



Response to the Examiner's MIQs dated 6 November 2017

Within document EL7 003a (pages 29 to 36) we raised a number of issues as part of the Local Plan re-consultation. Whilst we do not consider it necessary to repeat these here, we would reiterate some of these matters in summary and also refer to the Council's response.

If the opportunity arises at Stage 3 of the Local Plan Examination, we would like to see these matters discussed and clarified.

Session 1

1.1 As said within our Consultation response (and also raised by other resident representatives) the current level of job losses significantly outweighs those shown in the Consultants reports as being created over the plan period. Now included in this are the recent 600 job losses at BAe. We do not consider that the Council's response explains or justifies their approach. (The FBC response is given at the top of page 11 of the document entitled "Summary of Responses to the Evidence Consultation".) The main "hoped for" job creation at the Warton EZ's is merely to replace jobs lost from BAe over recent years. To date take-up has been extremely poor - worst in the country according to press reports.

1.2 In relation to affordable housing needs which, at the time the figure was set related purely to social housing, the figure appears to be grossly inflated. Each year the amount of provision shown as required is more than the TOTAL outstanding waiting list at the time the figure was compiled. We fail to see that such a high figure is justified. This matter has also been raised by a number of other resident representatives. (The FBC response is given at the bottom of page 20 of the document entitled "Summary of Responses to the Evidence Consultation".)

Evaluation - As the affordable housing total per annum forms a greater part of the overall volume within the OAHN, we consider that this OAHN is inflated. Added to this is the said figure for jobs growth, which should be recorded as negative (para 1.1), then the OAHN is grossly overstated.

We responded to the Government's Consultation concerning "The Right Homes in the Right Places" on 12 October and, as part of this, agree with the concerns about use of Consultants. We understand, from the Examination Administrator, that your question regarding this was directed solely at the Council and have therefore not included a copy of our response to the Consultation.

Session 2

Please see comments under para 1.1 above.

Session 3

3.1 In relation to paras 3 and 4, given the start of two MAJOR developments we consider that, if the Liverpool method is not used, a significant OVER-supply is likely to materialise within the plan period. This will bring many more problems than a POTENTIAL small shortfall in the short-term.

3.2 In relation to para 5, we raised a considerable number of matters as part of our consultation reply. We do not consider the Council's response addresses these issues. The Council response on HOW the points scoring is allocated is indeed correct, but not WHY those scorings are used, the relevant correlation between scorings nor the application. We consider that these matters are relevant to the Scoring and Tier Level given to Wrea Green, particularly in relation to Local Service Centres. It is clear from the comparative results that this matter needs further examination and explanation. (The FBC response is given on page 52 of the document entitled "Summary of Responses to the Evidence Consultation"). In effect, this should lower the score for Wrea Green to Tier 2, although the development approved to date is already well in excess of that expected for a Tier 1 rural settlement (the target was 150 although 259 have already been approved, with another 159 under Appeal).

3.3 In relation to Wrea Green, account needs to be taken of Inspectors exceeding of the levels of sustainable development within rural settlements (as assessed locally by the Council, and disagreeing with a prior inspector's recent conclusions for a total of 154 dwellings), ready access to jobs and other key matters as indicated in the NPPF. (The FBC response is given on page 52 of the document entitled "Summary of Responses to the Evidence Consultation".)

John Rowson

Chairman of the Community Association for the Protection of Wrea Green

7 November 2017