

Wyre Local Plan Examination

Matters Issues and Questions

Statement In Response to Matter 8 - Allocations Inskip

Matter 8 Issue 2 Inskip Extension (SA1/13)

2.1 Would any of the following issues in isolation or cumulatively lead to a conclusion that the allocation would not comprise sustainable development?

Statement 2.1 Yes

1) The Scale of the allocation relative to the size of the village

A detailed study of the issues and documentation surrounding the Wyre Local Plan leads the reader to the uncomfortable conclusion that the root cause of many of the Plans Ills and difficulties stem from the adoption of the spatial strategy for housing placement called "dispersal".

Village residents would no doubt understand a moderate amount of housing development allocation in the current climate but are at pains and highly distressed at the scale of the proposal (282 additional units) for the village as there is no identified local need or employment at the level necessary to sustain such housing. You will already be aware that this allocation will increase the core settlement of the village by 120% compared with its January 2016 level. Any analytical mind knows that to increase the scale of anything in life which is already at a significant level or population, by 120% is to change its nature and character directly. Indeed, WBC's Sustainability Appraisal Report August 2017 p231 notes this as a potential major adverse effect in the Allocation. The document goes on to note that the site concerned is large and significant amounts of green infrastructure will be needed to offset the adverse effects. Village residents are not fools, and this is where the insulting and patronising manner of this statement is evident. Are they supposed not to notice that this is a desperate clutch at a comment to fill a box in the associated table with some kind of mitigation when in reality there is none. Reasonable people know from life's experiences and observations that no amount of green infrastructure is going to disguise the thousands of tons of bricks, mortar and tiles that will be this site, loaded with so many houses. To claim otherwise is to deny reality.

The NPPF at **clause 54** indicates that in rural areas, exercising the duty to cooperate with neighbouring authorities, local planning authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. In not meeting Clause 54 the plan for Inskip is unsound.

The Scale of the Allocation represents Unsustainable Development because it is not underpinned locally by commensurate demand or by the large number of employment opportunities at the salaries necessary to sustain it.

- ii) The effects on the character and appearance of the village and
vii) The creation of inclusive and mixed communities

Villagers' generally fall into two categories of origin:

- a) They were born in the settlement and have lived here all their lives. These people often have a strong affinity with the local farming community and clearly enjoy the relative seclusion of a rural way of life. They shoulder the difficulties and extra costs that way of life creates for the pleasure / comfort / friendliness / return to older values / close knit nature / more raw way of life/ slower /quiet /proximity to wildlife / perhaps more genuine way of life the country lifestyle is.

Or

- b) They moved here because they sought some or all of the very values and characteristics listed above.

Speaking to residents, the vast majority value greatly their way of life in the village, with what it lacks being more than compensated for by the aspects unique to life here. The imposition of this large allocation, will change the village permanently in many ways for instance:

- As a direct result of the development, some residents will find themselves back living within a housing estate again when escape from such an environment and its more urban nature, was the expressed reason they moved to the village in the first place.
- Studies have shown that the cohesiveness and friendliness between residents in a community only works up to a point as a settlement grows. Above that size psychological pressures come into play as people gradually become more circumspect and cautious about whom they relate to socially.
- The quiet nature of the settlement will inevitably be impacted with circa 700 additional people around.
- Residents will have to compete with newcomers in all kinds of subtle ways as they try to continue life as it was, from mothers queuing with their young children to get them onto a swing at the park to waiting to cross the road safely at school times to inordinate waiting times at the Medical and Dental Surgery, to queues in the local shops,
- The village primary school will need to more than double in size to ensure places for the children of the new families.
- The YIPS Centre will be insufficient capacity and will fall by the wayside unless funding and space is found to double its size.
- The Local Church (St Peter') will be too small at key times of the year (Christmas, Easter)
- The village pub will be in the worst possible place to benefit from potential customer growth, at the southern end of the village.
- Village businesses won't be able to benefit from the associated influx of potential employees as they cannot afford the salaries the new home owners will need.
- With teenagers wandering about 'bored because there is nothing to do locally' vandalism and other petty crime is likely to increase.
- Neighbours will become less willing to help and cooperate with one another as numbers grow.

- Special celebrations (eg a street party at the time of a wedding or coronation) with their ability to help improve the cohesiveness of a community, will be less likely to take place as numbers become large and people decide to do nothing.

Unlike an attempt to build more carefully within the village boundary so as to enhance the settlement, this development is in no way organic. It was switched to at the last minute in the Plan Development phase as an easy option for a planning team presumably under severe time constraints, because the land was on offer rather than there is local need, under the pretext of being 'more deliverable'. Of course a greenfield site is more deliverable but planners should not be seeking the easy or quick option at the expense of an existing settlement. They would earn credit and respect from residents by striving to meet instead the Settlement's wishes (Parish Council) particularly if that is a more difficult path, instead of just 'imposing' their will on the community. At the proposed scale on the proposed site, the development can be nothing other than a large modern dormitory housing estate (in a block because of the site shape and housing density), consuming one of the best and most versatile agricultural fields in the village as it encroaches into open countryside, patched onto the northern boundary of the existing settlement.

All of this, although unpalatable might have won a level of sympathy with the community if in the background there was a known demand for so many houses in Inskip and there was commensurate employment within sensible reach to sustain them, but there isn't and villagers know that. So why is the allocation so large – because WBC, driven by Government figures, cannot find space on the Fyde peninsular or the A6 Corridor for these houses so they are happy to solve their problem by allocating (some would say 'dumping') an inordinate quota onto a sleepy village on the southern boundary of the borough so destroying its existing nature and character while convincing themselves in planning terms, it is an acceptable thing to do. Inskip is an ancient settlement and has mention in the Domesday book. Its character and nature are about to be sacrificed here for the convenience of planners taking the easy option - a massive allocation on a green field site - as they race to plug the 7-year gap in their Development Plan documentation, so avoiding Government intervention and the associated embarrassment that would bring (Name and Shame). It is a crime by all concerned!

The rural character of the village will be dealt such a blow by the inordinate scale of this allocation that it will lose a proportion of its country way of life and take on a more urban tone both in lifestyle and appearance. The plan for Inskip is unsustainable because it fails to take due account of and make any credible attempt to preserve the character of the settlement for both the current residents and future generations despite commitments to the contrary set out in early development phase documentation. It appears to residents that their way of life and associated values are a complete irrelevance to the Borough's plan makers.

- iii) Availability of services and employment within or close to the village and
- iv) Choice of modes of travel to access services and jobs and
- x) Climate Change Implications

Inskip has few amenities (a primary school, a Baptist and a C of E church, one pub, a bowling club a small play park for youngsters and a Youth Centre building). It scored a count of just 7 in the baseline study for the Local Plan. Land for an extension to the school and land for a small shop are both proposed in the plan but it is noted that funding to create these amenities is not, severely compromising their probability of ever coming to fruition. (It is noted that CIL issues are being considered in the current review of the NPPF but will not be finalised in time for this plan). Health

services are currently provided at Gt Eccleston and are at capacity. Without enlargement these facilities will be overwhelmed by patient numbers from the current boom in housing in the area.

An assessment involving local employers has been carried out and reported in another Statement on Matter 8 Allocations Inskip (M Nunn ID 0860). It indicates no jobs to support the houses proposed are available locally and house owners will therefore be obliged to commute to suitable work.

The nearest train station is 6 miles away in Kirkham and a car or taxi would be needed to get there. No practicable alternative currently exists for residents in the village other than to commute to work



Appendix 1

by car. A 'ground-up' assessment (see Appendix 1 ^{Commuter Journeys}) of the number of commuter journeys by car that the development will generate has shown a figure of 758 single journeys per working day, as new residents travel to work, sufficient in salary to support their needs in owning and running the typical mix of Affordable, plus 2, 3 and 4 bedroomed houses. (If any reader is in doubt as to the assessment's conclusions I would challenge them to indicate where the analysis is materially wrong so as to change the net conclusion ie the number of commuter journeys generated per working day by the Inskip Extension will be 350 to 400 return trips).

The allocation is the consequence of the dispersal strategy which by its very name, places housing in the wrong place, so consigning buyers to long commuter journeys as summarised above. The strategy should have no place in modern day planning and where it does appear it should be treated as an 'alarm bell' that a proposal may not be sound. New owners will in the majority be obliged to commute large distances daily by car (average 30 miles round trip) to jobs remote from the village with all the drudgery and implications for their safety that entails. In doing so, simple analysis (Appendix 1 p.3) shows they will pass 489 tonnes of CO² per annum into the environment – just one element of the environmental cost for the use of the Dispersal Strategy within this plan!

The Allocation represents Unsustainable Development because it isn't underpinned locally by the large number of employment opportunities at the salaries necessary to sustain the properties. Also it causes an unnecessary environmental burden by its requirement for home buyers to commute to suitable employment by car

v) *Loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land*

The proposed site for the Inskip Extension is 17.9 Ha of Grade 2, Flood Risk 1 Agricultural Land outside the settlement northern boundary. Other land in the village identified for possible housing development is Grade 2, Flood Risk 2 and 3 rendering the site some of the best agricultural land in the vicinity. Farmer will tell you that boggy land (e.g. the higher flood risk) causes livestock, especially sheep, permanent injury to limb joints (ligaments and tendons) so this site is especially valuable farmland locally. It has been part of village farming life for centuries.

The Issues and Options document 2015 identified six parcels of land all with the potential for housing development, three of these (IO68, IO72, and the site IO73) are of substantial area. IO68 has undergone extensive consideration during the Local Plan development process but was rejected at the last minute (April 2017) for the current site on the grounds IO73 is more "Deliverable". (The former site was withdrawn from sale by the landowner with no minutes of WBC meetings with ~~the~~ ~~landowner~~ Metacre Ltd (9 meetings over the plan development period) being forthcoming under Freedom of Information legislation. In addition to Lease Compensation issues with the farmer at IO68,

the withdrawal of the land from sale removed a subordinate package of land from consideration, helping justify the case for the best land at IO73. Government Planning Guidance indicates that where the best land is proposed, subordinate land of lesser quality should be used instead. No attempt has been made to identify lesser quality land either locally e.g. as aggregated smaller packages or within neighbouring Boroughs.

This loss to the current and to future farming communities is relevant in that it does not meet Government guidance and cumulatively the loss is an even greater disaster in the face of the other aspects of unsustainability raised in this and other statements.

The site (SA1/13) represents Unsustainable Development because it removes permanently from the current and future farming communities, a large swathe of the best agricultural land in the village, on the grounds of it being "more deliverable" than the previous option, with no attempt having been made to find a lesser quality site (or aggregated sites). The loss is cumulatively even more disastrous in the face of the lack locally, of demand for housing and commensurate employment.

vi) The highway network

The highways linking the village of Inskip to the wider area are as follows:

Preston Road B5269

Mill Lane

Higham Side Road

Pinfold Lane

Woods Lane

Preston Road B5269 passes through the centre of the village. It is the main route to the regional motorways and as such is the primary commuter route to the south and east of the county. However as one approaches the area of Lewth to the east of Inskip en-route to Broughton, the A6 and the M6, it becomes narrow with repeating right angle bends, with high hedges and trees obscuring a clear view until the half mile relative straight section to the Lancaster canal. At this point all traffic is confronted with one of two key bottlenecks in the area, the narrow, blind, single-vehicle pack-horse bridge over the canal. Negotiating this bridge, one is obliged to 'chance one's luck' that the bridge is clear as a car driver is too low to see. This situation applies equally to the route to the proposed M55 Junction 2 from Inskip through Catforth where one is confronted with the same design of bridge over the same canal. Both these bridges are ancient listed structures. If as happens with a fair regularity, these narrow bridges are hit by a vehicle, making their structure unstable, the closure of the route for repairs would shut a key commuter artery, with a major impact on peak hours traffic flow.

Higham side road is the obvious and therefore main route to the nearby town of Kirkham. Although the road is wider than many at Inskip, within two miles of the village it narrows severely (Wharles to Treals) where it becomes difficult for oncoming vehicles to pass without avoiding action being necessary in the above stretch. Additional traffic on this road at key times (morning rush, school run) would exacerbate this problem.

Closer to home, Wood Lane runs north/south from Carrs Green common. It has a right / left chicane 400 yards in from the southern end which floods significantly, cutting off the route at such times.

The most critical road for the proposed development would be Pinfold Lane, running north/south from the western edge of the Site. This road has evolved from an ancient moss lane and is bounded in many places by deep dykes. This road would be the most convenient route north from the village for new residents and would attract a corresponding proportion of northbound traffic. However driving the road soon shows its limitations with constant subsidence due to its height above the surrounding fields, sharp 90 degree left and right turns, one around Pad End farm literally a few feet from the farmhouse (the farmer's living room is not a dozen feet from the traffic as it negotiates the turn), with 4 and 5 axle juggernauts using the route in addition to the HGV Garage business (R Wells Ltd) on Moss Lane itself. This route heads in the direction of St Michaels. Amazingly, this and Woods Lane are the routes Lancashire Highways have assessed can tolerate the additional traffic from 200 new homes in Inskip. It is worryingly notable that beyond this desktop study, no other assessment of the road network around Inskip has been conducted in support of the development yet these are the very roads that threaten the sustainability of the proposal by congestion, bottle necks, subsidence and occasional flooding.

The proposal is unsound because its sustainability with respect to the adequacy of the highways network surrounding the village has not been tested to inform the feasibility of the proposal, (other than for the route to and from St Michaels - when this route is not the most critical route at peak times, rather the B5269 to Broughton).

Appendix 1 to Matter 8 - Allocations Inskip, Issue 2 Statement by Inskip Residents Action Group

Commuter Journeys By Car Per Working Day Generated By The Inskip Extension Housing Development Resulting From The Cost Of Buying And Operating The Various House Types And The Income Level Required Not Being Available Locally

	Property	Cost to Buy (£)	Deposit 10% (£)	Monthly Mortgage Payment (£)	Cost to Operate Per Month (excl Mortgage) (£)	Min Nett Income Per Annum Required (£)	Min. Gross Income Per Annum Required (£)	Hourly Rate (£)	Jobs at this Hourly Rate Exist In Village Yes / No	No. of Households	No. of Cars Per Household	No. of Cars
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	J	K	L
		Note 2		Note 5	Note 7	12(C+D)	Note 8	F/(37.5x48)		Note 9		
1.	Affordable Housing	75,500 Note 4	7,550	Note 5 355	Note 7 800	13860	15560	8.64	Yes (but filled)	76 (30%)	0.8 Note 10	61
2.	Two Bedroom Terraced House, Ash Meadows Inskip	151,000 Create Homes Website 2017	15,100 Create Homes Website 2017	710 Create Homes Website 2017 Note 3	1200	22920	30688	17.05	No	51 (20%)	1	51
3.	Three Bedroom Detached House, Ash Meadows Inskip	219,950 Create Homes Website 2017 (Mean of Four Types)	22,000	1034	1300	28008	38638	21.46	No	76 (30%)	2	152
4.	Four Bedroom	322,500	32,250	1,516	1500	36192	51659	28.70	No	51 (20%)	2.25	115

N O T E 6	Detached House, Ash Meadows Inskip	Create Homes Website 2017 (Mean of Two Types)						Note 11	
	Total Cars								379
	Av. Cars/Household								1.3
	Total Commute Trips/Workday								758

Notes

1. Calculations based upon cumulative new housing numbers commenced construction since January 2015 and proposed in the Submitted Local Plan (27+55+200 =282). This total is then reduced by 10% (to 254) to allow for occupants that do not commute (Retired, Independent Means, Work from Home etc).
2. House purchase prices taken from Create Homes Website for their Inskip Development named Ash Meadows
3. Mortgage Payment for 2 Bedroom Terrace House taken from Create Homes Website for their Inskip Development named Ash Meadows, (pre-Nov 2017 base rate increase).
4. Affordable Housing purchases anticipated to be 50% assisted.
5. Mortgage Payments for other properties (Column C) including Affordable Housing are scaled from sale price ratio with the property at Note 3.
6. Property Prices at Rows 3 and 4 are the mean prices for 4 and 2 different types respectively, constructed at Ash Meadows by Create Homes.
7. Costs to Operate per Month (Column D) are typical running costs for house types, including Energy, Water, Council Tax, Food, Travel, TV/Internet/Phone Package, Cleaning Materials, Insurance, Maintenance, Presents, Hobbies scaled to suit the size of house concerned.
8. Min Gross Income Required (Column F) calculated from Min Nett Income Required (Column E) using Salary Calculator App www.thesalarycalculator.co.uk, with Personal Allowances before tax as per year 2017/18 levels. Pension contribution set at 5% Gross into employer's pension plan except Row 1. Row 1 is assumed not to make pension contribution due to low wages.
9. Column J is the anticipated mix of housing types.
10. 80% of households in Row 1 are expected to run one car due to the lack of jobs near the village causing a need to commute to work plus the lack of amenities in the village and remoteness of its location. Other households run one, two or three cars. Two cars are necessary for most higher cost houses as partners will often both need to work (most likely in separate locations) to meet home running costs.
11. 25% of households in Row 4 (ie 13 houses) assumed to include young adults living with parents, requiring a third car.

Calculation to Show CO² Per Annum Generated by the Inskip Extension Commuter Trips

Units

gm CO²/car.km x kg/gm x tonnes/kg x miles/day x km/mile x days/year x cars = tonnes CO²/year

$$122.1 \times 1/1000 \times 1.6 \times 30 \times 220 \times 379 = 489 \text{ tonnes CO}^2 / \text{year}$$

Note.

This is an under estimate since the average car is 3-4 years old and will have higher emission of CO²

Data

Av. new car in UK emits 122.1 gm / km CO² (Source: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/new-car-carbon-dioxide-emissions>)

Assumed 30 mile (round trip) average daily commute distance driven

Assumed commuters work 220 days per year

Number of cars commuting taken from commuter trips calculation =379

