

## Maghull Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation –Summary of comments made

Ref	Respondents	Summary of comment
1.	Janet Ward	I request that my plot be included for consideration in the neighbourhood plan proposal in the lakes character area.
2.	Sport England	Generic response setting where to get advice on protecting playing fields and developing planning policy.
3.	Network Rail	Given the proposed residential development any increase in level crossing users could create more accidental or deliberate misuse, with potential for cumulative impact, requiring contributions towards mitigation, Transport Assessments and appropriate sustainable drainage proposals also required following consultation with Network Rail.
4.	United Utilities	<p>We recommend the following is included in the plan, as a separate policy.</p> <p><i>“New development should be designed to maximise the retention of surface water on the development site and to minimise runoff. The approach to surface water drainage should be considered in liaison with the LLFA, the public sewerage undertaker and where appropriate the Environment Agency”.</i></p> <p><i>Surface water should be discharged in the following order of priority:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>An adequate soakaway or some other form of infiltration system.</i></li> <li>• <i>An attenuated discharge to watercourse or other water body.</i></li> <li>• <i>An attenuated discharge to public surface water sewer.</i></li> <li>• <i>An attenuated discharge to public combined sewer.</i></li> </ul> <p>We respectfully request that Maghull Town Council continue to consult with United Utilities on all future planning documents.</p>
5.	Natural England	We do not have any specific comments. If the plan changes screening exercises may need to be undertaken.
6.	Historic England	<p>The strategy must safeguard those elements which contribute to the importance of historic assets. More detailed information on the historic environment is required and heritage should be mentioned in the Plans Vision and Objectives. The status of the local list for Maghull is unclear. Policies could be strengthened and alternative wording is provided, most notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bullet A only makes reference to appearance and bullet B refers to significance which is more than appearance so it might be better to use this in bullet A instead (and also to ensure consistency)</li> <li>• In para 5.4.2 an alternative wording: <b>‘Proposals for extensions or alterations requiring planning permission to any property named on the Maghull Local List <u>should demonstrate how it takes into account the significance of the asset including where appropriate,</u> the appearance of the property.’</b></li> <li>• Bullet B does not look at sustaining and enhancing or protecting the setting, which would help strengthen the protection given to these assets and the policy should look at including this.</li> <li>• We support the content of para 5.4.2 but this should be an additional bullet in the Policy MAG 3 box</li> <li>• In para 5.4.3 it would be helpful if the Plan identified the 7 properties included on the list. Para 5.4.1 describes the creation of a list, yet this para seems to suggest the list is already created, and they are marked on the map in Appendix 4.</li> </ul>

Ref	Respondents	Summary of comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In para 5.4.4 the wording uses features but the Policy refers to properties and the policy/supporting text should be amended to ensure consistency.</li> <li>Whilst we support policy MAG 4 Character Areas it would benefit from mentioning the Local Character Area documents to assist those putting forward proposals on where they are defined. 'Enhance' is more positive than 'improve' and reference for this to be part of the DAS would help strengthen the requirement.</li> <li>The policy could be amended as follows: Development <b>proposals</b> that respect and <b>demonstrate how it has taken into account</b> the distinct characteristics <b>defined in the Maghull Local Character Area document</b> in terms of the type of development, scale, design, open space provision and general layout, and <b>enhances improves</b> but does not detract from its surroundings in the Local Character Areas in which it is located, will be supported. <b><u>This should be included within a design and access statement that accompanies any application.</u></b></li> </ul>
7.	National Grid	National Grid has identified that it has no record of such apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan area. Clarification was also received that gas pipeline across Land East of Maghull site is a local distribution pipeline not belonging to National Grid.
8.	Gerard Crilly	Evidence in support of Maghull's totally inadequate drainage infrastructure and the impact the proposed new development will have on existing homes. This includes the Environment Agency's Flooding Report for Maghull (23.12.2016); A letter to the Examiner (25.06.2018); an email to Maghull Town Council (28.09.2017); photos of flooding incidents in Maghull and a written timeline of events (2016 onwards); A second letter to the Examiner (28.06.2018); a message to Sefton Councillors setting out the potential dangers of flooding (23.06.2018); various press articles detailing flooding events in Maghull and other evidence.
9.	Maureen Webb	Object to building over 1600 houses on land East of Maghull. We need this to grow food. It will be detrimental to wildlife. Proper wildlife surveys are needed. Infrastructure cannot cope with more houses.
10.	John Miller	Halt urban sprawl. Stop building semi-detached houses in brick.
11.	Gerard Crilly 2	Signatures of 100 residents of Maghull affected by dangerous flooding and further supporting information
12.	Gerard Crilly 3	Request for unsustainable drainage infrastructure and upgrading to be incorporated into the Neighbourhood Plan.
13.	Environment Agency	The plan does not seek to allocate any development further to that set out in the Sefton Local Plan. We note the plan objectives seek to ' <i>ensure Infrastructure is improved</i> ' however this appears to be related to matters outside our planning remit. This includes drainage proposals which we would remind the Council are matters for the Lead Local Flood Authority. Therefore we have no objection to the plan and no further comments to make.
14.	White Peak Planning on behalf of Countryside Properties, Persimmon Homes and The East Maghull Consortium *	<p>The role of the Land East of Maghull Supplementary Planning Document in guiding development and infrastructure delivery needs to be set out more fully. We request that the first paragraph of MAG 6 is amended to the following: <i>'The Masterplan for Land East of Maghull, to be submitted and approved before the first planning applications have been approved, should include not only proposed land-uses and layouts, but also a framework for infrastructure delivery and phasing, both on and off site (where possible).'</i></p> <p>Request more character areas are acknowledged within the Land East of Maghull site and that point 'b)' of MAG 6 is</p>

Ref	Respondents	Summary of comment
		<p>amended to the following: <i>'include a number of character areas so that different locations within the site have a distinctive built character of their own.'</i></p> <p>The fourth bullet of paragraph 5.7.4 states that the Town Council would prefer the proposed local shopping provision to be located centrally to the site. However, as stated in our previous representations, this conflicts with LEM8 of the SPD which states that <i>'The parade should be located adjacent to School Lane at its junction with the Local Distributor Road.'</i> As guidance relating to the location of the local shopping provision is already provided in the SPD which was subject to consultation and subsequently adopted by Sefton Council, we request that the fourth bullet of paragraph 5.7.4, requesting that the local shopping provision is centrally located, is removed.</p> <p>Bullet 5 of paragraph 5.7.4 requests that the Masterplan includes more detail in relation to the Business Park and an assessment of potential impacts on Maghull Town Centre and the proposed local shopping provision within the Land East of Maghull allocation.</p> <p>Policies MN2 and MN3 of the Local Plan already allocate land for a Business Park and define the uses that would be acceptable within it. Policy MN3 and the SPD also couple construction and occupation of the Business Park to the delivery of residential development within the allocation and the implementation of off-site infrastructure.</p> <p>As the principle of development of the Business Park is already established, the impacts of this on the surrounding area should not need to be assessed within the Masterplan. Should planning applications be submitted that do not accord with Policies MN2 and MN3 of the Local Plan, justification will be required at that stage, taking into account potential impacts on the surrounding area, including within the allocation.</p> <p>Regarding delivery and phasing of commercial units within the Business Park, this will be subject to market demand and therefore, it is not possible to provide specific details on the exact uses or phasing within the Masterplan.</p> <p>On the basis of the above, we request that the fifth bullet of paragraph 5.7.4 is removed from the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
15.	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Anwyl Land Ltd *	<p>Our Client maintains their concerns with Policy MAG1 of the MNP. The Policy sets out that contributions from planning applications within the plan area will be sought over and above that necessary to make the development acceptable. Policy MAG1 lists the following infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maghull District Centre Regeneration;</li> <li>• Traffic Management Schemes;</li> <li>• Town Hall Improvement Works;</li> <li>• A New Sports Hall;</li> <li>• A new Outdoor Running Track; and</li> <li>• Open Space Improvements including enhanced Green Corridors.</li> </ul> <p>This list identified above is loosely defined with Appendix 7 of the MNP offers only limited further explanation of these projects. There is no detail provided of cost, timescales or responsibility for delivery. As such there is no mechanism provided by the MNP to secure the delivery of these projects. The approach of Policy MAG1 is clearly inconsistent with Paragraph 204 of the NPPF. It is unclear what level of contribution would be required of proposed developments to respond to this policy requirement. The Policy therefore introduces uncertainty for applicant's and decision makers alike and has the potential to result in the refusal or failure for otherwise sustainable development in coming forward.</p>

Ref	Respondents	Summary of comment
		<p>An alternative approach for the Town Council in securing this infrastructure which would be consistent with national policy would be to draw up a Regulation 123 list. This list would provide the basis against which collated CIL monies would be spent from qualifying applications determined and delivered within the Neighbourhood Plan Boundary. The Town Council should focus on refining the infrastructure identified within the bullet points to Policy MAG1 into a definite Regulation 123 list. This approach would be most effective in securing the Town Council's ambitions Maghull, including securing the infrastructure necessary to support and facilitate the delivery of the Regeneration Framework for the Town Centre.</p> <p>Our Client is supportive of the Town Council's aim to prepare and adopted a Regeneration Plan for Maghull Town Centre (MAG 2). The Regeneration Plan provides an excellent opportunity for the Town Council, stakeholders and the community to achieve real improvements to the Town Centre, attracting new occupiers including smaller independent businesses and to provide for a vibrant centre. The approach of this document however will need to be sufficiently flexible to ensure that sustainable developments are allowed. The Town Council should also seek a mix of land uses and should not adopt allocations which are inflexible to other uses where proven to be unviable or where it has been proven that there is no demand.</p> <p>Our Client notes that the Green Corridor (MAG 5) identified within Maghull is defined along the route of the Merseyrail link into Liverpool. Whilst our Client is supportive of the Town Council's aims to secure the longevity of this Green Corridor, it must be recognised by the Town Council that the Borough Council are powerless in controlling developments which occur within the railway boundary which are undertaken by Network Rail through Permitted Development Rights. Furthermore, Network Rail are highly critical and influential of developments adjacent to working sections of their land which might prevent access, affect maintenance, safety or which might result in subsidence. Our Client would suggest that the Town Council (or Borough Council) contact Network Rail to determine the acceptability of this policy.</p> <p>Our Client maintains the view that there is a general absence within the MNP of any long-term strategies/policies which will be effective in achieving the ambitions of the local community, especially with regard to local housing provision. The Town Council could review current Green Belt boundaries within the plan area in the aim of achieving its infrastructure and economic ambitions, and meeting housing need, whilst securing new communities which are truly shaped by local people.</p>
<b>One unsolicited submission has been received since the close of Regulation 16 consultation on 30<sup>th</sup> July and accepted by the Examiner</b>		
16.	Gerard Crilly 4	Surface water and other issues relating to flooding

\* Indicates request to be notified of decision to adopt Maghull Neighbourhood Plan

The full responses are available in the Maghull Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation at: [www.sefton.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplanning](http://www.sefton.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplanning)