

OTHER REPRESENTATIONS NOT RELATING TO THE MODIFICATIONS SCHEDULES

Person ID	Rep No	Name or Organisation	Supporting/Objecting	Legally Compliant	Sound	Subject	Representation	Council's Response
2	5	BNP Paribas Real Estate on behalf of BAE Systems	Objecting	n/a	n/a	Policy C5 Allocation on the Proposals Map	<p>Previous representations to the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD made on behalf of BAE Systems requested that the boundary of the Policy C5 allocation of the BAE Systems, Samlesbury site on the Proposals Map be amended to include all of the areas shaded yellow and green (Parcels A, B, C and D) on the enclosed BAE Systems plan. This amendment was requested to support the development of the BAE Systems Core Area and particularly the delivery of the Enterprise Zone.</p> <p>Following these representations, the majority of this area has been included within the allocation, but a small area to the east has not (see area hatched black on the enclosed scan of the Proposals Map and shaded green on the BAE Systems plan). Based on discussions with South Ribble Council, it is understood that this is a drafting error rather than a conscious decision to exclude this area from the allocation.</p> <p>As set out above, this land forms part of the Enterprise Zone (the proposed second phase). Accordingly, its allocation on the Proposals Map under Policy C5 and removal from the Green Belt is therefore vital to both:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support the delivery of the Vision for the Enterprise Zone to “create thousands of new jobs by attracting companies in the advanced engineering and manufacturing sector”; and 2. Ensure the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD is legally compliant and sound for the reasons set out in more detail below. <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) recognises at paragraph 20 the need for local planning authorities to “plan proactively to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21st century”. Paragraph 160 of the NPPF also notes the need when preparing Local Plans for local planning authorities to:</p> <p>“work together with county and neighbouring authorities and with Local Enterprise Partnerships to prepare and maintain a robust evidence base to understand both existing business needs and likely changes in the market”</p> <p>The Lancashire Enterprise Zone (based on the two BAE Systems sites at Samlesbury and Warton) has been proposed to build on the County's existing strengths, focusing solely on the advanced engineering and manufacturing sector. It is expected to create up to 6,000 high-value, high-skilled jobs over its lifetime, with a further 5,000 to 7,000 high-value, high-skilled jobs generated in the wider advanced engineering and manufacturing supply chain. In doing so, it is envisaged that the Enterprise Zone will become one of Europe's largest and most important advanced engineering complexes.</p> <p>In light of the above, it is clear that the Enterprise Zone proposals should form an integral part of the evidence base for the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD and be supported by the document in line with the NPPF. This has been acknowledged and reflected in part by the previous amendment to the Policy C5 allocation on the Proposals Map. It is, however, vital that the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD supports the full Enterprise Zone at Samlesbury, by allocating all of the land within it on the Proposals Map under Policy C5 and removing it from the Green Belt to ensure the</p>	<p>This does not relate to a Main or Additional Modification. However, the Council accepts that there was a cartographic error in respect of the change to the Green Belt boundary for the Enterprise Zone on the Policies Map DPD. Whilst this is not a modification, the Council requests that the Inspector is minded to approve this alteration on the Policies Map DPD for consistency with the designated boundary of the Enterprise Zone. (Please see Appendix A).</p>

Person ID	Rep No	Name or Organisation	Supporting/Objecting	Legally Compliant	Sound	Subject	Representation	Council's Response
							<p>DPD is legally compliant and sound. It is therefore requested that the boundary of Policy C5 allocation is checked and amended on the Proposals Map to ensure it includes all of the land shaded yellow and green (Parcels A, B, C and D) on the enclosed BAE Systems plan, particularly the area hatched black on the enclosed scan of the Proposals Map.</p> <p>We consider that this modification will be unsound because it is: Not consistent with national policy</p>	
3	6	Peter Carter	Objecting	No	No	<p>Consultation process and allocation of Site S (Land off Brindle Road)</p>	<p>Community involvement was non-existent! Sites affected by the proposed development should have been notified by SRBC (Brindle Road and Cottage Gardens). We should not have to rely on a poster fastened to a lamppost by a neighbour on Brindle Road to tell us of the proposed development. Just posting supermarkets and South Ribble news is not really "community involvement". Even this document has not been seen by most people on our estate and Brindle Road.</p> <p>This site is the only green area in the triangle that we have in between the motorways and railway. Wildlife is everywhere due to the fact it's the only land with trees and ditches to support. Many people walk their dogs and children romp about in the fields. It's great to have one patch of green land in such a built up triangle! What wildlife studies have been made and what results were concluded?</p> <p>With development all around the area in a time when irrespective of national results houses are not selling very well. How many people moving house or first time buying a house do you know? Not very many I bet. We have the development at Pear Tree Garden in full flow 209 houses, Miller Homes "Gate House Fold" 42 houses, Wesley Street Mill and old social services building on Brindle Road. This development must be more than enough to satisfy the need of housing in this area. Persimmon Homes Development of 250+ houses on the one patch of green land left is not needed to satisfy the housing needs of SRBC.</p> <p>The level crossing is a bottle neck and even before these developments people overtaking on the wrong side of the road creates a danger to cars and people alike. All these proposed developments will have a big impact on the traffic flow at the crossings. At peak times there is a backlog of cars along Brindle Road and up Bank Head Lane. The Kellet Lane side from Walton Summit most evenings is queued back to the junction at the end of the road and up to the crossing.</p> <p>I saw a survey of traffic flow and numbers the other day. This was carried out when all colleges and most schools had broken up. This is the most non-representative survey of traffic there could be! Survey the traffic after a school holiday, then a true account will be had.</p> <p>I consider the modification will be unsound because it is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not justified • Not effective <p>Changes considered necessary:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Full community involvement from early stages. 2. All property with boundaries on any development notified by email or flyer or letter from SRBC. 3. Open and clear advice to all communities involved. 4. Re-think the present "poor" policy for informing interested parties. 	<p>This does not relate to a Main or Additional Modification.</p> <p>The issues surrounding the consultation methods were discussed fully at the Examination in Public in March 2013. The Council awaits the Inspector's findings and as such have no further comments. The Council is confident that it has fully adhered to all the regulations and legal processes in plan making.</p>
4	21	Lynn Preston	n/a	n/a	n/a	Site S (Land off Brindle Road)	<p>Where are the new schools going to be? My 6 year old daughter attends Brindle Gregson Lane primary School, which is considered to be one of the best primary</p>	<p>This does not relate to a Main or Additional</p>

Person ID	Rep No	Name or Organisation	Supporting/Objecting	Legally Compliant	Sound	Subject	Representation	Council's Response
							<p>schools in the area. It is currently to capacity, to the detriment of my daughter's education; having 30 children in one class with 1.5 teachers, we have to consider moving her to a private school. We are on the outskirts of the catchment area living on Cottage Gardens, as will be this proposed development; in fact we are on the outskirts to most of the schools in the area. SO WHAT PLANS ARE THERE AND WHERE WILL THE NEW SCHOOL BE FOR THE MANY ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENTS IN THE BAMBER BRIDGE AREA AND FOR THE 500+ CHILDREN ON THIS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT?</p> <p>Wildlife - we are blessed with a wide range of beautiful and loved wildlife in our little fields. My daughter has binoculars and she and her friends observe the families of wildlife from her bedroom window. A family of foxes, squirrels, deer, woodpecker, many other varieties of birds including a buzzard. Most importantly, Pipistrelle Bats (after hearing on BBC Radio 1 that bats in England are diminishing quickly because of the increase in unnecessary housing development, I contacted a national bat conservationist and they are most concerned that this would be another great loss as the trees, fields and surrounding hedgerows are their habitat). WHERE ARE THE LEGAL SURVEY REPORTS INCLUDING THE EUROPEAN ECOLOGICAL SURVEY? We have ponds in the area and the perfect habitat for the Great Crested Newt; apparently it was recently found on the land opposite the Hospital Inn on Miller Homes Gate House Fold but was informed by the people battling that development that it was brought to the attention of SRBC but apparently was ignored and now they are lost forever on that site; which I thought was highly illegal as they are protected.</p>	<p>Modification.</p> <p>The issues surrounding legal compliance were discussed fully at the Examination in Public in March 2013. The Council awaits the Inspector's findings. The Council is confident that it has fully adhered to all the regulations and legal processes in plan making</p>
4	7	Lynn Preston	Objecting	No	No	Site S (Land off Brindle Road)	<p>I was more than a little disappointed, however to learn that the majority of my neighbours on Brindle Road and surrounding areas have not received the 'Modification Schedules to the Publication Version of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD' email and only a limited number of home owners have. I considered going the area informing people, as I did in August, however it is after all the legal responsibility of yourself and SRBC to do that, and every false step has implications.</p> <p>After consulting a solicitor, the original proposal was indeed illegal; as none of the homeowners were properly contacted in the initial instance by either the SRBC or by our local Councillor Watts. As the development will directly effect my home, value of property, security, and aesthetics, I and my neighbours on Cottage Gardens and homes on Brindle Road should have been contacted personally in the initial stages.</p> <p>I consider the modification will be unsound because it is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not justified • Not effective • Not consistent with national policy • Not positively prepared 	<p>We are only seeking comments on the modifications we have published. This comment relates to the consultation process surrounding the modifications schedules.</p> <p>The Council has contacted all respondents who indicated at the previous stage that they wished to be informed in the next stage of this process. The Council is not required to contact each household during this process of plan making. If a planning application was received on this site then households adjacent to the site would be kept informed of the process. The Council is confident that it has fully adhered to all the regulations and legal processes in plan making.</p>
		The Coal Authority				n/a	I have reviewed the Modification Schedules and can confirm that The Coal Authority has no comments to make.	Noted.
		United Utilities				n/a	Whilst United Utilities has reviewed the above-mentioned document, we are currently unable to provide a response and request a meeting to discuss our	Noted. The Council is currently in discussion

Person ID	Rep No	Name or Organisation	Supporting/Objecting	Legally Compliant	Sound	Subject	Representation	Council's Response
							operational comments. United Utilities will work closely with the LPA during the preparation of its planning policy documents.	with United Utilities, however this does not have an impact on the Main Modifications or the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD.



BNP PARIBAS REAL ESTATE

BAE Systems, Samlesbury
Proposed Amendments to the Site Allocations DPD Proposals Map
Areas Hatched Black Requested for Inclusion within the Policy C5 Allocation

