a revised Appendix C. It is acknowledged that the open space contributions are higher than Knowsley’s. The approach in Sefton also acknowledges the need to mitigate for any impacts of additional recreational pressure from residents of new homes on the integrity of internationally important nature sites especially those on the Sefton coast.
Bellway Homes Ltd	<u>Appendix A, Summary of open space requirements for allocated housing sites, site MN2.42 Former St Wilfrid’s School:</u> Welcome principle that off-site public open space provision through the enhancement to Orrell Mount Park is appropriate.	Noted.
Bellway Homes Ltd	<u>Appendix A, Summary of open space requirements for allocated housing sites, site MN2.42 Former St Wilfrid’s School:</u> The SPD should not duplicate the requirement of policy NH5, that the existing disused football pitches within the site are to be retained and improved. Instead the SPD should allow for a flexible approach given that a more appropriate solution other than the retention of the pitches could be put forward by the landowner and/or Council that would deliver greater benefit to	This requirement is set out in Appendix 1 of the Local Plan rather than policy NH5. The SPD cannot vary the wording that “Development of this site must.... retain and improve the disused football pitches within the site and bring them back into use”. If a

External Consultee	Summary of comments made	Council response
	local sports provision and activity within the immediate locality.	better solution is proposed this will be assessed at the planning application stage.
Bellway Homes Ltd	<u>Appendix A, Summary of open space requirements for allocated housing sites, site MN2.42 Former St Wilfrid's School</u> : The provisions relating to cycle and other path links should re-consider the most appropriate routing to ensure that this remains in-keeping with the local context and townscape and aligns with the Council's objectives for the area through creating a more organic link through the site whilst still providing connectivity to the wider area.	The SPD does not specify set routes for these links. Part 5 of policy EQ9 allows appropriate alternatives, and part 6 requires links to extensions to existing paths where they improve the accessibility of an existing community or development site.
Bellway Homes Ltd	<u>Appendix C, Minimum commuted sums, site MN2.42 Former St Wilfrid's School</u> : Commuted sum too high, not sufficiently justified and unreasonable, and so do not comply with NPPF para 204 and 205. Site stated to fall into Band 4 due to the site being on the edge of the urban area and the need to provide for strategic paths. The current adopted SPG confirms a figure of £2,025 per dwelling whereas the proposed draft SPD indicates an uplift of 27% to £2,562.50 which is a significant increase, and is too high.	Agreed. The commuted sum payments have been recalculated and the rationale explained in a revised Appendix C. This sets out that sometimes additional sums will be sought for site specific elements to be determined at the planning application stage.
Canal and River Trust	Our waterways contribute to the health and well-being of local communities and economies, creating attractive and connected places to live, work, volunteer and spend leisure time.	Noted.
Canal and River Trust	The Trust's waterways will be impacted by sites referenced in the Open Space SPD: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MN2.28 Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull • MN2.34 Land at Wango Lane, Aintree • MN2.40 Former Daleacre School, Daleacre Drive, Netherton • MN2.44 People's Site, Linacre Lane, Bootle • MN2.46 Former St Mary's Primary School playing fields, Waverley Street, Bootle • MN2.47 Land East of Maghull These sites may increase towpath usage and this brings with it maintenance costs to the Trust. A mechanism should therefore be provided for financial contributions towards towpath improvements.	Agreed. Appropriate towpath improvements are now specified for these sites in Appendix 1 of the SPD: except for MN2.44 which is not immediately adjacent to the canal and MN2.47 which is subject to a separate Land East of Maghull SPD, where appropriate wording will be added. Canal towpath improvements may be appropriate for managing recreation pressure on the internationally designated nature sites on the Sefton Coast and will be determined at the planning application stage.
Canal and River Trust	<u>Section 3, General design principles</u> : Open space plays an important role in the design of canal side developments and so the Trust would therefore wish to see the integration of the towpath into open space for canal side developments	Noted. The Canal and River Trust may make appropriate representation when any planning application for significant

External Consultee	Summary of comments made	Council response
		residential developments close to the Leeds Liverpool Canal are submitted. No change to SPD.
Environment Agency	We acknowledge and welcome the contents of the document, especially with regards to the importance of open space for flood mitigation and protection, ecological value and in meeting the Environment Agency's requirements for 8 metre easements on watercourses designated 'Main River'.	Noted.
Historic England	No comments at this stage.	Noted.
Marine Management Organisation	No specific comments.	Noted.
Natural England	<u>Section 5: Protection of open space and replacement provision:</u> The criteria for deciding whether a surplus of open space occurs are based on accessibility to existing spaces, quantity and quality. Natural England suggest that additional green space may be required to allow for higher usage which would avoid access increases on sensitive nature sites elsewhere.	Noted. However, this departs from the policy requirements in Local Plan policy EQ9 which sets out when and where open space must be provided and Local Plan policy NH5 which sets out how existing areas of public open space will be protected. The SPD reiterates that the circumstances where a surplus of open space might occur are very limited.
Natural England	<u>Section 5, Protection of open space and replacement provision, paragraph 5.5:</u> The SPD recognises the importance of some open space for historic buildings and building conservation areas. The SPD needs a similar paragraph which reflects the importance of some sites as part of the approach to managing recreational pressure on areas with high nature conservation value such as the Sefton Coast.	Noted. The role of public open space and other open space away from the Sefton Coast in managing recreational pressure on the internationally important nature sites on the Sefton Coast is set out in paras 10.74 (re ED9) and 11.74 (re NH5) of the Local Plan. This has now been reinforced by including similar wording in para 1.2 of the SPD. Other references will be added to the SPD regarding the issue of recreational pressure, in a new paragraph 1.8, paragraph 6.9 and C2 in the revised Appendix C. Appendix C also now refers to possible additional commuted sums for additional, specific

External Consultee	Summary of comments made	Council response
		enhancements or contributions towards proposals to offset the impact of increased recreational pressure on the internationally important nature sites on the Sefton Coast.
Natural England	<p><u>Appendix A, Summary of open space requirements for allocated housing sites:</u> Welcome this section as it includes the need for open space to reduce recreational disturbance at some sites to help with meeting the requirements of the Habitats Regulations, including any mitigation.</p>	<p>Noted. Other references will be added to the SPD regarding the issue of recreational pressure, in a new paragraph 1.8, paragraph 6.9 and C2 in the revised Appendix C. Appendix C also now refers to possible additional commuted sums for additional, specific enhancements or contributions towards proposals to offset the impact of increased recreational pressure on the internationally important nature sites on the Sefton Coast.</p>
Network Rail	No comments.	Noted.
Sport England (initial comment)	Support for the SPD. Would like to be informed once it is adopted.	Noted.
Sport England (additional comment)	Amend paragraph 3.20 to clarify that nature enhancements to playing fields should not prejudice the future of a playing pitch or pitches, in line with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (Statutory Instrument 2015 No. 595).	Change made to the wording of this paragraph to reflect Sport England's concern.
Sport England (additional comment)	Paragraph 5.6: Support this section [sic] and the links made to the playing pitch strategy. However links could also be made in the earlier section in using this evidence base to identify new locations for playing fields and help predict the locations best to fulfil investment from developer contributions.	<p>Paragraph 5.20 amended so that it refers to any compensatory provision, as well as compensatory financial provision, and says that both must be set within the context of implementation of the Playing Pitch Strategy.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.14 already says that alternative sports and recreation provision should consider the recommendations of the Playing Pitch Strategy.</p>
Sport England	Welcome the referencing of the recently published Sport England advice 'Active	A reference to 'Active Design' has been

External Consultee	Summary of comments made	Council response
(additional comment)	Design' (2015). However references should be more explicit as has great benefits to bring in terms securing enhancements to new open space developments within residential schemes to create active communities.	added to paragraph 3.3.
Taylor Wimpey UK	Comments on the over-arching principles of the SPDs and regarding site MN2.12 'Land at Brackenway, Formby' aim to make sure that the emerging SPDs are consistent with the Local Plan and provide an appropriate and reasonable interpretation of adopted policy. All SPDs including the Open Space SPD should reflect the Local Plan and not contradict or place an additional burden on the Local Plan housing allocations.	Noted.
Taylor Wimpey UK	Section 4, Viability, para 4.16: Welcome the recognition that applicants may seek to depart from the ED9 public open space requirement on the grounds of economic viability, but consider that the costs of appraising any viability study by external consultants should be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In full or in part paid for via the cost of the application, particularly for major applications • Where part funded by the applicant, apportioned in a fair and appropriate way • Put forward for tender where external consultants are necessary, to ensure that the cost of any appraisal review work is appropriate and competitive. 	Disagree. If any applicant is arguing they cannot comply with a policy requirement, they should absorb the costs for any independent validation of that viability appraisal. The Council have retained viability consultants. They were appointed following a competitive bidding process. This enables the Council to commission viability work immediately, minimising any delay to an application.
Taylor Wimpey UK	<u>Appendix A, Summary of open space requirements for allocated housing sites, site MN2.12/policy MN6 'Land north of Brackenway, Formby'</u> : Support the flexibility which allows for formal open space provision at the site to be provided off-site in part where necessary.	Noted.
Taylor Wimpey UK	<u>Appendix A, Summary of open space requirements for allocated housing sites, site MN2.12/policy MN6 'Land north of Brackenway, Formby'</u> : recognises that a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) will be required to be undertaken by the Council to understand the impact of development on internationally important nature sites in Formby. However, the SPD should not refer to the HRA as a mechanism to deliver additional 'public open space' above and beyond the requirements of Policy EQ9. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The requirement for HRA is set out in part 1 of Policy NH2 'Nature' and so additional guidance is not required in this SPD. • Policy MN6 which relates specifically to the Brackenway site seeks to ensure 	Disagree. This is one of only 3 sites where the Habitats Regulations Assessment report for the Publication Draft Local Plan (2015) is clear that the site could have a standalone impact in terms of increasing recreational pressure on the designated internationally important nature sites on the Sefton coast. Paragraph 6.69 of the explanation to policy MN6 reflects this and requires information

External Consultee	Summary of comments made	Council response
	<p>that a 7.9 hectare area of grassland and wetland is retained and managed outside of the allocation to ensure that any impact on important nature sites in Formby is mitigated; and therefore significant mitigation is already in place to support the Brackenway site.</p> <p>As such, either the text in relation to HRA in the Open Space Guide SPD should be removed in full, or if this is not considered acceptable, the SPD text here should be amended to say:</p> <p><i>The information provided to enable the Council to make a Habitats Regulations Assessment will also indicate whether any additional (in excess of policy EQ9 requirements) public open space provision or other measures within or outside the site will be required to mitigate for any impacts of additional recreational pressure from residents of the new homes on the integrity of internationally important nature sites.</i></p>	<p>to be “provided about the impact of recreational pressure on the integrity of the internationally important nature sites”. The SPD reflects the fact that additional public open space may be required to mitigate this increased recreational pressure. This is separate to the mitigation set out in the policy which is for direct loss/impact of supporting habitat. No change to SPD. However, other references will be added to the SPD regarding the issue of recreational pressure, in a new paragraph 1.8, paragraph 6.9 and C2 in the revised Appendix C. Appendix C also now refers to possible additional commuted sums for additional, specific enhancements or contributions towards proposals to offset the impact of increased recreational pressure on the internationally important nature sites on the Sefton Coast.</p>
Taylor Wimpey UK	<p><u>Appendix A, Summary of open space requirements for allocated housing sites, site MN2.12/policy MN6 ‘Land north of Brackenway, Formby’</u>: Support principle of retaining and enhancing the bridleways (Nos 39 and 40 on Eight Acres and Sixteen Acres Lanes, and Formby Footpath No. 7)) but consider that SPD is too prescriptive and should only be considered as part of any detailed design for the site. As such, the SPD text here should be amended to say:</p> <p><i>Formby No. 39 & 40 public bridleways (Eight and Sixteen Acre Lanes) and Formby No. 7 footpath run along the site’s southern boundary. The bridleways should be upgraded using appropriate resin bound surface to form bridleways which are suitable for use by cycles.</i></p>	<p>Disagree. It is not appropriate to remove known site-specific requirements. No change to the SPD.</p>
Taylor Wimpey UK	<p><u>Appendix A, Summary of open space requirements for allocated housing sites, site MN2.12/policy MN6 ‘Land north of Brackenway, Formby’</u>: Part 1c of policy MN6 requires development to “include a signal controlled junction onto the Formby</p>	<p>No change to the SPD. This is covered by Local Plan policy MN6 and will be addressed at the planning application stage.</p>

External Consultee	Summary of comments made	Council response
	<p><i>Bypass and a through route as a secondary means of access via Paradise Lane”.</i></p> <p>The SPD should be consistent with MN6 and at this stage, i.e. prior to more detailed design and feasibility work, should not define the type of signal controlled pedestrian crossing that might be delivered as part of any new junction arrangement;. As such, the text here should be amended to say:</p> <p><i>A signal controlled toucan crossing controlled junction required across onto the Formby By-pass has the potential to provide residents of the site with improved access to the wider footpath network.</i></p>	
Taylor Wimpey UK	<p><u>Para 2.12, and Appendix C, Minimum commuted sums:</u> Para 2.12 of the SPD states that minimum commuted amounts would vary within the given range depending both on the site location and on likely open space and green infrastructure and other requirements. Appendix C sets out a range of commuted sums or bonds. The amounts in Appendix C use the 2008 SPD as a baseline, but add to this baseline based on requirements relating to public open space, flood risk and surface water management and habitat creation. The SPD is unclear how the additional requirements are calculated and why they are allocated to specific sites. The methodology should be more clearly set out, so that the figures quoted in Appendix C are robust and transparent. E.g. it is unclear how a 75% increase in the current baseline figure is calculated, justified and ultimately applied to a specific site.</p>	Agreed. The commuted sum payments have been recalculated and the rationale explained in a revised Appendix C.
Taylor Wimpey UK	<p><u>Appendix C, Minimum commuted sums:</u> Examples of allocated sites should not be provided in Appendix C, i.e. prior to any relevant assessment being undertaken as sites come forward. Each site will be unique in its specific characteristics (as the SPD recognises) and it is important that each site is considered on its individual merits and the appropriateness of applying specific rates to each allocated site considers the National Planning Policy Framework para 204, that planning obligations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; • Directly related to the development, and • Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. 	Agreed. The commuted sum payments have been recalculated and the rationale explained in a revised Appendix C. Examples of allocated sites have been removed from Appendix C.