

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Summary of Preferred Option Representations September 2012

Site Address	Settlement	Council Proposed Use	Support	Object	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations	Site Allocation Reference
Grove Farm, Railway Road	Adlington	Mixed use		3		Residents object to housing at this site on traffic/congestion/access/amenity/loss of wildlife and housing type grounds, residents also states the site is only accessibly by private car and is not suited to walkers/cyclists and public transport users.	HS1.27
Land Adjacent to Bolton Road	Adlington	Mixed use	3	12	2	<p>HOUSING</p> <p>Residents object to housing and employment use on traffic/congestion/amenity ecology grounds, and it will affect existing residential properties</p> <p>EMPLOYMENT</p> <p>Site is not suitable for an employment allocation as incompatible with site. The need for additional employment development at this location is highly questionable. Given the 'backland' character of the site and its proximity to existing residential uses employment use is likely to be economically unviable given its lack of prominence and main road frontage which is considered necessary to deliver an attractive commercial proposition. Inappropriate access route to the site, the lack of site prominence, lack of main road frontage and site topography..</p> <p>Residents object to housing and employment use on traffic/congestion/amenity ecology grounds, and it will affect existing residential properties. Also there are already industrial units for sale or rent in the Chorley area. Need to further assess market for new employment floor space in Adlington.</p>	HS1.28 EP1.17
			0	12	2		
Land at Babylon Lane	Adlington	Housing	3	474	2	Development would change the rural character of the area. Loss of mature trees, some of which have TPOs. Loss of the Band Hut which is a practice venue for the local brass band.	HS1.29

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Site Address	Settlement	Council Proposed Use	Support	Object	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations	Site Allocation Reference
						<p>There are existing traffic problems on Babylon Lane and it is reduced to a single lane for long stretches due to residents parking. Development would make this worse and there would be an increase in potential road traffic accidents, especially as there is a school nearby.</p> <p>Development would lead to the destruction of a valuable wildlife habitat. Services in Adlington such as schools and doctors are already full.</p> <p>The site is enjoyed by residents for recreational use.</p> <p>The site is subject to flooding when it rains and if the site was developed there would be further pressure on the natural drainage system.</p> <p>Development would decrease the value of surrounding properties and lead to overlooking and loss of privacy.</p>	
Remainder of Fairview Farm	Adlington	Housing				No representations received	HS1.30
Weldbank Plastics	Adlington	Housing	0	0	1	There are a number of other constraints that would impact upon any subsequent proposals on this proposed allocation, but which we do not consider would prevent the development of the site in principle: These sites border an Ordinary Watercourse, and a sufficient buffer should be incorporated into the design.	HS1.31
Fairport, Market Place	Adlington	Mixed use			1	Agent acting for owner says Policy EP1 should adopt a more flexible and proactive approach. The site represents a somewhat unique opportunity in Adlington (including that element within the Local Centre).Such an allocation could set out that development in classes A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5 and other main town centre uses would be permitted on that part of the site within the defined Local Centre boundary, and that complementary economic development would be permitted on the remainder of the site	EP1.18
Land off The Common	Adlington	Safeguarded land				No representations received	BNE2.3
Land off Park Road	Adlington	Safeguarded land				No representations received	BNE2.4
Land between Bolton Road and Huyton Lodge	Adlington	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Land at/adjacent	Adlington	---				No representations received	---

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Site Address	Settlement	Council Proposed Use	Support	Object	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations	Site Allocation Reference
to White Bear Marina, Park Road							
Land off Westhoughton Road	Adlington	---				No representations received	---
Red Rose Garage, Westhoughton Road	Adlington	---				No representations received	---
Brook Mill, Brook Street	Adlington	---				No representations received	---
Land Adjacent Buckshaw Primary School	Astley Village	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Chancery Road	Astley Village	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Astley Village Green, Chancery Road	Astley Village	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Land at Drinkwater Farm, Windsor Drive	Brinscall	Housing		3		Residents object to housing on this site due to traffic/flooding and a decline in amenity and services grounds, also residents state the proposal will remove the rural aspect from the village.	HS1.48
Land off Heather Lea Drive	Brinscall	Open space				No representations received	HW1.8
Disused Railway Line from Brinscall to Abbey Village	Brinscall	Cycleway overlaps with LCC cycle route				No representations received	---
Land at Lodge	Brinscall	Await Open				No representations received	---

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Site Address	Settlement	Council Proposed Use	Support	Object	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations	Site Allocation Reference
Bank		Space Study					
Commercial Premises, Hartington Road	Brinscall	---				No representations received	---
Group 4N, Royal Ordnance Site, Euxton Lane	Buckshaw Village	Housing				No representations received	HS1.24
Group 1, Former Royal Ordnance Site, Euxton Lane	Buckshaw Village	Mixed use				No representations received	HS1.25
Southern Commercial	Buckshaw Village	Employment	1			Support the allocation of the Southern Commercial Area, for B1, B2 and B8 uses. However, the allocation boundary does not correspond exactly to the Buckshaw Village design Code Master plan boundary and is closest to the new rail station and the proposed swale.	EP1.16
Perimeter of Buckshaw Village	Buckshaw Village	Cycleway overlaps with LCC cycle route				No representations received	---
Land Rear of Dog & Partridge, Chorley Lane	Charnock Richard	Housing. (Previously discounted at Issues & Options, but site now has planning permission)				No representations received	HS1.49
Coppull New Road	Charnock Richard	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Park Hall Hotel/Camelot Theme Park	Charnock Richard	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Site Address	Settlement	Council Proposed Use	Support	Object	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations	Site Allocation Reference
Eaves Green, off Lower Burgh Lane	Chorley	Housing	2	3		Residents object to housing on this site due to traffic/congestion/loss of wildlife grounds. Residents also object to there being a lack of local services and the site is not within walking distance to a school and housing will detract from the country park feel of the area. The developer and the Home and Community Agency support the allocation.	HS1.1
Carr Lane (Vertex Site)	Chorley	Mixed use		1		EMPLOYMENT Delete employment allocation as site marketed for over 2 years as per planning consent and no market demand. So allocate for housing.	HS1.2 EP1.4
Land off Quarry Road	Chorley	Housing				No representations received	HS1.4
Cowling Mill, Cowling Brow	Chorley	Housing	1	1		The owner of this site supports the allocation and one objection has been received just stating they object. . EA state that site is wholly or partly within Flood Zones 3 or 2, defined by PPS25 as having a high and medium probability of flooding respectively. EA state that if satisfied that this site satisfies PPS25 Sequential Test a level 2 SFRA should be produced to consider the risk of flooding before allocating it for development. In the absence of a Level 2 SFRA, the risk of flooding to the site is unknown and it cannot be determined if it is appropriate for residential development.	HS1.5
Cowling Farm	Chorley	Mixed use		8		6 Objections? To employment and housing allocations. 0 support	HS1.6 EP1.6
Talbot Mill, Froom Street	Chorley	Housing		3		Residents object to housing on this site due to traffic flow/ congestion/ access and existing parking problems in the area.	HS1.8
Land off Froom Street	Chorley	Housing	1	6		Residents object to housing on this site on access/traffic congestion and flow/deliverability and the pressure on local services and amenity grounds. They also object as the site is at risk of flooding. The site owner support the allocation.	HS1.9
West of Blackburn Road	Chorley	Housing	3	22		Residents object to housing on this site on traffic/ noise / poor access to public transport/ wildlife/ flooding and gradient grounds, also residents state the allocation would have a negative impact on the countryside and would as a result bring the urban boundary closer. There is also a small holding at one property which bounds the site on three sides and they are	HS1.10

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Site Address	Settlement	Council Proposed Use	Support	Object	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations	Site Allocation Reference
						concerned their livestock would generate neighbour complaints. The site owner supports this allocation.	
Blackburn Brow	Chorley	Mixed use	2	14		Residents object to housing on this site on traffic/ noise / poor access to public transport/ wildlife/ flooding and gradient grounds, also residents state the allocation would have a negative impact on the countryside and would as a result bring the urban boundary closer. The site owner supports this allocation.	HS1.11
Chancery Way/West Way (Chorley RUFC)	Chorley	Housing/ Open space	2	141	3	The local highway infrastructure, particularly West Way, struggles to cope at present. Further development would worsen this. The site should be protected from development to retain the separation between Astley Village and Euxton. The site provides a valuable recreation use and should be kept for that use. There are concerns that the site would be developed for more social housing and it is considered that Astley Village has enough. There is enough housing in the area with the development at Buckshaw Village.	HS1.12 BNE2.12
Gillibrand	Chorley	Housing				No representations received	HS1.13
Hodder Avenue	Chorley	Housing				No representations received	HS1.14
Park Mills, Deighton Road	Chorley	Housing				No representations received	HS1.15
Commercial Premises, Cottam Street	Chorley	Housing				No representations received	HS1.16
Land off Duke Street	Chorley	Housing	1			One supporting statement has been received for this allocation stating the site is available and the principle of development has been accepted.	HS1.17
Lyons Lane Mill, Townley Street	Chorley	Mixed use				No representations received	HS1.18 EP1.9
Land at Worthy Street/Buchanan Street	Chorley	Housing/ Open space				No representations received	HS1.19
Railway Road	Chorley	Housing				No representations received	HS1.20

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Site Address	Settlement	Council Proposed Use	Support	Object	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations	Site Allocation Reference
Initial Textile Services, Harpers Lane	Chorley	Housing	3			Residents support housing on this site as it will improve the look of the area.	HS1.21
Cabbage Hall Fields	Chorley	Housing				No representations received	HS1.22
Rydal House, Chorley Hall Road	Chorley	Housing				The site owners LCC have extended the site area and have submitted a new site allocation for the new site area.	HS1.23
Botany/Great Knowley	Chorley	Employment/ Recreation/ Green Belt	3	22	1	2 owners want the site allocated for Housing and recreation for canal. Already too much employment in Chorley and area. Ecology and Traffic /congestion issues. Loss of views to Pennine Moors. 3 supports with conditions for employment?.	EP1.1
M61 Botany Bay	Chorley	Employment (part)	6	11	0	Agent for Botany bay owner wants range of uses re- inserted i.e. A3,A4,C1as per planning consents Botany Bay Village agent says BBV is A1 use and should not be covered by this allocation and applies to their car parks. Already too much employment in Chorley and area. Ecology and Traffic /congestion issues.	EP1.2
Land to North East of M61 Junction (Gale Moss)	Chorley	Employment	6	18	0	Area source of River Chor. Already too much employment in Chorley and area. Ecology and Traffic /congestion issues. 18 objections, 6 supports.	EP1.3
Carr Lane (Vertex Site)	Chorley	Employment		1		SEE HS1.2 ABOVE	EP1.4
North of Euxton Lane	Chorley	Employment	0	47	1	2 owners do not want employment. HCA wants housing or mixed use. Other owner wants housing. No demand for employment and site not suitable, separated from Buckshaw and highway issues. Resident objections from Strawberry Fields and local area about protecting site for openness/amenity and traffic issues/congestion.	EP1.5
Martindales Depot, Cowling Brow	Chorley	Employment			2	Suggest remove allocation. There is an existing 2010 commitment for a single storey commercial building (B2)on the site but will not be affected as the site is an old employment site. Site and also parts in existing use (mainly open storage) protected by Core Strategy Policy 10.Part of existing allocation is embankment and woodland and therefore not viable. EP1.7 is located within Flood Zones 3 and 2, defined by PPS25 as having a	EP1.7

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Site Address	Settlement	Council Proposed Use	Support	Object	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations	Site Allocation Reference
						<p>high and medium probability of flooding respectively. You should be satisfied that the allocation of this site satisfies the requirements of the Sequential Test as set out in PPS25 and that you can justify this to an Inspector.</p> <p>We are satisfied that as the site is already used for employment purposes, formally allocating it as an employment site would not need to be supported by a SFRA. However, any subsequent proposals to redevelop the site would need to be supported a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) in accordance with PPS25.</p> <p>Black Brook, which is designated as a Main River watercourse, flows through the centre of site EP1.7. Therefore the site will be subject to Byelaw Control. In particular, no works may take place within 8 metres of the bank top of the watercourse without the prior consent of the Agency. This may affect the viability of any redevelopment proposals for the site as the watercourse runs through the centre of the site. Consent is also required under the Water Resources Act 1991, for any works on, over or within the channel of the watercourse, including construction of surface water outfalls.</p>	
Land at Ackhurst Park	Chorley	Employment			1	Northern Trust support the current proposed allocation for B1, B2, B8 and A2 uses but consider it would be appropriate to widen this to include A3, A4, A5, D1 and D2 uses. Consider this would have no detrimental affect on town centre and allow a more flexible site.	EP1.8
Bankside House and Weldbank Training Centre, Weldbank Lane	Chorley	Employment/ Open space		3		The County Council has withdrawn this site from the process.	EP1.10
Woodlands Centre, Southport Road	Chorley	Mixed use	1			LCC support mixed allocation for employment and education.	EP1.11
Cross Hall Street	Chorley	Employment			1	One letter has been received on the employment allocation of this site and states British Waterways will need to be consulted on any plans and the trees along the embankment stabilise it so need to be retained.	EP1.13
Flat Iron Car Park	Chorley	Retail				No representations received	EP4.1

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Site Address	Settlement	Council Proposed Use	Support	Object	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations	Site Allocation Reference
Bolton Street/Pall Mall	Chorley	Retail				No representations received	EP4.2
East of M61	Chorley	Safeguarded land				No representations received	BNE2.1
Southport Road	Chorley	Playspace				No representations received	HW1.10
Former Phoenix MG Rover Dealership, Bengal Street	Chorley	---				The site owners for this still want the site considering as part of the site allocations process and considered for development.	---
Astley Park	Chorley	---				No representations received	---
Footpath from Knowley Brow to Higher House Lane	Chorley	---				No representations received	---
Ellerbeck East and West	Chorley	---				No representations received	---
Chorley Social Club, Friday Street	Chorley	---				No representations received	---
Ellerbeck, Off Wigan Lane	Chorley	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
FDC (Holdings) Ltd & Ferax Premises, Moorland Gate, Cowling Brow	Chorley	---				No representations received	---
						No representations received	
Yarrow Mill, Yarrow Road	Chorley	---				No representations received	---
Market Street/High Street/Cleveland Street/Union	Chorley	---				No representations received	---

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Site Address	Settlement	Council Proposed Use	Support	Object	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations	Site Allocation Reference
Street							
St Georges Institute, Trinity Road	Chorley	---				No representations received	---
Land bounded by Standish Street and Bolton Street	Chorley	---				No representations received	---
Southport Road	Chorley	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Buttermere Green	Chorley	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Healey Nab	Chorley	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Yarrow Bridge Depot	Chorley	---				No representations received	---
Buckingham Street Yard	Chorley	---				No representations received	---
Land South of Crosse Hall Lane	Chorley	---				No representations received	---
Saville Street	Chorley	---				No representations received	---
Devonshire Road/Alker Street	Chorley	---				No representations received	---
Back Lane Reservoir, Back Lane	Clayton Brook/Green	Housing	1			One letter of support has been received stating the site is deliverable and sustainable but would like the status of the site changed from greenfield to brownfield as it is a covered reservoir which continues the development on site.	HS1.32
Radburn Works, Sandy Lane	Clayton Brook/Green	Housing				No representations received	HS1.33
Westwood Road	Clayton Brook/Green	Housing		21		Residents object to housing on this site on traffic/ loss of wildlife/ loss of visual amenity/ loss of trees and loss of valuable green space grounds, also	HS1.34

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Site Address	Settlement	Council Proposed Use	Support	Object	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations	Site Allocation Reference
						the site is in close proximity to two primary schools.	
Land to the Rear of Ley Inn, Back Lane	Clayton Brook/Green	---				No representations received	---
Land to the Rear of St Bede's Club, off Chorley Old Road	Clayton Brook/Green	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Cuerden Valley Park – Linear Path from A6 to B5256 and Area North of B5256	Clayton-le-Woods	---				No representations received	---

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Site Address	Settlement	Council Proposed Use	Support	Object	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations	Site Allocation Reference
Land to East of Wigan Road (A49)	Clayton-le-Woods	Mixed use	6	84*	1	<p>HOUSING</p> <p>The site already has planning permission for 300 houses, no more houses are needed in the area.</p> <p>The roads cannot cope with any more traffic especially Lancaster Lane and the Hayrick junction.</p> <p>Local schools and doctors are already full.</p> <p>There is a Biological Heritage Site on the site and development would have an adverse impact on wildlife.</p> <p>The site is a greatly valued open space for local residents and development will affect their wellbeing.</p> <p>Nearby Buckshaw Village is far from complete and is scheduled to provide thousands more homes and many already built remain unoccupied.</p> <p>There is concern over the impact the development would have on the road safety in existing developments adjacent to the site due to the increase in traffic.</p> <p>Development would lead to overlooking and loss of views for surrounding houses.</p> <p>Development of this site would lead to Chorley and South Ribble merging. Extensive development of this site is not in accordance with the Core Strategy which states that there should be 'some growth' in Urban Local Service Centres. A huge proportion of the housing requirement for Chorley is earmarked for Clayton-le-Woods and this is not consistent with the overall plan.</p> <p>EMPLOYMENT</p> <p>There are concerns over the effect development will have on local infrastructure. The roads cannot cope with any more traffic especially Lancaster Lane and the Hayrick junction.</p> <p>Development will lead to disruption to elderly residents at Cuerden Residential Park.</p> <p>There is a Biological Heritage Site on the site and development would have an adverse impact on wildlife.</p> <p>HCA supports the allocation of this site but as an alternative approach consider site for residential –led development with local employment opportunities. The proportion of employment land envisaged does not appear to be specifically justified in this location within the DPD, nor is there evidence of specific employment demand for this site to come forward. It is not clear to what extent the level of employment offer in neighbouring South Ribble has been considered, in addition to the potential large scale employment offer from the Cuerden Strategic Investment Site, located 1.5 miles from the allocation. In addition the provision of large scale B1 development on the site is not in accordance with DPS4 and the</p>	HS1.35 EP1.19
			1	71*	2		

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Site Address	Settlement	Council Proposed Use	Support	Object	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations	Site Allocation Reference
Burrows (GM) Premises, Wigan Road	Clayton-le-Woods	---				No representations received	---
Discover Leisure, Chapel Lane	Coppull	Mixed use	1			Representee supports the allocation of part of the site for proposed residential development. Seeks to reduce the employment allocation. Considers that the site has not been in any traditional employment use as it has been a facility used by a caravan and motor homes sales and servicing business. Whilst people are employed in this form of business, it is a fairly low density employment use and falls within sui generis.	HS1.36 EP1.20
Regent Street	Coppull	Housing				No representations received	HS1.37
Land at Northenden Road	Coppull	Housing		1		One resident has objected to housing on this site on traffic grounds and also the strain on already stretched local services and amenities.	HS1.38
Coppull Enterprise Centre, Mill Lane	Coppull	Housing		1		One resident has objected to housing on this site on traffic grounds and also the strain on already stretched local services and amenities.	HS1.39
Clancutt Lane	Coppull	Housing	2	19		Residents object to housing on this site on traffic/ access/ loss of wildlife/ drainage and lack of children's facility grounds, also the road is very narrow leading to road safety concerns. Two letters of support have been received stating the site is sustainable and available.	HS1.40
North of Hewlett Ave	Coppull	Safeguarded land				No representations received	BNE2.7
Blainscough Hall	Coppull	Safeguarded land/ Green Belt				No representations received	BNE2.8
Land at Mountain Road	Coppull	Open space				No representations received	---
Orchard Heys Farm, Off Park Rd	Coppull	---				No representations received	---
263 Spendmore Lane	Coppull	---				No representations received	---

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Site Address	Settlement	Council Proposed Use	Support	Object	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations	Site Allocation Reference
Land Adjacent 32 Moor Road	Croston	Housing. (Previously discounted at Issues & Options, but site now has planning permission)				No representations received	HS1.50
Croston Timber Works Goods Yard, Station Road	Croston	Housing. (Previously discounted at Issues & Options, but site now has planning permission)	1			One letter of support from the site owner has been received.	HS1.51
Land off Riverside Crescent	Croston	Playspace				No representations received	HW1.30
Land off Westhead Road	Croston	---				No representations received	---
Land to the north of Brickcroft Lane	Croston	---				No representations received	---
Land to the east of Out Lane	Croston	---				No representations received	---
Land to the east of Station Road	Croston	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Land off Out Lane	Croston	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Land off Coniston Way	Croston	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Croft Field, Off	Croston	Await Open				No representations received	---

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Site Address	Settlement	Council Proposed Use	Support	Object	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations	Site Allocation Reference
Grape Lane		Space Study					
Rear of 81-101 Station Road	Croston	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Recreational Area, off Station Road	Croston	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
75 Towngate	Eccleston	Housing		32		Residents object to housing on this site on traffic/ amenity/ access/ noise and flooding grounds, they also state this site would result in an overdelivery of housing in Eccleston.	HS1.52
Land North of Bradley Lane	Eccleston	Housing/ Safeguarded land/ open space	1	33	3	Residents object to housing on this site on traffic/ amenity/ access/ noise and flooding grounds, they also state this site would result in an overdelivery of housing in Eccleston.	HS1.53
Sagar House, Langton Brow	Eccleston	Housing		1		One resident has objected to housing on this site as they feel Eccleston has had more than its fair share of development.	HS1.54
East of Tincklers Lane	Eccleston	Safeguarded land				No representations received	BNE2.10
Between Bradley Lane, 7 Parr Lane	Eccleston	Safeguarded land				No representations received	BNE2.11
Lawrence Lane	Eccleston	Playspace				No representations received	HW1.32
Parr Hall Farm, Parr Lane	Eccleston	Housing element discounted, Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Bygone Times	Eccleston	---				No representations received	---
Land Between Lydiate Lane and New Lane	Eccleston	Housing element discounted. Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Site Address	Settlement	Council Proposed Use	Support	Object	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations	Site Allocation Reference
Land between Bannisters Lane and Tincklers Lane	Eccleston	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Land between Bradley Lane and Parr Lane	Eccleston	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Eccleston Village Green	Eccleston	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
The Hawthorns Play Area	Eccleston	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Middlewood Close Play Area	Eccleston	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Millennium Green	Eccleston	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Land off the Hawthorns	Eccleston	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Land at Sylvesters Farm	Euxton	Mixed use	3	288	4	<p>HOUSING; The open fields act as a buffer between Euxton and Chorley and they are the last green space separating them.</p> <p>More housing development in Euxton is unnecessary due to the development at Buckshaw Village. Euxton has had more than its fair share of development in recent years and appears to have been targeted to take a disproportionate share of new housing.</p> <p>There is an excess of unsold houses in Euxton and Buckshaw Village. There are not enough school places. The roads cannot cope with an increase in traffic and when the quarry is in operation the area will be gridlocked. Pear Tree Lane is used extensively by horse riders, dog walkers and cyclists etc and is too narrow and unsuitable for development. Development would lead to a negative impact on wildlife.</p> <p>Euxton is supposed to be a village, more development means it is losing its identity as a village.</p> <p>EMPLOYMENT; HCA say the mixed use allocation includes the provision of 3Ha of employment land (B1, B2 & B8). The scale and location of this</p>	HS1.41 EP1.21

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Site Address	Settlement	Council Proposed Use	Support	Object	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations	Site Allocation Reference
			0	280	4	<p>employment provision raises questions in respect of demand (especially given the close proximity of the employment offer at Buckshaw Village) and issues around accommodating compatible land uses (the site is surrounded on three sides by the developed residential areas of Euxton and Buckshaw). As proposed, the allocation could result in visually intrusive employment development on the frontage of the site onto Euxton Lane, as well as necessitating access through the mixed use area into the residential part of the site and its connection to existing development and highway. The HCA consider that allocating the entire site for residential development would be a more sustainable approach and accord with the HCA's detailed Development Strategy which makes a strong case for the delivery of housing in this location, as well as providing a technically robust assessment to justify development parcels and uses. Such an allocation would also enable development to respect the existing development along Pear Tree Lane.</p> <p>Resident objections to employment cover already employment at Buckshaw and too many empty units, where is the need for more employment as well as transport/ecology, too much development in Euxton issues. 280 employment objections, 4 not statedThe open fields act as a buffer between Euxton and Chorley and they are the last green space separating them.</p> <p>More employment development in Euxton is unnecessary due to the development at Buckshaw Village and the number of existing employment units in Euxton.</p> <p>The roads cannot cope with an increase in traffic and when the quarry is in operation the area will be gridlocked.</p> <p>Pear Tree Lane is used extensively by horse riders, dog walkers and cyclists etc and is too narrow and unsuitable for development.</p> <p>Development would lead to a negative impact on wildlife.</p> <p>Euxton is supposed to be a village, more development means it is losing its identity as a village.</p>	
Land at end of	Euxton	Housing/	1	110	4	The access road from Dunrobin Drive onto Wigan Road cannot cope with	HS1.42

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Site Address	Settlement	Council Proposed Use	Support	Object	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations	Site Allocation Reference
Dunrobin Drive		Green Belt				<p>the current level of traffic. It is too narrow and cannot be widened and extra traffic would be dangerous.</p> <p>The site is a wildlife haven and a large number of species use the field due to its proximity to Yarrow Valley Country Park.</p> <p>Development would lead to the loss of the boundary between Euxton and Charnock Richard.</p> <p>The area is poorly served by public transport.</p> <p>A previous proposal to develop the site was refused based on the access being inadequate and the problem has got worse since then.</p> <p>More housing development in Euxton is unnecessary due to the development at Buckshaw Village.</p>	
37-41 Wigan Road	Euxton	Housing				No representations received	HS1.43
Land at Junction of Balshaw Lane/Wigan Road	Euxton	Open space				No representations received	---
Highways Avenue	Euxton	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Bredon Ave	Euxton	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Adjacent Yarrow Valley car park, Southport Road	Euxton	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Adjacent Pear Tree Lane	Euxton	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Concrete Works, Wigan Road	Euxton	---				No representations received	---
Dismantled Railway Line	Heapey	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Site Address	Settlement	Council Proposed Use	Support	Object	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations	Site Allocation Reference
Bramblewood Nursey and Garden Centre, Wigan Lane	Heath Charnock	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Heskin Green	Heskin	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Rear of New Street	Mawdesley	Employment				No representations specifically on EP1.22 but a new site suggestion covers part of this site. GT Goodyear land at Gorsey Lane is being proposed by the site owner for mixed use development including retention of existing employment, housing on additional area and retention of part EP1.22 in their ownership.	EP1.22---
Copthurst Lane/Kenyon Lane	Wheelton	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Copthurst Lane/Kenyon Lane	Wheelton	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Old Sand Quarry, Between Kenyon Lane and Copthurst Lane	Wheelton	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Black Lion Field, Blackburn Road	Wheelton	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Land off Ryefield	Wheelton	Await Open Space Study				No representations received	---
Land off Moss Lane	Whittle-le-Woods	Housing	4	220	2	Development of the site would wipe out the last green spaces in the area and result in the loss of a beautiful, open green space. Drainage systems in the area are not sufficient and development would add to flooding on Lower Town Lane and Waterhouse Green.	HS1.44

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Site Address	Settlement	Council Proposed Use	Support	Object	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations	Site Allocation Reference
						<p>Local schools and doctors surgeries are already full.</p> <p>Dunham Drive should not be used for access to the proposed development as the increase in traffic will put the safety of children on the estate at risk and would have a negative impact on existing properties.</p> <p>Development would lead to the loss of a wildlife habitat.</p> <p>The development is not needed due to the amount of development taking place at Buckshaw Village and the number of empty properties there.</p> <p>Whittle-le-Woods has lost its village appeal and further development would worsen this.</p> <p>The A6 is already extremely busy.</p> <p>There was a lack of consultation on the selection of this site as a preferred housing allocation.</p>	
Hill Top Lane	Whittle-le-Woods	Housing		6		Residents object to housing on this site on access/ poor topography/ wildlife and traffic grounds. This site should only become available when the dangerous quarry is filled in.	HS1.45
Land rear of 23 Birchin Lane	Whittle-le-Woods	Housing		3	1	Residents object to housing on this site on traffic/ congestion/ wildlife and environmental grounds, and they feel the Village will lose its community and identity if more housing is built.	HS1.46
Rear of 243-281, Preston Road	Whittle-le-Woods	Housing		1	1	Residents object to housing on this site on traffic/ congestion/ wildlife and environmental grounds, and they feel the Village will lose its community and identity if more housing is built.	HS1.47
West of M61	Whittle-le-Woods	Safeguarded land				No representations received	BNE2.14
Kem Mill, Kem Mill Lane	Whittle-le-Woods	---				No representations received	---
Swansey Mill between Swansey Lane and Mill Lane	Whittle-le-Woods	---				No representations received	---
Adj Springside Farm, Moss Lane	Whittle-le-Woods	---				No representations received	---

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Site Address	Settlement	Council Proposed Use	Support	Object	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations	Site Allocation Reference
Land off Watkin Road	Whittle-le-Woods	---				No representations received	---

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Representations relating to Development Management Policies

Policy No	Policy Title				Summary of Representations
		Objection	Support	Not Stated/Other	
BNE1	Development in the Area of Other Open Countryside	0	1	0	The wording of this policy should read, 'appropriate to the character and quality of the surrounding countryside and where biodiversity is safeguarded.'
BNE2	Areas of Safeguarded Land	0	1	0	The policy is supported as it reflects National Policy.
BNE3	Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt	3	2	2	This Policy needs to be reassessed in light of the NPP
BNE4	Light Pollution	0	1	0	Support Policy BNE4 in relation to light pollution, but recommends that in relation to light spillage, this is minimised not only to prevent nuisance and avoid adverse effects on the character of the area, but also to prevent adverse effects on biodiversity.
BNE5	Unstable Land	1	1	1	Support that this policy is justified, effective and is consistent with National Policy. Object as flooding is not specifically included within this Policy.
BNE6	Heritage Assets	0	2	1	Support with minor amendments that I suggest some minor changes to the Policy wording under criteria (b): i. The conservation of features and elements that contribute to the heritage asset's significance and character. This may include: earthworks or buried remains,... ii. The reinstatement of features and elements that contribute to the heritage asset's significance which have been lost or damaged. iii. The conservation and, where appropriate, the enhancement of the space in between and around buildings as well as front, side and rear gardens, historic boundaries and ancillary structures. It welcomes Policy BNE6 Heritage Assets in terms of its protection of heritage assets and their settings. However it could be improved by also considering the wider historic character of both towns and countryside areas.
BNE7	Trees	0	1	2	Support : fully support the intention underlying this policy to protect trees within the borough and any loss f trees/ hedgerows should be replaced with the traditional species.

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Policy No	Policy Title	Objection	Support	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations
EP1	Employment Site Allocations	4	1	0	<p><u>Object:</u> At present there does not appear to be any reference to minerals and waste issues being addressed in the County level plan. This lack of a cross reference means that the plan does not in any way indicate how policies within that DPD may need to be taken into account in this DPD.</p> <p>There does not appear to have been any recorded consideration of mineral sterilisation in the site allocation process.</p> <p>The proposed employment allocation is greater than the residential allocation within Coppull without any justification.</p> <p>The policy is drafted completely at odds with the direction of travel of Government guidance such as PPS4</p> <p><u>Support with amendments:</u> Policy EP1 needs to adopt a much more flexible and pro-active approach in order for certain sites to expand to include within them a larger area.</p>
EP2	Development Criteria for Business & Industrial Development	0	3	0	<p>Support with minor amendments: This Policy is supported but it would be useful to have one similar or expand this policy to include residential developments.</p>
EP5	Primary Shopping Area and Primary Frontage	0	1	0	<p>Support the Primary Shopping Area and Secondary Shopping Frontage policies and the inclusion of Oak House, High Street, Chorley within them.</p>
EP6	Secondary Shopping Frontage	0	1	0	<p>Support the Primary Shopping Area and Secondary Shopping Frontage policies and the inclusion of Oak House, High Street, Chorley within them.</p>
EP7	Development and Change of Use in District & Local Centres	1	2	0	<p>Support with minor amendments suggest that Policy EP7 needs to be reviewed and re-drafted to properly reflect current and emerging National Planning Policy which already indicates a more flexible and pro-active approach</p>

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Policy No	Policy Title	Objection	Support	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations
EP8	Existing Local Shops	1	0	0	Objection stating Given that we remain in a time of significant economic uncertainty, the terms of this policy are considered significantly onerous. It is not considered that this policy is necessary or consistent with national planning policies. If it remains in place, it appears certain to increase the level of vacant units within settlements, whilst a 12 month marketing process is completed. In this time a potential alternative tenant could be lost.
EP9	Development in Edge of Centre and Out of Centre Locations	1	0	0	Objection the policy is said to relate to small scale proposals (presumably under 2,500 sq m), we would suggest that a detailed assessment of impact should not be required in the terms of the policy to comply with National Policy.
EP11	Further and Higher Education Facilities	0	1	0	Support with amendments the criteria should include compatibility with the surrounding townscape as well as land uses, and there should be no net loss in wildlife or habitat as a result of the development. Since these requirements are applicable to several policy areas, it may be that such requirements can be included in a cross-cutting policy within the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD.
HS1	Housing Site Allocations	13	2	1	Object; Policy HS1 proposals are insufficient to meet housing land requirements and a significant number of additional sites need to be allocated for development across the timescale of the plan. Residents object to housing in Euxton on road safety, congestion, overcrowding and pollution grounds. Residents also object to Policy HS1 on the grounds Buckshaw Village has not yet been completed. Support; Housebuilders support the allocation table and have requested any change in Core Strategy is taken account of here.

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Policy No	Policy Title	Objection	Support	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations
HS2	Phasing of Housing Development	7	3	1	<p>Object; there is no reasoned justification to seek to delay the delivery of housing at various sites.</p> <p>The Council will be aware that it should not rely on windfall sites during the first 10 years of the plan period in accordance with paragraph 59 of PPS3 and paragraph 109 of the draft NPPF. It has not offered any genuine local circumstances to justify the need to rely on windfall sites.</p> <p>Support with amendments; Whilst we support policy HS2 in principle, we find it necessary to object to the proposals for phasing; albeit our objection would be overcome if the policy or narrative made clear that the phasing did not apply to special needs housing meeting an identified need.</p>
HS3	Windfall Housing Sites	1	4	1	<p>Support with amendments; The requirement for foul and surface water drainage is welcomed but why only for Windfall Housing sites</p> <p>Object: It is considered that the requirement of the final paragraph of Policy HS3: Windfall Housing Sites, together with the explanatory text within paragraph 5.15 is unduly onerous and, if applied literally, could rule out the development of all unallocated Greenfield land.</p> <p>Support; Policy HS3 provides for new residential development, of an appropriate scale and type, within the boundaries of settlements excluded from the green belt.</p>
HS4	Private Residential Garden Development	5	1	1	<p>Object: These areas are within urban development settings. The national policy does not state that residential garden development should be refused.</p> <p>This policy does not take account of properties with large gardens that are set in areas with a surrounding higher density, some limited development in these gardens may be appropriate and could better reflect the local character/density of the area.</p> <p>Support; Parish Councils support the restriction of garden development.</p>

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Policy No	Policy Title	Objection	Support	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations
HS5	Sub-division/Conversion of Dwellings into Flats & Conversion of Non-residential Properties into Residential Use	0	1	0	Support with amendments; The requirement to avoid demonstrable harm to the amenities of the local area should be extended to specifically include flooding damage due to sewage and run off along the downstream drainage channels.
HS6	Open Space Requirements in New Housing Developments	0	3	1	Support; supports the Policy HS6 proposals for new housing development to make provision for open space, or if more appropriate, a commuted sum for provision off site, where there is local qualitative and quantitative deficiencies identified in the forthcoming Open Space Study
HS9	Residential Development Within Rural Settlements Excluded from the Green Belt	1	1	0	Object; Policy HS9 does not provide for the flexibility necessary to respond to changing circumstances Support with amendments; we would suggest that the allowance of large scale redevelopment schemes be included as criterion d) of the policy
HS10	Rural Affordable Housing – Rural Exception Sites	1	1	0	Support; Generally the approach set out in this Policy is supported by the National Trust, including each of the criteria a) to e). However, it is suggested that the overall scale of any such scheme is a key consideration that should be more explicitly referred to in the Policy itself Object; the criteria in the policy are demanding, and that all have to be met. However, the fact that a proposed policy will allow for development in only a very limited set of circumstances does not constitute a justification for it.
HS11	Conversion of Rural Buildings in the Green Belt and Other Designated Rural Areas	1	2	0	Object; Policy HS11 it is considered that the continued reliance on a percentage rebuild figure is inappropriate and instead it should be clear that, in accordance with draft NPPF Paragraph 144, the policy should permit the re-use or replacement of existing buildings provided the new building is not materially larger than the one it replaces. It is therefore considered that Policy HS11 should be amended to reflect the emerging guidance contained in draft NPPF. Support; The approach set out in this Policy and the detailed wording is supported by National Trust.

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Policy No	Policy Title	Objection	Support	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations
HS12	Rural Replacement Dwellings and Extensions	0	1	0	It is requested that an additional criteria are added to the Policy, e.g.: d) the proposed replacement dwelling would not harm the character of the countryside; and g) the proposed extension would not harm the character of the countryside.
HS13	Removal of Agricultural Occupancy Conditions	0	1	0	Supporting comment states 'agree' with not further detail.
HW1	Playspace Allocations	0	2	0	Support with minor amendments play area welcomed but need more e.g. why not use the area to the back of Swansey Lane recently released by LCC from primary school use as a playspace? There is also a need at the bottom end around the newer areas and an even greater need should future housing developments go forward.
HW2	Playing Fields, Parks, Recreational & Amenity Open Space	1	1	0	Support with minor amendments We very much support the protection of existing greenspace, which is the aim underlying this policy, but we do not consider that the policy is strong enough as worded at present. Objection: Playing Fields, Parks, Recreational and Amenity Open Space: "...open spaces or sports or recreational facilities will be protected unless it can be demonstrated that the site is surplus to requirements" No such evidence has been provided to date.
HW3	Golf, Other Outdoor Sport and Related Development	0	1	0	Support with minor amendments Under criterion a), might be added the 'character and quality of the landscape'.
HW4	Valley Parks	0	3	0	Support with minor amendments: permits development in the vicinity of valley parks is reworded to be positive and to allow development in the vicinity valley parks provided that they would not detract from the amenity, recreation and wildlife value. It is not clear what development is referred to or envisaged under this policy.

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Policy No	Policy Title	Objection	Support	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations
HW5	The Leeds and Liverpool Canal	0	2	0	Support with minor amendments: In formulating Development Management Policy British Waterways would recommend that the advice contained in the Town and Country Planning Association and BW Policy Advice Note (PAN) on Inland Waterways, published 2009 , is taken into account and leisure uses should be positively planned for.
HW6	Allotments	0	2	0	<u>Support</u> ; wholly supportive of Chorley Council seeking to identify suitable plots of land on which to provide much needed allotments in Adlington though slightly disappointed with the choice of Common End. I am disappointed to find there are no new allotments indicated on the LDF map
HW7	Community Facilities	1	1	0	Object (Eccleston); No such evidence has been provided for this Policy and the application for village green status demonstrates that the land is currently used to serve the needs of the Eccleston community <u>Support with amendments</u> ; Whilst it may be hard to dictate to businesses when they ought to sell on their premises, this policy needs to be strengthened as too many premises are left to become neglected and unusable deliberately so that they cannot be sold on.
ST1	Provision or Improvement of Footpaths, Cycleways, Bridleways and their Associated Facilities	0	3	2	<u>Support</u> ; Anderton Parish Council is fully supportive of this policy and would like to see an audit of current footpath provision and route appropriateness The policy does not show any indication of how this will be done and bridleway provision increased with possible s106 monies.

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Policy No	Policy Title	Objection	Support	Not Stated/Other	Summary of representations
ST2	New Cycle Routes	0	4	2	<p><u>Support</u>; While not wishing to comment on particular routes set out in this policy, we welcome the aim of this policy to preserve existing cycle routes and provide or extend them.</p> <p>This route in Ecclestone is shown as starting half way down bradley lane, cyclists would have to get to that start point to utilise the route i.e. they would have to cycle past the access road to HS1.53 which would be very close to the start of the route</p> <p>Cycle route 004- what a fantastic, brilliant idea! I support this all the way.</p> <p>The Parish Council has concerns regarding the suitability of the existing roads through Ulnes Walton for use as a cycle route.</p>
ST4	Road Schemes and Development Access Points	0	0	1	It is acknowledged that the development of the allocated employment and residential sites at Botany Bay will require the provision of an access bridge over the canal.
ST5A	Car Parking Standards	1	1	0	Support for including a section on sui generis buildings and especially for including 1 coach space for theatres.
ST5B	Residential Car Parking Standards	1	1	0	<p>Object; Parking provision at residential development sites should be considered on a site by site basis.</p> <p>Support; The Parish Council welcomes the proposed minimum parking provision.</p>
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIONS		44	59	16	
		119			

119 representations were received relating to the Development Management Policies. The majority of these (59) were in support of the policies. Policies HS1 and HS2 raised the most objections. 13 objections were received for Policy HS1, which related generally to the number of houses proposed in various settlements and the overall total number of dwellings proposed as well as the densities proposed. 7 objections were received for Policy HS2 which mainly objected to the proposed phasing (time period in which the housing allocations were scheduled to come forward for development).

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

Representations relating to a specific chapter of the DPD

Chapter No	Chapter Title				Summary of Respresentations
		Objection	Support	Not Stated/Ot her	
1	Introduction	0	0	0	No representation received.
2	Vision for Chorley	0	0	2	Residents agree with the generalisations outlined in sections 2 to 9, noting however that as Clayton-le-Woods and Whittle-le-Woods is an area that has undergone much development over the past few decades, there should be a greater emphasis on the needs of present residents. There is little indication that flooding issues, particularly within Croston are recognised within this document.
3	Delivering Infrastructure	2	2	3	<p><u>Objection</u> Sewage is not mentioned within the infrastructure chapter and is a vital as existing systems are struggling to cope. Failure to mention sewage here is of major concern.</p> <p><u>Support</u> We very much welcome the attention given to green infrastructure (GI) in this section, particularly paragraphs 3.11 and 3.12.</p> <p><u>Other</u> I would have liked to have seen a sharper focus and greater transparency as to the means by which this would be achieved, and more particularly the importance of engaging with infrastructure providers, including the County Council, in the work that the Central Lancashire authorities are progressing in relation to CIL. Reference to green infrastructure in this section is welcomed. However, there is no attempt to set out Chorley's existing green infrastructure and future requirements, this omission downplays the importance of green infrastructure and should be addressed in order to provide the local detail for strategic Policy 18 in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>New railway stations includes Coppull. What is the priority for Coppull Improving the bus service along Chapel Lane Coppull. This is, and will be needed as the plan includes areas of development at Discover Leisure HS1.36, including employment.</p>

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

4	Catering for Sustainable Travel	1	1	3	<p><u>Objection</u> There are and will be insufficient methods of travel ,particularly rail, in view of the development proposals for Chorley and it's surrounding areas.</p> <p><u>Support</u> The most heartening proposals are those for links north and south, east and west for walkers and cyclists</p> <p><u>Other</u> It is unclear what 'A high speed rail link through the Borough to Preston' refers to. It would perhaps be better phrased as support for Preston being linked into the High Speed Rail network. In addition, clarity is also sought on what is proposed by 'Assess the impact of using the Charnock Richard service area access as an unauthorised motorway junction.'</p> <p>West Lancashire Borough Council notes in paragraphs 4.14 and 4.15 the proposals by Trampower to develop a tram network within Central Lancashire, which may include an extension to Ormskirk, using the existing railway line southwards from Lostock Hall. Whilst this Council supports the principle of sustainable transport, we are sceptical that the stated tram proposals will be delivered, given the likely costs involved, and we question the appropriateness of their inclusion in the draft DPD.</p> <p>Also needed will be better rail services for the area as commuter trains at present are not in general of sufficient capacity for the current users.</p>
5	Homes for all	2	0	3	<p><u>Object</u> Information from your planning department stated 417 houses per year over the next 10-15 years was the number required by Central Government for Chorley. How can this possibly be valid? Who measured it/ predicted it? Has it been questioned? Why not 10 or 416 or 700? There must be some dubious rationale for such a number. This would give us 6,000 houses in 10 years- around 10,000 extra cars. Current roads cannot be widened. How could main commuter junctions to the M6 at Leyland and M61 at Chorley cope? Each site allocation has to have traffic plan/safety measures agreed by the Council but are these looked at in total and are their combined numbers or bottle necks and main roads taken into account when they are assessed?</p> <p><u>Other</u> With reference to the views expressed concerning Gypsy/Traveller sites in the Chorley area we would like to make the following points on the two separate items. Should Chorley have allocated sites for gypsy/traveller groups? This is a valid point, and so long as these sites are not on Green Belt, and are well away from housing and are well screened following Gypsy Council code of practice. We see no problem with this viewpoint. The current unlawful Site at Hut Lane in Chorley should be removed in accordance with planning decisions and appeals as this is Green Belt land.</p> <p>Gypsy sites are of concern, and I feel that any that are identified in the future need some form of restriction to prevent them becoming permanent homes and only used for temporary accommodation.</p> <p>Residents are concerned about the large number of apartment blocks under construction. Throughout the country there are already huge numbers of unsold/unoccupied apartments many of which are "buy to let" and are often rented out as a substitute for social housing for long term unemployed, refugees, asylum seekers and alike - are the apartments in Buckshaw likely to be any different? I believe that people need a place to live irrespective of their circumstances, but has the Council taken on board the social impact and cost implications of such issues which will almost certainly arise?</p>

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012

6	Delivering Economic Prosperity	0	1	1	<p><u>Support</u> ASDA Stores Ltd would like to take this opportunity to re-iterate its support of the overarching aspirations of existing and emerging Local Policy in improving the vitality and viability of shopping centres in the Borough</p> <p><u>Other</u> The draft DPD does not address visitor or rural economies. The Trust recognises that Core Strategy Policy 13 Rural Economy covers much of this ground, however there is still a need for site specific heritage and landscape based tourism and appropriate associated facilities to be recognised as important opportunities to boost the economy. This will have the benefit of reinforcing local distinctiveness and increasing the attractiveness for new investment.</p> <p>It is noted that there is a Core Strategy objective (third bullet point in the headline information on page 36) as well as Policy 11 in respect of tourism, but other than references at paras 6.22 and 6.23 in the context of Chorley Town Centre there is no reference to the visitor economy. Consideration should be given to an appropriate detailed policy regarding the location and development of tourist attractions</p>
7	Protecting and Enhancing the built and natural Environment	1	0	5	<p><u>Object</u> It is clear from the evidence report and the DPD itself that great care has been taken to avoid repetition of Core Strategy and National policy. The Trust recognises that this is a key aspect of a sound plan, however in this case the approach has a been taken too far and needs some degree of reconsideration, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dealing with some subjects in detail but failing to cover others at all leads to an unbalanced plan and a less robust policy approach to the overlooked areas. - Over-reliance on the draft Core Strategy and current national policy potentially means the draft DPD will not be flexible enough to deal with the changing policy background and therefore may require considerable redrafting at a later stage. <p><u>Other</u> While requirements to limit light pollution are recognised the relative space allocated to this topic in comparison with the neglect of sewage issues must be questioned.</p> <p>We suggest that this section identifies protected sites located within the district, and acknowledges their protected status. We also suggest that a list of other sites important for biodiversity and geological conservation are mentioned within this section</p> <p>We would recommend the inclusion of a policy within the DPD seeking to protect and enhance wildlife corridors and watercourses through the use of buffer zones, the restoration of culverted watercourses to open channel and the control of invasive species.</p>
8	Promoting Health and Wellbeing	0	0	1	<p>The Trust welcomes the inclusion of a variety of outdoor recreation opportunities within this section, including valley parks and canals. However, this policy approach could be widened to recognise the more general benefits of access to the countryside to health and well being.</p>
9	Tackling Climate Change	1	0	3	<p>The Trust recognises that there is a series of policies, in some cases quite detailed, dealing with tackling climate change in the Core Strategy. However, it is a serious concern that no policy at all has been provided in the draft DPD to cover these issues at a more local and detailed level.</p> <p><u>Other</u> We ask that the council consider whether there is a case for a more detailed policy in this DPD to augment what is in the Core Strategy and which will be an additional help in development management.</p>
Total		32			

Appendix 4 – Full Council – 25th September 2012