

Marton Moss Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 16 representations received

Rep No.	Name	Overview of representation(s)
1	National Highways	No comments to make on the Neighbourhood Plan.
2	Coal Authority	Blackpool Council lies outside the coalfield, therefore there is no requirement to be consulted.
3	Blackpool EZ (Cassidy & Ashton)	<p>Policy MM4: Support for amendment of site allocation C, which increases the boundary and the level of redevelopment that is identified. Noted that part of the site as recently been subject to planning approval 21/0272.</p> <p>Highway improvements to facilitate improved traffic flows and new spine road will need to be taken into consideration where they impact upon School Road and Common Edge Road.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan boundary does not overlap with the Enterprise Zone, but the Neighbourhood Plan should make reference to the Enterprise Zone and shown on the appropriate plan.</p>
4	Janet Dillon	Request for land adjacent to 562 Midgeland Road to be included in the Neighbourhood Plan for allocation for housing.
5	Paul Hargreaves	Support for the Neighbourhood Plan.
6	Claire Cumming	The area has enough housing development. There is increased traffic, noise and anti-social behaviour. Open green spaces are needed, not more housing, driveways, cars and people.
7	Dylan Greenwood	Request for land adjacent to 562 Midgeland Road to be included in the Neighbourhood Plan.
8	Deborah Acton	<p>Policy MM4: Housing Allocation A should be reinstated back into the Neighbourhood Plan and it should not form part of the Open Land</p> <p>Unaware of any issues of flooding on the site. It is noted that United Utilities have said that there are no sewer capacity constraints, which has been improved in recent years.</p>
9	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	<p>Support the production of the Neighbourhood Plan, Biodiversity Strategy and other documents.</p> <p>A Local Nature Recovery Strategy will be produced over the next year or so, it will be important to understand how Marton Moss can make a contribution to this. Keeping NP under regular review will allow it to contribute to other relevant climate change and biodiversity strategies.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Overview of representation(s)
10	Environment Agency	<p>Satisfied the plan meets the Basic Conditions, insofar as it relates to our remit.</p> <p>Pleased that the housing site allocations are all located in flood zone 1.</p>
11	Blackpool Council	<p>Policy MM2: Remove reference to golf in paragraph 70, to be in conformity with Core Strategy Policy CS8 and NPPF paragraph 84</p> <p>Policy MM4: Amend paragraph 85 with respect to the plan's housing figure to be in conformity with Core Strategy policies CS1 and CS2.</p> <p>Amend housing allocation I to make reference to School Road frontage to ensure TPO is taken into account.</p> <p>Policy MM6: Amend policy to make explicit reference to Local Plan policies and NPPF, for where a proposal is for a town centre use.</p> <p>Policy MM8: Amend policy and paragraphs 123 and 127 of the supporting text, as well as Objective 2 to ensure that the plan is in conformity with national and local policy.</p>
12	Tony Neal	Support for the Neighbourhood Plan.
13	Fylde Council	No comments to make on the Neighbourhood Plan.
14	Historic England	No comments to make on the Neighbourhood Plan.
15	Homes England	No comments to make on the Neighbourhood Plan.
16	Richard Dugdale	<p>Promotion of sites MM1, MM2 and MM3 through call for sites – land around Chapel Road and Yeadon Way.</p> <p>Disappointed that landowners have not been consulted in any part of the process.</p> <p>Policy MM2: This should be reconsidered as the above sites do not meet three of the four objectives listed under the policy.</p> <p>In respect of the sites, the major open land study is inconstant regarding the appearance of the site and its character.</p> <p>Comments regarding the viability of the site for grazing and its amenity value.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Overview of representation(s)
		<p>The planning of new homes on open land should be considered on a case-by-case basis rather than a blanket refusal.</p> <p>Sites MM1 and MM2 have no PROW or proposed bridleways / cycleways proposed in the plan. MM3 has a short footpath between it and Yeadon Way which is not used and is overgrown.</p> <p>Site MM10 (allocation R) is assessed as suitable for 2 dwellings, which calls into question the fairness / subjectivity of the assessment in comparison with the above sites.</p> <p>The approach taken to assessing accessibility of site MM5 (allocation S – allocated for 15 dwellings) is inconsistent with that taken for the above sites.</p>
17	Sylvia Denning	<p>Support for the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Policy MM4: Support allocation of Site U.</p>
18	Chris Walsh	<p>Policy MM4: Site Allocation N – objection to reduction of site capacity from 3 to 2. The Site Allocation Appraisal Report revised August 2022 states that the site could be appropriately developed for 3 dwellings.</p>
19	Darren Johnston	Support the housing allocations, design code and associated policies.
20	Caroline Leece	Support the housing allocations, design code and associated policies.
21	Darryl Neal	Support for the Neighbourhood Plan.
22	Robert Gibson	Land to the north of Progress Way should be excluded from the proposals This land represents a logical area for future housing development in Blackpool.
23	Mike Deness	Support the housing allocations, design code and associated policies.
24	Adam Skeen	Support the housing allocations, design code and associated policies.
25	Ellie Skeen	Support the housing allocations, design code and associated policies.
26	Karen Smith	Support the housing allocations, design code and associated policies.
27	Richard Newsham	Request for land opposite Eastbank Avenue and Chapel Road to be included as a housing allocation.
28	Kath Abram	The Open Land Study, in respect of land off Sandy Lane and Worthington Road is incorrect; as the site has previously been used for intensive market gardening.
29	Lancashire County Council	<p>Policy MM8: LCC is responsible for the management of Midgeland Farm, which is a managed landfill site.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Overview of representation(s)
		<p>Future use would need to accord with LCC’s future plans for the area. There is no agreement in place for public access on to Midgeland Farm – unaware of a County Council opinion on public use. It would be advisable to design the feature without reference to public access on Midgeland Farm.</p> <p>The buildings are understood to be structurally unsafe and beyond economic repair, retention of the footprint of the building would be subject to cost and feasibility.</p> <p>Midgeland Farm is currently being used for carbon storage trials and activities / monitoring may continue for another 4-5 years.</p>
30	Sport England	No comments to make on the Neighbourhood Plan.
31	United Utilities	<p>Policy MM1: It is noted that the policy includes wording on sustainable drainage, but it is recommended that this is supplemented by a more detailed and separate drainage policy. Full policy wording is supplied.</p> <p>Criterion C of Policy MM1 makes reference to ‘no site level raising’, this is a concern and we would be grateful to understand the reasons for this. Policy wording has previously been recommended which requires the submission of drainage proposals as part of the grant of planning permission.</p> <p>Policy MM4: The removal of sites A, K and M and amendment to site C are noted.</p> <p>The annotated footnotes to the housing allocations are useful, but it would be more appropriate to have site-specific policy wording to guide development for various allocations.</p> <p>We are grateful for attempts to reference sewer flooding incidents in vicinity of allocations D, E, P and Q, but it is important to note that the risk of flooding from the public sewer is not unique to those sites alone.</p> <p>Site Allocation T should be amended to refer to vicinity of a sewer flooding incident.</p>

Rep No.	Name	Overview of representation(s)
		<p>Site Allocations T, U and W should be amended to make reference to combined sewers.</p> <p>Water efficiency: We previously recommended a water efficiency policy within the Neighbourhood Plan. We recommend a policy that meets the optional standard of water efficiency of 110 litres per person per day for new residential development, from Building Regulations Part G and a requirement for non-domestic buildings to achieve a BREEAM rating of ‘very good’.</p> <p>Climate change: We previously supported a climate change policy within the Neighbourhood Plan. We recommend that this is reconsidered and makes reference to sustainable surface water management and the efficient use of water, as well as natural flood management techniques.</p> <p>Landscaping: We previously recommended a landscaping policy in the Neighbourhood Plan. We request that the plan gives further thought to the proposed approach to landscaping. Suggested addition of text referring to surface water management opportunities through permeable surfacing, rain gardens, retrofitted swales and storage areas and bioretention tree pits.</p>