

Local Plan for Sefton
Statement of Consultation
Regulation 22 Statement

July 2015

Section A Introduction

Role of this document

1. This document sets out the details of publicity and consultation undertaken to prepare and inform the Sefton Local Plan [previously called the Sefton Core Strategy]. It also provides a summary of the main issues raised by representations made to the Council and how these have been taken into account in the preparation of the Local Plan.

2. This document has been prepared by the Council as Local Planning Authority to meet the requirements of Regulations 22 (1) (c) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. This regulation requires a statement to be prepared setting out how the Council has complied with Regulations 18 and 20 of the same Regulations. Regulation 18 refers to consultation undertaken and representations made prior to the Local Plan being published. Regulation 20 refers to consultation undertaken and representations made following publication of the Local Plan.

3. The Sefton Local Plan has been prepared over a number of years, including early stages when it was previously labelled as the Sefton Core Strategy. The table below sets out the individual stages that we have undertaken to engage people on the Core Strategy/Local Plan:

| Stage | Regulation | Dates |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|
| Issues | Regulation 18 | April to September 2009 |
| Options | Regulation 18 | 23 May to 12 August 2011 |
| Preferred Options | Regulation 18 | 8 July to 27 September 2013 |
| Preferred Options – Additional Sites | Regulation 18 | 16 June to 8 August 2014 |
| Local Plan Publication | Regulation 20 | 30 January to 27 March 2015 |

4. This document is not intended to provide a comprehensive overview of each representation that was made at each stage. Rather its aim is to provide a summary of the main issues made. Separate reports of consultation were made for each stage. These are provided as separate documents and are included in the Examination Library as separate documents as follows:

- Issues [document ES.2]
- Options [document ES.4]
- Preferred Options [document ES.6]
- Additional Sites [document ES.8]

5. Copies of each representation made at publication stage [regulation 20] are submitted [document LP.9].

Engagement

6. Throughout the plan preparation process, the Council has made extensive efforts to engage statutory consultees, local groups, residents, businesses and others in the refinement of the policies, proposals and site allocations in the Local Plan. At each stage the Council has adhered to the standards for consultation set out in its Statement of Community Involvement [document LP.6], as

well as those set by legislation and guidance. In many instances we have gone beyond these standards. We have also has our consultation process scrutinised at each stage by the Council's Public Engagement and Consultation Panel. We have also responded to criticism of our consultation methods, seeking to improve how we get our message across and engage with people at each stage. Whilst there are always improvements that can be made we consider that the process has provided ample opportunity for many people and organisations to have their say on the Local Plan.

Format of this document

7. This document is arranged into a number of separate sections setting out the engagement process and summaries of key issues at each consultation stage.

Section B – considers the Issues stage

Section C – considers the Options stage

Section D – considers the Preferred Options stage

Section E – considers the Additional Sites consultation

Section F – considers the Publication stage

Section B Consultation on Issues

8. At this early stage of the process the consultation was aimed at finding out what were the key issues the Council should address, and how it could go about doing so. Whilst we didn't start with a 'blank sheet', providing a framework for discussion, we were quite flexible on the types of issues people could discuss. Primarily this stage was about raising awareness and getting people and organisations to set out their priorities for Sefton and how they would like planning policy to influence these.

9. A number of methods were used to raise awareness of the Core Strategy [as the Local Plan was then known]at the Issues stage:

- Presentations were given to Area Committees and Parish Councils across Sefton, partner organisations and local groups including local businesses.
- The Council's web site drew attention to how people could get involved.
- A leaflet was included in all Council Tax Bills sent out in March 2009, highlighting some of the issues Sefton faces and encouraging people to contribute to the process.
- Leaflets advertising a Sefton Core Strategy logo competition for young people were distributed at Council Leisure Centres during school holiday activity sessions.
- A Newsletter was made available in Council One Stop Shops and sent to consultees on our database.

10. The initial consultation on the issues of the Core Strategy took place over a number of months, and culminated in a period of focused consultation events between April and September 2009. Various methods were used, including:

- Individual meetings with a range of organisations with an interest in the Borough as well as other Council departments
- Formal and informal meetings with Area Committees and Parish Councils
- Meetings with seldom heard and specific interest groups
- Interactive youth and children's sessions
- Presentations to local business partnerships

Stakeholder meetings

11. There were a number of individual meetings with a range of organisations with an interest in the Borough (including the Environment Agency, United Utilities, the Primary Care Trust, and Peel Ports), and with other departments of the Council. These discussions helped us develop our understanding of what issues these organisations faced or anticipated in the future, and how the Core Strategy could help them develop and implement their plans and strategies.

Workshops

12. A significant element of the consultation events took place through seven workshops held in each part of Sefton, i.e. Southport, Formby, Crosby, Maghull, Bootle, Netherton and Litherland. These took place between April and June 2009. This allowed us to focus on the relevant issues for each of the settlement areas within Sefton as well as Borough-wide issues. The aim was to build up a picture of the key issues and opportunities by targeting a wide range of interests within those areas. At each of these events we provided a profile of the Local Plan of Sefton on a display board setting out the key issues as we understood them to be. These were intended to provoke a discussion about

whether we had identified the right issues and whether any were missed. Copies of these are provided in the Examination Library [ES.1].

13. Local Councillors were asked to suggest names of anyone who would be likely to be interested in making a contribution to these discussions. Over 230 people in total attended these workshops and around 60 groups and organisations were represented.

14. Attendees included Sefton Councillors, Parish Councillors, local environmental, voluntary and faith groups, local businesses through the Business Village Partnerships and the Chamber of Commerce, Housing Associations and developers. Most attendees received an invitation as they represented a group or organisation with a significant local interest in the issues to be discussed. Local residents also had an opportunity to be involved as workshops were publicised on the web and the 15 members of the Citizens Panel were invited to each one. The workshops were generally well received with participants raising many interesting issues and welcoming their chance to discuss local issues.

15. The discussions at each workshop were chaired by people not directly connected with the Core Strategy to encourage a more objective process. These were mainly officers from other teams within the Planning and Economic Regeneration Department, other departments within the Council, from Sefton CVS or from the independent planning charity, Planning Aid.

16. Each workshop considered four themes. These were:

- Housing
- Jobs and the economy
- Protecting and enhancing the environment and climate change
- Town and local centres, facilities, services and getting around

Youth and children's events

17. Due to the long-term nature of the Core Strategy and the wide range of issues it encompassed, children and young people were a specific group identified by the Council to be consulted. A number of consultation sessions and events enabled us to do this, including one at Aintree Racecourse in July. This was organised by the Young Advisors and Planning Aid to gain the views of teenagers (14-15 years old). Forty pupils attended from a total of 5 schools, which represented most of the communities across the borough.

18. Planning Aid and staff from Savio High also ran a number of activity sessions in local primary schools, including Year 5 children at St Robert Bellarmine RC Primary in Bootle, and Year 6 and 7 pupils during a Formby Schools Voice session. Both discussed planning issues and sought the views of pupils on their local area.

Seldom heard groups

19. Significant attempts were also made to engage with more seldom heard groups within the Borough by holding separate discussions or events. Discussions were held with organisations including ABILITY¹, Sefton Older Person's Forum, South Sefton Business Forum, traders' and residents' groups and a parenting group.

Main Issues

¹ A representative group of people with disabilities.

20. As expected with a wide range of groups and residents who attended the events we received a wide range of comments and issues.

Housing

- More affordable homes and a better mix of housing types and tenures
- More family housing and fewer flats
- More housing for those with specific needs e.g. for the elderly, & housing should be more flexible and adaptable to suit changing needs
- New housing development should take place primarily within the existing urban area

Jobs and Economy

- More employment land needs to be provided in many areas
- Existing employment areas need to be of higher quality with better infrastructure
- There needs to be more start-up units for small businesses, particularly in the south of the borough
- The rural economy requires greater support
- The success of rural businesses should be encouraged
- The Port must balance future expansion with effects on the local environment e.g. noise and traffic

Environment and Climate Change

- The coast is an important natural asset which must be protected
- The Green Belt and green spaces should be protected from housing development
- Green spaces are important to communities and need to be protected from development
- The quality of and facilities in many parks need improvement
- Green Infrastructure (including street trees) is important and should be enhanced
- Local townscape and Victorian heritage is valued in many areas, particularly in the north of Sefton
- New developments need to respect local character and design
- The impacts of climate change need to be taken into account – particularly flooding
- New and existing homes should be made more energy efficient and 'greener'

Centres, Facilities and getting around

- Many centres need more investment and a better local environment if they are to serve communities well
- The closure of smaller local shops was a significant concern in many areas
- Need better facilities for young people which are accessible and affordable
- Access to health facilities is a concern across many areas
- A lack of leisure facilities in Bootle means the town centre is used little in the evenings
- Congestion and pollution is a concern along several main roads in Sefton
- Public transport needs improvement – particularly in rural areas and the more outlying urban estates, and in the evenings and at weekends
- Must make it easier for people to choose more sustainable transport modes – including walking and cycling
- Should make more of the coast and the leisure and commercial opportunities it offers, including better business facilities
- The canal should be treated more as a local asset

How we responded to comments

21. At this early stage the information that we gathered enabled the Council to identify the priorities for the Local Plan. This stage also helped determine which studies the Council should commission to support the Local Plan, and studies on housing needs, employment, retail [including town centre health checks], flood risk and open space were undertaken to inform the next stage of the process.

Section C Consultation on Options

22. The Core Strategy Options paper set out the principles for future development across Sefton. Importantly this included three options for the future levels of growth for homes and employment. These were:

Option One – Urban Containment

23. This would seek to limit the number of homes and land for jobs to sites within the existing urban area.

Option Two – Meeting Identified Needs

24. This option would seek to identify enough land to meet the projected housing need [at that time] of 480 homes each year and for an additional 25 hectares of employment land in the Green Belt.

Option Three – Stabilising Sefton’s Population

25. This option sought to maintain Sefton’s population at the current [2010] levels, i.e. 272,000. At the time it was estimated this would require 650 homes per year. An additional 25 hectares in the Green Belt for employment land [as Option Two] was also proposed.

26. The Core Strategy Options Paper is available in the Examination Library [Document ES.3]. This document was informed by a Green Belt Study [Document EN.1] which set out our approach to identifying sites in the Green Belt for potential development, needed for both Options 2 and 3. At this stage the Green Belt Study identified more land for potential development than was needed for any of the options.

27. The Core Strategy Options paper and the Green Belt Study were approved for consultation purposes by Planning Committee (9 February 2011) and Cabinet (17 February 2011). It was agreed that the consultation period would run for a period of 12 weeks to allow plenty of time for the Council hold its events [see below] and for groups to co-ordinate their responses following these events. This is twice the minimum period set out in the planning regulations and more than the 8 weeks set out in Sefton’s approved Statement of Community Involvement.

28. The consultation strategy was approved by the Public Engagement and Consultation Panel on 18 March 2011 with the proviso that we return to set out in more detail how we would engage younger people. On 20 May 2011 a further report was taken to the Panel setting out plans to hold events in a number of schools and to meet with the youth forum and youth cabinet.

29. The format of the consultation [23rd May - 12th August 2011] was partly through a series of drop in events held across Sefton which enabled residents to view and discuss proposals with planning officers on a one-to-one basis.

30. The drop in events were held at Crosby, Melling, Lydiate, Southport, Aintree, Formby, Maghull, Ainsdale, Bootle, Netherton, Litherland, Churchtown and Little Crosby over the first 8 weeks of the consultation period.

31. There were also a number of presentations to a range of interest groups. Documents were also made available online, at Bootle and Southport Town Halls and One Stop Shops and at all local libraries, including the mobile library.

32. The consultation was advertised through a quarter page advert in the local press, namely:

- the Trinity Group (Bootle Times, Crosby Herald, Formby Times, Maghull and Aintree Star and the Southport Visitor) for two weeks. The advert was accompanied on both weeks by a quarter page article
- The Liverpool Daily Post for one week
- The Metro [a free local paper available on public transport] for one week

33. In addition posters were distributed to many public buildings, including Council buildings, one stop shops, libraries, leisure centres, schools and youth centres. The consultation was advertised on Sefton's website and on the website of many of our Parish Councils. Presentations were also given to all the Area Committee meetings held during the consultation period.

34. Letters or e-mails were sent to everyone on the Local Development Framework database. This is a list of people who have asked to be kept informed of consultation on the development plan. Information was also sent out by Sefton CVS through Network South which reaches 400 organisations in the South of the Borough. E-mails were sent out to everyone on the Active Sefton e-mail database (approx 2,000). We put notices on Active Sefton's Twitter and Facebook pages at the beginning of the Consultation Period and again added a reminder two weeks from the end of the consultation.

35. At the second drop in event, at Melling, concerns were raised that many local residents were not aware of the consultation and the view was given that residents, particularly those who would be directly affected by proposed allocations should have been notified directly.

36. In response to these criticisms a decision was taken to write to every home in Sefton that is within 50 metres of a Green Belt or Green Space site that had been identified as having some potential for development in the longer term. Over 8000 letters were sent. We also simplified the poster to make it clearer and distributed it more widely to include other locations, such as local shops and GP surgeries.

37. In addition, the local press continued to run stories on the Core Strategy and Green Belt Study at regular intervals and listed the dates and times of the drop in events. Many local residents and interest groups also held their own meetings and provided details of our consultation. This significantly raised the profile of the consultation across the Borough.

38. These further stages had a significant impact with many of the subsequent drop in events being very well attended.

39. At Planning Committee on 29 June 2011 an update of the consultation was provided to members. At this meeting confirmation was sought on whether the approach to consultation was appropriate. Planning Committee reiterated that the cost implications of sending letters to every home in Sefton would be prohibitive and that the selective notification of residents determined by proximity to sites was suitable. They did however agree to hold a number of additional drop in events if it was necessary. As a result of this additional drop-in events were organised for Aintree

[which was also convenient for Aintree] and Ainsdale, and for three local groups in Bootle and Netherton.

40. Planning Committee also supported the organisation of focus groups to provide snap-shot opinions across the borough. The Council subsequently commissioned consultants Mott McDonald to run Focus Groups in seven areas across Sefton to reach a representative sample of the population.

41. An issue that arose during one of the drop in events was that some residents within the 50 metre distance had not received a notification letter. Many people lived in Kirkby and so were outside the Sefton administrative area. On investigation of this we sent out a further 700 letters to the areas where this occurred. As this was towards the end of the consultation period, this left just two and half weeks for these residents to make comments. Whilst this was unfortunate, affected residents were sent details of the sites near them in order to compensate for the lack of time remaining in the consultation period.

42. During the consultation period the Core Strategy team attended 65 events attended by about 3000 people.

43. Overall we received over 2400 individual comments and a 13 petitions containing around 7800 signatures.

Responses

44. A full summary of comments [and the consultation events] at the Options stage can be seen within Document ES.4 in the examination library. The following paragraphs provide a summary of the key issues made at this stage and how we addressed them:

45. 95% of all representations comprised objections to the potential loss of Green Belt, or greenspaces in the urban area, to development. The main concerns which people expressed about development of sites in the Green Belt or on green spaces are listed below, including the percentages of people who commented:

- Wish to protect the Green Belt/ prevent urban sprawl 65%
- Concern over traffic issues 55%
- Impact on or lack of services/ facilities 40%
- Need to protect agricultural land/ concern over 'food security' 31%
- Desire to protect nature/ habitats 30%
- Green Belt land is used for recreation/ tourism 25%
- There are enough brownfield sites to meet need 23%
- Don't need new homes as there are too many vacant homes 22%
- Area prone to flooding 19%

46. There was generally a more positive response to the Options Paper from statutory consultees and organisations representing developers. These often supported Options Two or Three (which involve varying degrees of building in the Green Belt).

47. The adjoining local authorities of West Lancashire and Knowsley supported Option Two. Both authorities face similar shortages of land within their built-up areas. Both identified land in the Green Belt to meet future needs in their Core Strategy/Local Plans. Liverpool Council also gave

qualified support for this Option. Their support for this option, and in particular for the release of Green Belt for housing, was conditional on a commitment by Sefton to explore and evaluate all ways of maximising the delivery of its urban land for housing and bringing back into use vacant properties.

48. Natural England, the Government's advisors on the environment, recognised that there comes a point when it is no longer practicable to continue building in the urban area. They noted that brownfield land, when left undisturbed, can acquire an ecological value. Their view is that in the longer term the preferred solution, in environmental terms, would be to allow some building in the Green Belt rather than to build ever more densely in the urban area.

49. The National Trust also generally supported Option Two; they considered that Option One would not meet the needs of Sefton residents, could undermine the area's economy and could lead to "planning by appeal" by the early 2020's and reduce funding for green spaces such as the Formby coast. However, in generally supporting Option Two, the National Trust would want to ensure that the most appropriate (brownfield, within centre etc) sites are released and developed first prior to Green Belt land being released.

50. Formby Civic Trust supported Option Two as did the Council for the Protection of Rural England.

51. In an electronic survey participated in by 20 members of the Sefton Economic Forum, 81% felt that Options Two or Three best met Sefton's economic needs. Peel Ports supported Option Three, although they noted that the Port remains critical irrespective of which Option is pursued. Peel Ports view is that Option Three offers the greatest potential for developing communities and business throughout the borough. This is likely to most closely align with their Port of Liverpool Master Plan on which they consulted during 2011.

52. Developers and landowners also generally supported either Option Two or Three, often identifying land which they wished to see developed. Many developers, including the Home Builders Federation, support Option Three as they consider this is the only Option which is likely to bring economic growth and avoid decline. A number mentioned their concern about the rate at which the labour force would decline under Options One and Two. One Vision Housing [the largest Registered Provider in Sefton] supports Option Two.

53. A few landowners whose land has been identified as having potential for development said that they did not want their land to be developed for housing or employment. These sites were not pursued in the subsequent development of the Local Plan.

54. There was some support for an approach between Option One and Option Two – i.e. an acceptance of some development in the Green Belt was required, but not as much as was implied by either of these Options. In general there was less opposition to identifying sites in the Green Belt for employment rather than for housing.

Housing requirement for Sefton

55. This topic was a key debating point during the consultation. Many people found it difficult to understand the evidence which lies behind these figures and queried the review of Sefton's Housing Requirement [document HO.4] which had been carried out on the Council's behalf. It was decided following this stage to carry out an update of the housing requirement for Sefton to take account of census statistics which had been released in the summer of 2012.

Agricultural land quality

56. A major concern during the consultation was that a couple of the options involved building on Green Belt some of which was Grade 1 agricultural land. In view of the broad brush nature of the Agricultural Land Classification [ALC] maps published by Natural England and on the Government's 'Magic' website, it is impossible to know the actual quality of the land without carrying out more detailed surveys. We have found that detailed analysis in the past has often shown that the quality of land is lower than the more general ALC mapping would suggest.

57. Advice was taken from the Government's advisers in these matters –the Department of Communities and Local Government [CLG], the Department of Food and Rural Affairs [DEFRA], and Natural England. In order to get a definitive view of the quality of the land and its value for food production, it was decided to commission a study of agricultural land quality in the Borough and the implications arising from possible future development in the Green Belt. It was considered this would provide a sounder base on which recommendations can be made. The Sefton Agricultural Land Study [ADAS] was completed in November in 2012 [Document EN.6].

Consequences Study

58. In response to the range of concerns that people had to the potential housing and employment land requirements for each of the Core Strategy Options the Council decided to commission a specific study to fully consider these options in turn. The study was titled the Consequences Study as it looked at the economic, social and environmental consequences of implementing each of the Core Strategy Options. This study specifically considered a range of implications that were relevant to the comments made at consultation and included: Impacts on local economy; jobs created; the labour force; travel to work implications; highways implications; potential Council Tax/New Homes Bonus; total additional land requirement [and where]; impact on Green Belt; impact on ecological assets; impact on agricultural land; flood risk implications; implications for other assets, e.g. heritage, landscape, open space; and cross boundary implications. The Consequences Study was completed [by NLP] in May 2013 [Document MI.3].

59. Overall this stage of consultation enabled the Council to have a clear idea of the priorities for action that the Local Plan needed to address. This was important in identifying the overall strategy for the Local Plan and which policies we would seek to include. It also provided the Council with a huge amount of information on potential development sites as it embarked on discussions with local landowners.

Section D Consultation on Preferred Options

60. The Council's Preferred Option for its Local Plan was broadly consistent with Option Two from the previous Options Stage. At this stage detailed draft policies were included for comment for the first time. A copy of the Local Plan Preferred Option Document is included in the Examination Library [Document ES.5].

61. The Local Plan Preferred Options paper was approved for consultation purposes by Council (27th June 2013). It was agreed that the consultation period would run for a period of 12 weeks. This was to accommodate the public events [see below] and to account for the period being over summer. This is twice the minimum period set out in the planning regulations and more than the 8 weeks set out in Sefton's approved Statement of Community Involvement.

62. The consultation took place over a 12 week period between 8th July and 27th September 2013

63. The approach to consultation was developed in discussion with other departments of the Council and outside organisations, including Corporate Communications, the Consultation and Engagement Team, Libraries Service, Sefton Council for Voluntary Services including the Young Advisors, and the Planning Advisory Service.

64. A detailed consultation strategy and associated media campaign was developed with support from the Corporate Communications team to ensure a corporate approach to publicising the Plan.

65. The approach to consultation was agreed by the Public Engagement and Consultation Panel which advises on the approach to consultations carried out by the Council and other public services in Sefton.

66. The consultation was publicised in the Champion Newspapers in the week commencing July 8th 2013 with a full cover colour 'wraparound', followed by an advert half-way to remind people of the consultation.

67. We also wrote to, or e-mailed, approximately 3,000 people on our consultation databases [i.e. general database and those who commented at the previous stage] and distributed posters to raise awareness of the Local Plan. Information about the Local Plan consultation was also included on an e-mail sent out by One Vision Housing to those on the Affordable Housing waiting list.

68. The Local Plan was advertised on the Sefton website and was the top news item on the front page for almost the entire 12 weeks of the consultation. A short video was commissioned to provide an overview of the Local Plan and a link to this was also on the Sefton home page. An innovative pocket sized FAQ document was also produced.

69. Copies of the Local Plan documents were sent to all 13 Sefton libraries for the duration of the consultation period and were available at the Council's offices in Magdalen House, Bootle. The Local Plan was featured on the Liverpool Echo home page throughout the consultation. The Council tweeted information (about the video, public events and consultation deadline) on 7 occasions during the consultation period.

Public events

70. 15 public events were held. These consisted of 10 events spread across the borough in July and August 2013, with the aim of getting widespread geographical coverage, and a further 5 events across the borough in September.

71. Display boards containing key information was provided at each of the events. This was tailored to each part of the Borough, explaining the implications of the Local Plan for that area. A Sefton-wide board was also included.

72. A booking system was used this time which allowed people to attend an event for an hour and to have an opportunity to speak one to one with a member of the planning team. This approach was recommended by the Planning Advisory Service for three reasons:

- safety - to avoid potential difficulties of large numbers of people arriving at the same time
- to enable members of the public to be able to speak direct to members of the planning team, and
- to make the most efficient use of the limited numbers of staff in the most effective way.

73. The booking system received some limited criticism in the press and from a number of residents. One or two people said they boycotted the events, claiming it was anti-democratic.

74. However this approach to consultation worked well in many respects. Every single person who rang or e-mailed to make a booking or who turned up on the day without an appointment was given a slot at a time largely convenient to them. There was positive feedback at most of the events, with many people saying that officers were very helpful and had explained information clearly.

75. In total around 600 people attended the public events. This compares to the last occasion where approximately 1,500 attended the drop-in events. This may be partly explained by the fact that many fewer sites were identified for development in the Preferred Option draft Plan. Some people may also have chosen not to attend the events.

76. Three 'Youth' events were organised with advice from Sefton Council for Voluntary Services (CVS). The material was prepared entirely by Sefton's Young Advisors with guidance from the Local Plan team. The events were publicised by the Young Advisors. Only the Bootle session had enough young people attending to make it worthwhile running the event. Part of the reason may have been the exceptionally hot weather in early July.

77. Given the low turnout, Sefton CVS, Children's Services and Planning Services arranged two additional events for September, in Bootle and Southport, which were better attended. Sefton CVS and Sefton Council arranged two events for September for the Voluntary sector. Despite widespread attempts by Sefton CVS to publicise the events, one of the events had to be cancelled due to low numbers and only one event took place.

78. Anecdotal evidence suggests a high level of awareness of the consultation. Maghull Town Council carried out its own survey of 556 randomly chosen households, and 70% of these were aware of the Local Plan.

79. Just under 1,200 individual representations on the draft Local Plan were received in total. Some included detailed supporting studies. Around 570 of these representations comprised an identical form signed by residents objecting to sites identified for housing development in Melling.

80. A review of the consultation was reported to the Public Engagement and Consultation Panel in November 2013. The Panel noted the various challenges associated with the consultation and agreed that overall the consultation had been very successful.

Main Issues from the Preferred Options Consultation

81. Just under 1,200 individual representations were received in total, which included 570 identical forms signed by residents from Melling. Two petitions were received against proposed sites in the Green Belt at Moss Lane, Churchtown [signed by 778 residents] and at Sandy Lane/ Lamshear Lane, Lydiate [signed by 892 residents].

82. In addition to comments from local people, a significant number of representations were received from developers and land owners (and their professional consultants). These included letters supporting the development of certain sites, including some not currently identified in the draft Local Plan.

83. A consistent theme in the developer / land owner representations was that Sefton's Local Plan is not ambitious enough to comply with Government planning policy contained in the National Planning Policy Framework, or to encourage economic growth. Many of these representations argued that the Local Plan would need to identify significantly more land than proposed in order to be found 'sound' by the Planning Inspectorate.

84. Adjoining local authorities generally supported the Preferred Option and welcomed the opportunity to comment on the draft Plan as part of the Duty to Cooperate. Statutory consultees generally supported the approach taken in the Preferred Option, and offered comments on matters of detail. Many other organisations welcomed the overall approach of the draft Plan and offered detailed comments in relation to their specific area of interest.

Comments on the introductory section of the Plan [Section A]

85. Some people thought that the Plan contained an undue emphasis on building houses and that this was being presented as the answer to everything. Others felt that it was inappropriate to encourage economic growth in Sefton as the borough with its high quality environment has always functioned as a 'dormitory' area from which people travelled to work in Liverpool and elsewhere. By contrast others expressed concern that the Plan would not meet Sefton's 'objectively assessed needs' for new homes and jobs. There was also support for the general approach of the Plan – there was recognition of the major challenge of satisfying the Government's agenda for growth and protecting Sefton's valuable environment.

Spatial strategy

86. A variety of views was expressed about the proposed 'spatial strategy' of development [i.e. distribution across the Borough]. Some expressed a view that particular areas were taking an unfair proportion of new development. Others recognised the wide number of constraints in finding new sites.

Need for new homes and possible sites

87. The theme which attracted most comment was the need for new homes and the sites identified to meet this need. Again the responses to this topic were polarised. On the one hand, individuals and residents' groups generally argued that the housing requirement was set too high, and that the evidence supporting this figure was suspect and out of date. They suggested that a lower housing requirement could be justified and that there was sufficient brownfield land and vacant homes in the built-up area which should be used for development before the Green Belt. Developers and their representatives, by contrast, typically argued the housing requirement was too low, and a significantly higher housing requirement figure would be necessary, and in some instances more land may need to be allocated. The Home Builders' Federation considered that the housing requirement proposed by Sefton was too low and referred to a number of aspects in which they felt that Government guidance for calculating the number of homes needed had not been followed.

88. In addition to expressing general concerns such as opposition to the principle of developing on land in the Green Belt or on high quality agricultural land, many individual representations raised issues about specific sites, including traffic & access, flood risk & drainage, lack of necessary infrastructure [in particular, school places, GPs, community facilities], change to the character of the area, effect on wildlife. Others questioned the suitability of certain sites for development.

89. Developer / land owner representations often sought to support the inclusion of certain sites and some promoted additional or larger sites for development. Many of these representations were accompanied by detailed studies relating to traffic, flood risk, ecology, agricultural land quality, noise and vibration. Members of the public also suggested sites which they considered suitable for development.

90. Representations from a number of developer interests and the Home Builders Federation further suggested the Council had not provided enough land to meet needs for homes and jobs. In particular they argued that the Preferred Option did not include 'safeguarded' land beyond the end of the plan period, that in calculating the number of homes needed the figure for 'backlog' and 'buffer' had been set too low, and that the supply of urban housing sites had been overestimated.

Response to comments in relation to housing issues

91. The Council commissioned an update to its Strategic Housing Market Assessment [SHMA] which, following a stakeholder event was consulted on early in 2014, and approved in November 2014. This clarified Sefton's position regards affordable and special needs homes.

92. The Council also updated its Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment [SHLAA] [Document HO.7] and consulted on this in early 2014. Linked to this a "Call for Sites" exercise was undertaken to see if any 'new' urban sites can be identified to maximise our urban housing capacity.

93. The Merseyside authorities and West Lancashire collectively decided to undertake a review of its gypsy and traveller accommodation requirements. This updated the requirement for traveller pitches [both permanent and transit] for each authority. The results were approved in September 2014 and subsequently used to identify sites in Sefton for the Publication Local Plan.

94. Meetings took place with landowners or their representatives on the sites identified in the Local Plan and meetings with promoters of new sites. This was to discuss emerging issues with the sites that had been identified, for instance around flood risk issues, traffic and access, heritage and

ground conditions. These meetings enabled the Council to request that studies on these issues be submitted to allow the Council to determine if the site could progress as an allocation.

95. The Council also committed to updating its Objectively Assessed Needs following the release of the 2012 Population Projections and commissioned NLP to do this on its behalf]. This was completed and approved in December 2014 [Document HO.2] and formed the basis of the housing requirement at the next stage [i.e. publication].

96. Representations from landowners / developers or objectors meant a review of the principle of developing all or part of some sites, the timing of when they might be able to be developed, and the density at which they might be developed. For instance the Ministry of Defence objected to the development of land south of the Coastal Road, Ainsdale [Preferred Option Site SR4.9], because of the potential impact on the operation of Woodvale Airfield. This site was subsequently removed from further consideration.

97. Overall the comments to housing sites, and the range of issues that people had to their identification [or not] for development, lead the Council to substantially reviewing its methodology for site selection. This was more closely aligned to the Sustainability Appraisal process, considered the impact of the Green Belt purposes, developer intentions, a range of site constraints and what benefits the development of a site could bring. The Local Plan Site Selection Methodology, which is part of the Sustainability Appraisal, and results are available in the Examination Library [Document LP.5].

Employment land

98. In relation to the employment requirement, arguments were put forward that the Borough did not need to identify more land for employment as there were currently plenty of empty units/ land. Some representors made specific comments about the proposed employment sites. Others suggested that not enough land was proposed for employment/ jobs and also proposed additional sites. Prominent examples included land [17 hectares] south of Tesco at Formby [now included in the Submission Local Plan as site MN2.49], and a site promoted by Peel Holdings (70 hectares) between the M57 & M58 (close to Switch Island) for Port related warehousing distribution and manufacturing.

99. It was argued by the owner of the proposed site at Crowland Street in Southport, that this site, because of viability issues, may not be capable of delivering as much employment land as is assumed by the Local Plan. Additionally, the consortium promoting land to the east of Maghull argued for a smaller business park (15 ha rather than 25 ha net) than planned, with a larger number of dwellings as a result.

100. The Local Enterprise Partnership supported the broad approach of the Plan. They noted that to realise the opportunities for growth and to create jobs for local people, it was vital that suitable land and facilities are made available to meet demand. They welcomed the proposals being put forward to this end and the positive jobs and investment implications they engender.

101. As with the housing sites, studies were submitted by landowners/ developers to support the development of the sites they were proposing, and often provided more detail about the timing, phasing and supporting infrastructure.

Response to comments in relation to employment land issues:

102. A viability assessment submitted on behalf of the landowner confirmed that land at Crowland Street would be unlikely to be achievable for a mixed use development. It was therefore determined to allocate this site for homes only.

103. The Liverpool City Region Local Enterprise Partnership carried out a further study which looks at the need for Port related distribution floorspace across the whole of the Liverpool City Region and immediately beyond, and the additional implications for the demand and supply of employment land provision across the sub region. This was published in 2014 [Document EM.6]. The results of this were considered in reviewing the requirement and locations for employment land in Sefton in the next stage of the Local Plan.

Centres and Regeneration

104. There was strong support for Crosby and Maghull Centres being identified as priorities for regeneration, with very strong support for taking urgent action in Crosby.

105. More ambition was called for to find a means of regenerating contaminated sites which could then be used for housing and so reduce the need to use land in the Green Belt for development.

106. There was widespread recognition of the challenges facing town and local centres generally, with a variety of views expressed about how to plan for the future of centres and promote a wider range of uses in order to make them more attractive and to help them respond to change. There was a call to exploit the upper floors in town centres and vacant retail units to provide living accommodation.

Response to comments in relation to Centres and Regeneration

107. Our approach to regeneration was reviewed in light of comments made. In particular a specific policy was added to cover the Crosby Town Centre area, which will be supported by a Supplementary Planning Document.

Infrastructure and Transport

108. Concerns were expressed that not enough work had been done to set out what infrastructure was needed to support the level of development proposed in the draft Plan. A repeated theme was the inability of the road system to cope with the level of development proposed, the impact of extra traffic on particular junctions and detailed issues relating to proposed access points.

109. There were many concerns about the presence of flood risk and the current inadequate drainage systems in many areas, and that further development would exacerbate these issues. There was a further concern as to whether what developers would be asked to do to manage flood risk would actually work and positively address problems raised.

110. There was also disquiet about the impact of proposed development on schools, GPs and dentists, local shopping facilities and green spaces. Doubts were expressed as to whether the required level of infrastructure could be afforded, or whether it could be guaranteed to be provided.

111. It was suggested that the Plan did not sufficiently embrace sustainable transport principles. Key transport themes were the support for more use of rail transport for goods to and from the Port, more clarity on the proposed access to the Port, and better rail and road connections to Southport.

Response to comments in relation to infrastructure and transport:

112. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan [version1] [Document MI.1] was completed setting out main infrastructure which it considers necessary to make sure sites proposed for development can be implemented satisfactorily. This was also written to assure people that the level of infrastructure was, or could, be in place to support the level of growth proposed.

113. In addition it was decided to set up an Infrastructure Working Group to discuss the emerging Local Plan in relation to potential impacts with infrastructure provision. This comprised a cross party group of four Councillors who took presentations from [and questioned] a whole range of infrastructure providers and others on issues such as schools, open space, health facilities, drainage, traffic, public transport, affordable housing and viability. The working group was useful in that it helped to focus discussions with infrastructure providers so that their responses addressed the concerns that have persisted throughout the Local Plan process.

114. An economic viability study was commissioned in early 2014 to assess whether key development sites are economically viable. This not only established if they could deliver the level of development proposed, or also started the process of determining if there was scope to establish a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging schedule in the borough. Whilst further work is required to determine the specific charging rate, the initial conclusions are that CIL will be achievable in Sefton and will help to support the provision or extension of infrastructure.

115. An assessment of the individual transport assessments [submitted to the Council] was undertaken. This was undertaken on our behalf by consultants who independently reviewed the assumptions within these submitted assessments. The transport assessments [and independent review] enabled the Local Plan Team, and its Transport Planners, to make informed decisions on the site selection.

Environment

116. Natural England welcomed the recognition of the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, including the need to protect and enhance biodiversity, including designated sites, landscape and open space, water quality, air quality and to address climate change.

117. There was concern about the potential contradiction between proposing to improve the environment, yet planning for the loss of Green Belt and an impact on the valued landscape. There was a general welcome for the policy on 'green infrastructure' and its emphasis on multifunctional benefits such as benefits to health and biodiversity. Concern was expressed over the increased pressure 10,000 new households would have on the Coast's environmentally sensitive areas.

118. There was significant concern over the proposed 'Area of Search' for wind energy near Ince Blundell and a request for a clearer policy approach to 'fracking'. The Environment Agency welcomed the inclusion of the strategic policy on climate change and related strategic objectives which reflect many of their priorities. There was also support from the Environment Agency for the policy approach to flooding, but concern from others on the impact of development on flood risk.

119. A comment was made that the plan is not ambitious enough regarding environmental sustainability, especially energy and that there needs to be real commitment to green energy and sustainability in any new developments (brownfield or greenbelt). It was considered the plan does not differentiate enough between measures which address adaptation to inevitable climate change and those measures which seek to mitigate the scale of climate change. There was, however,

general support for policy on energy and carbon reduction, but concerns from some that elements of it over-step the Government's approach to this topic.

Response to comments in relation to the environment and resources

120. Following this stage, and in part to comments made, the Council worked closely with colleagues, particularly at the Merseyside Environment Advisory Service, to develop further policy responses in relation to mitigation of ecological issues.

121. As a number of comments were concerned about the impact of new development on the valued landscape the Council decided to commission a landscape appraisal of the potential development sites in the Green Belt [Document EN.10].

122. Concerns regarding the proposed 'Area of Search' for for wind energy, north east of Ince Blundell, prompted the Council to engage with English Heritage on the potential impact on heritage assets. Following their response [EN. 11], and the results of the Landscape Assessment [see above], the Council to remove the designated site from the Local Plan.

Section E - Additional Sites Consultation

123. During the consultation on the Preferred Option, we received representations from landowners / developers proposing a number of alternative sites for housing / employment from those proposed by the Council. This included approximately 25 proposals for completely different sites, and five sites which comprise extensions to sites included in the Preferred Option. It was considered that it would be valuable to offer a specific additional opportunity to members of the public to make known their views on the newly proposed sites.

124. In May 2014 Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Tourism approved for consultation the newly proposed sites. The Council presented to these to the public as 'Additional Sites' but made it clear these were not necessarily to be included in the Local Plan, but would be assessed again to the same criteria as allocated sites. Details of these additional sites are provided in the Examination Library [Document ES.7].

125. The period for comment on the additional sites was 8 weeks from 16th June to 8th August 2014. This was advertised in the Champion group of local papers which cover Sefton and letters/emails [approximately 1500] were set to all those who had made comments at the preferred option stage or who are on the Local Plan consultee database. In addition we placed site notices around each of the newly promoted sites.

Main Issues during Additional Sites Consultation

126. During the consultation over 1600 individual responses were received in addition to 6 petitions containing 4132 signatures.

127. The site which received by far the most individual responses [not including petitions] was the site at Switch Island [i.e. Peel Holding proposals for employment land – site ref AS17]. This received almost twice as many comments as the second most objected to site, ref AS12 'Land West of Maghull'. This reflects the scale of the proposals, which would impact on a much wider area than many other of the sites, and that there were active resident's group co-ordinating opposition. Overall the sites around Maghull, Aintree and Melling generated a considerable number of responses, with many people commenting on several sites within their form/letter/email. Other sites, such as those in Churchtown, Hillside and Formby, despite being much smaller in size, still attracted many individual comments.

128. The most common reason for objecting to the potential allocation of any additional site for development was related to traffic and access issues. In total over 2300 individual comments to sites referred to issues with traffic and access, this equates to over 63% of all comments made. The principle to the loss of Green Belt was a concern for over 1800 individual responses, over 51% of responses to individual sites received.

129. The next three most cited specific reasons, in order, were flood risk and drainage [45%], loss of agricultural land [44.3%] and the lack of/impact upon local infrastructure and services [37.5%]. There were also over 1800 responses that were classified as 'other'. These were mostly comments relating to the need for new homes and employment land, the perceived underuse of brownfield sites and vacant homes and premises and the consultation process.

Response to comments made to Additional Sites

130. In broad terms comments made to the additional sites were similar to those made to sites identified for development at Preferred Option Stage. Many of the issues raised had been addressed in response to earlier comments, such as the reviewing the housing requirement number, working with infrastructure providers to determine if services could accommodate growth, looking at heritage, traffic and flood risk issues.

131. All the sites proposed were assessed using the same Site Selection Methodology [Document LP.5] as the other sites we proposed to allocate in the Local Plan. Using the information gained through this, and the Preferred Options, stage we concluded that a number of sites [or extensions of sites] should be added to the allocated sites. These were:

- [part of] AS01 at Bankfield Road, Southport [Extension to existing allocation]
- AS02 Land at Lynton Road, Southport
- AS05 Clarence House, Brewery Lane, Formby
- AS06 Land at Brackenway, Formby [Extension to existing allocation]
- AS08 Land to South of Altcar Road, Formby
- AS20 Land at Spencers Lane, Melling
- AS24 Land adjacent to Ashworth Hospital between Housing School Lane, M58 and Old Prescott Close, Maghull
- AS27 Lane at Lydiate Lane [Extension to existing allocation]

132. The most significant site to be consulted on at this stage was approximately 48 hectares in size, between the M57 and M58 motorway at Switch Island. This was submitted by Peel Holdings [site ref AS17] and specifically relates to future demand for Port related logistics uses.

133. Sefton considers this proposal must be viewed in a wider context. The Liverpool City Region Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) commissioned a Superport demand study in autumn 2013. The study was published in March 2014 [Document EM.6] and identified an estimated sub-regional demand, over the next 20 years, for an additional 634 hectares of land for port related logistics (418 hectares) and related manufacturing (216 hectares), rising to 851 hectares if an additional 25% "headroom" provision were allowed for to cater for market choice etc. Taking account of existing suitable supply across the sub-region, the net additional demand is for some 400 hectares or 500 hectares assuming 25% headroom.

134. In short, the study commissioned by the LEP has estimated sub-regional port related logistics demand (i.e. demand for logistics and related logistics manufacturing) in the period to about 2034. The LEP suggests that this demand is for employment land over and above that assessed in the 2012 Employment Study Refresh for Sefton [Document EM.2], which assessed demand for traditional employment uses (Use Classes B1,B2 and B8) for the borough. Some of Sefton's proposed employment allocations could meet an element of this demand in the short term. However, this demand relates to the strategic requirements of the Port which cover a very large geographical area including, and well beyond, the Liverpool City Region.

135. Sefton therefore considers that this potential demand should be appraised through a separately commissioned sub-regional study, which reviews demand and supply options for Port related

logistics as part of an assessment of wider employment demand. To do otherwise risks decisions being taken without knowledge of the sub-regional and regional implications of such a proposal. This also has potential to link to an anticipated sub-regional Strategic Housing Market Assessment. It is not however thought appropriate to delay the preparation of the Local Plan until such work has been completed. This is referred to in the Housing Technical Paper [Document TP.1]. Rather it is a matter that can best be addressed by a commitment to an early review of the plan.

Section F Consultation on Publication Local Plan

136. The Local Plan was approved for publication by full Council on 22 January 2015. It was agreed that the period for comment would run for 8 weeks. The period for comment was 30 January to March 2015. This is in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement [Document LP.6].

137. The Local Plan publication document and relevant supporting documents were made available on the Council's website, at the main planning offices in Bootle and at each of the six libraries [Southport, Formby, Crosby, Maghull, Netherton and Bootle] in Sefton. A 'wraparound' advertisement was used in the Champion Group of local newspaper that significantly covers Sefton. This provided an overview of the Local Plan and details of where to view further information and how to make comments.

138. Letters or emails were sent to everyone on the Council's Local Plan database, to statutory consultees and to all those residents and groups who had previously made comments to the Core Strategy/Local Plan. In total approximately 5500 letters or email were sent.

139. In total 1290 individual responses were received amounting to 2488 individual representations. Additionally 3 new petitions were received containing 7,900 signatures, and two further petitions were resubmitted from earlier stages. Copies of each of these representations are submitted to the examination separately [examination library document LP.9].

140. Summaries have been prepared of the main issues that were made to each of the Local Plan sections, policies and site allocations. These are provided at Appendix 1.

Appendix 1

Summaries of the main issues from the Local Plan Publication Consultation

Main Issues arising from representations to Local Plan Publication

Note – an [index](#) of representations number is provided at the end of this document

Local Plan Publication Draft General Comments (Whole Document)

Summary of key Issues:

- A lack of cross-boundary partnership working will have negative implications for those living close to the West Lancashire boundary in particular (114, 488). More could be done to instigate growth in the wider city and north west region (550, 724)
- The plan is ineffective in addressing the current needs of the population in terms of their foremost concerns such as infrastructure and service provision (212, 241)
- The plan is unsound due to the large quantity of housing sites allocated on prime agricultural land and green belt (488, 530, 703).
- Construction of brownfield land is preferable (703), and development should be focused in areas that are well served by public transport (553)
- Housing allocation sites are distributed unevenly across the borough, often in places with low housing requirement levels
- Studies conducted by the likes of Keppie Massie and NLP are a flawed basis to inform the plan often due to outdated, overcomplicated and unfavourable data collation techniques as well as conflict of interest (692, 699)
- Levels of community engagement were insufficient (114, 488, 680, 699, 740) and consultation over the additional sites submitted at the preferred options stage was non-existent (241)
- Concerns over problems surrounding the submission of online representations (692)
- Plan fails to set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment (648)
- Plan conforms with the NPPF, seeking to protect the interests of specific groups and it meets the duty to cooperate (125, 595, 615, 700, 722)
- Plan addresses issues within borough affectively without any significant cross-boundary implications (594)
- Clear guidance on flood risk management must be incorporated to avoid passing of responsibility (241, 530)
- The plan should include greater reference to the 2009 Transport SPD and the county-wide Local Transport Plan(553)
- Concerns over lack of policy relating to telecommunications (179)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

53 (Marine Management Organisation), 114 (Lydiat Parish council), 125 (Amphibian & Reptile Conservation Trust), 203 [National Grid], 212 (Maghull Town Council), 241 (Formby Parish Council), 268 (Councillor Weavers), 488 (Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group), 530 (Thornton Parish Council), 550 (Merseyside Civic Society), 553 (Merseytravel), 594 (Wirral Council), 595 (Knowsley Council), 615 (Health and Wellbeing Board), 680 (Reclaim Community), 692 (UKIP Sefton Branch), 699 (Maghull and Lydiat Action Group), 700

(Natural England), 703 (CPRE Lancashire), 722 (United Utilities), 724 (Sefton Central Liberal Democrats) 740 (Formby Residents Action Group),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
179 (Mono Consultants),

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:
64, 97, 144, 184, 234, 360, 361, 366, 383, 384, 407, 421, 424, 433, 468, 552, 590, 635, 657, 659, 665, 687, 881, 889, 895, 915, 927, 931, 955, 1011, 1013, 1023, 1025, 1033

Local Plan Introduction (Chapter 1)

Summary of key Issues:

- Adjacent local authorities satisfied with the overall undertaking of duty to cooperate (594, 595)
- Some bodies believe more should have been done to address cross-boundary issues (360, 724)
- Early monitoring post-adoption must consider emerging Superport Liverpool (553)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
553 (Merseytravel), 594 (Wirral Council), 595 (Knowsley Council), 724 (Sefton Central Liberal Democrats)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
N/A

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:
360

Local Plan Profile of Sefton (Chapter 2)

Summary of key Issues:

- Issues concerning infrastructure and service provision has been acknowledge within plan , however there is a lack of policy to address specific cases where these are lacking (52)
- Large scale transport related investment is welcomed and the plan should consider further schemes to improve links across the region (553)
- It is necessary to review the Green Belt in Sefton to allow for growth and the plan should

| |
|--|
| mention how it can stifle development (524) |
| Statutory Undertaker Representations: 52 (Ince Blundell Parish Council), 553 (Merseytravel) |
| Site Promoter and Developer Representations: 446 (Formby Play Sports Ltd), 542 (Liverpool and Chester Property Company) |
| General Public Representations [see index for name of resident]: 1037 |

| |
|---|
| Local Plan Key Issues and Challenges, Vision and Objectives (Chapter 3) |
| <p>Summary of key Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of major infrastructure schemes such as Superport Liverpool and Maghull North Station are supported (553) • Plan lacks vision and policy related to conservation, protection and enhancement of historic assets (648), a policy should also exist to not just simply protect natural assets but continuously enhance them (663) • Minor alterations to wording of vision will create more clarity (637) • Concerns raised over port area being the Local Plans only area specific objective (663) • Overall vision is flawed with housing allocations in inappropriate areas, often away from core urban populations. Housing requirement figures are also questioned (712, 716) • Vision and strategic objectives are welcomed however could be more concise to avoid dilution by policies (707, 712, 716) • Plan’s vision is fully supported and reflects the visions of a number of public and private bodies (707, 713) • Health and wellbeing should be at forefront of plan (723) • The effect of the Green Belt has prevented the natural growth of settlements eg Formby, (446) • More emphasis should be placed on working with the private sector to deliver economic development. (446) |
| Statutory Consultees and other groups: 553 (Merseytravel), 648 (Historic England), 663 (National Trust), 707 (Home Builders Federation), 713 (Canal & River Trust), 723 (Sefton Green Party) |

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

446 (Formby Play Sports Ltd), 637 (Mactaggart & Mickel Homes Ltd), 712 (Persimmon Homes), 716 (Robert Swift and family), 717 (TR Silcock Ltd, DWH & Barratt Homes) 737(Watmore)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

665, 737

Local Plan Developing a Strategy for Sefton (Chapter 4)

Summary of key Issues:

- Plan successfully addresses housing and employment needs of the borough while considering the effects on neighbouring areas (406)
- Development on large areas of Green Belt, agricultural land and wildlife habitats is not acceptable and the Plan unsound (680, 707, 716, 723, 724)
- The sites selected for Green Belt release are fully supported to meet Sefton's development needs (446, 492, 595, 715)
- Uneven distribution of site allocations should be addressed with Additional sites in Aintree brought forward (738)
- Plan fails to adequately take into account the borough-wide and regional implications of Superport Liverpool (702)
- Minor alterations to wording of vision will create more clarity (446, 637)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

406 (West Lancashire Borough Council), 595 (Knowsley Council), 707 (Home Builders Federation), 723 (Sefton Green Party), 724 (Sefton Liberal Democrats)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

446 (Formby Play Sports Ltd), 492 (Craig Seddon SIPP), 637 (Mactaggart & Mickel Homes Ltd), 680 (Reclaim Community), 702 (The Peel Group), 715 (Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd and Persimmon Homes Lancashire), 716 (Robert Swift and family), 738 (CP&S Ltd)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

359

Policy MN1 Housing and Employment Requirement

Summary of key Issues:

- The population has and continues to decline so why are the additional homes needed?
 - The population of Sefton is only projected to increase by 5000 so why are the Council proposing to build 11,000 new homes, enough for 24,000 people?
 - Concern that the housing figure is being inflated to maximise New Homes Bonus, Council Tax and developer profits.
 - Projections of population and household change are just estimates so they should not be relied on as the basis for planning.
 - The methodology used to derive the number of new homes Sefton used is not transparent, robust nor independent.
 - The OAN is over cautious, uses the wrong starting point and market signals have not been fully applied in deriving a housing requirement [707]
 - The housing requirement does not take account of the high number of vacant homes in Sefton
 - Assumptions about inward migration are not backed up by evidence
 - A 20% buffer needs to be applied to the housing requirement due to Sefton's persistent under delivery. There is inconsistency in the way the buffer is applied
 - Sefton are applying the 'Liverpool' approach but should apply the 'Sedgefield' approach in addressing under-delivery of homes.
 - Questions the reduced rate of housing at the early stage of plan.
 - The 2012- based household projections [published in 2015] need to be reflected in the Sefton OAN of housing.
 - Policy MN1 doesn't meet the NPPF [para 47] requirement which seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing.
 - The total housing requirement would be insufficient to meet the identified affordable housing need based on the affordable housing requirement of 30%
 - The number of homes proposed is not sufficient for the Council to meet its, and the sub region, economic objectives
 - The housing requirement does not reflect the growth and investment expected at Liverpool Waters , Liverpool 2 [the port expansion] and elsewhere in Sefton.
 - Concerns over the method for deriving the employment land requirement
 - Flexibility needs to be applied to the employment figure and the 84.5ha of land should be considered a minimum [446]
- The employment and logistic land requirement have not been properly addressed in the Local Plan. The expanded Port will be active at the end of 2015 and the Local Plan fails to address the imminent needs of this investment. Whilst between 634-793ha of port related employment land is identified as a result of recent investment in the Port of Liverpool is needed in the sub-region, local authorities should not postpone identifying sites to a sub-regional study. Each LPA should proactively identify sites asap, through joint working, in their respective Local Plans [702]
- This policy [or the Local Plan] doesn't address the need for self or custom build

homes [1066]

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

52 [Ince Blundell Parish], 241 [Formby Parish], 488 [Sefton Lib Dem Opposition Group], 541 [Meols Ward Cllrs], 680 [Reclaim your Community], 693 [Liverpool City Council], 699 [Maghull & Lydiate Action Group], 703 [CPRE Lancashire], 707 [HBF], 723 [Green Party], 724 [Sefton Central Lib Dem], 734 [Cllr Bennett], 740 [Frag Off]

Developer Representations:

376 [Network Rail], 446 [Formby Play Sports], 492 [Craig Seddon SIPP], 542 [Liverpool & Chester Property Company], 625 [Wainhomes], 637 [MacTaggart & Mickel], 655 [Nuffield Collage], 661 [PSA Developments], 668 [Morris Homes and Ballygorryveg Ltd], 685 [Taylor Wimpey], 696 [Redrow], 698 [Swift & Pittaras], 701 [Rostron], 702 [Peel Group], 704 [Mr Donnelly], 706 [Mr McComb], 712 [Persimmon Homes], 715 [Countryside Properties], 716 [Robert Swift], 717 [Silcock, DWH and Barratt], 721 [Morris Homes], 727 [Harrison & Sons], 729 [MerseyCare NHS Trust], 730 [Nextdom], 732 [Bellway], 735 [Catalyst Capital], 737 [Watmore], 738 [CP&S Ltd], 741 [Priority Asset Management]

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

52, 55, 131, 140, 358, 359, 360, 361, 363, 366, 380, 383, 384, 405, 433, 437, 505, 548, 550, 590, 612, 627, 629, 635, 676, 742, 750, 767, 769, 773, 789, 798, 802, 804, 853, 860, 882, 895, 900, 965, 1066

Policy MN2 Housing, Employment and Mixed Use Allocations [General]

Summary of key Issues:

- There are sufficient brownfield sites in Sefton that could be used in place of Green Belt/greenfield sites. Sefton has not undertaken a full assessment of its urban housing capacity. Sefton must implement a brownfield first policy.
- Sefton should target bringing back vacant homes into use rather than build more new homes. The potential for units from 'living over the shop' should be explored.
- Housing need does not provide the exceptional circumstances needed to consider releasing land from the Green Belt
- Oppose the principle of Green Belt release for development
- Individual towns/villages in Sefton cannot cope with the level of homes proposed
- Sefton does not have the existing infrastructure, or the commitment to invest in its infrastructure, to build on the sites proposed in this policy.
- The roads, schools, GP's, utilities, public transport are not sufficient to cope with the scale of housing proposed. Council services, already stretched, will struggle to cope with the additional homes.
- The proposed allocations will result in the loss of huge areas of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Sefton has some of the best quality agricultural land, this is a scarce commodity and will need to be protected to ensure food security in the

future.

- The loss of so much undeveloped land will increase the risk of flooding. The allocation of sites should take account of climate change, rising sea levels and tides.
- The Council will be responsible for maintaining more areas of swales and ditches
- Undeveloped land on the edge of towns provide places for people to enjoy and nature to live. The plans will harm the health of residents and the environment
- Part 4 of the policy [proposed open space] is too restrictive
- Part 6 of the policy is too restrictive [666]
- So many homes proposed in the Green Belt will result in the merging of Sefton's towns and villages and becoming one urban sprawl.
- Accept that new homes are needed and that some of these may have to go in Green Belt.
- The Council should consider allocating more sites for homes and jobs [see later for list]
- Query of the unrealistic building rate proposed in the local plan (433)
- Many of the Council owned sites allocated should be affordable homes (680)
- Windfalls have been incorrectly reduced (568)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

114 [Lydiat Parish Council], 203 [National Grid], 241 [Formby Parish Council], 268 [Cllr Weavers], 286 [Aintree Ratepayers Association], 406 [West Lancashire BC], 474 [Bill Esterson MP], 488 [Sefton Lib Dem Opposition Group], 550 [Merseyside Civic Society], 551 [Environment Agency], 680 [Reclaim your Community], 692 [UKIP], 693 [Liverpool City Council], 699 [Maghull & Lydiat Action Group], 703 [CPRE Lancashire], 707 [Homebuilders Federation], 722 [United Utilities], 723 [Sefton Green Party], 724 [Sefton Central Liberal Democrats], 734 [Cllr Bennett], 740 [Formby Residents Action Group]

Developer Representations:

108 [Cowell Family], 446 [Formby Play Sports], 492 [Craig Seddon SIPP], 625 [Wainhomes], 666 [Chancerygate], 696 [Redrow], 701 [Rostron], 712 [Persimmon], 716 [Robert Swift], 721 [Morris Homes], 726 [Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd], 729 [Mersey Care NHS Trust], 730 [Nextdom], 732 [Bellway], 737 [Watmore], 741 [Priority Asset Management],

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

5, 6 [petition], 7 [petition], 8, 12, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29, 33, 35, 36, 38, 49, 52, 58, 64, 70, 81, 83, 84, 88, 89, 93, 94, 95, 96, 98, 99, 101, 106, 109, 110, 111, 115, 116, 118, 119, 120, 121, 124, 128, 129, 130, 131, 133, 134, 135, 136, 139, 140, 141, 145, 146, 147, 149, 151, 152, 153, 154, 157, 163, 164, 166, 168, 171, 172, 175, 177, 182, 183, 185, 191, 197, 201, 210, 212, 214, 215, 222, 224, 225, 226, 231, 247, 248, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 257, 266, 267, 272, 282, 284, 285, 287, 289, 295, 301, 304, 306, 313, 316, 317, 320, 324, 325, 327, 328, 331, 332, 335, 337, 340, 346, 350, 351, 352, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 366, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 377, 378, 380, 383, 384, 388, 390, 392, 394, 395, 398, 399, 401, 405, 408, 409, 412, 415, 416, 418, 419, 420, 423, 431, 433, 439, 442, 443, 447, 448, 452, 453, 455, 456, 470, 478, 481, 482, 483, 487, 496, 498, 505, 506, 508, 510, 514, 521, 528, 529, 532, 545, 552, 557, 559, 559, 560, 561, 562, 568, 569, 572, 576, 582, 583, 584, 587, 589, 590, 592, 593, 597, 604, 605, 607, 608, 609, 611, 613, 617, 626, 629, 635, 641, 646, 652, 657, 658, 664, 665, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 679, 681, 683, 686, 687, 689, 690, 691, 734, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 751, 754, 755, 756,

757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 774, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 793, 794, 795, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 844, 846, 847, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 876, 879, 880, 881, 882, 887, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 916, 918, 919, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 928, 929, 930, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 938, 939, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000, 1001, 1002, 1003, 1004, 1006, 1007, 1008, 1009, 1010, 1016, 1017, 1018, 1019, 1020, 1024, 1026, 1031, 1033, 1035, 1036, 1038, 1040, 1047, 1066, 1068, 1070, 1075, 1283, 1284, 1285, 1286, 1287, 1289, 1290, 1291, 1292, 1293, 1294, 1295, 1296, 1297, 1298, 1301, 1302, 1303, 1304, 1305

Site MN2.1 Bartons Close, Southport

This is a Council owned site. Approval for its disposal was granted by Cabinet on 3 July 2015.

Summary of key Issues:

- Highway Safety, congestion and access issues. (1, 290, 1048)
- Construction of site would prevent a possible water lane bypass. (44)
- Traffic on Water Lane is increasing and the lane is not very wide. (44)
- Area does not have infrastructure to support growth. Lack of Schools/GP's. (290)
- Wrong to build on Flood Plain. (290, 1062)
- Too many houses on narrow strip of land.(290,632)
- No wildlife assessment done. (1062)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

N/A

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

1, 44, 290, 632, 1048, 1062

Site MN2.2 Land at Bankfield Lane, Southport

This site is promoted for development by Wainhomes [625].

Summary of key Issues:

- Support designation however density can be increased to 310 dwellings. (625)
- Highway Safety, congestion and access issues. (1, 10, 60, 334,357,492)
- Site is Best and Most Versatile agricultural land. (10, 492, 541)
- Area does not have infrastructure to support growth- Schools/GP's/roads.(54, 60, 161,290, 334,357,391)
- Local wildlife site, development would have negative impact on wildlife (60, 290, 492, 541, 703)
- No ecological assessment has been done, potential for water voles, ecology is a significant constraint , (492, 703, 716)
- Will increase risk of flooding (10, 60,161, 290, 334, 373,391, 488, 541, 703, 716)
- Wrong to build on Green Belt (161,334, 357, 497, 657, 703)
- History of flooding.(150)
- Detrimental impact on Chuchtown/ North Meols conservation area + Meols Hall.(92, 161,) 391, 703)
- Vibration and noise issues.(60, 161, 400,)
- Philips site (MN2.3) should be developed instead. (400, 488)
- Site capacity should be reduced from 220 dwellings to 200. (716)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

488 (Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group), 541 (Meols ward councillors), 703 (CPRE Lancashire)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

492 (Craig Seddon SIPP), 625 (Wainhomes Developments) 716 (Robert Swift and family)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

1, 10, 16, 54, 60, 92, 150, 161, 290, 334, 357, 373, 391, 400, 497, 657, 703

Site MN2.3 Former Philips Factory, Balmoral Drive, Southport

This site is promoted for development by Catalyst Capital [735].

Summary of key Issues:

- Support inclusion of site. (290, 488, 541, 735)
- Site capacity should be increased. (735)
- Highway Safety, congestion and access issues. (1, 161,
- Area does not have infrastructure to support growth. Schools/gp's/roads. (161)
- Site should be developed instead of Green Belt sites. (728)
- Development should also include school, GPs surgery and shops. (541)
- Site capacity should be reduced. (716)
- Site should be retained in employment use. (741)
- Contamination issues. (716, 741)
- Heritage concerns on the Clifford road side as it is locally listed. (716)
- Flood risk constraints. (741)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

488 (Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group), 541 (Meols ward councillors), 728 (Churchtown Green Belt Action Group)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

716 (Robert Swift and family), 735 (Catalyst Capital) 741 (Priority Asset Management LLP)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

1, 161, 290, 1034

Site MN2.4 Land at Moss Lane, Southport

This site is promoted for development by Redrow Homes (696) + Hesketh Estate (344).

Summary of key Issues:

- Support site-site area should be amended to reflect ownership. (344, 696)
- Highway Safety, congestion and access issues/road is very narrow. (492, 716)
- Area does not have infrastructure to support growth. Schools/GP's/roads.
- Development would have negative impact on wildlife, including Peregrine falcons. Local wildlife site is adjacent to site.
- Wrong to build on Green Belt/brownfield sites should be used first. (492)
- Detrimental impact on conservation area.
- Flooding/Sewerage and drainage constraints. (703)
- Subsidence issues/ potential damage to existing properties.
- Loss of agricultural land. (703)
- Unsustainable location with poor access to services/ more sustainable sites in West Lancashire (716)

- Impact on future of golf course due to impact on number of holes/ potential hazard of golf balls. (718)
- Site is used for recreation.
- Site is poorly located in relation to settlement. (492, 703)
- Increased congestion will cause health problems.

Statutory Consultees and other groups

488 (Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group), 541 (Meols ward Councillors), 703 (CPRE Lancashire), 718 (Southport Old Links Golf Club), 728 (Churchtown Green Belt Action Group),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

344 (Hesketh Estate), 492 (Craig Seddon SIPP), 696 (Redrow Homes) 716 (Robert Swift and family)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

32, 73, 92, 174, 176, 186, 192, 193, 195, 199, 227, 237, 239, 242, 243, 256, 258, 260, 264, 273, 276, 283, 290, 292, 296, 302, 303, 323, 330, 348, 386, 402, 411, 489, 496, 509, 519, 571, 602, 606, 623, 624, 644, 647, 649, 651, 654, 658, 659, 665, 682, 684, 687, 688, 1011, 1013, 1014, 1027, 1034, 1049, 1051, 1052, 1054, 1055, 1056, 1057, 1058, 1059, 1060, 1063, 1064, 1074, 1075, 1076, 1077, 1078, 1079

Site MN2.5 Land at Crowland Street, Southport

This site is promoted for development by Mr & Mrs Watmore.(737) Part of the site [the former Kew Park and Ride site] is Council owned. Approval for disposal of the Council owned part of the site was granted by Cabinet on 3 July 2015.

Summary of key Issues:

- Support allocation of site.(737)
- Area does not have infrastructure to support growth. Schools/gp's/roads. (227, 263)
- Highway Safety, congestion and access issues. (227,263, 1065)
- Wrong to build on Green Belt,brownfield sites should be used first.(350)
- Site capacity should be reduced as park and ride is still in operation. (716)
- Site should be mixed use as it is unsuitable for 100% housing. (716) (1013)
- Loss of Park and Ride (678, 1013, 1065)
- Site if allocated should be for employment use. (703)

Statutory Consultees and other groups

678, (Ormskirk, Preston and Southport Travellers Association), 703 (CPRE Lancashire,)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
716 (Robert Swift and family), 737 (Watmore)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:
227, 263, 350, 1013, 1065

Site MN2.6 Land adjacent to Dobbies Garden Centre, Benthams Way, Southport

This is a Council owned site. Approval for its disposal was granted by Cabinet on 3 July 2015.

Summary of key Issues:

- There are access constraints. (716)
- Flood risk constraints. There is a high risk of surface water flooding to the south. (716)
- Capacity of the site should be reduced. (716)

Statutory Consultees and other groups
N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
716 (Robert Swift and family)

General Public Representations:
N/A

Site MN2.7 Land at Lynton Road, Southport

This site is promoted for development by Network Rail [376].

Summary of key Issues:

- Support allocation, no negative ecological impacts, site capacity can be increased. (376)
- Local wildlife site / development would have negative impact on wildlife. Development would affect SSSI and sand lizards; site should be screened in as part of

HRA. (45, 71, 76, 125, 265, 429, 488, 513, 567, 716, 1044)

- Highway Safety, congestion and access issues.(45, 76, 429, 513, 567, 1044)
- Wrong to build on Green Belt/brownfield sites should be used first.(45, 71, 76, 513, 567)
- Flood risk constraints. (429, 567, 1044)
- Area does not have infrastructure to support growth. Schools/gp's/roads.(76, 429, 1044)
- Unsustainable location with poor access to services. (76)
- Dangerous due to live wires nearby. (567)
- Number of houses should be reduced-too high density.(76, 845)

Statutory Consultees and other groups

125 (Amphibian and Reptile Conservation Trust), 265 (North Merseyside Amphibian and Reptile Group), 488 (Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group), 703 (CPRE Lancashire,) 716 (Robert Swift and family), 1044 (Lynton Road Residents)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

376 (Network Rail)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

45, 71, 76, 429, 513, 567, 845, 1039, 1300

Site MN2.8 Former Ainsdale Hope School, Ainsdale

This is a Council owned site. Approval for its disposal was granted by Cabinet on 3 July 2015.

Summary of key Issues:

- Development on site will have adverse effects on the wildlife, flora and fauna of the adjacent SSI (125, 265, 329, 461, 492, 703, 716)
- Qualifies as a Local Wildlife site as a result of notable species observed during 2014 survey, site should be protected from development and impact on these species (329, 461)
- Many in favour of the Ainsdale Community Wildlife Trust's proposal to establish a low dune nature reserve on the site and its accompanying environmental and social benefits (265, 329, 461, 703)
- Loss of playing field must be compensated for (492, 725, 716, 741)
- Peat and gas in ground makes land unsuitable for development (716)
- Existing road network will be unable to cope with an increase in vehicle numbers, particularly with regards to the railway level crossing
- Parking will also become more problematic.
- An increase in population as a result of the development will put further strain on

local services and amenities, the demolition of a school building is counterproductive.

Statutory Consultees and other groups

125 (Amphibian & Reptile Conservation Trust), 265 (North Merseyside Amphibian and Reptile Group), 329 (Wildlife Trust for Lancashire), 461 (Ainsdale Community Wildlife Trust), 703 (CPRE Lancashire), 725 (Sport England)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

492 (Craig Seddon SIPP), 716 (Robert Swift and family), 741 (Priority Asset Management LLP)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

3, 46, 50, 59, 61, 62, 63, 65, 69, 74, 112, 117, 138, 142, 153, 198, 206, 207, 232, 245, 269, 271, 278, 281, 297, 299, 308, 314, 320, 321, 343, 345, 349, 396, 397, 404, 405, 413, 424, 445, 449, 464, 469, 502, 512, 516, 517, 518, 538, 539, 543, 573, 578, 609, 610, 621, 622, 627, 636, 640, 940, 1012, 1022, 1030, 1034, 1061, 1072

Site MN2.9 Former St John Stone School, Meadow Lane, Ainsdale

This is a Council owned site. Approval for its disposal was granted by Cabinet on 3 July 2015.

Summary of key Issues:

- The loss of a school building and its accompanying playing field is concerning (725, 1022)
- Indicative capacity is agreed with (716)

Statutory Consultees and other groups

725 (Sport England)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

716 (Robert Swift and family)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

1022

Site MN2.10 Land at Sandbrook Road, Ainsdale

This is a Council owned site. Approval for its disposal was granted by Cabinet on 3 July 2015.

Summary of key Issues:

- Concerns over the loss of a playing field (492, 725)
- Capacity for site is feasible (716) although accessibility may not be (492)

Statutory Consultees and other groups
725 (Sport England)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
492 (Craig Seddon SIPP), 716 (Robert Swift and family)

General Public Representations
N/A

Site MN2.11 Land south of Moor Lane, Ainsdale

This site is promoted for development by Mr Birch [375]

Summary of key Issues:

- The site is a suitable, available, and deliverable site for housing development.(375)
- Potential impact on wildlife, flora and fauna (326)
- The loss of green belt land and proposed weak boundary is a cause for concern (326, 703, 716)
- Concerns over strain on infrastructure in particularly road network and resulting congestion (326, 492)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
703 (CPRE Lancashire)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
375 (Mr Birch), 492 (Craig Seddon SIPP), 716 (Robert Swift and family)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:
240, 326 (Moor Lane and Moor Close Residents' Association), 375, 424, 481, 1022, 1288, 1299

Site MN2.12 Land north of Brackenway, Formby

This site is promoted for development by Taylor Wimpey [685]

Summary of key Issues:

- Location and size of site makes it viable to deliver significant levels of affordable housing (685)
- Explanation demanded as to why site has been reallocated and expanded in size, after opposition lead to site being excluded from initial Draft Plan (492)
- Infrastructure would be unable to cope with development with a number of surrounding roads already under strain and subject to 'rat running'(741)
- Increased local population will put further strain on healthcare and education provision
- The prospect of developing green belt land is unpopular
- Majority of respondents raise the issue of flood risk and drainage and the effects on existing properties should the land level be raised in any new development (241, 492, 716, 741)
- Flood risk and drainage constraints. Numerous representations request a description of specific flood management methods which will be implemented and the subsequent costs involved of their long term maintenance (492, 716, 740, 741)
- Concerns raised over damage to wildlife habitats and potential mitigation (329, 492, 703)
- Concerns raised over loss of amenity in the form of stables, and associated complications of relocating horses

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

241 (Formby Parish Council), 329 (Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester & North Merseyside), 703 (CPRE Lancashire) 740 (Formby Residents Action Group),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

492 (Craig Seddon SIPP), 685 (Taylor Wimpey), 716 (Robert Swift and family), 741 (Priory Asset Management LLP)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

13, 22, 33, 35, 167, 175, 267, 306, 307, 359, 361, 434, 435, 450, 457, 458, 476, 463, 486, 504, 546, 559, 585, 626, 774, 782, 792, 796, 888, 889, 891, 895, 917, 920, 1003, 1009, 1026, 1037

Site MN2.13 Land at West Lane, Formby

The site is a privately owned site promoted for development as part of school rationalisation.

Summary of key Issues:

- Calls for a thorough Sustainability Assessment (241)
- Infrastructure would be unable to cope with development with a number of surrounding roads already under strain
- Concerns raised over flooding in wider area (740)
- Indicative capacity of site is appropriate (716)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
241 (Formby Parish Council), 740 (Formby Residents Action Group)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
716 (Robert Swift and family)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:
33, 173, 217, 307, 546, 895, 1026, 1037

Site MN2.14 Former Holy Trinity School, Lonsdale Road, Formby

This is a partly Council owned site. Approval for disposal of the council owned part of the site was granted by Cabinet on 3 July 2015.

Summary of key Issues:

- Majority agree that allocation as housing is inappropriate for area, although a number of proposals are suggested in favour of housing for the elderly (741)
- Site should be considered for parking for the adjacent town centre
- Concerns raised over the loss of a school and its accompanying playing field (52, 725)
- Flood risk constraints. Concerns over flood risk (740)
- Indicative capacity of site is appropriate (716)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
52 (Ince Blundell Parish Council), 725 (Sport England), 740 (Formby Residents Action Group),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
716 (Robert Swift and family), 741 (Priory Asset Management LLP)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:
31, 208, 289, 354, 359, 361, 895, 1026, 1037

Site MN2.15 Formby Professional Development Centre, Park Road, Formby

This is a Council owned site. Approval for its disposal was granted by Cabinet on 3 July 2015.

Summary of key Issues:

- Concerns raised over uneven and saturated ground conditions (740)
- Site should be retained for community or education use (52, 241)
- Calls for part of site to remain open space to protect wildlife and recreational opportunities in the area (52, 241)
- Indicative capacity of site is appropriate (716)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

52 (Ince Blundell Parish Council), 241 (Formby Parish Council), 740 (Formby Residents Action Group),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

716 (Robert Swift and family)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

17, 31, 66, 208, 354,562, 895, 1026

Site MN2.16 Land at Liverpool Road, Formby

This site is promoted for development by TR Silcock Ltd, David Wilson Homes, and Barratt Homes [717] and by Morris Homes and Ballygoryveg [668]

Summary of key Issues:

- Support Site allocation however number of houses can be increased.(668)
- Flood risk, surface water and drainage constraints. Site lies within a former flood zone and remains prone to flooding, any development will be detrimental to the abilities of existing drainage systems (716, 740)
- Location of site on the periphery of Formby is inappropriate forming a weak green belt boundary and is served by no local amenities (668, 703, 740)
- Development will place further strain on the town's healthcare and education provision
- The prospect of developing agricultural and green belt land is unpopular (52, 703, 716)
- Site is of low ecological value and suitable for development

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

52 (Ince Blundell Parish Council), 703 (CPRE Lancashire), 740 (Formby Residents Action Group),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

668 (Morris Homes and Ballygorryveg Ltd), 716 (Robert Swift and family), 717 (TR Silcock Ltd)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

13,21, 51, 102, 158, 165, 175, 274, 295, 307, 359, 361, 419,435, 589, 619, 620, 626, 631, 777, 787, 789, 803, 814, 829, 831, 834, 837, 846, 848, 869, 871, 872, 875, 883, 887, 892, 893, 895, 899, 900, 901, 950, 951, 980, 982, 988, 1010, 1026, 1031, 1050

Site MN2.17 Land at Altcar Lane, Formby

This site is promoted for development by Morris Homes and Ballygoryveg who also request it be extended [668]

Summary of key Issues:

- Support Site allocation however the site can be enlarged to incorporate a small additional area.(668)
- Flood risk constraints. Site regularly floods and is inappropriate for development (703, 740)
- Interruption of existing strong physical boundary between Formby and greenbelt and the destruction of hedges is regrettable (703)
- Majority opposed to development on agricultural and green belt land (52, 703)
- Minimal ecological constraints and no heritage constraints make site suitable for development (668, 703).
- The Indicative capacity of site is appropriate (716)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

52 (Ince Blundell Parish Council), 703 (CPRE Lancashire) 740 (Formby Residents Action Group),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

668 (Morris Homes and Ballygorryveg Ltd), 716 (Robert Swift and family),

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

893, 895, 1026, 1031, 1050

Site MN2.18 Power House phase 2, Hoggs Hill Lane, Formby

This site is promoted for development by Mr McComb [706]

Summary of key Issues:

- Concerns over flood risk associated with adjacent river (740) although management techniques are realistic (706)
- Site encroaches on green belt despite partially lying within brownfield land (488, 703)
- Indicative capacity of site is appropriate (716)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

488 (Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group), 703 (CPRE Lancashire), 740 (Formby Residents Action Group),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

706 (Mr McComb), 716 (Robert Swift and family),

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

419, 882, 895, 1026, 1031, 1050

Site MN2.19 Land at Andrew's Close, Formby

This site is promoted for development by Redrow [696]

Summary of key Issues:

- Development viable but policy should allow for further consideration of the balance between housing and open space (696)
- Development on green belt land is unfavourable, and development would create weak boundary (492, 703, 740)
- Flood risk constraints. Concerns over site being liable to flooding (740)
- Access to site is problematic, and surrounding network will be unable to handle and increase in traffic, Traffic Assessment required (492)
- Indicative capacity of site is inappropriate (716)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

703 (CPRE Lancashire), 740 (Formby Residents Action Group),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

492 (Craig Seddon SIPP), 696 (Redrow Homes Ltd), 716 (Robert Swift and family)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:
86, 224, 307, 311, 393, 432, 435, 527, 789, 882, 1005, 1026

Site MN2.20 Land at Elmcroft Lane, Hightown

This site is promoted for development by Redrow [696]

Summary of key Issues:

- Development is viable (696) although indicative capacity should be reduced (716)
- The scale of development within Hightown will completely alter the character of the village
- The prospect of developing green belt land and wildlife habitats is unpopular (148, 329, 492, 703, 716, 741)
- Infrastructure is already under strain (particularly concerning the main road through the village) and will be unable to cope with development of such a size (148, 492, 741)
- Access to site off main road is inappropriate and will cause major congestion (148, 741)
- Development fails to ensure new amenities will be built on site, again existing are insufficient to deal with such a population increase
- Lack of education and general service provision in area is problematic for existing and future residents (148, 492, 716, 741)
- Existing roads are too narrow to allow for development, the associated construction vehicles and potential bus provision
- The timescale of development will cause prolonged disruption
- Flooding and drainage concerns (148)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

148 (Hightown Parish Council), 329 (Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester & North Merseyside), 703 (CPRE Lancashire)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

492 (Craig Seddon SIPP), 696 (Redrow Homes Ltd), 716 (Robert Swift and family), Priory Asset Management LLP (741)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

99, 126, 127, 128, 143, 162, 180, 181, 188, 189, 190, 194, 202, 205, 209, 213, 216, 223, 229, 230, 233, 238, 244, 249, 250, 259, 275, 277, 279, 280, 293, 294, 298, 300, 305, 312, 319, 322, 338, 339, 341, 342, 353, 359, 361, 385, 389, 414, 422, 425, 426, 430, 436, 451, 462, 465, 466, 467, 468, 484, 485, 494, 499, 500, 501, 503, 511, 514, 520, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 531, 544, 547, 549, 554, 556, 557, 564, 579, 587, 588, 591, 598, 603, 612, 614, 642, 667, 1015, 1028, 1032, 1043, 1045

Site MN2.21 Land at Sandy Lane, Hightown

This site is promoted for development by Redrow [696]

Summary of key Issues:

- Site is viable for development and can deliver a significant level of affordable housing (696)
- Existing roads are too narrow to allow for development, the associated construction vehicles and potential bus provision (148, 492)
- Majority of respondents raise concerns over impact of development on traffic which currently experiences prolonged periods of congestion along the one main road (148)
- Village lacks amenities and services (schools, shops, GPs) to support any further population growth and development fails to incorporate any such new facilities
- The scale of development within Hightown will completely alter the character of the village and destroy surrounding green belt land (148, 492)
- Flooding and drainage concerns (148)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
148 (Hightown Parish Council)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
492 (Craig Seddon SIPP), 696 (Redrow Homes Ltd)

Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:
126, 162, 188, 189, 190, 202, 205, 209, 213, 216, 223, 229, 230, 238, 275, 293, 294, 298,
300, 305, 312, 319, 322, 338, 339, 341, 353, 359, 361, 385, 389, 414, 430, 466, 484, 494,
499, 503, 514, 520, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 549, 557, 588, 612, 642, 667, 1015, 1028, 1029,
1032, 1043, 1045

Site MN2.22 Land at Hall Road West, Crosby

This site is promoted for development by Network Rail [376] and Morris Homes [721]

Summary of key Issues:

- Green belt does not correspond to the logical urban boundary and study shows contribution of site to its purposes as minor or none (376, 721)
- Good location for public transport links and local facilities accessible without private car (376, 721)
- Habitats present have little retention value (376)
- Indicative capacity of fewer than 50 dwellings on site agreed and draft layout of 14 detached dwellings has been subject to pre-application discussions (716, 721)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

716 (Robert Swift & Family), 721 (Morris Homes), 376 (Network Rail)

General Public Representations:

N/A

Site MN2.23 Land at Southport Old Road, Thornton

This is a Council owned site. Approval for its disposal was granted by Cabinet on 3 July 2015.

Summary of key Issues:

- Concern over the development of the site as local residents were assured there would be no development there (18, 100, 336)
- Avoid housing on site with fertile agricultural land (52, 656)
- Concerns about the strain on services and damage to the local community environment (100)
- Highlight the ecological importance of this green belt area (336, 656)
- Concern over the area being prone to periodic flooding without suitable drainage (530, 548, 656)
- Concern over adding to the already strained road network especially in light of the port expansion (530)
- No need for new local housing without new local jobs (548, 656)
- Support and agree with the indicative capacity (716)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
52 (Ince Blundell Parish Council), 530 (Thornton Parish Council),

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
716 (Robert Swift & Family)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:
18, 100, 336, 548, 656

Site MN2.24 Land at Holgate, Thornton

This is a Council owned site. Approval for its disposal was granted by Cabinet on 3 July 2015.

Summary of key Issues:

- Concern over the generation of additional vehicular traffic in an already busy area (18, 530)
- Site should be avoided as it contains best quality agricultural land (52, 656)
- Assured that no development would occur on this site following the new road (100)
- Concern over the area being prone to flooding (530, 656)
- There is no need for new housing developments unless new local jobs are found (548, 656)
- Concern over ownership of all of the land where a gap in development may occur (716)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
52 (Ince Blundell Parish Council), 530 (Thornton Parish Council),

Developer Representations:
Robert Swift & Family (716)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:
18, 100, 548, 656

Site MN2.25 Land at Lydiate Lane, Thornton

This site is promoted for development by Nuffield College (655)

Summary of key Issues:

- Supports the opportunity of developing a sustainable urban extension (655)
- Sites should be avoided with the best agricultural land and to preserve ecology (52, 656)
- Assured no development would take place and want clarity on where the new jobs to sustain the houses would come from (100, 548)
- Concerned over traffic congestion with additional housing undermining the point of the switch island link road (656)
- Problems of drainage in this area that periodically floods (656)
- Strongly oppose encroachment on the green corridor between Thornton and Netherton (703)
- Accessibility and facility concerns with poor public transport links (716, 741)
- Encroaches on conservation areas and heritage assets (741)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

52 (Ince Blundell Parish Council), 703 (CPRE Lancashire)

Developer Representations:

655 (Nuffield College), 716 (Robert Swift & Family), 741 (Priory Asset Management LLP)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

100, 548, 656

Site MN2.26 Land South of Runnell's Lane, Thornton

This site is promoted for development by Mr Swift and family [716]

Summary of key Issues:

- The reports commissioned by the landowner will aid developers with confirmed satisfactory vehicular access (698, 716)
- The site's best agricultural land (grade 2) should be protected (52, 100, 741)
- Concern over the increase in traffic congestion and strain on limited facilities (100, 548, 656)
- Environmental concerns regarding the habitats which are present and also noise pollution concerns (100, 367, 656)
- Flooding and drainage constraints. The site is prone to periodic flooding and lacks sufficient drainage (100, 367, 479, 548, 656, 740)
- The proposed site is deemed an acceptable area which doesn't encroach the green corridor and respects the grade 2 listed heritage site (492)
- Concerns about the site encroaching on the crucial green corridor (703, 741)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

52 (Ince Blundell Parish Council), 703 (CPRE Lancashire), 740 (Formby Residents Action Group),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

492 (Craig Seddon SIPP), 698 (Anthony Swift and Kipros Pittaris), 716 (Robert Swift & Family), 741 (Priory Asset Management LLP)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

100, 367, 479, 548, 656

Site MN2.27 Land at Turnbridge Road, Maghull

This site is promoted for development by Wainhomes [625]

Summary of key Issues:

- The indicative allocation of housing should be increased (625)
- Concern over the increase in volume of traffic in relation to restricted access and congestion (11, 58, 75, 183 247, 478, 699, 763, 765, 755, 1041)
- Against green belt land used for development, urban sprawl (57, 568, 699, 716, 763, 765, 766, 843, 993, 1041)
- Flood risk from the canal has been proven (75, 699, 740, 767, 769, 993, 1026)
- Concern over building on high grade agricultural land (114, 716, 843, 993)
- Has the same disadvantages as site AS12 so should be rejected for the same reasons (247)
- Ecology of the site deemed too important to develop on (699)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

114 (Lydiate Parish Council), 699 (Maghull & Lydiate Action Group), 740 (Formby Residents Action Group),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

625 (Wainhomes Developments Ltd), 716 (Robert Swift & family)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

11, 57, 58, 75, 183, 247, 478, 568, 763, 765, 766, 767, 769, 843, 993, 1026, 1041

Site MN2.28 Land north of Kenyons Lane, Lydiate

This site is promoted for development by Property Collateral [537]

Summary of key Issues:

- Site is suitable for development with good access to existing infrastructure and is deliverable today (537)
- Site is not suitable for the increase in congestion especially with proximity to the schools (30, 72, 440, 600, 699)
- Prime agricultural land should not be built on (72, 228, 433, 438, 488, 993)
- Erosion of green belt and urban sprawl issue (72, 90, 91, 228, 406, 433, 440, 488, 699, 703, 767, 769, 993)
- Loss of employment at Morton Dairy's (72, 716)
- The importance of habitat conservation on this site (433)
- Strain on local services would be too much (438, 440, 600, 993)
- Flood risk and drainage constraints. concerns of the lack of adequate drainage (699, 740, 993, 1026)
- The heritage of the local area is at risk with new development (699, 993)
- Indicative capacity should be reduced (716)
- Development on Green Belt should not take place, it will reduce the gap between settlements (699, 703) and more appropriate sites exist elsewhere (406, 488)
- Concerns over loss of agricultural land and jobs associated with farm/dairy (488)
- Access roads are insufficient to cope with increased traffic or heavy good construction vehicles (699)
- Site contains a number of habitats including bat roosts which should be protected
- Development will put strain on existing infrastructure and services, in particular schools (699)
- Flood risk concerns (699, 740)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

406 (West Lancashire Borough Council), 703 (CPRE Lancashire)488 (Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group), 699 (Maghull & Lydiate Action Group), 703 (CPRE Lancashire), 740 (Formby Residents Action Group),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

537 (Property Collateral Ltd), 716 (Robert Swift & family)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

30, 72, 90, 91, 228, 433, 438, 440, 600, 767, 769, 993, 1026

Site MN2.29 Former Prison Site, Park Lane, Maghull

Owned and being marketed by the Homes and Communities Agency. The site has outline Planning Permission.

Summary of key Issues:

- Site is part brownfield and part low grade Green Belt land, making it suitable for development (488)
- Development would encroach on the Green Belt and is distant from existing infrastructure (661)
- The loss of cricket pitch on site is a concern, the facility should be retained or replaced (725)
- Site should be removed as allocation due to existing planning application (716)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

488 (Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group), 725 (Sport England)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

661 (PSA Developments), 716 (Robert Swift and family)

General Public Representations:

N/A

Site MN2.30 Land east of Waddicar Lane, Melling

This site is promoted for development by Bellway [732]

Summary of key Issues:

- Site is suitable for development with no major technical or environmental constraints (732)
- Existing narrow roads around site make it unsuitable more development and increased traffic (492, 643, 716)
- Concerns raised over strain on infrastructure and services including drainage systems, schools and healthcare provision from increased local population (643)
- Flooding constraints. Site is prone to flooding making it unsuitable for development (643, 740)
- Brownfield sites should be prioritised over development on Green Belt land.

- Development encroaches on Green Belt and fails to follow existing boundaries (661, 703, 716), it is also not sufficiently connected to existing amenities (643)
- Concerns raised over impact of development on traffic flow in neighbouring authority (595)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

595 (Knowsley Council), 643 (Melling Parish Council), 703 (CPRE Lancashire), 740 (Formby Residents Action Group),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

492 (Craig Seddon SIPP), 661 (PSA Developments), 716 (Robert Swift and family), 732 (Bellway Homes)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

14, 56, 64, 82, 235, 381, 382, 387, 563, 1026, Melling Forms 1069, 1071, 1073, 1080 to 1282

Site MN2.31 Wadacre Farm, Chapel Lane, Melling

This site is promoted for development by Ms Griffiths [315]

Summary of key Issues:

- Support removal of site from Green Belt and allocation for housing.(315)
- Surrounding road network would not be able to cope with increased traffic as a result of development. Concerns over both traffic flow and safety (492, 643)
- Concerns raised over strain on infrastructure and services, in particular schools and healthcare provision (643)
- Green Belt and agricultural land should not be developed (492, 643), with brownfield sites prioritised
- Site has a weak boundary (703, 716) with its location on the periphery of Melling placing development far from existing facilities and services (661)
- Flood risk on site and to nearby properties is a significant issue (643, 716, 740)
- Concerns raised over impact of development on traffic flow in neighbouring authority (595)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

595 (Knowsley Council), 643 (Melling Parish Council), 703 (CPRE Lancashire) 740 (Formby Residents Action Group),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

315 (Griffiths), 492 (Craig Seddon SIPP), 661 (PSA Developments), 716 (Robert Swift and family)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

14, 56, 82, 87, 122, 200, 235, 381, 382, 387, 1026, Melling Forms 1069, 1071, 1073, 1080 to 1282

Site MN2.32 Land south of Spencers Lane, Melling

This site is promoted for development by Mr Donnelly who also requests it be expanded slightly [704]

Summary of key Issues:

- Support removal of the site from Green Belt and extension of the settlement. (704)
- However a larger site area should be included. (704)
- Development will put strain on existing road network through increased traffic
- Area has limited facilities and services that are insufficient for greater development
- Flood risk concerns
- Concerns raised over impact of development on traffic flow in neighbouring authority (595)
- Site doesn't fully meet high grade Green Belt land criteria and is suitable for development, indicative capacity on site is also realistic (716)
- Development would put further strain on areas infrastructure and services, although is well contained and suitable for development

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
595 (Knowsley Council)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
704 (Mr Donnelly), 716 (Robert Swift and family)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:
14, 56, 64, 155, 156, 169

Site MN2.33 Land at Wango Lane, Aintree

This site is promoted for development by the Hancock Family [427]

Summary of key Issues:

- The site is well served by existing infrastructure, unconstrained and would be readily

| |
|---|
| <p>available for development. (427)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congestion and related traffic issues are a major issue in area which would be worsened by development of site (286, 661), a Transport Assessment is required (492) • Existing facilities and services in area would not be able to cope with demand of increased local population, including schools, GPs, shops etc. • Concerns over impact on ecology and heritage (492, 661) • Flood risk concerns (286, 740) • Site is well contained and served well by infrastructure making development viable, indicative capacity is also agreed with (716) |
| <p>Statutory Consultees and other groups: 286 (Aintree Ratepayers Association), 740 (Formby Residents Action Group),</p> |
| <p>Site Promoter and Developer Representations: 492 (Craig Seddon SIPP), 661 (PSA Developments), 716 (Robert Swift and family)</p> |
| <p>General Public Representations [see index for name of resident]: 56, 68, 78, 285, 291, 309, 310, 355, 356, 364, 427, 515, 533, 535, 862, 863, 864, 877, 878, 885, 886, 1026</p> |

| |
|--|
| <p>Site MN2.34 Aintree Curve Site, Ridgewood Way, Netherton</p> |
| <p>The site is owned by the Homes and Communities Agency a planning application for the site was approved.</p> <p>Summary of key Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology and highway constraints should result in a reduced capacity (716) |
| <p>Statutory Consultees and other groups: N/A</p> |
| <p>Site Promoter and Developer Representations: 716 (Robert Swift and family)</p> |
| <p>General Public Representations: N/A</p> |

| |
|--|
| <p>Site MN2.35 Former Z Block Sites, Buckley Hill Lane, Netherton</p> |
|--|

This is a Council owned site. Approval for its disposal was granted by Cabinet on 3 July 2015.

Summary of key Issues:

- Site should be safeguarded short term until the housing market in area improves (741)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

741 (Priory Asset Management LLP)

General Public Representations:

N/A

Site MN2.36 Former St Raymond's School playing field, Harrops Croft, Netherton

This is a Council owned site. Approval for its disposal was granted by Cabinet on 3 July 2015.

Summary of key Issues:

- Loss of playing field can only be justified if its use is surplus in the area, if not the facility must be replaced prior to development (725)
- Site lies within poor quality area and proposed indicative capacity should be reduced (716)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

725 (Sport England)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

716 (Robert Swift and family)

General Public Representations:

N/A

Site MN2.37 Land at Pendle Drive, Netherton

This is a Council owned site. Approval for its disposal was granted by Cabinet on 3 July 2015.

Summary of key Issues:

- Highway constraints on site should result in a reduced capacity (716)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

716 (Robert Swift and family)

General Public Representations:

N/A

Site MN2.38 Former St Raymond's School playing field, Harrops Croft, Netherton

This site is partly owned by the Council. Approval for its disposal was granted by Cabinet on 3 July 2015.

Summary of key Issues:

- Loss of playing field can only be justified if its use is surplus in the area, if not the facility must be replaced prior to development (725)
- Highway constraints on site should result in a reduced capacity (716)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

725 (Sport England)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

716 (Robert Swift and family)

General Public Representations:

N/A

Site MN2.39 Former Daleacre School, Daleacre Drive, Netherton

This is a Council owned site. Approval for its disposal was granted by Cabinet on 3 July 2015.

Summary of key Issues:

- Loss of playing field can only be justified if its use is surplus in the area, if not the facility must be replaced prior to development (725)
- Indicative capacity on site is agreed with (716)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

725 (Sport England)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

716 (Robert Swift and family)

General Public Representations:

N/A

Site MN2.40 Former Rawson Road Primary School, Rawson Road, Bootle

This is a Council owned site. Approval for its disposal was granted by Cabinet on 3 July 2015.

Summary of key Issues:

- Loss of playing field can only be justified if its use is surplus in the area, if not the facility must be replaced prior to development (725)
- Indicative capacity on site is agreed with (716)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

725 (Sport England)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

716 (Robert Swift and family)

General Public Representations:

N/A

Site MN2.41 Former St Wilfrid's School, Orrell Road, Bootle

This site is partly owned by the Council. Approval for its disposal was granted by Cabinet on 3 July 2015.

Summary of key Issues:

- Loss of playing field can only be justified if its use is surplus in the area, if not the facility must be replaced prior to development (725, 741)
- Site lies within poor quality area and proposed indicative capacity should be reduced (716)
- Allocation of site is broadly supported (680)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

680 (Reclaim Community), 725 (Sport England)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

716 (Robert Swift and family), 741 (Priory Asset Management LLP)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

24

Site MN2.42 Klondyke Phases 2 and 3, Bootle

Summary of key Issues:

- Site should be removed as allocation due to existing planning application (716)
- Site should be safeguarded short term until housing market in area improves (741)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

716 (Robert Swift and family), 741 (Priory Asset Management LLP)

General Public Representations:

N/A

Site MN2.43 Peoples site, Linacre Lane, Bootle

This is a Council owned site. Approval for its disposal was granted by Cabinet on 3 July 2015.

Summary of key Issues:

- Surrounding industrial and commercial uses should result in a reduced capacity (716)
- Allocation of site is broadly supported (680)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
680 (Reclaim Community)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
716 (Robert Swift and family)

General Public Representations:
N/A

Site MN2.44 Former St Joan of Arc School, Rimrose Road, Bootle

This site is partly owned by the Council. Approval for its disposal was granted by Cabinet on 3 July 2015.

Summary of key Issues:

- Indicative capacity on site is agreed with (716)
- Loss of playing fields associated with former school may require mitigating (741)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
716 (Robert Swift and family), 741 (Priory Asset Management LLP)

General Public Representations:
N/A

Site MN2.45 Former St Mary's Primary School playing fields, Waverley Street, Bootle

This is a Council owned site. Approval for its disposal was granted by Cabinet on 3 July 2015.

Summary of key Issues:

- Loss of playing field can only be justified if its use is surplus in the area, if not the facility must be replaced prior to development (725, 741)
- Site lies within poor quality area and proposed indicative capacity should be reduced (716)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
725 (Sport England)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
716 (Robert Swift and family), 741 (Priory Asset Management LLP)

General Public Representations:
N/A

Site MN2.46 Land East of Maghull

The site is owned by a number of landowners (the consortia)(1021) Persimmon (715)

Summary of key Issues:

- Development of site is also supported to secure economic growth and provide affordable housing (1021)
- Area is well connected in terms of transportation, development is supported on site as it includes further improvements to infrastructure (553)
- Scale of development is unsuitable for a town the size of Maghull. It will significantly alter the character of the town and is disproportionate in comparison to other areas of the borough (212, 488, 661, 699)
- Concerns raised over developers avoiding affordable housing requirements and preferences for new-build homes given to non-local residents (212)
- Concerns over loss of agricultural and Green Belt land and accompanying habitats (212, 699)
- Issues associated with flood risk must be addressed (212, 699)
- Development will result in significant increase in local population and place strain on all forms of services, facilities and infrastructure. Improvements to a number of

| |
|--|
| <p>roads must also take place (212, 699)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicative capacity on site is agreed (716) |
| <p>Statutory Consultees and other groups: 212 (Maghull Town Council), 488 (Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group), 553 (Merseytravel), 699 (Maghull and Lydiate Action Group),</p> |
| <p>Site Promoter and Developer Representations: 661 (PSA Developments), 715 (Persimmon), 716 (Robert Swift and family), 1021 (The 'Consortia' At Maghull East),</p> |
| <p>General Public Representations [see index for name of resident]: 47, 55, 77, 85, 218, 220, 221, 228, 347, 360, 365, 366, 383, 421, 468, 477, 493, 581, 750, 752, 753, 767, 769, 773, 785, 931, 962, 981, 1026, 1042, 1068</p> |

| |
|--|
| <p>Site MN2.47 Dunnings Bridge Road Corridor, Netherton (Senate Business Park, Atlantic Business Park, and the Former Peerless Refinery Site)</p> |
| <p>The site is owned by a number of landowners (the consortia)(1021) Persimmon (715)</p> <p>Summary of key Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support policy (666,726) • There needs to be flexibility to allow for ancillary uses. (726) |
| <p>Statutory Consultees and other groups: N/A</p> |
| <p>Site Promoter and Developer Representations: 726 (Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd)</p> |
| <p>General Public Representations [see index for name of resident]: 666</p> |

| |
|---|
| <p>MN2.48 Land to the North of Formby Industrial Estate</p> |
| <p>The site is owned by a number of landowners (the consortia)(1021) Persimmon (715)</p> <p>Summary of key Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Allocation of site (701) • Object to allocation of this site (329, 703,) • This proposal is an encroachment on the Green Belt (703) • Site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and suffers from significant surface water flooding (703, 1026, 1031) |

- Transport assessment required (703)
- Holds a population of water voles and rare plants, no ecological survey undertaken, unable to assess impact.(329,)
- No need for large employment sites near Formby,
- Development will cause traffic problems in the town.
- Two large employment sites in Formby are excessive. (241)
- Site is local nature site.
- The Viability of the site means that retail cross-subsidy is required; this will have a negative effect on Formby Town Centre.

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

241 (Formby Parish Council), 329 (Lancashire Wildlife Trust), 740 (Formby Residents Action Group)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

701, (S Rostron), 730(Nextdom Ltd)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

359, 361, 895, 1026, 1031,

MN2.49 Land to the South of Formby Industrial Estate

The site is owned by a number of landowners (the consortia)(1021) Persimmon (715)

Summary of key Issues:

- Object to site unless new sports facilities are required to be provided before existing facilities are closed. (725)
- This proposal is an encroachment on the Green Belt (703)
- Site is in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and suffers from significant surface water flooding (703, 740, 1026)
- Development should avoid Best and Most Versatile agricultural land. (52) (703)
- Transport assessment required (703)
- Support proposal as it will the new sports facilities will benefit the community.
- Two large employment sites in Formby are excessive. (241)
- Retail will have a negative effect on Formby Town Centre.
- Development will cause traffic problems in the town.

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

52 (Ince Blundell Parish Council), 241 (Formby Parish Council), 703 (CPRE) 725 (Sport England), 740 (Formby Residents Action Group)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

730 (Nextdom Ltd) 737(Watmore]

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

4, 9, 28, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 359, 361, 896,1031,

Sites not allocated in the Local Plan

Site AS10 Land Edge Lane, Thornton

Site is promoted by Craig Seddon. (492)

Summary of key Issues:

- Site is suitable for development and would retain a significant gap between settlements.
- 4ha of the site is developable which could accommodate 104 dwellings.

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

Craig Seddon SIPP (492)

General Public Representations:

N/A

Site AS12 Land west of Maghull

Site is promoted by Maghull Ltd (697)

Summary of key Issues:

- Large site has high potential for residential development over 9 years (727)
- Development would alter character of area and result in urban sprawl (488)
- Destruction of agricultural and green belt land is unacceptable (488)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

488 (Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

727 (Harrison and Sons), 697 (Maghull Ltd)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

57, 70, 90

Site AS14 Land east of Northway

Site promoted on behalf of Harrison and Sons. (727,)

Summary of key Issues:

- Their site should allocated for housing (727)
- Development would alter character of area and result in urban sprawl (488)
- Destruction of agricultural and green belt land is unacceptable (488)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

488 (Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

697 (Maghull Limited), 727 (Harrison and Sons)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

90

Site AS15 Land south of The Crescent, Maghull

Site is promoted by Priory Asset Management LLP. (741)

Summary of key Issues:

- Site may be more viable than other allocated sites (741)
- Development on site will destroy green belt land and bring two separate settlements extremely close
- Concerns over flood risk (488)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

488 (Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

741 (Priory Asset Management LLP)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

152, 764, 775

Site AS17 Land at Switch Island North of M57

Site is promoted by The Peel Group. (702)

Summary of key Issues:

- Development by Peel will meet the logistics need associated with the growth of the port and will create many local jobs and support economic growth (702)
- Scale of development is inappropriate in a predominantly rural setting and will overwhelm area (488, 601)
- Switch Island is already a major transport intersection and development of site will worsen traffic congestion (488, 601)
- Loss of grade 1 agricultural and green belt land is unacceptable at a time when locally sourced food is being promoted (488, 601, 643)
- Brownfield land should be sought as an alternative closer to port
- Noise and environmental pollution associated with large scale industrial development
- Concerns over impact on wildlife
- Concerns over impact on listed farm building (601)
- Proposed diversion of river will pose flood risk (601)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

488 (Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group), 601 (Melling, Maghull and Aintree Against Peel Proposal), 643 (Melling Parish Council)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

702 (The Peel Group)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

14, 79, 80, 107, 137, 170, 178, 187, 196, 204, 211, 219, 236, 246, 261, 262, 270, 318, 360, 366, 374, 403, 410, 428, 441, 444, 454, 459, 460, 468, 471, 472, 475, 495, 507, 536, 555, 558, 565, 566, 574, 575, 577, 580, 616, 618, 633, 634, 645, 650, 1046, 1067

Site AS18 Oriel Drive, Aintree

Site is promoted by C & P S Limited (GVA) (738) + Philip Sedden (639)

Summary of key Issues:

- Site has no constraints that would prevent development taking place and could provide 350 dwellings. Site is in a sustainable location with good public transport provision (639, 738)
- Development would put further strain on areas infrastructure and services,
- Development will result in sprawl (488)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

488 (Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

639 (CP&S Limited), 738 (CP&S Limited)

General Public Representations:
68, 169, 309, 310, 355, 356, 565, 566

Site AS19 Land west of Bulls Bridge Lane Aintree

Site is promoted by PSA Developments (661)

Summary of key Issues:

- Development is viable due to contained nature of the site (661)
- Development will put further strain on areas infrastructure and services and result in sprawl (488)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
488 (Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
661 (PSA Developments)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:
68, 169, 309, 310, 355, 356, 565, 566

Site AS21 Land east of Bulls Bridge Lane, Aintree

Site is promoted by Liverpool and Chester Property Company (542)

Summary of key Issues:

- Site is well contained and suitable for development (542)
- Development would put further strain on areas infrastructure and services, although is well contained and suitable for development
- Development would result in sprawl (488)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
488 (Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
542 (Liverpool and Chester Property Company)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:
68, 169, 309, 310, 355, 356, 565, 566, 884

Site AS22 Mill Farm, Aintree

Site is promoted by Persimmon Homes (712)

Summary of key Issues:

- Land is under single ownership and non-agricultural making it suitable for development (712)
- Development would put further strain on areas infrastructure and services
- Flood risk concerns
- Development will result in sprawl (488)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
488 (Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
712 (Persimmon Homes)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:
169, 309, 310, 355, 356, 565, 566

Site AS23 Land east of Aintree Racecourse

Site is promoted by Hourwatch (695)

Summary of key Issues:

- Site has had a previous marina proposal and is viable for development (695)
- Development would put further strain on areas infrastructure and services
- Flood risk concerns
- Loss of green belt land and habitats is unjustified, development will close gap between settlements (488)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
488 (Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
695 (Hourwatch)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:
68, 155, 156, 169, 309, 310, 355, 356, 565, 566

Site AS25 Land at The Stables, Netherton

Site is promoted on behalf of Mr and Mrs Radford (374)

Summary of key Issues:

- Site is well contained and viable for development (374)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
374 (Mr and Mrs Radford)

General Public Representations:
N/A

Site AS26 Land at Southport Old Road, Formby

Site is promoted by GPC Rail Ltd (630)

Summary of key Issues:

- Site suitable for development and would retain a significant gap between settlements (630)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
630 (GPC Rail Ltd)

General Public Representations:
N/A

Site AS27 Site south of MN2.49, east of Formby bypass

Site is promoted by Nextdom Ltd (730)

Summary of key Issues:

- Site isn't fulfilling purpose of green belt land and is a viable site for commercial development (730)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

730 (Nextdom Ltd)

General Public Representations:

N/A

Site AS29 Land at Shorrocks Hil, Formby

Site is promoted by Ascot Property Group (708)

Summary of key Issues:

- Partly brownfield site in sought after area for development (708)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

708 (Ascot Property Group)

General Public Representations:

N/A

Site AS30 Damfield Lane, Maghull

Site is promoted on behalf of The Cowell Family (108)

Summary of key Issues:

- Heritage Assessment of area states development would be viable (108)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
108 (The Cowell Family)

General Public Representations:
N/A

Site SR4.09 Land south of Coastal Road, Ainsdale

Summary of key Issues:

- Site should be reconsidered as a viable option (728)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
728 (Churchtown Green Belt Action Group),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
N/A

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:
687, 688, 1034

Site SR4.15 Land south of Altcar Lane, Formby (AS28)

Site is promoted by TR Silcock Ltd, DWH & Barratt Homes (717)

Summary of key Issues:

- Site suitable for development as it is well contained and comprises limited green belt land (717)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
717 (TR Silcock Ltd, DWH & Barratt Homes)

General Public Representations:
N/A

Site SR4.49 Land south of Melling Lane, Maghull

Site is promoted on behalf of Robert Swift and family (716)

Summary of key Issues:

- Site appropriate for development due to containment and proximity of MN2.46 (716)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
716 (Robert Swift and family)

General Public Representations:
N/A

Site S011 Land at Jubilee Nature Trail, Southport

Site was suggested by Churchtown Green Belt Action Group (728) as an alternative to MN2.4.

Summary of key Issues:

- Site is contained and should be considered for development (728)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
728 (Churchtown Green Belt Action Group)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
N/A

General Public Representations:
N/A

Site S032 Woodvale Airfield

Summary of key Issues:

- Site should be considered for development should airfield close

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

N/A

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

687

Site S152 Land to South West of Waddicar

Summary of key Issues:

- Site is suitable for development due to well nearby established infrastructure and facilities

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

N/A

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

235

Land to the west of Southport and Formby Hospital

Summary of key Issues:

- Brownfield sites such as this should be pushed for development as current plans aren't materialising

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

N/A

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

609

Policy MN3 (Strategic Mixed Use Allocation – Land East of Maghull)

Summary of key Issues:

- General support of policy and provision of this mixed use allocation (595, 715)
- Concerns raised over traffic on A-road leading from M58 J unction 1 (595)
- SPD should seek to address delivery and implementation of policy, although policy MN3 should define clear links to the document (1021)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

595 (Knowsley Council)

Developer Representations:

288 (Seller), 715 (Countryside Properties (UK) and Persimmon Homes Lancashire), 1021 (The Consortia at Maghull East)

General Public Representations:

N/A

Policy MN4 (Land North of Formby Industrial Estate)

Summary of key Issues:

- Site is low grade agricultural land and suitable for development (701)
- Existing ecology, encroachment on Green Belt and flood risk makes site unsuitable for development (703)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
703 (CPRE Lancashire)

Developer Representations:
701 (S Rostron Ltd)

General Public Representations:
N/A

Policy MN5 (Land South of Formby Industrial Estate)

Summary of key Issues:

- Policy supported although should be amended to allow greater flexibility for developers (446)
- Lack of existing boundaries, green belt status and flood risk makes site unsuitable for development (703)
- Policy must ensure new playing fields are developed prior to the loss of existing facilities (725)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
703 (CPRE Lancashire), 725 (Sport England)

Developer Representations:
446 (Formby Play Sports Ltd)

General Public Representations:
N/A

Policy MN6 (Land North of Brackenway, Formby)

Summary of key Issues:

- Policy is supported however should be worded as such to mention natural habitats that will be retained on site by developer (685)
- Flood risk and loss of habitat are primary concerns in relation to policy (703)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
703 (CPRE Lancashire)

Developer Representations:
685 (Taylor Wimpey)

General Public Representations:
N/A

Policy MN7 (Sefton's Green Belt)

Summary of key Issues:

- Concerns over whether sufficient number of sites have been selected and safeguarded for the Plan period (661, 730, 738, 741), especially if allocated sites fail to come forward (542)
- Green Belt land should be retained to prevent urban sprawl, destruction of farmland, habitats etc. amongst other issues (699, 723)
- Green Belt boundaries should be redefined to reflect defined natural and built features throughout the Borough (708)
- Plan should ensure brownfield sites are exhausted fully before development is allowed to take place on Green Belt if demand remains
- 'Exceptional circumstances' to require development of Green Belt should be explained and justified
- Housing density requirements should be raised to encourage development of non-executive homes and reduce the need for some sites all together
- It is necessary to review the Green Belt in Sefton to allow for growth and the plan should mention how it can stifle development (542)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
723 (Sefton Green Party), 699 (Maghull and Lydiate Action Group),

Developer Representations:
542 (Liverpool and Chester Property Company), 661 (PSA Development), 708 (Ascot Property Group), 730 (Nextdom Ltd), 738 (CP&S Ltd), 741 (Priory Asset Management LLP)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:
421, 548, 567, 704, 706, 1037

Policy MN8 (Safeguarded Land)

Summary of key Issues:

- Quantity of sites allocated as Safeguarded Land are insufficient to meet any substantial housing requirement (707, 717, 738, 741)
- Specific triggers to allow the release of Safeguarded Land should be defined (637)
- AS14 Land east of Northway (727) and AS21 Land east of Bulls Bridge Lane, Aintree (542) proposed as appropriate sites to allocate as Safeguarded Land

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

N/A

Developer Representations:

542 (Liverpool and Chester Property Company), 637 (Mactaggart & Mickel Homes Ltd), 707 (Home Builders Federation), 717 (TR Silcock Ltd, DWH & Barratt Homes), 727 (Harrison and Sons), 738 (CP&S Ltd), 741 (Priory Asset Management LLP)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

882

MN8.1 Land at Lambshear Lane, Lydiate

This site is promoted for development by Mactaggart & Mickel Homes Ltd (637)

Summary of key Issues:

- The site should be allocated under policy MN2 as it is deliverable, available and suitable for development.
- MN8.1 is prime agricultural land and Green Belt (114), development will reduce gap between settlements (406, 488, 697, 741)
- Concerns over flood risk on site MN8.1 (740)
- Site not as sustainable as other sites not included (697, 741)
- Flooding Problems (1026)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

114 (Lydiate Parish Council), 406 (West Lancashire Borough Council), 488 (Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group), 740 (Formby Residents Action Group)

Developer Representations:

637 Mactaggart & Mickel Homes Ltd, 697 (Maghull Limited), 741 (Priory Asset Management LLP)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

30, 90, 1026

MN8.2 Land adjacent to Ashworth Hospital, Maghull

This site is promoted for development by Merseycare NHS Trust (729)

Summary of key Issues:

- MN8.2 is suitable for development and deliverable now and should not be allocated as Safeguarded Land (406, 643, 729)
- Site not as sustainable as other sites not included (697, 741)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

406 (West Lancashire Borough Council), 643 (Melling Parish Council), 729 (Mersey Care NHS Trust)

Developer Representations:

697 (Maghull Limited), 729 (Merseycare NHS Trust), 741 (Priory Asset Management LLP)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

Melling Forms 1069, 1071, 1073, 1080 to 1282

Local Plan Economic Development and Regeneration (Chapter 7)

Summary of key Issues:

- The wider regional benefits of the Superport are recognised, although Sefton's extensive travel to work area could have been addressed more effectively (553)
- Too much of a focus being placed on Port redevelopment. The knowledge economy is growing and should be supported to the same extent (740).
- The plan could be more supportive of the 'Green economy' (723).

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

553 (Merseytravel), 723 (Sefton Green Party) 740 (Formby Residents Action Group)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

N/A

General Public Representations:

N/A

Policy ED1 The Port and Maritime Zone

Summary of key Issues:

- Support policy as it reflects our aspirations (694)
- The Local Plan does not fully consider the potential need for land and premises beyond the immediate port area that may be needed as a result of the port expansion. (702)
- The policy needs amending to make clear the precise requirements of the Habitats Regulations in relation to suitable compensatory habitat [329]
- The policy should not only consider the potential impact on Seaforth Nature Reserve. It should also consider potential on all internationally import nature sites.
- Concerns with the impact the expansion the port will have on the health of local communities, including those outside Sefton, through pollution, emissions and traffic (594)
- The expansion of the Port is unlikely to bring investment and jobs to the immediate local area.
- The Local Plan should address the critical issue of port access

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

329 [Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester & North Merseyside], 550 [Merseyside Civic Society], 594 [Wirral MBC], 680 [Reclaim your Community], 700 [Natural England], 701 [Liverpool City Region LEP], 740 [Formby Residents Group]

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

694 [The Mersey Docks & Harbour Company], 702 (The Peel Group)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

568, 586, 882, 937

Policy ED2 Development in Town, District Local Centres, Local Shopping Parades and Outside Defined Centres

Summary of key Issues:

- Thresholds for when a Retail Impact Assessment is required should be fully defined and justified (417, 490, 710)
- The Policy is supported as it encourages provision of non-retail uses also (599), although more could be stated within policy to support overall sustainable aims of the plan (638)
- There is insufficient parking in borough's town and district centres which plan fails to cater for
- The negative impact of betting shops and pay day loan shops should be considered

| |
|--|
| <p>(488, 740)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns over impact of out-of-town retail development on traditional town centres and existing retail parks (490) Birkdale Trading Estate should be allocated for commercial and retail and not just industry (662) Conflict between Primary shopping frontages in policy map but primary shopping area (710) |
| <p>Statutory Consultees and other groups: 488 (Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group), 599 (The Theatres Trust), 740 (Formby Residents Action Group)</p> |
| <p>Site Promoter and Developer Representations: 417 (Sainsbury's Supermarkets), 490 (Aintree Retail Park Limited), 638 (Crosby Investment Strategy Steering Group), 662 (Birkdale Trading Estate), 710 (GL Europe Bootle Sarl)</p> |
| <p>General Public Representations [see index for name of resident]: 361</p> |

| |
|--|
| <p>Policy ED3 Primarily Industrial Areas</p> |
| <p>Summary of key Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'Primarily Industrial Areas' should be reworded to 'Primarily Commercial Areas' to allow for more long term flexibility in business and retail land use (491, 662) |
| <p>Statutory Consultees and other groups: N/A</p> |
| <p>Site Promoter and Developer Representations: 491 (Orbit Investments Limited), 662 (Birkdale Trading Estate)</p> |
| <p>General Public Representations: N/A</p> |

| |
|--|
| <p>Policy ED4 Mixed Use Areas</p> |
|--|

Summary of key Issues:

- The policy should define which uses would be subject to greater scrutiny (710) and opportunity should be taken to insist on high quality development within such areas (723)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
723 (Sefton Green Party)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
710 (GL Europe Bootle Sarl)

General Public Representations:
N/A

Policy ED5 Tourism

Summary of key Issues:

- The policy needs to address tourism across the borough and not only the four specific sites identified (663)
- Clarification is required as to what tourism development would be deemed acceptable (711)
- Development in the Green Belt will limit tourism opportunities (740)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
663 (National Trust), 740 (Formby Residents Action Group)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
711 (Jockey Club)

General Public Representations:
N/A

Policy ED6 Regeneration Areas

Summary of key Issues:

- Support for the policy as a whole which aims to regenerate deprived areas (638) with a National Grid site specifically referenced (333)
- The number of Regeneration Areas may stifle other areas, particularly Bootle (710)
- Sources of funding should be identified through Infrastructure Delivery Plan (638)
- Renovation of existing dwellings should be favoured over demolition and regeneration although derelict industrial areas should be regenerated (680)
- Regeneration and development of playing fields is contested (725)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

680 (Reclaim Community), 725 (Sport England)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

333 (Capita), 638 (Crosby Investment Steering Group), 710 (GL Europe Bootle Sarl)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

627

Policy ED7 Southport Central Area

Summary of key Issues:

- Provision of new facilities and infrastructure supported (599)
- Policy should be amended to ensure it safeguards Southport's historic assets (648)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

599 (The Theatre Trust), 648 (Historic England)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

N/A

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

103, 104, 105, 132

Policy ED8 Southport Seafront

Summary of key Issues:

- Southport Skatepark Project favoured as a component for policy to regenerate area and create more recreational opportunities (540)
- Policy should be amended to ensure it safeguards Southport's historic (648) and natural assets (723)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

648 (Historic England), 723 (Sefton Green Party)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

540 (Southport Skatepark Project)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

103, 104, 105, 132

Policy ED9 Crosby Centre

Summary of key Issues:

- The policy is unviable and undeliverable, previous experience has indicated a lack of cooperation and interest between landowners and developers. Specific funding routes must be identified (638)
- Policy should be expanded to consider conserving and enhancing historic environment (648)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

648 (Historic England)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

638 (Crosby Investment Steering Group)

General Public Representations:

N/A

Local Plan Housing and Communities (Chapter 8)

Summary of key Issues:

- It is essential housing development is only considered after existing stock has been fully utilised (723)
- Any new developments should be to a high quality design and reflect needs and character of the locality (550)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

723 (Sefton Green Party) 550 (Merseyside Civic Society)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

N/A

General Public Representations:

N/A

Policy HC1 Affordable and Special Needs Housing

Summary of key Issues:

- Affordable housing requirements should be determined on a dwelling basis not on bed space as this will overestimate percentage of affordable homes required, this has viability implications for developers (653, 680, 685, 696, 717, 721, 729, 731, 732, 735)
- Housing needs and demand vary and will continue to vary across the borough throughout the plan period which the policy fails to consider (268, 625, 707)
- The ratio of social rented and affordable rented houses should be 50/50 (637, 707) or removed from plan completely as it is too constricting (668). Parts of the policy will make it more difficult to provide extra care housing (709)
- Concerns over developers avoiding 30% affordable housing requirement due to economic unviability (474, 692)
- Affordable housing is often purchased by private firms and landlords who in turn increase rent and purchase costs so it is no longer affordable (740)
- South Sefton should be incorporated within policy (680)
- Council-owned and brownfield land should be brought forward for the purpose of affordable and special needs housing (474, 707)
- The Oriel Drive site (AS18) will contribute to meeting the need for affordable housing development (738)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

268 (Councillor Weavers), 474 (Bill Esterton MP), 680 (Reclaim Community), 692 (UKIP Sefton Branch), 729 (Mersey Care NHS Trust), 740 (Formby Residents Action Group),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

625 (Wainhomes Developments Ltd), 637 (Mactaggart & Mickel Homes Ltd), 653 (Satplan Ltd), 668 (Morris Homes and Ballygorryveg Ltd), 685 (Taylor Wimpey), 696 (Redrow Homes Ltd), 707 (Home Builders Federation), 709 (Collective Edge Ltd), 717 (TR Silcock Ltd, DWH & Barratt Homes), 721 (Morris Homes), 731 (Hallam Land Management and Taylor Wimpey), 732 (Bellway Homes Ltd), 735 (Catalyst Capital), 738 (CP&S Ltd)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

421, 635, 706, 734, 831, 846, 860, 882, 889

Policy HC2 Housing Type, Mix and Choice

Summary of key Issues:

- Policy is over prescriptive and is open to misinterpretation. It should be redrafted to allow for more flexibility for developers in terms of number of bedrooms (625, 655, 668, 685, 696, 707, 717, 729, 731, 732, 735)
- Policy fails to address long term changes in demand (712, 715, 716, 721)
- Policy should place a greater focus on the development of homes for elderly people (241)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

241 (Formby Parish Council), 729 (Mersey Care NHS Trust)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

625 (Wainhomes Developments Ltd), 655 (Nuffield College), 668 (Morris Homes and Ballygorryveg Ltd), 685 (Taylor Wimpey), 696 (Redrow Homes Ltd), 707 (Home Builders Federation), 712 (Persimmon Homes), 715 (Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd and Persimmon Homes Lancashire), 716 (Robert Swift and family), 717 (TR Silcock Ltd, DWH & Barratt Homes), 721 (Morris Homes), 731 (Hallam Land Management and Taylor Wimpey), 732 (Bellway Homes Ltd), 735 (Catalyst Capital), 738 (CP&S Ltd)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

361, 706

Policy HC3 Residential Development and Development in Primary Residential Developments

Summary of key Issues:

- Support for retail, leisure and other use development of an appropriate scale in Primary Residential Developments (41, 599, 685, 735)
- Concerns over conflicts with other policies, particularly the HC2 (707)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
599 (The Theatres Trust)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
417 (Sainsbury's Supermarkets), 685 (Taylor Wimpey), 707 (Home Builders Federation), 735 (Catalyst Capital)

General Public Representations:
N/A

Policy HC4 Housing Extensions and Alterations and Conversions to Houses in Multiple Occupation and Flats

Summary of key Issues:

- No representation received.

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
N/A

General Public Representations:
N/A

Policy HC5 Planning for Gypsies and Travellers

Summary of key Issues:

- General support for policy as new sites are required for Gypsies and Travellers (680)
- Concerns over environmental damage to sites (703) and anti-social behaviour (52, 740)
- Concerns over flood risk issues at both site (hc5.3 and 5.4) S (52, 740), damage to Green Belt (52, 703) as well as vehicular access issues

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

52 (Ince Blundell Parish Council), 680 (Reclaim Community), 703 (CPRE Lancashire), 740 (Formby Residents Action Group),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

N/A

General Public Representations:

N/A

**HC5.1 Land north east of Red Rose Traveller Park,
Broad Lane, Formby**

Summary of key Issues:

- No representation received.

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

N/A

General Public Representations:

N/A

**HC5.2 Land south west of Red Rose Traveller Park,
Broad Lane, Formby**

Summary of key Issues:

- No representation received.

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

N/A

General Public Representations:

N/A

HC5.3 Land at Plex Moss Lane Ainsdale

Summary of key Issues:

- Needs to be enforceable conditions relating to prevent waste (703)
- Unsuitable for traffic movements.
- Unsuitable for Green Belt.
- High risk of flooding (1026)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

52 (Ince Blundell Parish Council), 680 (Reclaim Community), 703 (CPRE Lancashire), 740 (Formby Residents Action Group),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

N/A

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

1022, 1026

HC5.4 Land at New Causeway, Ince Blundell

Summary of key Issues:

- Encroachment into Green Belt. (703)
- Ecological assessment needed due to proximity of River Alt. (703)
- Site is BMV agricultural land (703)
- High risk of flooding (52)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
52 (Ince Blundell Parish Council), 680 (Reclaim Community), 703 (CPRE Lancashire), 740 (Formby Residents Action Group),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
N/A

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:
1022, 1026

Policy HC6 Assets of Community Value

Summary of key Issues:

- Policy supported in principle, however it fails to consider all valuable community facilities

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
599 (The Theatres Trust)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
N/A

General Public Representations:
N/A

Policy HC7 Education and Care Institutions in the Urban Area

Summary of key Issues:

- The policy should be amended to promote green infrastructure and minimise harm to the historic and natural environment (648)
- The plan fails to address the outdoor and indoor sports facilities that often accompany educational buildings. Part 3 of the policy should be deleted or the explanation amended to properly protect land or buildings used for sport and recreation, in line with the NPPF (725).

| |
|---|
| |
| Statutory Consultees and other groups: 648 (Historic England), 725 (Sport England) |
| Site Promoter and Developer Representations: N/A |
| General Public Representations: N/A |

Policy IN1 Infrastructure and developer contributions

Summary of key Issues:

- Concern about pushing for the new homes bonus without considering long term impact of the area's services and capacity (5, 360, 366, 433, 692, 723)
- Concern over the increase in houses in relation to school capacity (208, 433, 488)
- Pressure on services, in particular health, with an increasingly ageing population (241, 488)
- Concern regarding reliance on developers and Environment Agency to provide necessary infrastructure for flooding defence (241)
- Concerns over the sites chosen and degree to which they are suitable in providing necessary infrastructure and mitigation (361)
- Transport infrastructure may not cope with additional users with regards to both road networks and additional public transport passengers (380, 665, 680)
- Query of the unrealistic building rate proposed in the local plan (433)
- Concerns about infrastructure funding given cuts to local authority funding (550)
- Suggested amendment to allow developer contributions to be used to support cross-boundary infrastructure (594)
- Support the aim to resist loss of 'social infrastructure' however clarity required over its meaning (599, 725)
- Clarity required over the expectation for developers to provide viability assessments to be considered during the determination of planning applications (685, 726)
- Concern over the lack of recognition of the canal as a priority for repair or enhancement (713)
- Suggest emphasis away from 'big grid' approaches to infrastructure and towards renewable, community based efficient development (723)
- Issues concerning infrastructure and service provision has been acknowledge within plan , however there is a lack of policy to address specific cases where these are lacking (52)
- Infrastructure Delivery Plan is too vague about what is proposed (638)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

52 (Ince Blundell Parish Council), 241 (Formby Parish Council), 488 (Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group), 550 (Merseyside Civic Society), 594 (Wirral Council), 599 (The Theatres Trust), 638 (Crosby Investment Strategy Steering Group), 680 (Reclaim Community), 692 (UKIP Sefton Branch), 713 (Canal & River Trust), 723 (Sefton Green Party), 725 (Sport England),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

685 (Taylor Wimpey), 726 (Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

5, 208, 360, 361, 366, 380, 433, 665,

Policy IN2 Transport

Summary of key Issues:

- Concern over lack of mitigation from the traffic impact with regards to the port expansion and residential protection (433, 550, 680)
- Concern over the lack of protection from private bus companies and the routes they may remove
- Concern over the access in Southport and lack of incorporation of the implications of recent rail links to the plan (488)
- The policy should state that options to re-connect the southern part of the port to the rail network should be explored as well as other improvements.(553)
- Support for the improvement in variety of public transport in particular to major town centres (638, 694, 726)
- Clarity required on details of how increased freight from the port will be mitigated (680)
- Minor change is required to bullet point 4 to make it consistent with NPPF (712, 715, 716)
- Concerns over the car-centric approach and lack of consideration for the development of alternative transport routes (723)
- Large scale transport related investment is welcomed and the plan should consider further schemes to improve links across the region (553)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

488 (Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group), 550 (Merseyside Civic Society), 553 (Merseytravel) 638 (Crosby Investment Strategy Steering Group), 680 (Reclaim Community), 723 (Sefton Green Party),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

694 (The Mersey Docks and Harbour Company), 712 (Persimmon Homes), 715 (Countryside Properties UK Ltd and Persimmon Homes Lancashire), 716 (Robert Swift & family), 726 (Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

379, 433,

Policy IN3 Managing Waste

Summary of key Issues:

- Refer Joint Waste Local Plan in the context of the Port of Liverpool (694)
- Should commit to zero waste policy (723)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
723 (Sefton Green Party)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
694 (The Mersey Docks & Harbour Company),

General Public Representations:
N/A

Policy EQ1 Planning for a Healthy Sefton

Summary of key Issues:

- The loss of playing pitches to development will affect the health of children (665)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
723 (Sefton Green Party)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
N/A

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:
665

Policy EQ2 Design

Summary of key Issues:

- Policy should include reference to biodiversity and the need to protect and enhance it (329)
- Policy should be amended to allow innovative design as required by Paragraph 63 of NPPF (735)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
329 (Wildlife Trust), 550 (Merseyside Civic Society)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
638 (Crosby Investment Strategy Steering Group), 735 (Catalyst Capital)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:
20,

Policy EQ3 Accessibility

Summary of key Issues:

- Policy duplicates Policies SD1 and SD2 and could be deleted (715, 716)
- Clarity required with regards to the Council's parking standards (726)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
723 (Sefton Green Party)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
638 (Crosby Investment Strategy Steering Group), 715 (Countryside Properties UK Ltd and Persimmon Homes Lancashire), 726 (Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:
716,

Policy EQ4 Pollution and Hazards

Summary of key Issues:

- No representation received.

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
N/A

General Public Representations:
N/A

Policy EQ5 Air Quality

Summary of key Issues:

- No representation received.

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
N/A

General Public Representations:
N/A

Policy EQ6 Land affected by contamination

Summary of key Issues:

- Insist new policy will seek to introduce England Partnership policies for decontamination and remediation of historically contaminated lands (680)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
680 (Reclaim Community)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
N/A

General Public Representations:
N/A

Policy EQ7 Energy Efficient and low carbon design

Summary of key Issues:

- The Council should provide up-to-date local evidence in support the requirement to 'use' decentralised or district energy systems (417)
- The plan is not ambitious enough in relation to environmental sustainability (488)
- Not consistent with national policy. Whilst the explanatory text says that the Council will only encourage developments to go beyond national standards the Policy states that this 'should' happen (707).
- High requirements can undermine the viability of a development (735)
- Omission of the provision of large scale low carbon or renewable energy provision (729).
- No reference to encourage Allowable Solutions to fund low carbon infrastructure (729)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

417 (Sainsbury's Supermarkets), 488 (Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group), 723 (Sefton Green Party), 729 (Mersey Care NHS Trust)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

707 (Home Builders Federation), 735 (Catalyst Capital)

General Public Representations:

N/A

Policy EQ8 Managing flood risk and surface water

Summary of key Issues:

- The plan relies on integrity of developers and the Environment Agency to provide the necessary infrastructure to deal with tidal problems and sewage capacity (241)
- Concern about the lack of consideration for the uniquely increased risk of flooding especially on Sefton coast (361, 394, 1026)
- Concern that SUDS only mitigates new development but doesn't address the already growing problem. Not capable of coping with the increase in housing suggested (361, 394, 433, 1026).
- Cost of dealing with water will fall on the farmers productive land (584)
- Concern that sites which are prone to flooding have been ear-marked to be built on (692)
- Parts 1 and 2 of the Policy duplicate national planning policy, oversimplify planning's role in reducing flood risk and should be deleted (715, 716)
- Incorrect use and preference of theoretical flood maps over real world flooding (1026)
- Clear guidance on flood risk management must be incorporated to avoid passing of

responsibility (241, 530)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

241 (Formby Parish Council), 722 (United Utilities), 530 (Thornton Parish Council), 692 (UKIP Sefton Branch),

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

715 (Countryside Properties UK Ltd and Persimmon Homes Lancashire), 735 (Catalyst Capital)

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:

361, 394, 433, 584, 716, 1026

Policy EQ9 Provision of public open space, strategic paths and trees in development

Summary of key Issues:

- Policy wording should be amended allowing for the improvement to current public open space and to clarify the mechanism used to secure off-site provision (725, 735)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

723 (Sefton Green Party), 725 (Sport England)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

696 (Redrow Homes Ltd), 735 (Catalyst Capital)

General Public Representations:

N/A

Policy EQ10 Food and Drink

Summary of key Issues:

- More clarity required in terms of acceptable developments outside of town, district and local centres (446)
- Policy is unsound and should seek to create, not restrict choice. No evidence provided as to links between fast food, school proximity and obesity (720, 733)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

446 (Formby Play Sports Ltd), 720 (McDonalds), 733 (KFC)

General Public Representations:

N/A

Policy EQ11 Advertisements

Summary of key Issues:

- Clarification required as to the approach to advertisements and heritage assets (648)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

648 (Historic England)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

N/A

General Public Representations:

N/A

Policy NH1 Environmental assets

Summary of key Issues:

- Support for the approach as both appropriate and proportionate (663)
- Need for a separate heritage strategy not just this policy which focusses on development management (329, 550, 648)
- Clarity needed over policies to guide regeneration with links to heritage (550)
- Pressing need for revision and implementation of the Sefton Coast Nature Conservation Strategy and Biodiversity Plan (329)
- Reference should be made to potential cross boundary partnership working (594)
- Need to clarify that the policy applies to heritage assets and their setting. (648)
- Contradiction between allowing development on the Green Belt and protecting and extending habitats in the Green Belt. Green belts and spaces should be protected and enhanced. (723)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

329 (Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and North Merseyside), 550 (Merseyside Civic Society), 648 English Heritage, 723 (Sefton Green Party), 594 (Wirral Council), 663 (National Trust)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

N/A

General Public Representations:

N/A

Policy NH2 Protection and Enhancement of Nature Sites, Priority Habitats and Species

Summary of key Issues:

- Nature SPD should accompany the plan and links should be made to enforcement policy PIM1. (329)
- The balance of this policy should be weighted more toward enhancement. Compensatory approaches are often too readily accepted for what is in effect unsuitable development (723)
- Concern that the increase in population will increase pressure on nature reserves (882)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

329 (Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester & North Merseyside), 663 (National Trust), 723 (Sefton Green Party), 882, 909

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
N/A

General Public Representations:
N/A

Policy NH3 Development in the Nature Improvement Area

Summary of key Issues:

- Oppose the designation of a portion of the River Mersey, adjacent to the Port, as a Nature Improvement Area in terms of its legality and impact on port activity (694)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
694 (The Mersey Docks and Harbour Company)

General Public Representations:
N/A

Policy NH4 The Sefton Coast and Development

Summary of key Issue:

- Concerned about erosion taking place along the coast between Burbo Bank and Hightown, sea defences in the area should be urgently strengthened. (123)
- National Trust welcomes and supports the Policy. (663)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
663 (National Trust)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
N/A

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:
123

Policy NH5 Protection of open space and Countryside Recreation Areas

Summary of key Issue:

- Concern that being “surplus to Sefton standards” is not the same as ‘surplus to requirements’ and so is not in line with the NPPF (725)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
725 (Sport England)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
N/A

General Public Representations:
N/A

Policy NH6 Urban Golf Courses

Summary of key Issues:

- No representation received.

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
N/A

General Public Representations:
N/A

Policy NH7 Rural Landscape Character

Summary of key Issues:

- No representation received.

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

N/A

General Public Representations:

N/A

Policy NH8 Minerals

Summary of key Issues:

- The Local Plan should include Mineral Safeguarding Areas to cover alluvial sand and gravel and silica sand [719]
- The policy should include development management criteria to set out what ‘special circumstances’ would justify overriding the presumption in favour of prior extraction [719].
- Clarification that policies for minerals, pollution and hazards will also apply for relevant cross boundary implications (594)
- The Local Plan should recognise the possible impacts of fracking and seek to ensure no negative impacts for the people of Sefton [723]

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

594 [Wirral Council], 719 [Minerals Products Association], 723 [Sefton Green Party]

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

N/A

General Public Representations:

N/A

Policies NH9 – NH14 Heritage Policies

Summary of key Issues:

- Paragraph 11.82 refers to non-designated assets [in addition to designated assets] yet Policy NH9 only considers designated assets (648)
- It may be appropriate develop the provision of para 11.83 (Policy NH9 Explanation) in an SPD (550)
- The Local Plan needs to be amended to ensure that it is in line with the requirements of NPPF, e.g. safeguarding and enhancing the setting and significance of heritage assets (648)
- Policy NH11 Development affecting conservation areas, concern regarding the protection of the Green Lane Conservation Area, Formby which is at specific risk to neglect (660)
- Policies NH12 and NH13 should be amended; to prevent harm and to conserve and enhance, rather than merely being 'sympathetic to' and 'not detracting from.'
- Policy NH13 needs to be amended to be clear that firstly the process of archaeological assessment and evaluation applies even when the significance, extent and state of preservation of archaeological remains are unclear, and secondly whether it relates to designated or non-designated assets.

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

550 (Merseyside Civic Society), 648 (English Heritage), 660 (Green Lane Conservation Area Society), 663 (National Trust)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

N/A

General Public Representations:

N/A

Local Plan Implementation and Monitoring (Chapter 12)

Summary of key Issues:

- Rigorous monitoring and review is required to adapt to changes in local demand and requirements (550)
- Monitoring cross-boundary implications is important (594)
- Specific reference should be made to planning enforcement in terms of nature conservation in policy PIM1 (329)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

594 (Wirral Council), 329 (Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester & North Merseyside), 550 (Merseyside Civic Society)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

N/A

General Public Representations:

N/A

Local Plan Policy Maps

Summary of key Issues:

- Shopping parades should be shown on maps (417), and the boundary of Crosby Centre redefined (638)
- An area within site MN2.2 should be excluded from the area designated under local plan policy NH2 protection, enhancement of nature sites, priority habitats and species (625)
- Nature Improvement Area should not extend into River Mersey near the Port

Statutory Consultees and other groups:

N/A

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:

417 (Sainsbury's Supermarkets), 625 (Wainhomes Developments Ltd), 638 (Crosby Investment Strategy Steering Group), 694 (Mersey Docks and Harbour Company)

General Public Representations:
N/A

Appendices

Summary of key Issues:

- Corrections to status of wildlife sites (329)

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
329 (Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester & North Merseyside)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
N/A

General Public Representations:
N/A

Consultation General

Summary of key Issues:

- Concerns over how the Council informed residents
- The approval process wasn't democratic
- Lack of information provided
- Consultation period not long enough
- Documents were difficult to access on the website
- The format of the events [e.g. having to book a slot] was designed to prevent people attending

Statutory Consultees and other groups:
488 (Sefton Council Liberal Democrats Opposition Group), 692 (UKIP), 699 (Maghull and Lydiate Action Group), 734 (Cllr M Bennett), 740 (Formby Residents Action Group)

Site Promoter and Developer Representations:
N/A

General Public Representations [see [index](#) for name of resident]:
88, 99, 371, 372, 377, 380, 383, 384, 424, 548, 561, 562, 590, 597, 635, 578, 742, 767, 769, 772, 773, 793, 794, 802, 821, 828, 838, 840, 870, 887, 889, 890, 891, 955

Index of Respondents to the Local Plan for Sefton Publication 2015

| Res. No | First Name | Last Name | Organisation Name | Category |
|---------|-------------------|-------------|---|----------|
| 1 | David | Walshe | | MOP |
| 3 | Margaret | Barr | | MOP |
| 4 | AC | Dixon | | MOP |
| 5 | Elizabeth | Thompson | | MOP |
| 6 | Elizabeth | Thompson | Petition of Green Park Estate Residents | PET |
| 7 | Elizabeth | Thompson | Petition of Local Sefton Residents | PET |
| 8 | Derek and Barbara | Cadwallader | | MOP |
| 9 | Joseph | Kigonya | | MOP |
| 10 | John | Christy | | MOP |
| 11 | Kevin | Duggan | | MOP |
| 12 | Muriel | Lammond | | MOP |
| 13 | John | Medley | | MOP |
| 14 | Anita | Pruden | | MOP |
| 15 | Paula | Ormond | | MOP |
| 16 | Terence | Slocombe | | MOP |
| 17 | Marc | Bourhill | | MOP |
| 18 | Paul | Bentzien | | MOP |
| 19 | Steven | Williams | | MOP |
| 20 | John H | Miller | | MOP |
| 21 | Ian | Robertson | | MOP |
| 22 | Florence | Smith | | MOP |
| 23 | M | Patten | | MOP |
| 24 | Lorraine | Highton | | MOP |
| 25 | Gemma | Watts | | MOP |
| 26 | Babara and Ron | Marsh | | MOP |
| 27 | Carol | Walsh | | MOP |
| 28 | Craig | Donaldson | | MOP |
| 29 | John | Cooke | | MOP |
| 30 | E | Billington | | MOP |
| 31 | Roger | Pontefract | | MOP |
| 32 | N | Walmsley | | MOP |
| 33 | Maureen | Costello | | MOP |
| 34 | Robert | Gould | | MOP |
| 35 | Carol | Duty | | MOP |
| 36 | Joan | Rimmer | | MOP |
| 37 | Ian | Morris | | MOP |
| 38 | N | Edwards | | MOP |
| 39 | Nick | Parry | | MOP |
| 40 | Melanie | Grice | | MOP |
| 41 | Corin | Holness | | MOP |
| 42 | Dan | Gregory | | MOP |
| 43 | Stephen | Edmondson | | MOP |

MOP - Member of Public; PUB - Public Body; PET - Petition; LAN - Landowner; PRI - Private Organisation;
SCB - Specific Consultation Body; CLR - Councillor; OTH - Other Group;

| | | | | |
|----|----------------------|-------------|--------------------------------|-----|
| 44 | Keith | Blundell | | MOP |
| 45 | Pam | Cowen | | MOP |
| 46 | Barry | Marsden | | MOP |
| 47 | Robert | Snowden | | MOP |
| 48 | Christopher | Wood | | MOP |
| 49 | Paul | Illingworth | | MOP |
| 50 | Patricia | Marsden | | MOP |
| 51 | Stan | Hughes | | MOP |
| 52 | Ian | Cowell | Ince Blundell Parish Council | PUB |
| 53 | Angela | Gemmill | Marine Management Organisation | PUB |
| 54 | Philip | Kitchen | | MOP |
| 55 | Fergus | Molloy | | MOP |
| 56 | Marjorie | Harvey | | MOP |
| 57 | Joyce | Scott | | MOP |
| 58 | Andrew and Margaret | McDonald | | MOP |
| 59 | Claire | Heaton | | MOP |
| 60 | Matthew | Fleming | | MOP |
| 61 | Peter | Walters | | MOP |
| 62 | Ken | Pickard | | MOP |
| 63 | Sue | Pickard | | MOP |
| 64 | KJ | Trainer | | MOP |
| 65 | Graham & Susan | Lowe | | MOP |
| 66 | Amanda | Mercer | | MOP |
| 67 | Clive | Narrainen | | MOP |
| 68 | Stephen | Leonard | | MOP |
| 69 | John | Bungey | | MOP |
| 70 | Stephen, Lisa & Alex | Fry | | MOP |
| 71 | Philippa | Canavan | | MOP |
| 72 | L | Wilcock | | MOP |
| 73 | John | Duffy | | MOP |
| 74 | Kim | Woodham | | MOP |
| 75 | Lesley | Sarsfield | | MOP |
| 76 | Ann | McLennan | | MOP |
| 77 | Maureen | Webb | | MOP |
| 78 | Michelle | Bates | | MOP |
| 79 | Stephen | Bird | | MOP |
| 80 | Sheila | Bird | | MOP |
| 81 | Elaine and Peter | Charnock | | MOP |
| 82 | Steve | Graves | | MOP |
| 83 | D | Tierney | | MOP |
| 84 | James | Wildman | | MOP |
| 85 | Colin | Leatham | | MOP |
| 86 | Alison | Moody | | MOP |
| 87 | Brian | Beardwood | | MOP |

| | | | | |
|-----|---------------------|-----------|--|-----|
| 88 | Karen | Atkinson | | MOP |
| 89 | George | Waters | | MOP |
| 90 | Helen | Bromfield | | MOP |
| 91 | Gary | Dunn | | MOP |
| 92 | Richard | Stuttard | | MOP |
| 93 | Andrew | Heckle | | MOP |
| 94 | Alan | Dobson | | MOP |
| 95 | Anne | Thornton | | MOP |
| 96 | John | Barrett | | MOP |
| 97 | Joe | England | | MOP |
| 98 | Steve | Rowe | | MOP |
| 99 | Jim | O'Gorman | | MOP |
| 100 | Lin | Carvell | | MOP |
| 101 | John | Nelson | | MOP |
| 102 | Irene | Fox | | MOP |
| 103 | Sheenagh | Burdell | | MOP |
| 104 | Graham | Wells | | MOP |
| 105 | Steven | Lewis | | MOP |
| 106 | Stephen & Christine | Adamson | | MOP |
| 107 | Lynn | MacAdam | | MOP |
| 108 | | | The Cowell Family | LAN |
| 109 | Diane | Harvey | | MOP |
| 110 | Stephen | Lange | | MOP |
| 111 | Natalie | Burke | | MOP |
| 112 | Alan | Sharples | | MOP |
| 114 | Barbara | Keenan | Lydiate Parish Council | PUB |
| 115 | Pauline | Hughes | | MOP |
| 116 | Shirley and Peter | Irving | | MOP |
| 117 | James and Clare | Brayshaw | | MOP |
| 118 | Kathy | Munro | | MOP |
| 119 | James | Foy | | MOP |
| 120 | Paul | Swinburne | | MOP |
| 121 | Angela | Johnson | | MOP |
| 122 | John | Hart | | MOP |
| 123 | Frances | Quirk | | MOP |
| 124 | Ronald | Caffrey | | MOP |
| 125 | Nick | Moulton | Amphibian & Reptile Conservation Trust | OTH |
| 126 | Peter | Walker | | MOP |
| 127 | Jane | Wilson | | MOP |
| 128 | John | Armstrong | | MOP |
| 129 | John & Rosemary | Haworth | | MOP |
| 130 | Lynn | Macadam | | MOP |
| 131 | William | Honeyman | | MOP |

| | | | | |
|-----|---------------|-------------|-------------------------|-----|
| 132 | Karyl | Cartwright | | MOP |
| 133 | John | Carragher | | MOP |
| 134 | Gordon | Lynes | | MOP |
| 135 | Fiona | Kinsella | | MOP |
| 136 | Derek | McStea | | MOP |
| 137 | Peter | Neild | | MOP |
| 138 | Roy | Silcock | | MOP |
| 139 | David | Partington | | MOP |
| 140 | Ian | Harvey | | MOP |
| 141 | John | McNaughton | | MOP |
| 142 | Michele | Coffey | | MOP |
| 143 | Peter | Smith | | MOP |
| 145 | Lawrence | Burke | | MOP |
| 146 | Paul | Lange | | MOP |
| 147 | Rachel | Hudson | | MOP |
| 148 | Tim | Astbury | Hightown Parish Council | PUB |
| 149 | Shorna | Warren | | MOP |
| 150 | Michael | Andrew | | MOP |
| 151 | Matthew | Warren | | MOP |
| 152 | Carmel | Gresham | | MOP |
| 153 | Richard | Hendry | | MOP |
| 154 | Liz | Williams | | MOP |
| 155 | Clive | Dunn | | MOP |
| 156 | Gwynneth Jean | Dunn | | MOP |
| 157 | Mike | Pearson | | MOP |
| 158 | Elizabeth | Fitzpatrick | | MOP |
| 160 | Lee | Hammond | | MOP |
| 161 | Karen | Burns | | MOP |
| 162 | John | McCall | | MOP |
| 163 | T | Yeoman | | MOP |
| 164 | A | Hagan | | MOP |
| 165 | Peter | Hughes | | MOP |
| 166 | Deborah | Simmonds | | MOP |
| 167 | R | Makin | | MOP |
| 168 | Joan | Balfour | | MOP |
| 169 | Albert | McDonnell | | MOP |
| 170 | | Anon | | MOP |
| 171 | John A | McLean | | MOP |
| 172 | Joyce and K P | Hunter | | MOP |
| 173 | MR | Duty | | MOP |
| 174 | Deborah | Hancox | | MOP |
| 175 | Anthony | Horne | | MOP |
| 176 | Derek | Hancox | | MOP |
| 177 | David | Hayes | | MOP |
| 178 | Malcolm | Morton | | MOP |
| 179 | Jacquelyn | Fee | Mono Consultants | PRI |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----|
| 180 | M&J | Fleet | | MOP |
| 181 | | Reid | | MOP |
| 182 | M | Pollard | | MOP |
| 183 | William | Supple | | MOP |
| 184 | Paul | Erwood | | MOP |
| 185 | Marie | Dewhurst | | MOP |
| 186 | A | Oldfield | | MOP |
| 187 | Neil | Dawson | | MOP |
| 188 | Debra and Clive | Harris | | MOP |
| 189 | Thomas | Hanlon | | MOP |
| 190 | P | Inskip | | MOP |
| 191 | | Rajan and family | | MOP |
| 192 | Janet and Gordon | Rimmer | | MOP |
| 193 | | Rimmer | | MOP |
| 194 | P | Robinson | | MOP |
| 195 | Andrew | Watson | | MOP |
| 196 | | Lock | | MOP |
| 197 | M | Woods | | MOP |
| 198 | Patricia | Simpkin | | MOP |
| 199 | SW | Hardman | | MOP |
| 200 | Ian | Thomson | | MOP |
| 201 | SE | Templeton | | MOP |
| 202 | Marjorie | Walker | | MOP |
| 203 | Julian | Austin | National Grid | PRI |
| 204 | Gill | Armstrong & others | | MOP |
| 205 | Jane | Young | | MOP |
| 206 | Pamela | Main | | MOP |
| 207 | Michael | Main | | MOP |
| 208 | Ian | Cowell | | MOP |
| 209 | Nicholas | Deering | | MOP |
| 210 | Gemma | Harpin | | MOP |
| 211 | Malcolm | Swann | | MOP |
| 212 | Angela | McIntyre | Maghull Town Council | PUB |
| 213 | Dorothy | Walsh | | MOP |
| 214 | Brenda | Brown | | MOP |
| 215 | John | Walsh | | MOP |
| 216 | Janeann & David | Fealey | | MOP |
| 217 | Mel | Duty | | MOP |
| 218 | Andrea | Webster | | MOP |
| 219 | Pat | Roberts | | MOP |
| 220 | Beryl | Ashcroft | | MOP |
| 221 | George | Ashcroft | | MOP |
| 222 | Mark | Brown | | MOP |
| 223 | Roger | Walsh | | MOP |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------------|------------|--|-----|
| 224 | Mike | McGibbon | | MOP |
| 225 | Jackie | Taylor | | MOP |
| 226 | Alan | Grimshaw | | MOP |
| 227 | Marianne | Welsh | | CLR |
| 228 | G | Yates | | MOP |
| 229 | Angela | Laffler | | MOP |
| 230 | C | Scrine | | MOP |
| 231 | Phyllis & Arthur | Broughton | | MOP |
| 232 | John and Mary | Whitehead | | MOP |
| 233 | LJ | Jenkins | | MOP |
| 234 | | | | MOP |
| 235 | Ian | Whiley | | MOP |
| 236 | Malcolm | Robinson | | MOP |
| 237 | Christopher | Wood | | MOP |
| 238 | D | Higham | | MOP |
| 239 | JA&M | Grierson | | MOP |
| 240 | Andrew | Lee | | MOP |
| 241 | Claire | Jenkins | Formby Parish Council | PUB |
| 242 | Lindsay | Hansford | | MOP |
| 243 | Andrew | Standeven | | MOP |
| 244 | Kim and Barbara | Bryan | | MOP |
| 245 | D.Stuart | Livingston | | MOP |
| 246 | Michael | Broom | | MOP |
| 247 | L | Marten | | MOP |
| 248 | Jessica | Sayers | | MOP |
| 249 | David | Bosworth | | MOP |
| 250 | Akshay | Bhatnagar | | MOP |
| 251 | C | Bedford | | MOP |
| 252 | Helen | Gannon | | MOP |
| 253 | Peter | Gannon | | MOP |
| 254 | Matt | Gannon | | MOP |
| 255 | | Neil | | MOP |
| 256 | Christine | Whincup | | MOP |
| 257 | Shirley | Childs | | MOP |
| 258 | John | Milnes | | MOP |
| 259 | D | Howard | | MOP |
| 260 | R A | Lewis | | MOP |
| 261 | Margorie | Harvey | | MOP |
| 262 | M | Wagner | | MOP |
| 263 | Susan | Anderson | | MOP |
| 264 | Derek | Coulthard | | MOP |
| 265 | Michael | Brown | North Merseyside Amphibian and Reptile Group | OTH |
| 266 | Alyson | Thornton | | MOP |
| 267 | Keith | Fell | | MOP |
| 268 | Fred | Weavers | Sefton MBC | CLR |

| | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-----|
| 269 | Brian | Garston | | MOP |
| 270 | E | Lee | | MOP |
| 271 | Haydn | Preece | | CLR |
| 272 | A | Hockey | | MOP |
| 273 | Paul and Katy | Spencer | | MOP |
| 274 | M D | Lyons | | MOP |
| 275 | G | Rowe | | MOP |
| 276 | Russell | Hart | | MOP |
| 277 | Judy | Glynne-Jones | | MOP |
| 278 | Veronica | Frear | | MOP |
| 279 | Anne | Fletcher | | MOP |
| 280 | | Anon | | MOP |
| 281 | William & Barbara | Watt | | MOP |
| 282 | A A | Gillett | | MOP |
| 283 | Krishnan | Gokul | | MOP |
| 284 | Emma & Jimmy | Brand & Sprung | | MOP |
| 285 | Stephen | Gent | | MOP |
| 286 | Stephen | Gent | Aintree Ratepayers Association | OTH |
| 287 | Stephen | Morgan | | MOP |
| 288 | Tim and Jennie | Seller | | MOP |
| 289 | Alan & Barbara | Hodges | | MOP |
| 290 | Clair | Fellows | | MOP |
| 291 | | Ferguson | | MOP |
| 292 | Hilda | Smith | | MOP |
| 293 | AW & EA | Triggs | | MOP |
| 294 | M. E. | Richardson | | MOP |
| 295 | Barbara | Kirkpatrick | | MOP |
| 296 | C | Speakman | | MOP |
| 297 | James | Reed | | MOP |
| 298 | David | Taylor | | MOP |
| 299 | Eric | Norman | | MOP |
| 300 | Carole & Grenville | Evans | | MOP |
| 301 | Colette | O'Neill | | MOP |
| 302 | Scott | Owen | | MOP |
| 303 | Dorothy | Vickers | | MOP |
| 304 | Nicholas | Fellows | | MOP |
| 305 | Hanorah B | Noonan | | MOP |
| 306 | Jane | Newby | | MOP |
| 307 | Edmond Samuel / Elsie | Lowe | | MOP |
| 308 | Reginald | Handley | | MOP |
| 309 | Leonard | Stephen | | MOP |
| 310 | Margaret | Stephen | | MOP |
| 311 | Shirley | Potter | | MOP |
| 312 | Kevin | Kewn | | MOP |

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------------|---------------|--|-----|
| 313 | Sandra | Hartley-Clegg | | MOP |
| 314 | Maureen | McGuinness | | MOP |
| 315 | Jeanette | Griffiths | | LAN |
| 316 | David J | Parry | | MOP |
| 317 | Vivienne | Hilset | | MOP |
| 318 | Marion | Elson | | MOP |
| 319 | | McLean | | MOP |
| 320 | Carol | Davies | | MOP |
| 321 | Nigel | Williams | | MOP |
| 322 | R, JJ, C & V | Wolfe | | MOP |
| 323 | Audie | Barnes | | MOP |
| 324 | Ian | Taylor | | MOP |
| 325 | Bernard | Ormrod | | MOP |
| 326 | John | Baker | Moor Lane and Moor Close Residents' Association | OTH |
| 327 | Dyanna | Swindlehurst | | MOP |
| 328 | Janet | Carver | | MOP |
| 329 | Michael | Collier | Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester & North Merseyside | OTH |
| 330 | Derek & Yvonne | Roberts | | MOP |
| 331 | Joan | Carruthers | | MOP |
| 332 | Kate | Hogan | | MOP |
| 333 | Tim | Harrison | Capita | PRI |
| 334 | Carl & Marjorie | Kirk | | MOP |
| 335 | Lynne | Howard | | MOP |
| 336 | Kathleen | Phythian | | MOP |
| 337 | B.E. | Karran | | MOP |
| 338 | Phyllis | Gunner | | MOP |
| 339 | Edward & Blanche | Arch | | MOP |
| 340 | Laura | Harvey | | MOP |
| 341 | Malcolm | Walker | | MOP |
| 342 | Barbara | Hope | | MOP |
| 343 | K | Seddon | | MOP |
| 344 | | | Hesketh Estate | LAN |
| 345 | Irene | Trim | | MOP |
| 346 | Frank | Carruthers | | MOP |
| 347 | Dave | Billows | | MOP |
| 348 | CE | Johnson | | MOP |
| 349 | John | McNamara | | MOP |
| 350 | Carol and Stephen | Hosker | | MOP |
| 351 | Mike | Penn | | MOP |
| 352 | Neil | Rogers | | MOP |
| 353 | | Symondson | | MOP |
| 354 | Ngaio | Bell | | MOP |
| 355 | Brian | Mann | | MOP |

| | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|------------|--------------|-----|
| 356 | Patricia | Mann | | MOP |
| 357 | Edward | Bird | | MOP |
| 358 | John | Thompson | | MOP |
| 359 | Catherine | Fraser | | MOP |
| 360 | John | Hill | | MOP |
| 361 | A D | Fraser | | MOP |
| 362 | A | Baden | | MOP |
| 363 | John | Lemon | | MOP |
| 364 | Michael & Joan | McDonough | | MOP |
| 365 | Pauline | Lewis | | MOP |
| 366 | Margaret Anne | Hill | | MOP |
| 367 | Kathleen | Phythian | | MOP |
| 368 | M. F. | Robinson | | MOP |
| 369 | Thomas | McCall | | MOP |
| 370 | Frances | Horne | | MOP |
| 371 | Scott | Owen | | MOP |
| 372 | Andrew | Owen | | MOP |
| 373 | Joan | Kendrew | | MOP |
| 374 | John & Angela | Radford | | LAN |
| 375 | Jon | Birch | | LAN |
| 376 | Michael | Gradwell | Network Rail | LAN |
| 377 | Dale | Harris | | MOP |
| 378 | M J & E D | Murphy | | MOP |
| 379 | Colette | O'Neill | | MOP |
| 380 | Ian | Gent | | MOP |
| 381 | Benedict | Cleary | | MOP |
| 382 | Elisabeth | Cleary | | MOP |
| 383 | Malcolm | Gore | | MOP |
| 384 | Stephen and Clare | Jones | | MOP |
| 385 | Shirley | Roberts | | MOP |
| 386 | L.S. | McDonald | | MOP |
| 387 | JR & B | Mulholland | | MOP |
| 388 | D.K. | Neal | | MOP |
| 389 | Stephen | Smith | | MOP |
| 390 | Robert | Jackson | | MOP |
| 391 | William | Roberts | | MOP |
| 392 | Roger | Williams | | MOP |
| 393 | David | Davidson | | MOP |
| 394 | Mark | Derbyshire | | MOP |
| 395 | Leslie | Ferguson | | MOP |
| 396 | David N | Smith | | MOP |
| 397 | Barbara Joan | Smith | | MOP |
| 398 | Joanne | Allman | | MOP |
| 399 | Terence | Allman | | MOP |
| 400 | Robert | Berry | | MOP |
| 401 | Michael and | Danbury | | MOP |

| | | | | |
|-----|---------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|-----|
| | Joyce | | | |
| 402 | Derek and Anne | Kershaw | | MOP |
| 403 | Denise | France | | MOP |
| 404 | Brian | Sutcliffe | | MOP |
| 405 | Michael | Perkins | | MOP |
| 406 | Peter | Richards | West Lancashire Borough Council | PUB |
| 407 | Gordon | Ferguson | | MOP |
| 408 | Tony | Brandwood | | MOP |
| 409 | Angela | O'Brien | | MOP |
| 410 | Alan | Stirrup | | MOP |
| 411 | M | Anderson | | MOP |
| 412 | A M | Woods | | MOP |
| 413 | Brian | Frear | | MOP |
| 414 | F G | McLean | | MOP |
| 415 | T P | Neal | | MOP |
| 416 | P | Perrin | | MOP |
| 417 | Lerato | Marema | Sainsbury's Supermarkets | PRI |
| 418 | DE | Budd | | MOP |
| 419 | A | Rowland | | MOP |
| 420 | C | Bradburn | | MOP |
| 421 | Colin | Reader | | MOP |
| 422 | Tony | Handley | | MOP |
| 423 | Moya | Middlehurst | | MOP |
| 424 | Ian | Brandes | | MOP |
| 425 | Richard and Marilyn | Kinch | | MOP |
| 426 | Joan | Fieldsend | | MOP |
| 427 | Thomas | Hancock | | LAN |
| 428 | Ruth | Slater | | MOP |
| 429 | Michael | Preston | | MOP |
| 430 | Craig | Stobie | | MOP |
| 431 | C | Domville | | MOP |
| 432 | George | Simpson | | MOP |
| 433 | Eric | Haworth | | MOP |
| 434 | Val | Ormrod | | MOP |
| 435 | James | Crawford | | MOP |
| 436 | David | Griffiths | | MOP |
| 437 | Emma | Winstanley | | MOP |
| 438 | Liam | Pritchard | | MOP |
| 439 | James | Winstanley | | MOP |
| 440 | Sarah | Moyes | | MOP |
| 441 | Derrick | Martin | | MOP |
| 442 | Angela | Winstanley | | MOP |
| 443 | Jane | Quintana | | MOP |
| 444 | J H | Glover | | MOP |
| 445 | David | Tyson | | MOP |
| 446 | Hugh | McAuley | Formby Play Sports Ltd | LAN |

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------------|---------------|---|-----|
| 447 | Audrey | Irons | | MOP |
| 448 | S | Kennedy | | MOP |
| 449 | Jessie D | Skillicorn | | MOP |
| 450 | William | Kirkham | | MOP |
| 451 | Peter R | Williams | | MOP |
| 452 | Ben | Middlehurst | | MOP |
| 453 | Alan | Middlehurst | | MOP |
| 454 | John | France | | MOP |
| 455 | Jane | Rigby | | MOP |
| 456 | T R | Blake | | MOP |
| 457 | Peter | Sheridan | | MOP |
| 458 | Emma | Sheridan | | MOP |
| 459 | Jean | Mullen | | MOP |
| 460 | C E | Farrell | | MOP |
| 461 | Brenda | Porter | Ainsdale Community Wildlife Trust | OTH |
| 462 | David | Raw | | MOP |
| 463 | Trevor | Williams | | MOP |
| 464 | Siobhan | Thomson | | MOP |
| 465 | Maureen | Garrett | | MOP |
| 466 | Sarah and Darin | Harrison | | MOP |
| 467 | Yvonne | West | | MOP |
| 468 | David | Scott | | MOP |
| 469 | Arthur & Jennifer | Blackhurst | | MOP |
| 470 | Barbara | Harvey | | MOP |
| 471 | D. P. | Williams | | MOP |
| 472 | L | Williams | | MOP |
| 474 | Bill | Esterson | Member of Parliament | CLR |
| 475 | P | Battersby | | MOP |
| 476 | Jacqueline | Williams | | MOP |
| 477 | B J | Fenerty | | MOP |
| 478 | J | Smallpage | | MOP |
| 479 | Mary | McBride | | MOP |
| 481 | Barrie | Partington | | MOP |
| 482 | Sharon | Partington | | MOP |
| 483 | Ken | Dennis | | MOP |
| 484 | Barbara A | Macy | | MOP |
| 485 | Philip | Roberts | | MOP |
| 486 | D | Parr | | MOP |
| 487 | Carolyn | Rodick | | MOP |
| 488 | Ian | Brodie Browne | Sefton Council Lib Dem Opposition Group | CLR |
| 489 | Anne | Sarsfield | | MOP |
| 490 | | | Aintree Retail Park Limited | PRI |
| 491 | | | Orbit Investments (Properties) Limited | PRI |
| 492 | | | Craig Seddon SIPP | LAN |

| | | | | |
|-----|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-----|
| 493 | Michael | Jones | | MOP |
| 494 | Derek | Jones | | MOP |
| 495 | Christine | Glover | | MOP |
| 496 | Allan | Watson | | MOP |
| 497 | David | Newall | | MOP |
| 498 | David | Quilliam | | MOP |
| 499 | John | Foley | | MOP |
| 500 | Dawn and Gerard | Collins | | MOP |
| 501 | McLeod | | | MOP |
| 502 | Peter | Muldoon | | MOP |
| 503 | David | Llewellyn | | MOP |
| 504 | Dian | Shields | | MOP |
| 505 | Keith | Lewis | | MOP |
| 506 | Lorraine | Saunders | | MOP |
| 507 | N | Slater | | MOP |
| 508 | Gina | Blackshaw | | MOP |
| 509 | John | Lycett | | MOP |
| 510 | Peter | Quilliam | | MOP |
| 511 | Carol | Sharman | | MOP |
| 512 | L M | Seddon | | MOP |
| 513 | Jenny | Todd | | MOP |
| 514 | D&L | Larkey | | MOP |
| 515 | Lynn | Woodward | | MOP |
| 516 | Joan | Hodson | | MOP |
| 517 | H | Kingsley | | MOP |
| 518 | J | Morris | | MOP |
| 519 | B and D G | Wheldon | | MOP |
| 520 | L and J | Tynon | | MOP |
| 521 | J & G | Larkey & Copeland | | MOP |
| 522 | George | Copeland | | MOP |
| 523 | Jane | Larkey | | MOP |
| 524 | J | Warburton | | MOP |
| 525 | J | Wain | | MOP |
| 526 | M L | Tyrer | | MOP |
| 527 | Graham | Bell | | MOP |
| 528 | Stuart | Rodick | | MOP |
| 529 | Vincent | Bowe | | MOP |
| 530 | J K | Hounsell | Thornton Parish Council | PUB |
| 531 | Alex | Porcelli | | MOP |
| 532 | Luke | Middlemarsh | | MOP |
| 533 | G H | Sands | | MOP |
| 534 | Brendan | Abbott | | MOP |
| 535 | J P | Woodward | | MOP |
| 536 | P I | Phodes | | MOP |
| 537 | Edward | Landor | Property Collateral Ltd | LAN |

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------------|-------------------|--|-----|
| 538 | Antoinette | McLellan | | MOP |
| 539 | Roy | Connell | | MOP |
| 540 | Trevor | Wells | Southport Skatepark Project | OTH |
| 541 | Nigel | Ashton | Meols ward councillors | CLR |
| 542 | Jennifer | Hadland | Liverpool and Chester Property Company | LAN |
| 543 | Anne | Jones | | MOP |
| 544 | Peter | Costello | | MOP |
| 545 | Christine | Jamieson | | MOP |
| 546 | Linda | Speck | | MOP |
| 547 | Diane | Short | | MOP |
| 548 | Michael and Julie | Corbitt | | MOP |
| 549 | Alan | Verinder | | MOP |
| 550 | Peter | Brown | Merseyside Civic Society | OTH |
| 551 | Stephen | Sayce | Environment Agency | SCB |
| 552 | Susan | Allen | | MOP |
| 553 | Alex | Naughton | Merseytravel | SCB |
| 554 | Philip | Dillon | | MOP |
| 555 | Emma | Denyer | | MOP |
| 556 | | Quinn | | MOP |
| 557 | David and Bridget | Jacks | | MOP |
| 558 | Kathryn | Williams | | MOP |
| 559 | Christopher | Simmons | | MOP |
| 560 | Vincent | Jamieson | | MOP |
| 561 | Bridget | Carroll | | MOP |
| 562 | Amanda and Dave | Mercer | | MOP |
| 563 | A | Watson | | MOP |
| 564 | K | Bradshaw | | MOP |
| 565 | Paula | Maguire | | MOP |
| 566 | Craig | Maguire | | MOP |
| 567 | Janette | Miller | | MOP |
| 568 | Peter | Greener | | MOP |
| 569 | Nuala | Kranas | | MOP |
| 570 | Lynn | Gibson | Green Lane Conservation Area Society | OTH |
| 571 | | The Willis family | | MOP |
| 572 | Lynne | Randles | | MOP |
| 573 | Barbara | Bowler | | MOP |
| 574 | Anne | Jones | | MOP |
| 575 | Gill | Hall | | MOP |
| 576 | J David | Chambers | | MOP |
| 577 | Paul | Maguire | | MOP |
| 578 | Philip C | Thompson | | MOP |
| 579 | Rob and Sue | Lees | | MOP |

| | | | | |
|-----|--------------------|-------------|---|-----|
| 580 | Simon | Denyer | | MOP |
| 581 | Frank | Vaughn | | MOP |
| 582 | Sheila | Supple | | MOP |
| 583 | Gerry | Doyle | | MOP |
| 584 | Lisa | Edwards | Goose Meadow Farming Limited | MOP |
| 585 | D | Marsden | | MOP |
| 586 | S | Wright | | MOP |
| 587 | Mark | Holmes | | MOP |
| 588 | Alison | Holmes | | MOP |
| 589 | Edward | O'Connor | | MOP |
| 590 | Sheila | Brown | | MOP |
| 591 | Suzanne and David | Oliver | | MOP |
| 592 | Teresa | Baker | | MOP |
| 593 | Alex | Webster | | MOP |
| 594 | Peter | Cushion | Wirral Council | PUB |
| 595 | Jonathan | Clarke | Knowsley Council | PUB |
| 596 | | | | |
| 597 | David | Parmley | | MOP |
| 598 | Geoffrey and Linda | Abrahams | | MOP |
| 599 | Ross | Anthony | The Theatres Trust | MOP |
| 600 | Enid | Cumberlidge | | MOP |
| 601 | John | Hoggarth | Melling Maghull and Aintree Against Peel Proposal | OTH |
| 602 | Howard | Hayden | | MOP |
| 603 | Anne | Axon | | MOP |
| 604 | Susan | Mietke | | MOP |
| 605 | Eric | Irwin | | MOP |
| 606 | Alistair | Cooke | | MOP |
| 607 | Glenys | Burkey | | MOP |
| 608 | Angela | Berry | | MOP |
| 609 | M E | Baylis | | MOP |
| 610 | P | Knifton | | MOP |
| 611 | Robert | Noonan | | MOP |
| 612 | Pamela | Holmes | | MOP |
| 613 | R D | Goodwin | | MOP |
| 614 | S E | Phillips | | MOP |
| 615 | Rachael | Musgrave | Health and Wellbeing Board | MOP |
| 616 | David | Lewis | | MOP |
| 617 | James | Quinn | | MOP |
| 618 | Jean | Lewis | | MOP |
| 619 | Jonathan | Walsh | | MOP |
| 620 | Colin | Reilly | | MOP |
| 621 | Tim | Hastings | | MOP |
| 622 | Amanda | Hastings | | MOP |
| 623 | Win | Beaumont | | MOP |

| | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|-----------|--|-----|
| 624 | W | Miles | | MOP |
| 625 | | | Wainhomes Developments Ltd | LAN |
| 626 | S | Wilson | | MOP |
| 627 | C&S | Belsham | | MOP |
| 629 | Richard | Simmons | | MOP |
| 630 | Gary | Clarke | GPC Rail Ltd | LAN |
| 631 | Tony | Roberts | | MOP |
| 632 | Sylvia | Phillips | | MOP |
| 633 | Rosalind | Hoggarth | | MOP |
| 634 | John | Hoggarth | | MOP |
| 635 | Graham | Nelson | | MOP |
| 636 | Aurea | Russell | | MOP |
| 637 | Ken | Hopkins | Mactaggart & Mickel Homes Ltd | LAN |
| 638 | | | Crosby Investment Strategy Steering Group | OTH |
| 639 | | | C P & S Limited | LAN |
| 640 | Ann | Paulett | | MOP |
| 641 | Colin | Leatham | | MOP |
| 642 | Simone and John | Gunn | | MOP |
| 643 | Chad | Thompson | Melling Parish Council | PUB |
| 644 | Michael | Murphy | | MOP |
| 645 | Aiden | Ogden | | MOP |
| 646 | Peter | Gill | | MOP |
| 647 | Christina | Veevers | | MOP |
| 648 | Emily | Hrycan | English Heritage | SCB |
| 649 | Sally | Veevers | | MOP |
| 650 | Craig | Allen | | MOP |
| 651 | Sheila | Cooksey | | MOP |
| 652 | Barbara | Graham | | MOP |
| 653 | Shaun | Taylor | Satplan Ltd | PRI |
| 654 | T nd B | Miller | | MOP |
| 655 | | | Nuffield College | LAN |
| 656 | Ian | Wolfenden | | MOP |
| 657 | Robert | Burns MBE | | MOP |
| 658 | Stewart | Porter | | MOP |
| 659 | Stephen and Wendy | Blundell | | MOP |
| 660 | Ann Victoria | Hall | Green Lane Conservation Area Society | OTH |
| 661 | | | PSA Developments | LAN |
| 662 | | | Birkdale Trading Estate | LAN |
| 663 | Alan | Hubbard | National Trust | OTH |
| 664 | Richard | Kranas | | MOP |
| 665 | Tony | Dawson | | CLR |
| 666 | | | Chancerygate | LAN |
| 667 | I M | Hill | | MOP |
| 668 | Andrew | Thompson | Morris Homes and Ballygorryveg | LAN |

| | | | Ltd | |
|-----|----------------|------------|--|-----|
| 669 | John | Ashburner | | MOP |
| 670 | Karen | Williamson | | MOP |
| 671 | Jane | Tasker | | MOP |
| 672 | Brenda | Ashburner | | MOP |
| 673 | Kim | Albanese | | MOP |
| 674 | Maria Jesus | Torres | | MOP |
| 675 | Michael | Truman | | MOP |
| 676 | Salam | Kenyani | | MOP |
| 677 | Adam | Kenyani | | MOP |
| 678 | James A | Ford | Ormskirk, Preston and Southport Travellers Association | OTH |
| 679 | Freda | Kenyani | | MOP |
| 680 | J Edgar and MJ | Joyce | Reclaim Community | OTH |
| 681 | Mike | Walsh | | MOP |
| 682 | Michael | Halsall | | MOP |
| 683 | Alison | Gibbon | | MOP |
| 684 | Barbara | Halsall | | MOP |
| 685 | | | Taylor Wimpey | LAN |
| 686 | June | Ritson | | MOP |
| 687 | Diana | Sayer | | MOP |
| 688 | Ann | Rimmer | | MOP |
| 689 | Mick | Clarke | | MOP |
| 690 | Louise | Graham | | MOP |
| 691 | Jennifer | Wright | | MOP |
| 692 | Peter | Harper | UKIP Sefton Branch | OTH |
| 693 | Michael | Eccles | Liverpool City Council | PUB |
| 694 | Warren | Marshall | The Mersey Docks and Harbour Company | OTH |
| 695 | P | Booth | Hourwatch | LAN |
| 696 | Robin | Buckley | Redrow Homes Ltd | LAN |
| 697 | | | Maghull Limited | LAN |
| 698 | Anthony | Swift | Anthony Swift and Kipros Pittaris | LAN |
| 699 | P | O'Hanlon | Maghull and Lydiate Action Group | OTH |
| 700 | Kate | Wheeler | Natural England | SCB |
| 701 | Brian | Rostron | S Rostron Ltd | LAN |
| 702 | | | The Peel Group | LAN |
| 703 | Jackie | Copley | CPRE Lancashire | OTH |
| 704 | A | Donnelly | | LAN |
| 705 | Alistair | Wilcock | Robinson New Homes | LAN |
| 706 | Mike | McComb | | LAN |
| 707 | Matthew | Good | Home Builders Federation | OTH |
| 708 | Terry | Riley | Ascot Property Group | LAN |
| 709 | Peter | Furmedge | Collective Edge Ltd | OTH |
| 710 | | | GL Europe Bootle Sarl (Ellandi LLP) | PRI |
| 711 | | | Jockey Club | OTH |
| 712 | Andrew | Pepper | Persimmon Homes | LAN |

| | | | | |
|-----|---------------|----------|--|-----|
| 713 | Alison | Truman | Canal & River Trust | PUB |
| 715 | | | Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd and Persimmon Homes Lancashire | LAN |
| 716 | Robert | Swift | Robert Swift and family | LAN |
| 717 | | | TR Silcock Ltd, DWH & Barratt Homes | LAN |
| 718 | Brian | Kenyon | Southport Old Links Golf Club | OTH |
| 719 | Malcolm | Ratcliff | Mineral Products Association | OTH |
| 720 | | | McDonalds | PRI |
| 721 | Andrew | Thompson | Morris Homes | LAN |
| 722 | Jenny | Hope | United Utilities Ltd | SCB |
| 723 | Laurence | Rankin | Sefton Green Party | OTH |
| 724 | Paula | Keaveney | Sefton Central Liberal Democrats | CLR |
| 725 | Paul | Daly | Sport England | SCB |
| 726 | | | Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd | LAN |
| 727 | | | Harrison and Sons | LAN |
| 728 | Martyn | Sayer | Churchtown Green Belt Action Group | OTH |
| 729 | Alison | Jordan | Mersey Care NHS Trust | LAN |
| 730 | Gerry | O'Brien | Nextdom Ltd | LAN |
| 731 | | | Hallam Land Management and Taylor Wimpey | LAN |
| 732 | | | Bellway Homes Ltd | LAN |
| 733 | | | Kentucky Fried Chicken (Great Britain) Ltd | PRI |
| 734 | Maria | Bennett | | CLR |
| 735 | | | Catalyst Capital | LAN |
| 736 | Mark | Basnett | Liverpool City Region LEP | PUB |
| 737 | | Watmore | | LAN |
| 738 | Charles | Smith | CP&S Ltd | LAN |
| 739 | | | Kwok, Cropper et al | LAN |
| 740 | | | Formby Residents Action Group | OTH |
| 741 | | | Priory Asset Management LLP | LAN |
| 742 | RF | Hughes | | MOP |
| 743 | Enid and Paul | Hoole | | MOP |
| 744 | JP | Holliday | | MOP |
| 745 | Ann-Louise | Hartley | | MOP |
| 746 | Sandra | Halligan | | MOP |
| 747 | Katie | Halligan | | MOP |
| 748 | Brian | Halligan | | MOP |
| 749 | Janet | Hagar | | MOP |
| 750 | Joan | Gore | | MOP |
| 751 | A | Evans | | MOP |
| 752 | Winifred | Cox | | MOP |
| 753 | Ray | Cox | | MOP |
| 754 | JA | Carroll | | MOP |
| 755 | Eric | Calvert | | MOP |

| | | | |
|-----|------------------|-----------|-----|
| 756 | Malcolm | Calvert | MOP |
| 757 | M | Cain | MOP |
| 758 | LJ | Burke | MOP |
| 759 | | Burke | MOP |
| 760 | Jennifer | Burke | MOP |
| 761 | KA | Bruns | MOP |
| 762 | DC | Bruns | MOP |
| 763 | Tess | Atherton | MOP |
| 764 | T | Bentley | MOP |
| 765 | Terry | Atherton | MOP |
| 766 | J | Atherton | MOP |
| 767 | J | Avery | MOP |
| 768 | K | Ainsworth | MOP |
| 769 | D | Avery | MOP |
| 770 | | Ashcroft | MOP |
| 771 | Lynn | Allen | MOP |
| 772 | Paula | Robinson | MOP |
| 773 | Neil | Roberts | MOP |
| 774 | A | Hockey | MOP |
| 775 | V | Rhoades | MOP |
| 776 | Alan and Karen | Range | MOP |
| 777 | Mike and Shirley | Goffey | MOP |
| 778 | Alan W and Mary | Range | MOP |
| 779 | John | Ramsden | MOP |
| 780 | David | Stevens | MOP |
| 781 | Colin | Quarrie | MOP |
| 782 | Karen | Stevens | MOP |
| 783 | K | Puckey | MOP |
| 784 | James | Bennett | MOP |
| 785 | Katherine | Petrie | MOP |
| 786 | Joyce Bennett | | MOP |
| 787 | Elizabeth | Hogan | MOP |
| 788 | Pradip | Patel | MOP |
| 789 | JD and M-A | Campbell | MOP |
| 790 | Y | Entwistle | MOP |
| 791 | Neave | Patel | MOP |
| 792 | PJ | Morley | MOP |
| 793 | Gail | Pickett | MOP |
| 794 | Phil | Pickett | MOP |
| 795 | George | Parkinson | MOP |
| 796 | John | Evans | MOP |
| 797 | Joanne | Burke | MOP |
| 798 | Arthur | Finch | MOP |
| 799 | Mariane | Patel | MOP |
| 800 | P | Finch | MOP |

| | | | |
|-----|-----------|------------|-----|
| 801 | Joan | Wilkinson | MOP |
| 802 | M | O'Hanlon | MOP |
| 803 | P | Larsen | MOP |
| 804 | P | O'Hanlon | MOP |
| 805 | Colette | Larson | MOP |
| 806 | B | Newell | MOP |
| 807 | James | O'Hara | MOP |
| 808 | C | Maylor | MOP |
| 809 | Karen | Edge | MOP |
| 810 | Paul | Martin | MOP |
| 811 | D | Seddon | MOP |
| 812 | Alan | Hall | MOP |
| 813 | Roy | Martin | MOP |
| 814 | Paul | Edge | MOP |
| 815 | Dorothy | Martin | MOP |
| 816 | Alexandra | Martin | MOP |
| 817 | Lynne | Webster | MOP |
| 818 | E | Seddon | MOP |
| 819 | Noreen | McGowan | MOP |
| 820 | Gail | Walters | MOP |
| 821 | A | McCaffley | MOP |
| 822 | Frank A | Boardman | MOP |
| 823 | Ann | Logan | MOP |
| 824 | Maureen | Jacques | MOP |
| 825 | V | Roberts | MOP |
| 826 | PJ | Mowatt | MOP |
| 827 | Carol | Sahin | MOP |
| 828 | S | Brodie | MOP |
| 829 | R | Thompson | MOP |
| 830 | D B | Taylor | MOP |
| 831 | Kay | Thompson | MOP |
| 832 | Joyce | Swift | MOP |
| 833 | A E | Clotworthy | MOP |
| 834 | Raymond | Wix | MOP |
| 835 | S | Verell | MOP |
| 836 | Gwyneth | O'Hara | MOP |
| 837 | Colleen | Bold | MOP |
| 838 | L | Smith | MOP |
| 839 | Denise | Forrest | MOP |
| 840 | JF | Smith | MOP |
| 841 | John | Wooder | MOP |
| 842 | FE | Smith | MOP |
| 843 | J | Hutchings | MOP |
| 844 | Robert | Wooder | MOP |
| 845 | Paul S | Blenkinsop | MOP |
| 846 | J | Williams | MOP |
| 847 | Ken | Smith | MOP |

| | | | |
|-----|--------------|------------------|-----|
| 848 | E | Williams | MOP |
| 849 | Elaine | Smith | MOP |
| 850 | W | Boardman | MOP |
| 851 | John | Short | MOP |
| 852 | Rhona | Simon | MOP |
| 853 | Robert | Simon | MOP |
| 854 | Hayley | Sargeant | MOP |
| 855 | Peter | Robinson | MOP |
| 856 | David | Hogan | MOP |
| 857 | Francis | Hogan | MOP |
| 858 | Ann | Hogan | MOP |
| 859 | Oli | Caffrey | MOP |
| 860 | Mark | Caffrey | MOP |
| 861 | Frances | Byrne | MOP |
| 862 | S | McClelland | MOP |
| 863 | Ann | Eaves | MOP |
| 864 | Thomas | Eaves | MOP |
| 865 | Patricia | Roberts | MOP |
| 866 | Keith | Bradley | MOP |
| 867 | Lynn | Caffrey | MOP |
| 868 | Malcolm | Wooder | MOP |
| 869 | Leanne | McKee | MOP |
| 870 | JV | Alderson | MOP |
| 871 | Earl | O'Keefe | MOP |
| 872 | Pauline | O'Keefe | MOP |
| 873 | N | Armstrong | MOP |
| 874 | Norman | Brown | MOP |
| 875 | TE | Roberts | MOP |
| 876 | Enid | Brown | MOP |
| 877 | Eva | Bradley | MOP |
| 878 | Neil | Cole | MOP |
| 879 | Deirdre | Chesser | MOP |
| 880 | Helena | Randles | MOP |
| 881 | Brian | Chesser | MOP |
| 882 | Leslie James | Baxter | MOP |
| 883 | Catherine | Gouge | MOP |
| 884 | Jean | Bradley | MOP |
| 885 | Lorraine | Bradley | MOP |
| 886 | Nicholas | Bradley | MOP |
| 887 | LA | Roberts | MOP |
| 888 | HL | Moore | MOP |
| 889 | P | Gwyther | MOP |
| 890 | NL | Gwyther | MOP |
| 891 | H | Lee | MOP |
| 892 | PJ and JM | Allen and Winrow | MOP |
| 893 | Elaine | Roberts | MOP |

| | | | |
|-----|-----------|--------------------|-----|
| 894 | KD | Mowat | MOP |
| 895 | Yvonne | Irving | MOP |
| 896 | Bernard | Prescott | MOP |
| 897 | Alan | Brett | MOP |
| 898 | Geraldine | Brett | MOP |
| 899 | Fay | Rooke | MOP |
| 900 | David | Shore | MOP |
| 901 | Linda | Shore | MOP |
| 902 | J | Houghton | MOP |
| 903 | Richard | Houghton | MOP |
| 904 | P | Cullen | MOP |
| 905 | E | Brownlee | MOP |
| 906 | Suzanne | Williams | MOP |
| 907 | D | Brodie | MOP |
| 908 | Michael | Cullen | MOP |
| 909 | Carole | Dean | MOP |
| 910 | FM | Humpreys | MOP |
| 911 | G | Jackson | MOP |
| 912 | L&A | Curlett and Lander | MOP |
| 913 | Iris | Cross | MOP |
| 914 | VA | Hignett | MOP |
| 915 | Frank | Douglas | MOP |
| 916 | P | Richardson | MOP |
| 917 | Carol | Duty | MOP |
| 918 | J | Parker | MOP |
| 919 | P | Parker | MOP |
| 920 | Derek | Smith | MOP |
| 921 | Linda | Smith | MOP |
| 922 | AN | Pawson | MOP |
| 923 | John | Hankinson | MOP |
| 924 | MA | Iliff | MOP |
| 925 | William | Valentine | MOP |
| 926 | JE | Thompson | MOP |
| 927 | D | Anderson | MOP |
| 928 | R | Anderson | MOP |
| 929 | | Ellison | MOP |
| 930 | Janice | Court | MOP |
| 931 | Philip | Cassidy | MOP |
| 932 | E | Brady | MOP |
| 933 | D | Barker | MOP |
| 934 | Jean | Cole | MOP |
| 935 | David | Cowley | MOP |
| 936 | John | Mullen | MOP |
| 937 | S | Wright | MOP |
| 938 | JR | Young | MOP |
| 939 | C | Young | MOP |

| | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----------|-----|
| 940 | G | Williams | MOP |
| 941 | Nikolai | Smith | MOP |
| 942 | Janet | Watson | MOP |
| 943 | Linda | Poole | MOP |
| 944 | S | Pendleton | MOP |
| 945 | P | Anthony | MOP |
| 946 | P | Thompson | MOP |
| 947 | JG | Blair | MOP |
| 948 | D | Bradley | MOP |
| 949 | Maureen | Brady | MOP |
| 950 | DJ | Simpson | MOP |
| 951 | S | Mutch | MOP |
| 952 | Matthew | Smith | MOP |
| 953 | Lesley | Smith | MOP |
| 954 | T | Williams | MOP |
| 955 | E | Williams | MOP |
| 956 | N and J | West | MOP |
| 957 | Irene | Webster | MOP |
| 958 | P | Waring | MOP |
| 959 | Christine | Walker | MOP |
| 960 | I R | Vaudrey | MOP |
| 961 | M | Vaudrey | MOP |
| 962 | F and NP | Thornton | MOP |
| 963 | J | Sullivan | MOP |
| 964 | HJ | Sparkhill | MOP |
| 965 | Tracy | Mallard | MOP |
| 966 | A | O'Brien | MOP |
| 967 | Peter | Matthews | MOP |
| 968 | N | Matthews | MOP |
| 969 | R&G | Lowe | MOP |
| 970 | S | Lee | MOP |
| 971 | M | Kearney | MOP |
| 972 | ME | Jones | MOP |
| 973 | GM | H | MOP |
| 974 | Paul | Lavin | MOP |
| 975 | K | Frey | MOP |
| 976 | J | Lammond | MOP |
| 977 | JE | Lammond | MOP |
| 978 | A | Glover | MOP |
| 979 | Mary | Kirkwood | MOP |
| 980 | V | Houghton | MOP |
| 981 | Maureen | Kinsella | MOP |
| 982 | Sylvia | Smith | MOP |
| 983 | M | Kilroe | MOP |
| 984 | J and S | Lawton | MOP |
| 985 | Valerie | Jukes | MOP |
| 986 | B | Jukes | MOP |

| | | | | |
|------|-------------|-----------|---------------------------------|-----|
| 987 | Terri | Young | | MOP |
| 988 | P | Jones | | MOP |
| 989 | George | Brownlee | | MOP |
| 990 | JD | Jones | | MOP |
| 991 | M | Jones | | MOP |
| 992 | E | Hughes | | MOP |
| 993 | Helen | Jones | | MOP |
| 994 | Susan | Hughes | | MOP |
| 995 | HH | Jones | | MOP |
| 996 | E | Jones | | MOP |
| 997 | Mervyn | Jones | | MOP |
| 998 | Brenda | Jones | | MOP |
| 999 | Pauline | Irving | | MOP |
| 1000 | Elizabeth | Wilson | | MOP |
| 1001 | Blair | Hilton | | MOP |
| 1002 | Jan and Ted | Murray | | MOP |
| 1003 | R | Rodriguez | | MOP |
| 1004 | M | Belshaw | | MOP |
| 1005 | Paul | Radcliffe | | MOP |
| 1006 | John | Colson | | MOP |
| 1007 | D | Armstrong | | MOP |
| 1008 | Gregory | Thomas | | MOP |
| 1009 | Alison | Doran | | MOP |
| 1010 | Michael | Weild | | MOP |
| 1011 | WJR | Stuttard | | MOP |
| 1012 | Anne | Swales | | MOP |
| 1013 | Daniel | Lewis | | MOP |
| 1014 | Peter | Dewhurst | | MOP |
| 1015 | Janice | Doyle | | MOP |
| 1016 | Robert | Ketchell | | MOP |
| 1017 | Norma | Ketchell | | MOP |
| 1018 | | Hewir | | MOP |
| 1019 | R | McCann | | MOP |
| 1020 | Susan | McCann | | MOP |
| 1021 | | | The 'Consortia' at Maghull East | LAN |
| 1022 | Stephen | McCloskey | | MOP |
| 1023 | Derek | Baxter | | MOP |
| 1024 | Paul | O'Toole | | MOP |
| 1025 | Eric | Woodcock | | MOP |
| 1026 | John | Williams | | MOP |
| 1027 | David | Cobham | | MOP |
| 1028 | Lee | Ashall | | MOP |
| 1029 | Alexandra | Holmes | | MOP |
| 1030 | Helen | Hardman | | MOP |
| 1031 | Janet | Roberts | | MOP |
| 1032 | Brian | Lea | | MOP |
| 1033 | Sharon and | Edwards | | MOP |

| | | | | |
|------|------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|-----|
| | Alfred | | | |
| 1034 | Stephen | Giles | | MOP |
| 1035 | Diane | Culverhouse | | MOP |
| 1036 | Brian and Christine | McDonald | | MOP |
| 1037 | Marilyn | Griffiths | | MOP |
| 1038 | Anthony | Griffiths | | MOP |
| 1039 | John | Nichols | | MOP |
| 1040 | Lynne | Randalls | | MOP |
| 1041 | W | Wilkinson | | MOP |
| 1042 | Frank | Vaughan | | MOP |
| 1043 | M | Jones | | MOP |
| 1044 | Julie | Preston | Lynton Road Residents | MOP |
| 1045 | Carolyn | Platt | | MOP |
| 1046 | CN | Jones | | MOP |
| 1047 | Linda | Rushton | | MOP |
| 1048 | Jackie | McGovern | | MOP |
| 1049 | James | Rimmer | | MOP |
| 1050 | Francis | Roberts | | MOP |
| 1051 | David | Evans | | MOP |
| 1052 | John | Milnes | | MOP |
| 1053 | David | Mannheim | | MOP |
| 1054 | Barnaby | Wylder | | MOP |
| 1055 | Laura | Lattimer | | MOP |
| 1056 | Elizabeth | Glover | | MOP |
| 1057 | Peter | Ostenfeld | | MOP |
| 1058 | Christine | Lattimer | | MOP |
| 1059 | D | Barker | | MOP |
| 1060 | RS and NC | Holt | | MOP |
| 1061 | Michael | Follett | | MOP |
| 1062 | Therese | Forfar | | MOP |
| 1063 | CD & AN | Abberley | | MOP |
| 1064 | Hazel | Burt | | MOP |
| 1065 | Christine | McGregor | | MOP |
| 1066 | Chris | Jones | | MOP |
| 1067 | BA | Connolly | | MOP |
| 1068 | Ben | Albanese | | MOP |
| 1069 | A | Wilson | | MOP |
| 1070 | Jane | Cunningham | | MOP |
| 1071 | Ann | Woods | | MOP |
| 1072 | F&M | Hyland | | MOP |
| 1073 | Gerry | Woods | | MOP |
| 1074 | Pamela | Stones | | MOP |
| 1075 | P | Abbott | | MOP |
| 1076 | PH | Fowler | | MOP |
| 1077 | Z | Fowler | | MOP |
| 1078 | MG | Clarke | | MOP |

| | | | |
|------|--------------|-----------|-----|
| 1079 | Howard | Hayden | MOP |
| 1080 | Lyn | Tunstall | MOP |
| 1081 | A | Halsall | MOP |
| 1082 | Andrew | Horrocks | MOP |
| 1083 | David | Bamber | MOP |
| 1084 | Alan | Bolton | MOP |
| 1085 | | Berry | MOP |
| 1086 | A | Miller | MOP |
| 1087 | Jonathan | Lock | MOP |
| 1088 | A F | Jones | MOP |
| 1089 | Edna | Lawley | MOP |
| 1090 | J | Cleary | MOP |
| 1091 | L | Green | MOP |
| 1092 | Mawdsley | | MOP |
| 1093 | Ian | Gregory | MOP |
| 1094 | BE | Karran | MOP |
| 1095 | Susan | Mooney | MOP |
| 1096 | Stephen/Lynn | Collins | MOP |
| 1097 | C | Wilson | MOP |
| 1098 | William | Driscoll | MOP |
| 1099 | David | McGarvey | MOP |
| 1100 | Erica | Skelton | MOP |
| 1101 | Pam | Quigley | MOP |
| 1102 | Tony | Thomas | MOP |
| 1103 | J | Hallahan | MOP |
| 1105 | Sue | Cutts | MOP |
| 1106 | Ian | Doyle | MOP |
| 1107 | John | Hart | MOP |
| 1108 | B | Thomas | MOP |
| 1109 | Steven | Glanister | MOP |
| 1110 | S | Noon | MOP |
| 1111 | PJ | Noon | MOP |
| 1112 | A | Owens | MOP |
| 1113 | JV | Copeland | MOP |
| 1114 | | O'Connor | MOP |
| 1115 | B | McCarthy | MOP |
| 1116 | Debbie | Ritchie | MOP |
| 1117 | Ann | Powell | MOP |
| 1118 | A | Harland | MOP |
| 1119 | John | Higgins | MOP |
| 1120 | Mona P | Fletcher | MOP |
| 1121 | Paul | Lamb | MOP |
| 1122 | C | Collinge | MOP |
| 1123 | Tim | Ritchie | MOP |
| 1125 | K | Milward | MOP |
| 1126 | Maggie | Hannigan | MOP |
| 1127 | Elaine | Butchard | MOP |

| | | | |
|------|-------------------|---------------|-----|
| 1128 | L and T | Shaffrey | MOP |
| 1129 | Cheryl and Wayne | Kevan | MOP |
| 1130 | M | Egerton-Jones | MOP |
| 1131 | Barbara and Roy | Nickson | MOP |
| 1132 | Graham and Amanda | Murphy | MOP |
| 1133 | C | Lomax | MOP |
| 1134 | Gill | Jones | MOP |
| 1135 | Joseph | Earley | MOP |
| 1136 | Terry | Magee | MOP |
| 1137 | T | Maloney | MOP |
| 1138 | B&J | Mullholland | MOP |
| 1139 | James | Barrett | MOP |
| 1140 | Audrey | Veller | MOP |
| 1141 | M | Marsh | MOP |
| 1142 | Elise | McDonald | MOP |
| 1143 | Henry | McDonald | MOP |
| 1144 | V | Davies | MOP |
| 1145 | Louise | Horrocks | MOP |
| 1146 | Carol | Mosey | MOP |
| 1147 | Gillian | Woods | MOP |
| 1148 | Pam | Kinnear | MOP |
| 1149 | Kenneth | Robinson | MOP |
| 1150 | Ian | Moorcroft | MOP |
| 1151 | J | Al Ramadhan | MOP |
| 1152 | Janet | Flannery | MOP |
| 1153 | | Whiley | MOP |
| 1154 | Hugh | Porter | MOP |
| 1155 | T | Robb | MOP |
| 1156 | | Quinn | MOP |
| 1157 | J | Buchan | MOP |
| 1158 | C | Cuddy | MOP |
| 1159 | Julie | Elliot | MOP |
| 1160 | A | Claus | MOP |
| 1161 | K&A | Joy | MOP |
| 1162 | Helen | Carr | MOP |
| 1163 | Derrick | Martin | MOP |
| 1164 | Alex | Pruden | MOP |
| 1165 | P&D | Hendrick | MOP |
| 1166 | John | Hillier | MOP |
| 1167 | Philip | Ledwidge | MOP |
| 1168 | Graham | Pugh | MOP |
| 1169 | Pauline | Oakley | MOP |
| 1170 | K | Heron | MOP |
| 1171 | Joanne | Witterick | MOP |

| | | | |
|------|-----------|------------|-----|
| 1172 | Elizabeth | Mitchell | MOP |
| 1173 | Jacqui | Neill | MOP |
| 1174 | C | Armstrong | MOP |
| 1175 | Alan | Unsworth | MOP |
| 1176 | C | Clarke | MOP |
| 1177 | Phil | King | MOP |
| 1178 | Terence | Clarke | MOP |
| 1179 | B | Carr | MOP |
| 1180 | Clare | Hobson | MOP |
| 1181 | Frank | Armstrong | MOP |
| 1182 | Stephen | Bird | MOP |
| 1183 | R | Soo | MOP |
| 1184 | | Elliott | MOP |
| 1185 | P | Hulme | MOP |
| 1186 | Caroline | Connell | MOP |
| 1187 | P | Corrigan | MOP |
| 1188 | Joanne | Harris | MOP |
| 1189 | John | Harnick | MOP |
| 1190 | | Collins | MOP |
| 1191 | | | MOP |
| 1192 | Joyce | Tanner | MOP |
| 1193 | John | Wilson | MOP |
| 1194 | | Chadwick | MOP |
| 1195 | Joyce | Tanner | MOP |
| 1196 | J | Nelson | MOP |
| 1197 | | Blakeman | MOP |
| 1198 | E | Martin | MOP |
| 1199 | Sarah | Aldwinckle | MOP |
| 1200 | Louise | Sneddon | MOP |
| 1201 | Steven | Gerard | MOP |
| 1202 | | Birchall | MOP |
| 1203 | Eddie | Bucknall | MOP |
| 1204 | Pauline | Mac | MOP |
| 1205 | Kevin | Hermanson | MOP |
| 1206 | Gary | Reid | MOP |
| 1207 | | Collins | MOP |
| 1208 | Nicola | Murphy | MOP |
| 1209 | Robert | Aldwinckle | MOP |
| 1210 | Ann | Gilpin | MOP |
| 1211 | Mark | Gilpin | MOP |
| 1212 | Marilyn | Connell | MOP |
| 1213 | Paul | Milliken | MOP |
| 1214 | Gillian | Doherty | MOP |
| 1215 | Herbert J | Dowell | MOP |
| 1216 | Samantha | Owens | MOP |
| 1217 | Mr&Mrs | Scully | MOP |
| 1218 | Beryl | Ireland | MOP |

| | | | |
|------|-------------------|------------------|-----|
| 1219 | Lawrence | Reeves | MOP |
| 1220 | | Slater | MOP |
| 1221 | Les | Mooney | MOP |
| 1222 | Lynne | Hughes | MOP |
| 1223 | Louise | Hughes | MOP |
| 1224 | Marion | Simmons | MOP |
| 1225 | J | Hargreaves-Brady | MOP |
| 1226 | Sid, Lil and Lucy | Blakeman | MOP |
| 1227 | Phil | Quinn | MOP |
| 1228 | C | Mason | MOP |
| 1229 | V | Jarvis | MOP |
| 1230 | S&D | Lamb | MOP |
| 1231 | A | Perry | MOP |
| 1232 | Diane | Oconnell | MOP |
| 1233 | Sarah | Stott | MOP |
| 1234 | David | Knowles | MOP |
| 1235 | J | Mcnab | MOP |
| 1236 | R | Kurs | MOP |
| 1237 | Graeme | Teague | MOP |
| 1238 | B | Mullholland | MOP |
| 1239 | Robert | Warrilow | MOP |
| 1240 | Anthony | | MOP |
| 1241 | Vicky and Mark | | MOP |
| 1242 | R | Hudson | MOP |
| 1243 | Alistair | Neely | MOP |
| 1244 | G | Lee | MOP |
| 1245 | | Clavis | MOP |
| 1246 | Stephen | Baines | MOP |
| 1247 | Steve | Shaw | MOP |
| 1248 | T | Carter | MOP |
| 1249 | P | Chadwick | MOP |
| 1250 | R&J | Molloy | MOP |
| 1251 | Lynda | Robinson | MOP |
| 1252 | H | Carberry | MOP |
| 1253 | Kevin | Carberry | MOP |
| 1254 | Graham | Cutts | MOP |
| 1255 | M | Raworth | MOP |
| 1256 | Colin | Sharrock | MOP |
| 1257 | Sandra | Lackey | MOP |
| 1258 | D | Beaumont | MOP |
| 1259 | Eileen | Pennington | MOP |
| 1260 | Rachel | Tomlinson | MOP |
| 1261 | Mike | Rawling | MOP |
| 1262 | Vicky | Magill | MOP |
| 1263 | Carmen | Nickless | MOP |
| 1264 | S | Lawless | MOP |

| | | | | |
|------|---------------------|-----------------------|--|-----|
| 1265 | Julia | Boynton | | MOP |
| 1266 | P&L | Clarke | | MOP |
| 1267 | Stacey | Barrington | | MOP |
| 1268 | Lindsay | Rea | | MOP |
| 1269 | P | Anderson | | MOP |
| 1270 | Lyn | Joyce | | MOP |
| 1271 | Anthony | Beyga | | MOP |
| 1272 | Peter | McDermott | | MOP |
| 1273 | C | Bartley | | MOP |
| 1274 | Sarah | Powell | | MOP |
| 1275 | Dawn | McDermott | | MOP |
| 1276 | | Harris | | MOP |
| 1277 | | Holdsworth | | MOP |
| 1278 | Philip | Marsh | | MOP |
| 1279 | | Owens | | MOP |
| 1280 | Len and Jo | Maguire and Broughton | | MOP |
| 1281 | Jennifer | Leavitt | | MOP |
| 1282 | Wendy | Edward | | MOP |
| 1283 | Louis | Barnett | | MOP |
| 1284 | V | White | | MOP |
| 1285 | Deirdre and Brian J | Chessar | | MOP |
| 1286 | AW and MW | Bullock | | MOP |
| 1287 | I | Roby | | MOP |
| 1288 | J.A. | Hawkesworth | | MOP |
| 1289 | | Trees | | MOP |
| 1290 | Pauline and Peter | Gibney | | MOP |
| 1291 | | | | MOP |
| 1292 | Patrcia | Jeffrey | | MOP |
| 1293 | B | Spencer | | MOP |
| 1294 | | | | MOP |
| 1295 | R and BC | Buckton | | MOP |
| 1296 | J | Moult | | MOP |
| 1297 | R | Rennie | | MOP |
| 1298 | | | | MOP |
| 1299 | | | | PET |
| 1300 | | | | PET |
| 1301 | | | | PET |
| 1302 | Gillian & Leslie | Street | | MOP |
| 1303 | Mr, Mrs and Miss | Cahill | | MOP |
| 1304 | A&A | Blanchard | | MOP |
| 1305 | Marie & Tom | McVeigh | | MOP |