

ALDCLIFFE with STODDAY PARISH COUNCIL



Derek Whiteway, Clerk to the Council
122 North Wing, The Residence
Kershaw Drive
Lancaster
LA1 3TF

Tel: 01524 64908 (Home)
07805 260976 (Mobile)
Email: clerk@aldcliffewithstoddaypc.org
Website: www.aldcliffewithstoddaypc.org

Planning and Housing Strategy Team
Planning & Place
Lancaster City Council

By Email to planningpolicy@lancaster.gov.uk

20th January 2023

Dear Sirs

LANCASTER SOUTH AREA ACTION PLAN (LSAAP) CONSULTATION: TOPIC PAPERS

Thank you for your invitation to comment on the LSAAP topic papers and for allowing the Parish Council extra time in which to submit its response. The attached responses were considered and agreed by Councillors at the Parish Council's meeting on 17th January 2023. The document includes responses to topic papers 1,2,4,5 and 6 (no response is submitted to topic paper 3).

Councillors feel compelled to express concerns over the number of asterisked items in the Evidence Base table which are ongoing or still to be commissioned. Some of these, for example Viability Assessment, Drainage Strategy, Highways Assessment and Housing Strategy, are absolutely critical to the Plan and the Parish Council feels they should have been completed, or at least started, prior to the draft Area Plan being written and consulted on. Councillors hold the view that any one of these evidence pieces could reveal a game-changing issue which might substantively alter the focus or extent of the Area Plan.

Yours faithfully,

Derek Whiteway
Clerk to the Parish Council

DISCLAIMER: The information in this message is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this message by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, or distribution of the message, or any action or omission taken by you in reliance on it, is prohibited and may be unlawful. As a public body, Aldcliffe with Stodday Parish Council may be required to disclose this letter (or any response to it) under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, unless the information is covered by one of the exemptions in the Act.

Please immediately contact the sender if you have received this message in error. Thank you

LANCASTER SOUTH AREA ACTION PLAN (LSAAP) CONSULTATION: TOPIC PAPERS

CONSULTATION RESPONSE SUBMITTED BY ALDCLIFFE WITH STODDAY PARISH COUNCIL, 20TH JANUARY 2023

TOPIC PAPER 1: ESTABLISHING A DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR GROWTH

Question T1.1: Do you feel that the evidence base identified in Table 4.1 (NB should be 4.2.1) represents a reasonable and proportional basis to prepare the Lancaster South Area Action Plan? If not, what gaps in evidence do you think are missing?

There are a number of asterisked items in the Evidence Base table which indicate they are ongoing or still to be commissioned. Some of these, for example Viability Assessment, Drainage Strategy, Highways Assessment and Housing Strategy, are absolutely critical to the Plan and it is baffling they that they have not been completed, or even started, prior to the draft Area Plan being written and consulted on. What if one or more of these evidence pieces reveals a game-changing issue which might alter the focus or extent of the Area Plan?

There doesn't appear to be anything in this evidence list by way of local education and health services strategies and studies. For parishioners in Aldcliffe with Stodday, there are key questions about provision of these and other facilities in the context of already stretched health centres, hospitals and schools. We note that these topics are covered in paper 6, but given their importance, perhaps they should also feature in Paper 1.

Likewise, there is little or no mention of sewage strategy. As the main wastewater treatment for the Lancaster district lies in our parish, we are keen to be assured that a viable strategy with United Utilities has been agreed and will not lead to a) significant additional traffic on local lanes, which are already dangerous (see responses to Topic Paper 2) and b) environmental damage arising from increased capacity at the works. Furthermore, the Parish Council is highly conscious of geographical constraints to expansion of the existing site and would oppose any expansion that might have an adverse impact on the surrounding countryside, especially the wooded area on the eastern border of the site.

T1.2: Do you agree with the proposed vision for the Area Action Plan? Are there any issues or opportunities which you feel have been missed from the vision?

It's hard to argue against the broad themes in the vision, however we would argue with the central premise that a development of the size of the Garden Village is required. The enormous environmental impact of the project and the massive, and still spiralling, costs involved in delivery of the infrastructure are just two reasons for our ongoing opposition to the development.

Question T1.3: Do you agree that the Objectives set out in this Paper accurately reflect the Key Growth Principles set out in Policy SG1 of the Strategic Policies & Land Allocations DPD and the Vision? If not, what areas have not been covered, providing suggestion of how they might be considered.

Here again, it's difficult to argue with the objectives in and of themselves, however the task of implementing many of them, in the context of national and local economic challenges, and lack of enforcement to require developers to build to these standards, is likely to make many of them unachievable.

Referring back to our response to question T1.1, until the evidence on key items around existing natural environment is complete, surely it is not possible to say that x and y 'will' happen?

Objectives 1 and 4 refer to the separation of Garden Village/new housing and existing settlements. The Area Plan is therefore already too late in this regard as developers are applying, and in some cases succeeding, in building on land designated as 'Green Halo' in the plans.

Question T1.4: Do you agree with the proposed starting point in terms of the Geographical Scope for the Lancaster South Area Action Plan? If not, please explain your preferred approach and the rationale for your choice

Prefer Approach A

Question T1.5: Do you agree with the proposed starting point in terms of the timescales for the Lancaster South Area Action Plan? If not, please explain your preferred approach and the rationale for your choice.

Prefer Approach B

Question T1.6: Do you agree with the proposed starting point in terms of the starting point for achieving the quantum of development proposed within the 'Broad Location for Growth' as per the expectations of Policy SG1 of the Strategic Policies & Land Allocations DPD? If not, please explain your preferred approach and the rationale for your choice.

We are still struggling to understand how the various numbers quoted in the draft LSAAP document were arrived at and, critically, what is the final agreed number and how was this calculated. Even allowing for the removal of the southern area of projected development in the JTP Masterplan, there are still a variety of figures in the document from 2,500 to 4,300 homes (local plan) to 5,000 homes (Masterplan). This is made all the more puzzling when LCC acknowledged that in order to comply with the HIF bid, a figure nearer 9,000 homes would be required.

Question T1.7: Do you agree with the proposed starting point in terms of the provision of a diverse mix of development densities within the 'Broad Location for Growth'?

LCC prefer approach B: That the Area Action Plan should look toward a balance of high- and low-density development across the 'Broad Location for Growth' which seek to achieve the positive benefits described in Approaches A and C. This would seem sensible, however given the pressure on water services and necessary flooding mitigations, Approach C (That the Area Action Plan should look towards low density development across the 'Broad Location for Growth' which would reduce the quantum of development which could be achieved but would increase space for Green and Blue Infrastructure) ultimately might have to be implemented.

Question T1.8: Do you agree with the proposed starting point in terms of the provision of a diverse mix of development densities within the ‘Broad Location for Growth’?

Hard to disagree with the proposed mix although the likelihood of high costs and developer (un)willingness to build affordable housing makes this an aspiration rather than a likely end-point.

Question T1.9: Do you consider that the Area Action Plan should seek to allocate land for employment purposes in South Lancaster? What types of employment should be promoted in this location and why?

Yes, employment opportunities should be an integrated part of any development. Employment development should be sustainable and not attract high traffic flows to add to existing transport problems (see our responses to Topic Paper 2: Travel and Transport).

Question T1.10: What do you consider the key elements of a local centre to consist of? Do you agree that it should be located centrally within the new Garden Village?

See responses to Topic Paper 6

Question T1.11: Do you agree with the proposed starting point in terms of the identification of Areas of Separation? If not, please explain your preferred approach and rationale for your choice.

We support Approach B (Allocation of areas of separation to the north and south of the Garden Village providing clear boundaries which prohibit development within them which would impact on the ability to maintain a physical and visual separation from existing settlements and the Garden Village. In exploring Approach B, the Council would be keen to understand from consultees how these areas should be identified and what factors should be used to determine appropriate boundaries.)

Existing settlements should have their character and environments protected from development. As a parish on the western boundary of the Growth Area and BGV, we would also strongly support an area of separation to the west (i.e. along the east side of the A588) as a number of dwellings and businesses in the parish would be severely affected by visual and noise impact. We would wish to be consulted on the design and siting of these areas of separation.

Question T1.12: Do you agree that the Area Action Plan should consider development opportunities for urban extensions beyond development of a Garden Village? Please explain your rationale for your opinion.

As stated in the response to Question 2, our comments are based on the principle that we do not believe that development in South Lancaster should be on anything like the scale being proposed. We would not wish to see any additional development on Whinney Carr or Bailrigg Lane, however if these areas are included in the AAP then at least any development would have to comply with the design principles set out for the AAP/Garden Village and might be less exposed to individual developers being left to their own devices. Regarding Whinney Carr, if the BGV is built, would this land not be in the proposed “Green Halo”, so building on it would contravene the principles in the BGV proposals?

Question T1.13: Do you agree that a Phasing Plan is a critical component of the future Area Action Plan, have you any views on how phasing should be dealt with in South Lancaster in terms of the approaches taken?

Agree (although phasing will in all likelihood come down to delivery of infrastructure and money rather than planning principles).

Question T1.14: Are there any other points you wish to raise which have not been captured in responses to other questions in this Topic Paper?

The maps presented in this topic paper are out of date. For example, we know that the latest highways plans from County show roads and park and ride facilities in different places from both the original JTP and other maps presented and subsequent maps shared with PC reps at engagement meetings. This paper needs to show the most up-to-date maps and plans in order for respondents to make informed comments.

TOPIC PAPER 2: TRAVEL, TRANSPORT AND SECURING MODAL SHIFT

Questions T2.1, T2.2

We have no comment on these.

Question T2.3: Do you agree that the approach to addressing implications on the local highway network provide a clear and logical approach to this critical matter? Do you feel that the Council should be exploring these issues in an alternative way? If so, please explain your answer

Both the M6 J33 reconfiguration and the Spine Road, due for delivery by 2027 and 2025 respectively are classed as “Critical” in the Topic Paper

Your Local Plan states at Policy SG3, “*In delivering strategic growth in South Lancaster and the Bailrigg Garden Village it is critical that the necessary strategic infrastructure can be delivered, at the appropriate time, to make development acceptable in planning terms and to ensure that both the individual and cumulative impacts on local infrastructure are fully addressed.*” and “*The forthcoming DPD will.....address matters relating to financing and delivery, the phasing of new infrastructure and its specific location.*” We trust that this principle will be applied and that the necessary highways infrastructure improvements are instigated at an early stage.

Although we appreciate that the White Young Green (WYG) Report considers only projected traffic flows with no further development in South Lancaster, it does highlight the main constraints along the A6. Other than the A6 / Hazelrigg junction we understand that the traffic flows considered only refer to projected flows without traffic from the Bailrigg Garden Village (BGV) and that further analyses will be undertaken to evaluate this.

It states that both the Hala / Ashford Roads Junction and the Pointer Roundabout are forecast to operate above capacity by 2023 and improvements will be required by 2023 & 2033, irrespective of the BGV development.

We note that, even without the BGV traffic, a signalled junction is proposed to ease traffic congestion at the Pointer Roundabout, but it suggests that this will not bring traffic flows to acceptable levels, even without the BGV traffic.

Whereas the conceptual drawings representing the Junction 33 re-alignment show the underpass to the West Coast Main Line to be part of this construction, 4.3.1 of Paper 2 suggests that the underpass will be a part of the “spine road” running through the centre of the BGV. We would welcome clarification of this issue. The actual allocation of this underpass to either may affect the timetable for provision.

We do not believe that the underpass of the West Coast Main Line can be achieved within the timescale of the Junction 33 re-configuration (2027), let alone the “spine road” construction (2025) and that it may exceed the more generous timetable by a number of years. Construction of the “spine road” will therefore most likely start at the northern end and construction traffic for this and any dwellings constructed before completion of the underpass will have to use the existing road infrastructure. A significant proportion of the raw materials, particularly for the spine road are likely to come from the north and therefore pass through the city prior to entering the Pointer Roundabout and the A588. Construction traffic from the south will have to enter the Pointer Roundabout before exiting onto the A588. We trust therefore that improvements to the various junctions on the A6 south of the Pointer Roundabout and those to the Pointer Roundabout will be completed before significant construction related to the BGV (including the spine road) has begun.

Whereas the above issues are of general concern to the city, the indirect effects, should these issues not be resolved, are likely to be severe for our parish. We have seen numerous times in the recent past that traffic flow problems in the city and the broader area south of the city can lead to a significant increase in “rat running” through our parish and particularly along Aldcliffe Road, Aldcliffe Lane and Lunecliffe Road, with a likely increase along Stodday Lane and hence through Stodday itself. We have been disappointed that traffic impact assessments for recent housing developments and the Aldi store on Aldcliffe Road have failed to address traffic along the narrow, dangerous and increasingly congested roads through our parish.

We have tried numerous times to resolve issues with parking along the canalside on Aldcliffe Road, which causes congestion and often gridlock when cars travelling in each direction are unable to pass. We suggest that the opportunity be taken to resolve such local issues in addition to those on the main highways.

Paper 2 fails to address the impact of the BGV on the A588 Ashton Road. We draw your attention to the various bottlenecks along this road in addition to the Pointer Roundabout and specifically the pinch point at Royal Albert Cottages, and congestion at Ripley St Thomas School (particularly buses) at the start and end of the school day. There is also the issue of dangerous bends along the whole length of this road, and blind brows at the junctions of Waterside Lane and Lunecliffe Road with the A588. We draw your attention to the recent proposal to install average speed cameras along this stretch of the A588 as being indicative of the highly dangerous nature of the road.

Questions T2.4, T2.5

We have no comment on these

Sustainable Transport

Question T2.6: Do you have any preferred approach from the approaches described? Please give rationale for your answer. Are there any approaches which you think are missing? Please provide further detail on what you believe those approaches to be.

With regard to the proposed Bus Priority Intervention Schemes (BPIS), we are a largely rural parish with no direct access to public transport and therefore largely dependent on car use and this is unlikely to change. We therefore trust that “.....disincentives to using private cars....” will not adversely impact on our parishioners, who have little choice but to use cars.

The WYG report does not consider the introduction of buses only lanes (which appears to be at the centre of the sustainable transport proposals for BGV) at the Pointer Roundabout. There appears to be little scope for providing an additional lane for this purpose. Desirable as dedicated bus lanes may be, we are concerned that this could restrict other traffic to an unacceptable extent with a knock-on effect to traffic through our parish.

Cycling

Fig 6.2 suggests a cycleway along the A588 Ashton Road, bounding the west side of the BGV. We would be interested as to how this will be integrated into the A588, already a dangerous route for all road users and particularly pedestrians and cyclists.

Fig 6.3 suggests a cycle “superhighway” through Stodday, presumably from the Lune Estuary path. The lane from Stodday to the A588 is narrow and unsuitable for both cars and cycles together and therefore it would be unwise to encourage cyclists to use this route.

TOPIC PAPER 4: SECURING GREEN & BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE AND BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN

Question T4.1: Do you feel that the evidence base identified above represents a reasonable and proportional basis for the production of the Lancaster South Area Action Plan from a green and blue infrastructure perspective? If not, what gaps in the evidence do you think are missing?

Yes

Question T4.2: How can we seek to better incorporate/consider the historic environment within our assessment of GBI potential?

We have no particular comment on improvements other than, having gone through the Neighbourhood Plan process we are very conscious of the need to protect the historical environment including appropriate Design Codes.

Question T4.3: Do you agree that the 8 Design Principles set out in the JTP Masterplan represent a logical starting point for understanding how landscape-led development could be achieved across the wider 'Broad Location for Growth'? If not, what would you consider the logical starting point to be?

Yes

Question T4.5: Do you have a preferred approach from those described? Are there any approaches which you think are missing? Please provide further detail on what you believe those approaches to be.

Approach B

Question T4.5: Do you have a preferred approach from those described? Are there any approaches which you think are missing? Please provide further detail on what you believe those approaches to be.

It is not clear from the paper which of the Options the Council prefers. Approach B seems to be the most acceptable

Question T4.7: Do you agree with the Council's preferred approach in relation to the protection of existing habitats? If not, please explain your preferred option and the rationale for your choice.

We have no views on this issue.

Question T4.7: Do you agree with the Council's preferred approach in relation to the protection of existing habitats? If not, please explain your preferred option and the rationale for your choice.

We find the concept of +10% net biodiversity difficult to understand in the context of such a large development, but trust that it is achievable. It seems likely that such gain will have to be off-site and as such, considering the constraints to the east of the BGV and our proximity to the Lune Estuary, may well impact on our parish. Whereas we would welcome increased biodiversity in our parish we would welcome our involvement in this aspect, such that any changes are not detrimental to our parishioners and particularly land owners.

Question T4.9: Do you have any preferred approach from those described? Please give a rationale for your answer. Are there any approaches which you think are missing? Please provide further detail on what you believe those approaches to be.

We do not feel that we are able to comment on this issue.

Question T4.10: Do you agree with the principles of soil protection set out above? Do you feel that any principles are more important than others? Do you foresee any barriers to implementing these principles through planning policy in the AAP?

We agree that the correct handling of soils and development of a “cut-fill balance” will not only be ecologically beneficial but that retention of soils on site and minimising soils sent to landfill will benefit the wider area and our parish by reduction in traffic movements.

Question T4.11 Do you have any preferred approach from those described? Please give a rationale for your answer. Are there any approaches which you think are missing? Please provide further detail on what you believe those approaches to be.

We prefer Approach C

Question T4.12: Are there any other points you wish to raise which have not been capture in responses to other questions in this Topic Paper?

In allocating green spaces which are distributed throughout the BGV we are concerned that the resultant smaller parcels of land will be unsustainable for agricultural use. This could lead to the breakup of these parcels of land into even smaller units. Whereas this may be desirable for some land-use such as orchards and allotments, it can also lead to unsightly development and unauthorised semi-permanent residential development.

TOPIC PAPER 5: WATER MANAGEMENT

Paper 5 has little impact on our Parish and therefore we have limited input to this issue. However, in general terms we wish to be assured that the various comments received from the Parish representatives attending the series of Parish liaison events are considered. In particular, the local knowledge of flooding issues not highlighted by the Environment Agency, as discussed at the meetings, should be taken into account.

TOPIC PAPER 6: CREATING SUSTAINABLE PLACES AND COMMUNITIES

Question T6.1: Do you feel that the evidence base identified in Table 3.1 (should be Table 3.2.1) represents a reasonable and proportional basis for the production of the Lancaster South Area Action Plan? If not what gaps in evidence do you think are missing?

See response to Topic Paper T1.1

Question T6.2: Do you agree with the garden village principles above in the context of achieving a sustainable place and community? Are there any principles which should be considered more valuable in the context of preparing the Area Action Plan? If so why?

Agree.

Question T6.3: Do you agree that issues of design should be considered in the Area Action Plan? How do you feel interested parties should be engaged in relation to design? Should this include the role of workshops to inform matters of design?

Agree that design issues are of primary importance. Workshops could be very useful but, unless the thoughts and feelings of local people are properly taken into consideration, they would be a waste of time. The JTP Consultations with local people were a good example of how not to do it.

Workshops should help create an understanding of the specific housing needs of particular groups with special needs e.g. those who live in affordable housing, self and custom-build housing, housing for vulnerable adults: disabled and mentally unwell, supported communities (both elderly and disabled), and gypsy and traveller communities, to make sure housing provision for these groups is fit for purpose from the outset and that the community is inclusive and somewhere where you could live from 'cradle to grave' whatever might beset your health.

Design review panels incorporating a range of local people (not just from invested parties and local council) would be a good idea.

Question T6.4: Do you feel that the high-level principles set out in the JTP Masterplan provide a reasonable starting point for preparing the Area Action Plan for the wider 'Broad Location for Growth'? Do you feel any of these principles have greater value in terms of the plan-making process? If you do not consider these principles to represent a reasonable starting point what should? Please provide rationale to your response.

Hard to argue against any of these high-level principles although we would like to see a fuller explanation of point 8 (the reference to 'countryside hamlets outside' in particular). Could add principles around availability and proximity of education and health facilities. Principles 1, 2,3, 7 and 8 are of particular interest to a neighbouring parish such as ours.

Question T6.5: Do you agree that the National Design Guide provides a logical and robust starting point for the creation of well-designed places, spaces and buildings? If not why not and what should an alternative starting point be?

Agree. Characteristic No. 10 (Homes and Buildings) is silent on environmental impact. Perhaps a note could be added to strengthen the specifics about aspiring to Passivhaus-standard homes etc. as put forward in Topic Paper 3.

Question T6.6: Do you agree that this provides the appropriate starting point to address the issues of design within the Action Plan? If not, which approach do you think would be preferable? Do the approaches presented represent all available approaches to the Council in relation to this matter?

Prefer Approach A, i.e. making use of the principles contained in the JTP Masterplan and National Design Guidance to provide a starting point to design which is both consistent with national direction on design but also locally specific. This will be expressed through a detailed Design Code which supports the Plan. Without prescription, developers can and will do their own thing as far as they can, leading to a mish-mash of designs and lack of attention to environmental and other considerations. If the Design Code is well researched and written, it will still allow for change in construction techniques and emerging technologies.

Question T6.7: Do you feel that there are any aspects of infrastructure missing? Do you consider that any elements of the infrastructure referred to in Figure 5.1 (should be 5.3.1) which should have a priority in terms of delivering in South Lancaster? Please provide rationale to your response.

Agree with all of the core aspects. Assumption that *pre-school care/education* will come in the Education Provision although there is no mention of this in Paragraph 5.7. Also, there is no mention of provision of services for older people, for example a care/nursing home.

Question T6.8: Do you feel that there are any infrastructure providers that you think are missing from Figure 5.2 (should be 5.4.2)?

The key national providers are included but would it not be useful to identify more *local* providers of key infrastructure, for example NHS England is only one of a range of stakeholders and providers of dental care. Lancashire County Council provides Health Visiting services and Public Health Services, yet these are not included in the table of stakeholders. Their absence would seem a missed opportunity. Public Health, with its focus on health promotions and illness prevention, might help ensure that the design and plan of BGV is ‘right first time’. Health Visiting services are likely to be needed given that 2 primary schools are proposed and presumably some of those children will require input from the HV services in their preschool years?

There is also no representation from the Voluntary sector. A lot of recreation is provided by the voluntary sector from after-school clubs to organisations like the Scout Movement, which might require facilities from which to operate.

Finally, shouldn’t food providers/supermarkets (or those governing them) be included as infrastructure providers?

Question T6.9: Do you have any further views on the Council’s approach to the delivery of infrastructure through the Area Action Plan process?

Paragraph 5.6.1 Healthcare Provision

Whilst consultation with NHS England and local medical practices is an absolute must, possibly overview of service provision with support of the Public Health services (based in Lancashire County Council) might be prudent too.

In Policy SG3 it states: ‘This should seek to investigate the needs for new health facilities within the local centre(s)’

There *will* be a need for new health facilities. No investigation will be needed other than to understand what those needs are so the statement should be a positive commitment to the health of the residents. The risk otherwise is that it will be financial pressures that then drive the delivery rather than a vision of what is required for a sustainable Bailrigg Village for the future.

Paragraph 5.7 Education Provision

'There is evidence that new build developments have higher child yields on average than the housing stock as a whole in early years (e.g. a larger number of families with young children moving in during the early stages) so this needs to be taken into account when setting child yield factors.' (from DfE's Education Provision in Garden Communities' 2020). With this mind, will two new primary schools be sufficient? How is projected provision calculated?

Question T6.9: Do you have any further views on the Council's approach to the delivery of infrastructure through the Area Action Plan process?

Given that this is an opportunity to shape a future community and once this virgin land is built on, it will be gone for all future generations, there is possibly a moral imperative that the plan is visionary and adds to the lives of the people who are resident there. It would be shameful if the plan became a way of addressing current issues because of financial imperatives (e.g. transport links) rather than using this opportunity to plan properly a new community.

Question T6.10: Do you have any preferred approach from those described? Please give rationale for your answer. Are there any approaches to the management of spaces and places which you think are missing? Please provide further detail on what you believe those approaches to be.

On the basis of the arguments put forward in the topic paper, our preference would be Approach B (That places and spaces within the 'Broad Location for Growth' are managed by some form of charitable trust which is accountable to the local community it serves.). As the paper suggests, it is likely that in the initial years, before there is a sizeable community, that some form of council support and governance will be required.

Question T6.11: Which of the ambitions of the JTP Masterplan do you consider to be the most relevant to the preparation of the Area Action Plan? What would that opportunities and challenges to delivering these ambitions? Please explain your rationale to your response

In 7.2.1 The key ambition should be that 'Bailrigg village is a thriving place of work', not a 'to commute from'. Moreover, this should be highlighted earlier in an opening statement rather than hidden in text towards the end of this document. We think it is highly unlikely that the Village will create sufficient employment/home working opportunities to discourage commuting. It is inevitable that a significant proportion of homeowners will commute to either Lancaster city centre or, more likely, to Preston, Manchester and beyond. The building of the new motorway junction, with direct access to the Village, would seem to support commuting opportunities.

As there may be fewer opportunities for work directly in the village, possibly making this place an attractive place to live for those already working in Lancaster should be explored. This might involve having higher numbers of properties being assigned to affordable housing and targeted for key workers already working in Lancaster. Although the focus on work is understandable, other aspects of life and how this area will support its residents should also be explored: what happens if something befalls a resident whether it be ill health or old age, meaning that they can no longer

reside in their home? Will there be appropriate alternative accommodation in the Village so that they can continue to live in their own community?

Although the Village landscape and ‘active town centre/hubs’ may provide a few opportunities, these are unlikely to support more than a few percent of the population. Provision of spaces for hot-desking is to be encouraged although here again this might affect only a very small proportion of the workforce.

Designing homes suitable for use as home offices is an interesting concept, but how many developers are going to consider adding private study/office space? It would be good to find out if any of the developers earmarked for the BGV have built such homes. The move towards (downstairs) open plan homes (less structural cost) would suggest that prospective dwellers would need to consider a home with an additional bedroom to turn into a home office space, something which many would find unaffordable.

Question T6.12: Do you consider the economic sectors describe represent reasonable and appropriate types of employment for South Lancaster. If not why not? Please provide rationale to your response.

The economic sectors listed are reasonable. There is an issue with the data. The DLP Strategy report was completed in September 2022, however all of the data for the economic projections was produced prior to the economic downturn in summer/autumn 2022. Surely the report should be reviewed in the light of *current* data, forecasts and global trends?

Question T6.13: Do you have any preferred approach from those described? Please give rationale for your answer. Are there any approaches to the delivery of employment which you think are missing? Please provide further detail on what you believe those approaches to be.

Probably Approach B or C BUT here again, the data and projections will need to be reviewed in the light of recent economic events.

Question T6.14: Do you consider the indicative housing mix within the Local Plan to be a correct and appropriate starting point for understanding the housing mix required within the ‘Broad Location for Growth’? If not, why not. Please provide rationale for your answer.

Figure 8.1 is attempting to cover two issues and is therefore unclear. In terms of housing mix, only the first two columns (Property Type and Marketing Housing%) are applicable. The affordable housing% column should be disaggregated into a new table in paragraph 8.2.

Looking at the percentage mix, shouldn’t the figure for flat/apartment be higher than 10%, particularly as the 2-bedroom house % is only 20% (30% ‘smaller homes’ in total)?

In addition, specific types of housing which will be important for a sustainable community are missing: supported accommodation for the elderly and those with additional health needs.

Question T6.15: Do you believe that the Local Plan threshold of 30% represents a reasonable starting point for understanding the affordable housing requirements within the ‘Broad Location for Growth’. Given the context for development in this area do you think the affordable housing requirements should be higher or lower than the Local Plan position? Please explain your rationale for your answer

30% is a good starting point. The question remains whether, as at other sites, developers will find ways of getting around building affordable homes due to building conditions, profit margins etc.

Question T6.16: Do you feel that the types of housing which are set out in this Section represent all types of housing which should be explored within the 'Broad Location for Growth'? Are there any types of housing which are missing from this section which should be considered?

Broadly agree. Provision for care for the elderly and those with particular needs should be an important feature of any development of this scale. Community-led housing is also to be encouraged, particularly as there are good examples in the Lancaster area from which to learn.

Question T6.17: Do you agree with the inclusion of a new Local Centre as part of development within the 'Broad Location for Growth'? What do you consider to be the most important elements of any local centre?

Yes, there MUST be a local centre providing shops and services. This is particularly important for those with young families, people with disabilities and older people who may not be able to access services outside of the village as easily. Typical services must include: health centre, post office (not just a postbox), newsagent, grocery shop, bakery, greengrocer, butcher, cash machine, barber/hairdresser, DIY shop.

Question T6.18: Do you feel that the provision of a new foodstore is an important element of the development proposed in South Lancaster?

It would be a shame if a large supermarket took away business from the (community-led) local centre. Any large foodstore would need to complement, rather than compete against, local stores.

Question T6.19: Do you have any preferred approach from those described? Please give rationale for your answer. Are there any approaches to local centre provision which you think are missing? Please provide further detail on what you believe those approaches to be.

Approach B seems the most sensible. Approach C would lead to even greater traffic flows and other environmental impacts.