Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan Statement of Consultation – Appendix 7f

Issues and Options 2015 Consultation – Matters Raised

Q5 – OPTIONS - Which of the options do you think should be taken forward as the Spatial Strategy showing where development will be directed? Can any of the Options be amended to make it more sustainable, deliverable or to increase the extent to which it would help to achieve the Vision and Strategic Objectives? Is there an alternative or hybrid option which would be more appropriate?

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|----|----------|--|
| 8 | Option 2 | No additional comments submitted |
| 15 | None | Recognises the need to increase housing stock, but must be done sympathetically and not at any cost. Consideration must be given to |
| | | existing residents with the impact and infrastructure to support such developments particularly access. |
| 16 | None | Don't support the plan for Scorton. Appreciate there are areas that will need to be built, IO-90 most appropriate. |
| 19 | Option 3 | No additional comments submitted |
| 23 | Option 2 | A mix of Option 2 and 3 could be an alternative approach. |
| 24 | Option 2 | Detached houses will be built and not lived in by people who work in Wyre (already happened in coastal area). Logic to build along A6 |
| | | as good access to motorway, Preston, Lancaster and beyond. Also benefits from Garstang town centre which has infrastructure to cope |
| | | with new housing. Option 3 would be disaster as rural settlements inc. Great Eccleston as they need steady organic growth. |
| 27 | Option 3 | Have proper regard to the concerns of the residents rather than the views of central government. |
| 36 | None | • Have to be realistic about the needs of the people living in the Borough. |
| | | • Should focus on Fleetwood - deprived area – need to make it a desirable place to live. |
| | | • Have to look objectively at the needs of the various local communities - all different - cannot apply the same rules for |
| | | building/planning for small villages as you can with the town areas. |
| | | • AONB on our doorstep, live in an area that attracts visitors and holiday makers – impact of building along the A6 and loss of countryside. |
| | | Many villages attract residents because they are quiet - expansion is not always necessary or required. Particularly if 4 and 5 |
| | | bedroomed executive homes will be built and smaller families can't afford to live in the villages to keep village life going. |
| | | Alternative option - Option one with a more realistic approach to the areas of countryside in the Wyre. |
| | | • All future options should include future plans for infrastructure so that the residents of Wyre can be assured that services will be at |
| | | the least maintained and should be improved. |
| 40 | Option 1 | Should be concentrating on improving town centres, encouraging development where there are areas of poverty and deprivation. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|----|----------|--|
| | | |
| | | Should be protecting the countryside and the rural businesses which depend mainly on tourism. |
| | | Building expensive houses in small rural villages will not help first time buyers, the elderly, the poorly paid or any other segment of society which is mentioned in your vision and strategic objectives document. |
| | | Should be considering ways of using huge areas of flood plains which are currently useless to any economic activity by either draining, building flood barriers or any other method which is appropriate. |
| 44 | Option 2 | Fleetwood – loss of employment and activity - should be exploring new ways to bring manufacturing and employment back into the area. Would avoid commuting. |
| | | New housing development must always include main road access with a two way option for commuting. |
| | | Newly built pubs and supermarkets do not constitute adequate employment and to guarantee sustainability. Industrial land should be retained just as green land/countryside should. |
| | | Fleetwood, Thornton and Cleveleys are already heavily populated with little land to spare. |
| | | Substantial land in Poulton - better road access to the motorway and other surrounding areas of the Fylde and far enough away from the river to avoid being a flood risk. |
| | | Best place would be to create a new mini town on the Windy Harbour site or on the A6 corridor - links to motorways north or south. |
| | | IO 27 |
| | | Land originally bestowed upon the area to be used for public recreation purposes only and therefore any building on that land would be inappropriate. |
| | | Any homes would lead to an unwarranted intrusion into the area. |
| 52 | Option 1 | Fleetwood is in need of development and provides the largest area of brownfield sites. Attention should be aimed in this area. |
| 55 | Option 2 | Fylde Coast peninsula does not have the infrastructure to support more dwellings and jobs. |
| 59 | Option 2 | Only Option 2 is sustainable although will significantly alter the nature of the area. No need for the amount of houses proposed. According to ONS 3000 are needed. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|----|----------|--|
| 61 | Option 3 | Comments only reflect Garstang area. Accepts the need for development. However, development should be located on the eastern side |
| | | of A6 as the A6 should continue to bypass the towns. Proposed development would be dangerous and unsafe. |
| 62 | None | Agree more housing needed but should be on PDL before Greenfield/Greenbelt. Wyre is an agricultural area yet fields with productive |
| | | farms have been marked. Areas need looking at independently. |
| | | Village facilities should be available if/when new housing is considered, i.e. School, shops, public transport homes for elderly. A lot of |
| | | family homes are occupied by one person as smaller homes aren't available. |
| 63 | Option 2 | Garstang has opportunity to build new railway station and new junction on motorway, alleviating transport problems. |
| 64 | Option 2 | Obvious solution is new town but ruled out due to costs. Garstang more attractive option than the coastal area. |
| 67 | Option 2 | 1) More area and space for development. |
| | | 2) Better linkages to A6 and M6. |
| | | 3) Better transport advantages. |
| | | 4) Close to major rail links. |
| | | 5) Option 2 best choice, map speaks for itself. |
| | | Option 3 could probably work on a small scale in conjunction with Option 3 if roads are improved. |
| 68 | Option 2 | No additional comments submitted |
| 69 | None | No additional comments submitted |
| 70 | Option 2 | A6 corridor better served by motorway, rail and infrastructure. Build new motorway junction. Area can absorb new residencies. |
| 71 | Option 2 | No additional comments submitted |
| 72 | Option 2 | Garstang area can sustain housing – jobs, roads, connection to the motorway. |
| 82 | None | The demand for housing has increased from 4500 to 9000 - figures that need checking. How can we be sure these figures are correct if |
| | | they were so far out previously? |
| | | |
| | | Priority should be given to the deprived areas of the borough and the rural areas to ensure these are sustainable. Building down the A6 |
| | | corridor doesn't address either of these. |
| | | Option 1 doesn't focus enough on rural areas and option 3 prioritises none. |
| | | None of the options provide enough information about infrastructure. |
| | | The A6 is said to have 'good links' - this is because it is a bypass road. The good links would be impacted with extensive building on the |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|----|----------|--|
| | | A6 corridor. |
| | | Wyre BC should be in close consultation with Preston and Lancaster when considering building on the A6 as developments in both of these cities would already impact the A6 significantly. |
| | | The same could be said for the west of the borough with regards to Blackpool. |
| 90 | None | Problems with Option 1 - Only a proportion of the objectives set can be achieved, in particular those necessary to retain and improve the vitality and sustainability of existing rural communities. Also inadequate weighting has been given to road and rail. |
| | | Problems with Option 2 - The sheer scale of proposed development would drive a coach and horse through being able to protect the natural and built environments of Garstang, Forton, Barton etc and the A6 would become one long urban ribbon development. The sustainability of the whole scheme is totally inadequate. Problems with Option 3 - As stated addresses few of the strategic objectives of for instance improving Fleetwood & in over development of the A6 corridor. |
| | | Combine all 3 options to include the best of all and prevent ribbon development of the A6 corridor. Include as necessary preconditions of the plan being adopted that major improvements to: |
| | | The A6 in particular through Broughton and the M6 junction north and south, also the A585. Major expansion of educational and health provision with particular emphasis around Garstang, which is already grossly insufficient to meet existing needs. |
| | | 3) Protection of the rural environment west of the A6 as well as to the east to ensure that the vitality of local farms and markets can be sustained. |
| 91 | Option 3 | A road connecting the end of Shard Lane to Garstang Road would significantly improve traffic flow to the Fleetwood/Blackpool areas. |
| | | Fleetwood's development is dependent upon industrial development but this will require a major infrastructure investment that is probably unaffordable in the short term so concentrating expansion there is not really feasible. Otherwise Fleetwood's workforce needs to be encouraged to live in Fleetwood in this case an equally significant investment in the town is needed. The M6 corridor does need more development but the area is not bad as it is; we must beware of development for developments sake. |
| 94 | Option 2 | No options if developers were made to use derelict areas. |
| 96 | - | In reality development will be market driven. However some key principles should be applied. The Green Belt should be maintained. Quality agricultural land for development should be avoided. Option 1 would appear to offer best |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|---|
| | | economic and environmental benefit. The adoption of Option 2 could lead to the eastern part of the borough turning into a 'dormitory |
| | | suburb' for industrial/commercial areas outside of Wyre, offering little local benefit. |
| | | Should the Plan not take into account proposed plans for adjacent authorities? A6 corrido already overused, a better option would be |
| | | to consider the M55 corridor. The proposed growth on the A6 corridor on this scale would undoubtedly destroy the very things that make these such successful communities. |
| 97 | Option 1 | Climate change, transport and health. |
| | | First the plan needs to determine how to transform the transport infrastructure to reduce traffic on all roads first – increase walking, |
| | | cycling, and public transport effectively in urban and rural areas. Then decide where developments of housing and employment areas should go. |
| 98 | Option 2 | Ensure all waste land/brownfield/underused sites are used first. Where greenfield sites are used, work with builders to promote extremely sustainable housing. |
| 100 | Option 2 | Option 2 as large proportion of Wyre residents commute to Lancaster or Preston. Although no rail infrastructure commuters still use |
| | | cars so not overly detrimental to the sustainability of the option. Developing in Fleetwood would not improve social deprivation. |
| 101 | Option 3 | Option 3 needs to take into account the very busy roads around the Hardhorn Road area. Any addition of housing as per option 1 would |
| | | cause even more chaos. The roads and access would have to be improved. Some form of bypass needs to be developed to reduce |
| | | traffic. |
| | | Road system and improvement needs to be top priority. |
| 103 | Option 2 | Adding housing in Thornton and Fleetwood will make commuting issue worse as most employment is out of the area. The A6 corridor is |
| | | better as commuters are on the main routes north and south. |
| 106 | None | The objectives addressed by this plan will not be met by any of these options. |
| | | Discussion of Option 1 makes good points about the benefits of focussing development (& redevelopment) where most people already |
| | | live, where car dependency is least and public transport best, and there is considerable untapped growth potential. |
| | | Option 3 may be more realistic. Many seek a less urban life. Domestic logistics frequently involve regular visits to a variety of places for |
| | | work, education etc. rather than one 'home' town. Option 2 risks putting undue strain on the A6 and its many junctions. There is no |
| | | obvious or cheap way to upgrade this road, and the proposals for large-scale residential and commercial development around Garstang |
| | | would remove many of its more attractive features and destroy much of its distinctive charm. It is hard to see how this would benefit |
| | | people to the west of the borough, and it is possible that a new employment hub on the A6, possibly with a new motorway junction to |
| | | the M6, will remove some of the already limited employment opportunities in Fleetwood. Western Wyre's best chances are probably |
| | | linked to its port, its industrial heritage and good mix of brownfield sites, and proximity to Blackpool. It is part of a large Blackpool |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|---|
| | | centred conurbation that stretches continuously from Lytham to Fleetwood and Poulton le Fylde, that would best be planned as a |
| | | single integrated unit, to the mutual advantage of more rural parts of Fylde & Wyre. |
| | | |
| | | Need sub-regional planning based on functional economic units, not arbitrary local authority boundaries. |
| | | Strategy should take a broader view of development potential and need across the borough. |
| | | The western part of Wyre should be a distinctive part of the larger Fylde Coast conurbation. |
| | | This means more redevelopment of existing urban areas than anticipated by the Local Plan, meeting demand for residential and |
| | | employment development in situ rather than to the rural east of the district. |
| | | |
| | | Other demand may be met by high-rise development, and by more intensive use of non-port land near Fleetwood docks. |
| | | |
| | | Poulton-le-Fylde and areas to the south of Blackpool may take much of the peripheral expansion of the coastal conurbation. |
| | | There will be pressure on the A6 corridor for development to meet demand for housing associated with both Preston and Lancaster, |
| | | but both districts have their own plans and allocations, so it is reasonable to seek a slower pace of expansion in Garstang and other |
| | | small settlements than the Plan options suggest. This should be limited by the capacity of the A6, should not threaten landscape |
| | | features or amenity and, ideally, should encourage a wider range of local employment opportunities. |
| | | Myerscough campus is a model that can be applied elsewhere as an alternative to spasmodic speculative estate development. |
| | | |
| | | The plan should encourage self-build and a dynamic rural and semi-rural economy. And enhance rather than threaten the cultural, |
| | | aesthetic and environmental assets of which we are proud. |
| 110 | Option 3 | Option 1 is not sustainable because of exacerbation of A585 and local traffic congestion. |
| | | |
| | | Pressure on schools from an increased population. |
| | | Flood Risk - mass building on countryside areas and along the banks of the regions major river (the Wyre) in Flood Plain and River Bank |
| | | areas goes against National Environmental & Property Insurance recommendations. |
| | | |
| | | The River Wyre is an SSSI, mass development in the countryside and green belt areas in SE Thornton will cause a deterioration in the |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|--|
| | | environment relating to wildlife habitat, local countryside and leisure amenities, air quality, noise and light pollution. |
| | | Option 3 is the only viable option as focusing all development on the Fylde Coast Peninsular will only increase the current stresses (above) and lack of employment. |
| | | Affordable housing development is needed in the rural areas of Wyre so that young families can remain close to family support, can help revitalise the rural economy and sustain local services. Will also mean that rural communities can avoid becoming dormitory areas or retirement zones. |
| | | Housing development should be spread across the borough and the development of large housing estates should not be an option. This type of mass building inevitably places intolerable stresses on existing road, health and education provision. |
| 112 | Option 1 | No additional comments |
| 113 | Option 1 | Whilst none of the options are ideal, we feel that there is a greater opportunity for development in the west of the Borough (Option 1) and that this development and investment (particularly in Fleetwood) would have a more positive impact than Options 2 or 3. There is a greater need for investment and housing in the areas identified in Option 1. However, we do question the figures which underpin the planning options and the demand for housing and we also have concerns regarding infrastructure planning which should be undertaken in parallel with any Options discussions. |
| 114 | Option 2 | Option 1 carries the risk of non-viable housing development and is highly optimistic about job creation in the FCP against a background of distance and poor highway links to major centres. By 2031 option 1 would mean that the FCP would be completely developed and there would be no scope for further development. Option 2 would enable further development in the FCP beyond 2031. |
| | | I recall in the last plan that development south of Garstang Rd East would only be viable if a new link road was built to link to the M55 but this would be expensive to build as it would need to cross a railway line. Option 2 still requires moderate development in the FCP. This would enable the use of previously developed land rather than Greenfield. Development along the A6 corridor would reduce development in flood risk areas and would provide a much better prospect for long term sustainability. |
| 115 | | Garstang /A6 area has better infrastructure, development is needed to support rural communities and space to absorb the proposed number of houses. Fylde Coast Peninsula dosen't. |
| 116 | Option 1 | Social deprivation of Fleetwood and surrounding areas needs to be addressed. |
| 121 | None | Need to aggressively identify and build on brownfield sites in the first instance. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|--|
| | | • Have realistic housing approval rate per year, not one based on excessive/unproven job creation rate per year. |
| | | Maintain the character of rural settlements, by limiting their expansion. |
| 131 | Option 3 | Sites IO_133 and IO_134 |
| | | Any proposed development within the Calder Vale area will need to be sustainable and support the vision and strategic objectives of |
| | | the local plan, particularly in relation to vision number 9 and 12 of the objectives. |
| 136 | Option 3 | All areas of the borough should take a share of the burden. To focus solely on Garstang would be a disaster for the town, particularly its |
| | | historic heritage, for the economy, as the A6 would stagnate, and for the infrastructure – education, health service, utilities, etc. Has |
| | | the council fully explored all brown field sites across the borough? Has it identified appropriate areas where the impact would be less? |
| | | Issue of infrastructure needs working out first. |
| 141 | Option 3 | No additional comments submitted. |
| 147 | Option 2 | Option 2 more able to sustain and absorb new housing - great roads and less people currently living there - less detrimental effects. |
| | | |
| | | The Fylde coast road infrastructure at present is struggling to deal with the current population. Also issue of impact on retail, educational and health infrastructure. |
| 151 | Option 2 | No indication of what moderate means for the Fylde Coast Peninsula under this option. |
| 131 | Option 2 | No indication of what moderate means for the Fyide Coast Fernissula under this option. |
| | | The Peninsula is isolated from the rest of Wyre – little room for development, poor accessibility which deters industry. More housing |
| | | leads to more commuting and more congestion. |
| | | |
| | | Garstang and the A6 corridor is the only answer. |
| | | |
| | | Alternative option – a new town centred on Garstang with access to the motorway and railway. |
| | | |
| | | Limited development on the Peninsula need a proper plan for infrastructure. Need to be more far sighted. |
| 152 | None | Increased food costs if agriculture land is built on. Forotn is I danger of becoming a commuter area and identity lost. Make more sense |
| | | to invest in Fleetwood. Each part of the borough is an individual community. |
| | | Forotn has already had housing. It is a network of small winding lanes. The school will be oversubscribed. Forton has no public transport |
| | | or amenities. |
| 153 | Option 2 | See response to question 4 |
| 154 | Option 2 | The FCP has severe traffic congestion particularly Lambs Road and Skippool Road. Further development will make peak times worse. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|---|
| | | Lambs Road and Skippool Road are narrow, winding and dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians. No rail service and no infrastructure to |
| | | support further development. Garstang has space and traffic links to absorb new houses and rural economy would be supported. |
| 155 | None | Forton has already had new builds and low cost housing in pipeline. The Options will make infrastructure worse. |
| | | Fleetwood in need of re-generation and will benefit from gas storage scheme. The Morecambe/Fleetwood barrage could help future |
| | | energy requirements. This could bring new growth, attract visitors and help re-introduce the rail link. |
| 156 | Option2 | Garstang better choice, access to M6/A6. New rail station and car parking. |
| 157 | Option2 | Garstang better choice, access to M6/A6 and now new Broughton bypass. New rail station. More green areas than FCP. |
| 158 | Option 2 | No additional comments submitted. |
| 161 | Option 2 | Serious weakness – no explanation of "moderate" or "significant". A585 issues mean Thornton is a poor choice for more house building. |
| | | Support for a new town centred on Garstang – has infrastructure, links to the M6/A6, proximity to Preston and growing demand for |
| | | housing/jobs. |
| 163 | Option 2 | Garstang the A6 area has space to absorb development and would support rural communities. The FCP already has traffic problems |
| | | particularly Lambs Road and Skipool Road which would be worsened, i.e safety, narrow, dangerous bends and unsuitable for |
| | | pedestrians/cyclists. Bus and rail services inadequate, FCP does not have space/infrastructure for further development. |
| 165 | None | No additional comments submitted. |
| 166 | Option 3 | No additional comments submitted. |
| 167 | None | No additional comments submitted. |
| 168 | Option 2 | Option 2 more sensible as a lot of spare land and easy access to the motorway network. |
| | | Each area has a responsibility to take what is needed. |
| 173 | Option 1 | Fylde Coast has a better infrastructure to cope with more housing. |
| | | Garstang's services are oversubscribed and the roads are not built for the amount of traffic this development would bring. |
| 179 | Option 1 | The priority should be economic regeneration (Fleetwood and the coastal strip) and work opportunities, social mobility, prosperity, |
| | | health and wealth creation. Options 2 and 3 do not target deprived areas. |
| 184 | None | No definition of sustainability. Forton identified for limited development in each option but there are 3 sites with current permission for |
| | | dwellings so not limited development. Why is it documented as such? |
| | | The needs of different communities in Wyre need to be considered separately. Fleetwood needs priority with housing and jobs. Forton |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|---|
| | | needs to be considered for agriculture, tourism, proximity to A6 and the Market town of Garstang. |
| 185 | Option 2 | Lot of spare land and easy access to motorway around Garstang area. Development would have space for recreation and therefore |
| | | attract young families |
| 187 | Option 1 | Ensure all development occurs on suitable land for housing and not built on recreational resources (bowling green, cricket field etc.) |
| | | and other key amenities or farm land. Use Brownfield sites. |
| 189 | None | No additional comments submitted. |
| 190 | Option 3 | More open space between Garstang and Broughton. Better air quality and travel facilities. New town with appropriate facilities and a junction off M6. |
| 193 | Option 1 | Option 1 should be adapted to allow Fleetwood to thrive. Added to existing infrastructure: |
| | | Existing rail line extended to Fleetwood |
| | | ■ M55 spur to Fleetwood |
| | | • Fleetwood port should be degraded to attract use. |
| | | Incentives: |
| | | Attract employment to Fleetwood |
| | | • Industrial on old docks export via revitalised port |
| | | Wyre Council should research European funding to Fleetwood. |
| 195 | | 1) Fleetwood needs development, rural villages on minor scale. 2) Development will diminish agriculture. 3) Villages become urbanised. |
| | | 4) Communities in the borough considered separately. |
| 196 | None | 1) Development will diminish agriculture. 2) Seems development more important than countryside which provides a living and leisure. |
| | | 3) Villages become urban suburbs. 4) Development should be confined to need, i.e. Fleetwood. 5) The borough has its own unique |
| | | circumstances and development should be judged independently. |
| 197 | None | Option 1 if amended would deliver a greater part of the Vision and Objectives. Major investment in Fleetwood would reverse the |
| | | decline and attract jobs and growth. Affordable houses needed to attract workers to Fleetwood. A6 is already at saturation point and |
| | | concentrating on A6 corridor would bring more problems. New roads needed in Fleetwood. An ageing population means less family |
| | | houses need to be built in future years as houses become on the market. Agricultural land must be valued economically and not |
| | | overridden by more houses. Greenbelt must be protected. Plans must not destroy village life with out of proportion expansion and suburban sprawl. |
| 198 | Option 2 | No advantages with Option 1 without serious impacts on local population. Option 2 offers opportunity for improved transport. Don't |
| | | understand how housing numbers have been derived. SHMA 2013 used but no logic applied by WBC. As stated Option 2 allow link up |
| | | development to motorway and perhaps new town with rail link. This would comply with NPPF (sustainability). Police would support |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|------------------|---|
| | | new M6 junction and would provide improvements to strategic road network. East of Preston good example. |
| 199 | Option 2 | A6 has strong connectivity links to Preston and beyond. |
| 202 | Option 1 | Favour a combination of Option 1 and 2 |
| | and 2 | Maintain the town centres of Fleetwood and Garstang. |
| 207 | Option 2 | A6 corridor has great infrastructure for development. Space and close links to railway and motorway. Development will support rural communities. |
| 208 | Option 2 | Most housing has been in Thornton and peninsula. Build new housing closer to transport links. |
| 213 | Option 3 | No additional comments submitted. |
| 214 | None Option 1 | Would prefer none, but out of all, go with Option 1 as keeps development in one area which already has road and rail links. Alternative Option 2 as good transport links as well as shops and employment. |
| | | Perhaps keep development centred around existing built up areas, i.e. Poulton, Thornton, Fleetwood and Garstang as already well served by transport etc. and leaves countryside free. In additional is the financial saving as developing Over Wyre would incur huge additional costs due to upgrading road networks to support the extra vehicles. Vast additional drainage will be required which is negative for the environment and existing drainage is at full capacity in Winter. New Fire/Police and Ambulance stations would be required at a time of closures. |
| 215 | Option 2 | Fail to see justification for housing numbers. Option 2 offers opportunity for improved transport links to support development complying with NPPF (sustainability). Perhaps new town near Garstang with rail/M6 link and park and ride. Highways England have finance available for improved infrastructure. Police would support new M6 junction. |
| 216 | Option 2 | See response 198 |
| 219 | None | Preferred option – develop along the A6 between Garstang and Broughton. |
| 221 | 2 | Least chance of serious adverse impacts and best chance for better transport links to support development. Doubts over housing projections put forward by SHMA. In favour of concentrating majority of housing provision around A6 corridor and Preston Growth area. Suggested alternative Creation of new town near Garstang with Rail and M6 connection. Including park and ride for Preston, Manchester and Lancaster. Housing is more valuable in this area due to connectivity, Infrastructure delivery will be cheaper due to existing connections, Proximity to new M55, J32 and Warton enterprise zone, Area will be more likely to attract further development due to motorway, and additional housing, which will in turn have beneficial |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|---|
| | | implications for developer contributions to infrastructure. |
| | | 5) Opportunity for future growth. |
| | | 6) Highways England have finance available toward funding improvements to Strategic Highways network to support developments. |
| | | 7) Police would support a new M6 junction between J32 and J33 |
| 222 | 2 | 1) Least chance of serious adverse impacts and best chance for better transport links to support development. |
| | | 2) Doubts over housing projections put forward by SHMA. |
| | | 3) In favour of concentrating majority of housing provision around A6 corridor and Preston Growth area. Suggested alternative |
| | | Creation of new town near Garstang with Rail and M6 connection. Include park and ride for Preston, Manchester and Lancaster. 1) Housing is more valuable in this area due to connectivity. |
| | | 2) Infrastructure delivery will be cheaper due to existing connections. |
| | | 3) Proximity to new M55, J32 and Warton enterprise zone. |
| | | 4) Area will be more likely to attract further development due to motorway and additional housing which will in turn have beneficial implications for developer contributions to infrastructure. |
| | | 5) Opportunity for future growth. |
| | | 6) Highways England have finance available toward funding improvements to Strategic Highways network to support developments.7) Police would support a new M6 junction between J32 and J33 |
| 223 | 3 | No additional comments submitted |
| 224 | 3 | No additional comments submitted |
| 228 | Option 1 | Option 1 - Best option for economic development would appear to be investment around areas where this is already infrastructure for this purpose e.g. Thornton (Hillhouse) and Fleetwood. |
| | | Although roads in this area are already congested (as are rural areas) there is more potential on the coast to extend the road network to the M55. |
| | | Do not agree with the A6 corridor focus – Option 2 - for the following reasons: |
| | | The east of the borough is rural, and is predominantly agricultural. |
| | | |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|------|----------|---|
| | | The A6 corridor is already congested. Poor bus transport infrastructure Further development here will add to the congestion. No |
| | | provision in the plan for the development of public transport services. |
| | | Impact on ability to access medical and educational services. |
| | | , |
| | | Completely agree that housing is an issue. Little discussion of how affordable housing for young people will be provided, (or the needs of the older population). |
| | | Current housing developments in Barton, Catterall, Forton and Garstang are high end, executive homes. The ratio of housing development to affordable housing is comparatively low. There needs to be more careful thought about where housing is located. |
| | | What kind of scoping study has been undertaken to identify affordable housing/older people needs? |
| | | Do not agree with Option 3 for same reasons as for option 2. Also: |
| | | Dispersal has the potential to adversely affect the rural road infrastructure. |
| | | Lack of sewage and service infrastructure, gas for example. |
| 239 | Option 1 | No additional comments submitted |
| 248 | None | Concerned that each of the 3 Options for consideration involve a similar level of development for Forton. |
| | | Goes against the key issues and vision which pledge to retain the character of such areas. |
| | | Countryside under threat and villages will be villages no more. |
| | | Development should be confined to existing large settlements where infrastructure is already established - deprived areas of Fleetwood |
| | | would surely benefit from the bulk of the required housing for the area. |
| 254a | 2 | A6 area has better roads and can therefore absorb proposed housing. Fylde lacks infrastructure for increase in housing. |
| 254b | 3 | No additional comments submitted |
| 258 | 2 | Garstang needs to grow in order to develop economically and socially. |
| | | Proposals for development west of the A6 should be supported and integrated into the plan. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|---|
| 260 | 2 | Transport improvements will support development. A6 corridor and linkages to larger town support sustainable growth. |
| | | Proposed junction on M6 between 32 & 33 would benefit commuters and emergency services. |
| 261 | 2 | Other options would have too heavy an impact on transport. |
| | | Provision of light rail link between Fleetwood and Poulton-le-Fylde railway station, Great Eccleston, St Michaels, Churchtown to a new |
| | | main-line station East of Garstang. The 'infill' from Garstang to the WCML and expand along this trajectory. |
| 263 | None | Op. 1 – inadequate highway infrastructure for development on FCP. |
| | | Op. 2 – Nateby and Winmarleigh are unsuitable for expansion due to lack of public transport, local amenities and flooding along |
| | | Longmoore Lane. Development would not be visually appropriate to exiting scale and character of settlements. |
| | | Op. 3 – Unsuitable for reasons listed above.] |
| | | Alternative – development must be of an appropriate scale and nature to existing. In villages (Nateby and Winmarleigh) redevelopment |
| | | should take place in a like for like fashion, reusing existing buildings and infilling existing settlements. |
| | | Development in 'lesser sustainable areas' should only take place where there is a proven local need. Development should be directed |
| | | to existing settlements where there is existing infrastructure provision. |
| | | Development along A6 highway should be avoided due to lack of infrastructure and public transport provision. |
| 264 | 3 | No additional comments submitted |
| 266 | 1 | Wye population is aging. 'Op. 1' is likely to provide necessary health care. |
| | | Op. 1 proposed housing would not be disproportionate to existing. |
| | | 'Op. 2' & 'Op.3' lead to increase in traffic on A6 which is already congested. New housing would be catering for commuters as opposed to existing population. |
| 268 | 2 | No additional comments submitted |
| 269 | 2 | A6 would be more suitable due to linkages with Lancaster and Preston where there are better facilities, employment and potential to |
| | | cope with additional traffic. |
| 270 | Option 2 | Highways network is in place and can provide for additional housing. Links with Preston will be good for Employment. |
| 271 | Option 2 | No additional comments submitted. |
| 272 | 2 | Bringing back the railway line on Station Road Poulton would be beneficial for motorway and employment. |
| | | Need better access to Preston and Lancaster from Poulton. |
| 275 | 3 | |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|--|
| 276 | 2 | Garstang development is preferable as it has direct access to Preston and Lancaster. |
| 282 | 2 | A6 is a better option as it links two university cities of Preston and Lancaster. There is far more employment in this cities than on the |
| | | Fylde coast. |
| 284 | 1 | Preferences in order of best to worst: |
| | | Op.1, Op.2, Op.3 |
| | | Against expansion of rural villages more than absolutely necessary due to impact on Wyre beauty. |
| 285 | 2 | No additional comments submitted |
| 286 | 1 | Only sensible option to alleviate the perceived housing shortage. |
| | | Small villages like Winmarleigh, Scorton and Nateby require pockets of affordable housing to be built – not mass development. |
| | | Their character and individuality must be retained whilst ensuring their future prosperity. |
| 288 | 2 | Location of development: |
| | | nearer Preston is better |
| | | brown field sites are better than greenfield (Old Norcross for example). |
| 290 | Option 2 | Re: Option 1 – |
| | | You say you want to maintain and strengthen the main urban areas – how does enlarging 'maintain' and what kind of development |
| | | 'strengthens'? If you mean that making something bigger is better, why should that be true? |
| | | You wish to deal with pockets of deprivation, a good aim, but how will developing more housing in Poulton or Thornton meet this objective? |
| | | You state it as an advantage to diminish pressure on the open countryside by building up the FCP, but you haven't said what kind of pressure is being experienced in the rural areas and why agricultural land being used for housing and other development is a bad thing. Surely some properly thought out development in the countryside would be a good thing, not least to provide a decent range of affordable housing to benefit agriculture? |
| | | The main reason for focusing development in the Poulton area apart from the best availability of land in the FCP appears to have nothing to do with improving the housing stock but to finance road and other infrastructure. This is surely the wrong way round: first |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|--------|--|
| | | decide the best future development of an area and then ask about necessary infrastructure and whether such need can be met. We |
| | | have great problems already with the A 585. |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | Agree with your list of disadvantages. |
| 296 | Hybrid | Option – 1 |
| | 2&3 | Peninsula is heavily developed. Accessibility problems would be exacerbated. Housing requirement figures are debatable. Loss of local |
| | | character. Pressure on greenbelt will reduce quality of life. |
| | | Option – 2 |
| | | Offers flexibility with housing and employment sites. Has good links to the motorway and employment areas. Planning across |
| | | boundaries would be welcomed. |
| | | |
| | | Option – 3 |
| | | Increase supply of rural housing in areas of reduced choice and affordability. Will provide employment. |
| | | |
| | | Modified option 2 with aspects of option 3 |
| | | 'Reduce development in the peninsular and direct it towards rural areas'. Growth of smaller settlements will improve local service |
| 207 | | provision. Less pressure on greenbelt in on FCP to be released. |
| 297 | 2 | Option – 1 would have adverse impacts upon area and inhabitants. |
| | | Option – 2 offers potential for improved transport links which will support development. |
| | | Option – 2 offers potential for improved transport links which will support development. |
| | | Option – 3 is too scattered to sustain growth and opportunities. |
| | | Alternative: |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 300 | None | |
| | | |
| 300 | None | A new town near Garstang with rail and M6 connection. Police would support a new M6 junction between J32 and J33. Option 2 is in line with the NPPF. A combination of options 1 and 2 would seem most appropriate from the point of view of infrastructure development. Option 3 is neither economically viable nor socially or environmentally acceptable. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|--------|--|
| 301 | | Hybrid Option |
| | | 600 new homes is too large a number for Poulton to cope with. Rural areas should be considered to offer more choice and any houses |
| | | in Poulton should be centred round Garstang Road where they would impact less on the existing housing. Brownfield sites should be |
| | | assiduously identified. |
| 303 | 1 | Of the three options proposed in the plan option 1 would benefit the county most. Employment prospects which gave rise to coastal towns are still present and with intelligent investment these areas can be revitalised and bring wealth to the region again. |
| | | The market towns and villages of Wyre make up its character and should be protected. |
| | | An alternative would be to target run down areas of the borough combined with one or two completely new combined community developments – being close to motorway and rail connections. |
| 304 | 2 | Garstang area has more space to achieve the goals. The Thornton area is already full to capacity. |
| 305 | None | None of the options have been given proper consideration. |
| | | Without infrastructure, how can proposals be called a Plan? |
| | | Option 1 is simply ploughing even more into a part of the borough that already soaks up most the WBC's resources. I doubt very much if this would be beneficial to Fleetwood. It would certainly not benefit the rest of the borough. |
| | | Option 2 is simply pandering to the developers who can see demand in desirable areas. The cost of losing so much greenbelt land is far too high. The area already suffers from a serious lack of investment in facilities (incl. Schools, doctors, and leisure). Not to mention the traffic problems this would bring. |
| | | Option 3 would seem to be the littlest of the three evils but it is too vague. |
| | | WBC should return to the drawing board and spend more time asking what people want before setting out 'options'. This will lengthen |
| | | the process but if it is not done well, it is not worth doing. |
| 306 | None | Make use of brown field sites, not the countryside. |
| 307 | 2 | Garstang and the A6 area has better infrastructure, development is needed to support rural communities and the area has space to |
| | | absorb the proposed number of houses whereas the Fylde Coast Peninsular does not. |
| 309 | 2 | Garstang and the A6 area has better infrastructure, development is needed to support rural communities and the area has space to |
| | | absorb the proposed number of houses whereas the Fylde Coast Peninsular does not. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|--------|--|
| | | Amendments: |
| | | Accessibility, infrastructure and environmental footprint. |
| 310 | Yes | No additional comments submitted. |
| 311 | 2 | A6 road Garstang area would be the perfect site, situated between 2 cities and universities. There are good motorway links. |
| | | A585 is gridlocked every day. |
| | | Trains are overcrowded. |
| | | Poulton is being transformed into an over populated big town. |
| 312 | 2 | A6 road would provide better transport connections for any new houses. Roads are already very busy around Poulton-le-Fylde. |
| 313 | None | New development should be around Fleetwood helping the surrounding deprived areas. |
| | | Each village has their own individual needs. |
| | | Lacii viilage ilas tileli own iliulviudai ileeus. |
| | | Agriculture is the primary consideration. |
| | | Countryside is under threat. This cannot be allowed to happen. |
| 315 | None | Why is development needed when there are hundreds of houses for sale in Wyre already? |
| | | Hybrid of Options 1 & 2 (Fylde Peninsular and Corridor) would be more acceptable: |
| | | Fylde has an abundance of schools, medical centres, recreational facilities and access to transport (railway station at Poulton). Greenfield sites between Thornton, Poulton and Cleveleys must be preserved. |
| | | 3) Option 2 is well situated for the motorway and is convenient for Preston station with good public transport. |
| | | 4) There are adequate medical opportunities and schools are available in the surrounding area, although more would be needed. |
| | | 5) Recreational facilities in the area are good. |
| | | Option 3: |
| | | Will not work, the road network will need to be completely rebuilt. It is struggling with present demand. The A588 main road to |
| | | Lancaster comes to a complete stand still at certain times. |
| | | More medical facilities, schools and recreational opportunities elsewhere. |
| | | Flooding is an issue and struggles with drainage and sewerage. |
| | | Very limited expansion in Winmarleigh and Nateby might be tolerable and help local schools. The location next to the A6 and motorway could be an advantage. |
| | | Codia De an advantage. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|--|
| 320 | Option 2 | Option 2 offers the least chance of serious adverse impacts and best hope for better transport links to support development and the creation of well paid local employment. |
| | | Need a new railway station and M6 junction in the east of the borough. |
| | | Housing numbers 6800 - 9700 dwellings - fail to see how these figures can be justified in terms of objectively assessed housing needs for the plan period. Suggest a more realistic number would be below 4,000. |
| | | Note the I & O 2015 document recognises that the A6 corridor (Option 2) and its linkages to the national motorway network and Preston Growth area offer opportunities for sustainable growth. |
| | | This makes it very clear that Option 2 is the only option that complies with NPPF requirements. |
| | | If any more than about 3,500 homes additional homes are included in the Local Plan then it must include for the formation of a new town near Garstang with new railway station and a direct M6 connection in due course. |
| | | Accommodating more than about 3,500 within and around existing settlements will swamp the local services and infrastructure and destroy the local character. |
| | | Housing in this corridor will be more valuable due to the far better connectivity and so there is far more chance of developer contributions being available for the necessary new infrastructure which will be achieved at lower cost than elsewhere in the borough. Such a new connected settlement should include a Park and Ride for Preston, Manchester and Lancaster and form a hub for public transport throughout the borough. In addition it will form the basis for further sustainable development beyond the end of this Local Plan. |
| | | The overwhelming case for Option 2 is further reinforced by the proximity to new M55 J2 and link to the Preston Growth Area, especially as the Broughton by pass is progressing and will remove the main bottleneck on the A6 north of M55 junction 1. |
| | | Highways England have finance available to be able to offer match funding to facilitate improvements to the Strategic Highways network to support developments and this would be an obvious facility to take into account. Understand the Police would support a new M6 junction between J32 and J33. |

| IO_23 IO_24, IO_25, IO_26, IO_27 and IO_28 will be unable to comply with the NPPF requirement for sustainable development on account of traffic congestion, poor connectivity, road safety issues, strain on local services, lack of local employment, loss of green spaces, flood risk and other matters. In most cases the adverse impact from development on these sites will be severe and contrary to most of the identified Strategic Objectives. There is an area of land around Stanah school included with site reference IO_27 that has protective covenants on it which should prevent development. This area of land must be protected as it was given to the council that preceded WC by a local family for use a public open space in perpetuity. If it is sold for development it will be a very serious breach of faith by WC. Issue of the recently approved Preesall Underground Gas Storage Facility - a Top Tier High Hazard site and any development within it vicinity must consider the impact of it. | ID | Option | Matters raised |
|---|-----|----------|--|
| Objectives. There is an area of land around Stanah school included with site reference IO_27 that has protective covenants on it which should prevent development. This area of land must be protected as it was given to the council that preceded WC by a local family for use a public open space in perpetuity. If it is sold for development it will be a very serious breach of faith by WC. Issue of the recently approved Preesall Underground Gas Storage Facility - a Top Tier High Hazard site and any development within it vicinity must consider the impact of it. | 322 | Option 2 | account of traffic congestion, poor connectivity, road safety issues, strain on local services, lack of local employment, loss of green |
| prevent development. This area of land must be protected as it was given to the council that preceded WC by a local family for use a public open space in perpetuity. If it is sold for development it will be a very serious breach of faith by WC. Issue of the recently approved Preesall Underground Gas Storage Facility - a Top Tier High Hazard site and any development within it vicinity must consider the impact of it. | | | |
| vicinity must consider the impact of it. | | | prevent development. This area of land must be protected as it was given to the council that preceded WC by a local family for use as |
| 226 Ontion 1 No additional comments submitted | | | Issue of the recently approved Preesall Underground Gas Storage Facility - a Top Tier High Hazard site and any development within its vicinity must consider the impact of it. |
| 520 Option 1 No additional comments submitted | 326 | Option 1 | No additional comments submitted |
| None A585 relief road needed. Offered in 2005 but was rejected by the council. | 336 | None | A585 relief road needed. Offered in 2005 but was rejected by the council. |
| 342 None • No variance in options for Forton. | 342 | None | No variance in options for Forton. |
| Support further development in Fleetwood - a more deprived area where additional investment would increase work opportunit and encourage tourism. | | | • Support further development in Fleetwood - a more deprived area where additional investment would increase work opportunities and encourage tourism. |
| Support moderate development of the A6 corridor - on the basis this needs to be an employment based development - otherwise. | | | • Support moderate development of the A6 corridor - on the basis this needs to be an employment based development - otherwise |
| there would just be a further increase in commuter traffic which would compound the current problems already experienced on heavily used A6. | | | there would just be a further increase in commuter traffic which would compound the current problems already experienced on the heavily used A6. |
| The very reason people relocate to Forton as a rural hamlet would be eroded by the plan proposals for Forton. | | | The very reason people relocate to Forton as a rural hamlet would be eroded by the plan proposals for Forton. |
| The plan needs to address the individual requirements within each community - rather than signposting all communities for development. | | | , |
| Agriculture is a significant factor within the Forton hamlet and this should be encouraged, supported and retained. | | | · · |
| The proposals for Forton threaten the greenbelt and countryside as the proposals are all on undeveloped areas. | | | |
| | | | Valuable village life which exists in this hamlet would be eroded with the threat of people leaving as the area would no longer be |
| desirable as a village residency. | | | |
| 348 None Option 1 – non-starter - low levels of employment opportunity in Wyre, the lack of a rail / light railway link between Poulton, Thornton | 1 | • | 1 |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|---|
| | | and Fleetwood, the absence of an A585 bypass, and very significant levels of road congestion in the west of the Borough. |
| | | Ensuring the infrastructure is in place before development proceeds is imperative. |
| | | At present we do not have the required key transport infrastructure in place and nor do we have the local jobs to support such population increases. |
| | | With regard to open space we are not even meeting the open space targets for the current population, let alone an increased population. |
| | | Any development not only has to meet the needs of the additional population in terms of open space but it needs to provide additional open space to cut / remove the current deficit. |
| 353 | 2 | A6 is sparsely populated and has large cities for employment and commuting. |
| | | There won't be any resistance from residents there, provided it is not too close to Garstang. |
| 354 | Option 3 | No further comments submitted. |
| 355 | 2 & 3 | Hybrid of options 2 and 3, |
| | | A mixture of these two will have a good chance of meeting requirements. |
| 356 | 2 | Hardhorn-Poulton could not cope with employment but areas nearer Preston would be more suitable and would cope better with the extra traffic. |
| 358 | 2 & 3 | A6 is sparsely populated. Lancaster, Blackpool and Preston can provide employment. |
| 359 | 2 | Over Wyre and Hambleton have great areas of cheap affordable land that needs to be used. |
| | | There is very little suitable land surrounding Poulton |
| | | Suggestions: |
| | | Both sides of the A6 should be developed so as to reduce impact of rural community. |
| | | This area will benefit more from additional housing so there will be less opposition. |
| 362 | None | A Hybrid of 1 & 2 would make for a more suitably balanced plan. |
| | | Age related outward migration would be addressed by employment and housing options in the rural East. |
| | | Garstang and A6 corridor is used by many as a commuter belt. |
| | | With intentions to make Manchester a Northern Power House, Wyre borough Council should not marginalise locals in the housing |
| | | market by under supply of housing. Also commercial opportunities which may well arise from this policy should be considered and |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|--------|---|
| | | allowed for. |
| 363 | None | Options are not supported in entirety. None of the options support Strategic Objectives. |
| | | Option 1, comparatively preferable: |
| | | Focusing growth on the West is most sustainable and will reduce carbon emissions; |
| | | Protection of the AONB gateway and surrounding settlements; |
| | | Industries identified for growth are to the West, this will reduce social disparities; |
| | | Will encourage greenbelt review, some of the land covered is not worthy of the high levels of protection; |
| | | Option is proportional, proposing growth, which relates to the scale of the settlements. |
| | | Option 2: |
| | | Inappropriate and disproportional. |
| | | Significant development is proposed in poorly connected, unsustainable, rural areas. |
| | | Areas make up the gateway to the Bowland AONB. |
| | | Disparities between wealthier and poorer parts of the borough will be exacerbated. |
| | | • Developers are concerned over low levels of demand and saturation to the East, despite council encouraging mixed-use development and employment sites. |
| | | Lack of employment to East. |
| | | Allocation of land to East may not lead to development. |
| | | • Affordable housing is calculated by percentage of market value. If neighbouring house prices are high, affordable housing may still be too expensive. Schemes for affordable housing, Wyre Way, are still vacant. |
| | | Affordable housing should be spread throughout the borough where its benefits can be achieved. |
| | | Option 3, fairer: |
| | | All parts of borough will grow proportionally. |
| | | Infrastructure is insufficient. It is unrealistic to assume that it would ever be delivered on the scale required. |
| | | Focused growth around Garstang would see key infrastructure delivered unlike smaller settlements. |
| | | Hybrid, elements from option 1 and 3: |
| | | Hybrid will be in line with Vision. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|--------|---|
| | | Westerly development will improve economic prospects. |
| | | Existing infrastructure will improve sustainability. |
| | | Dispersed development in line with option 3 is supported. All areas should see growth. |
| | | Garstang should see majority of development to the East due to existing infrastructure. |
| | | • Development along the A6 could occur but must be of a small scale and concentrated around the centre of existing settlements to avoid sprawl and merging. |
| | | Catterall, Claughton and Bilsborrow are unsustainable options due to lack of infrastructure. |
| 364 | None | Spurious 'options' invite NIMBYism. A coherent and detailed set of plans for each part of the borough is required. |
| | | The needs and potential of each settlement should be clearly identified and a plan produced that aims to meet those overarching approach to transport and other infrastructure. |
| 365 | 2 | Option 1 |
| | | Impact on residents' quality of life, |
| | | • Land is squeezed between estuary and the sea. It is difficult to suggest improvement without significant demolition of businesses and properties. |
| | | Option 2 |
| | | More opportunities for development |
| | | Located close to transport corridors (incl. West Coast Mainline and M6) |
| | | Potential for more sustainable development |
| 386 | 2 | Option 2 is least destructive |
| | | Option 1: |
| | | Unsustainable burden on Poulton-le-Fylde, Thornton and Fleetwood. |
| | | • Fleetwood is in need of regeneration of housing stock but does not have quality and quantity of employment required for scale or development. |
| | | Transport: |
| | | Amounderness Way (one way trunk road) is overburdened. |
| | | Rail capabilities need to be explored. |
| | | Lambs Road: |
| | | Inappropriate for 160+ houses earmarked. |
| | | Skippool: |

| d a further 500+ to be built on orate. |
|---|
| |
| |
| |
| ed for a defined period of time. relief road. |
| stroyed in creation of a dormitory |
| tate where access to motorways ic control and would be more |
| me one metropolitan area. |
| |
| |
| f |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|---|
| | | Appropriate option: |
| | | Resist further housing, |
| | | Avoid development of Garstang, |
| | | Enhance Churchtown, St Michaels, Inskip and Gt Eccleston with small scale development where it is in demand, |
| | | Expand Fleetwood, Thronton and Poulton where existing housing and facilities can easily cope. |
| 403 | Option 1 | Infrastructure already in place. |
| 404 | None | The whole of Forton and its current development plans have not been recognised and included. |
| | | Fleetwood is currently a deprived area and should be the focus for mass development. |
| | | Lack of jobs, services and facilities in the smaller communities of Wyre. |
| | | The plan doesn't place any value on agriculture - most of the development is on green belt and agricultural land. |
| | | Whole way of life in small villages is under threat and completely devalued. |
| 407 | 2 | A6 corridor development is most practical due to access. |
| | | Additional motorway junction and train station would also assist. |
| | | Alternative: |
| | | New town on the South side of the A6 |
| 408 | 2 | To Make FCP option more attractive either: |
| | | a) FCP should be extended out to sea, or, |
| | | b) Demolition of houses on Mains Lane to create a motorway. |
| | | Option 2 is more attractive due to: |
| | | - motorway links, |
| | | - Visitors will still be able to entre FCP without long queues. |
| | | Additions: |
| | | Less development needed. What is the justification? Planners were unable to explain why such large numbers of houses were needed. |
| 409 | 1 | It is very important to revitalise Fleetwood. |
| | | Development in rural areas should be concentrated on larger settlements which have an infrastructure framework. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|--------|---|
| 410 | 2 | A6 would be more suitable. There is more business and employment there. |
| 413 | 3 | No comment |
| 417 | 2 | Option 1 Impact on residents' quality of life, Land is squeezed between estuary and the sea; it is difficult to suggest improvement without significant demolition of businesses |
| | | and properties. Option 2 More opportunities for development Located close to transport corridors (incl. West Coast Mainline and M6) Potential for more sustainable development |
| 418 | 2 | A6 can take traffic better than Poulton. Sparsely populated areas take it much better. A6 would be more appropriate. |
| 419 | 3 | Fleetwood and Garstang should be focused on. High areas of deprivation in the West are spilling over from Blackpool; the needs of these settlements should be put first. Objectives for a buoyant local labour market and diverse infrastructure/services will not be created through development diffused across villages. |
| | | Economic potential of the rural east should be achieved by concentrating diverse development in Garstang. Garstang is already the commercial and service centre for the district. Facilities and services are few. Local market cannot support the range of entertainment offers that would make the town appealing to young/family evenings out. |
| | | Additional scale could make the town an attractive social and entertainment centre. - Support existing leisure centre, - Business stability, - Social services which would attract young families. - Increase number of GPs surgeries, - A larger population could potentially support a sixth form and encourage families to the area. Garstang is halfway between growth magnets proposed in the Lancashire Enterprise partnership (incl. Health Sciences Business Park). The Wyre Employment Land and Commercial Leisure study only proposes expansion of existing businesses. This will consolidate existing |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|--------|---|
| | | socio-economic structure. |
| | | A small business park will encourage start-ups and attract innovative enterprise. |
| | | A creative approach to economic development will generate new employment and potential dynamic development. |
| | | By focusing on Garstang: |
| | | - Access to and from A6 will receive sufficient funding to make it efficient. |
| | | - Direct access to M6 may become viable, providing relief for congested Broughton. |
| 421 | 2 | The A6 is preferable as it is sparsely populated and would be able to cope with further development in comparison with Poulton |
| 422 | None | 1. is housing required? |
| | | 2. can infrastructure and jobs be provided? |
| | | 3. plans should be based on existing communities needs |
| | | Level of development in options 3 is not sustainable |
| | | Proposed development is excessive and will lead to urbanisation. |
| | | Alternative : |
| | | Focus should be on regenerating Fleetwood and other urban areas. |
| | | Green belt must be preserved. |
| | | Development should be in line with demand from existing settlements. |
| | | Para.6.18, developers should not dictate local planning policy. |
| | | Housing developments in Forton have not resulted in affordable housing, what will be different in this instance? |
| 423 | 2 | Option 2: |
| | | Stronger infrastructure to support development, |
| | | Garstang will benefit from additional business, |
| | | • Easier to facilitate new housing which will not tamper with the local environment unlike the peninsular which would be at risk. |
| | | Option 3: |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|--|
| | | Would be a good second choice |
| | | Option 1: Serious mistake in relation to future generations. |
| 424 | 2 | Against development of IO_33 due to: |
| | | Congestion and implied commuting, |
| | | Loss of landscape. |
| 426 | 2 | No Comment |
| 427 | 2 | Option 2 is favourable due to: |
| | | Transport links and availability of services. |
| | | Least impact on rural areas of Wyre Peninsular |
| | | Gives opportunities for industrial development |
| _ | | Some housing development has already taken place in this area causing little impact |
| 431 | None | No additional comments submitted. |
| 435 | None | None of the options as described is appropriate since they all treat Wyre as a single entity and try to distribute a single set of supposed requirements across the borough. |
| | | Wyre consists of two distinct and separate parts. The urban peninsula and the rural area centred on Garstang. In developing a spatial strategy the two parts should be kept separate with the requirements of the urban area met within that area and the requirements of the rural area addressed within that area. To do otherwise will be satisfactory for neither part, even if it meets the supposed overall development targets. |
| 440 | Option 2 | Option 1 is not feasible bearing in mind transport issues and loss of Green Belt. |
| | | Option 2 has the advantage of better transport links with the hope of improvement – new motorway link and new train station |
| | | Questions whether not 9,000 new homes are needed. |
| 443 | Option 1 | Adding a new M6 junction near Garstang, a new train station on the west coast mainline near Garstang. |
| | | Prioritising building on brownfield sites and not flood plains. |
| | | Increasing civic facilities in Garstang area. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|--|
| 449 | None | Consider that Forton has fulfilled its obligation for new housing with the current housing developments on School Lane. |
| | | The village services are already over stretched, sewage, school, roads etc. |
| | | Further development will be to the detriment of what is a country village and as such has limited employment opportunities which |
| | | would entail any new residents using already over stretched roads to commute to places of work. |
| | | he area designated for building is greenbelt/agricultural land that acts as a buffer between the A6 and the village building would |
| | | encourage further building along the A6 corridor. |
| 450 | None | The housing requirement has been grossly overestimated bearing in mind natural growth requirements and the constraints on the |
| | | growth of the coastal towns. |
| 458 | Option 1 | Whilst there will inevitably be some development around the A6 corridor and the RURAL market town of Garstang the proposals under |
| | | options 2 and 3 include a level of development that would inflict irreversible damage on what is a huge asset to the borough as a whole. |
| 459 | Option 3 | No additional comments submitted. |
| 460 | n/a | IO_33 |
| | | |
| | | The scale of the development would totally change the character of the area and negatively impact the holiday businesses in the |
| | | village. |
| | | The increase in traffic in the area would cause congestion. |
| | | Existing drainage issues on the land behind Linderbreck Lane which is likely to be exacerbated by development. |
| | | There is a diverse population of wildlife In this area - nesting buzzards and protected newt, foxes, woodpeckers as well as more |
| | | common wildlife and birds. |
| | | Prefer to see small scattered developments instead. |
| 462 | Option 3 | No additional comments submitted. |
| 467 | Option 1 | Option 1 supported but it would need appropriate high density development. Giving up the Green Belts would not be a good idea. |
| | | Should consider one or two new towns or land reclamation from the sea. |
| | | The rural areas indicated do not have the infrastructure needed for new housing, and adding piecemeal to them will result in a |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|--|
| | | hotchpotch. |
| | | None of the spatial options give any indication on how housing for the elderly will be provided - this will require suitable high density developments. Senior cohousing may be an option for some areas. See: http://www.jrf.org.uk/publications/senior-cohousing-communities for some ideas. |
| 472 | None | Do not agree with any of the three options, but option 1 is the most acceptable because: Development in the west will be the most sustainable, and help to reduce carbon emissions as travel to work would be limited. It will protect the AONB and farmland Industries which enable growth will help to reduce social differences Retaining the green areas of Garstang and surrounding villages will preserve beauty and attraction of the area. |
| | | Option 2 is inappropriate as it will develop the rural areas. A mixture of options 1 and option 3 is the most suitable. |
| 474 | Option 1 | Hybrid |
| 4/4 | & 2 | Combination of Option 1 and Option 2 is preferred for the following reasons: |
| | Q Z | Urban areas have better infrastructure than rural areas |
| | | More employment opportunities in Option 1 and Option 2 |
| | | It would be simpler to provide alternative modes of transport in the urban areas by extending the current rail and tram services to ultimately result in less dependency on cars and therefore lower the carbon footprint for Wyre. |
| | | • The costs of living is higher in rural areas because rural dwellers spend more on essential goods such as vehicle fuel, food and home maintenance compared to the urban dweller. |
| | | • The dispersed character of development in option 3 would result in great pressure on the road and transport systems, but due to lack of development concentration in one area may mean that the necessity for new infrastructure is ignored. |
| 477 | 2 | Oppose Option 1 due to potential adverse impacts. |
| | | More supportive of Option 2 due to lesser chance of serious adverse impact. Existing transport links already better. Possible new rail station already mooted. The A6 corridor and its links to the national motorway network and Preston Growth area offer opportunities for sustainable growth. |
| | | This complies with NPPF requirements of something close to it. Perhaps a new town near Garstang with a new M6 connection. Housing |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|---|
| | | in this area is more valuable due to better connectivity and more scope for developer contributions to infrastructure. |
| 479 | 3 | No additional comments submitted. |
| 483 | 2 | A better balance of jobs in Garstang than has perhaps been the case in the past. Job creation should at least match, or exceed, any |
| | | house building in order to reduce long distance travel to work for the population of Garstang and surrounding areas. |
| 484 | Option 2 | Would like to see ample employment for the local communities around Garstang. We would then see a reduction in traffic, accidents |
| | | etc. Employment opportunities must be a major consideration as without it we just create more commuting and clogging of roads. |
| 485 | None | Wyre have not looked at Forton village and the amount of passed planning approved. We have already taken our fair share of building. |
| | | We are an agricultural area and should remain so. Fleetwood is a seriously deprived area, money should be spent there to improve the |
| | | area and tidy up the run down areas. The countryside is in danger of being eaten up by Wyre Borough. |
| 486 | Option 2 | Proposals need to compliment a clear strategy in respect of infrastructure, healthcare and education provision. |
| | | Infrastructure should consider rail transport more. |
| | | The impact cannot be determined until the Borough identify the housing need figure. The statements of 'significant', 'moderate' and |
| _ | | 'limited' development are meaningless until a figure has been agreed. |
| 487 | 2 | The area of Poulton is log-jammed with cars, stop further housing development in this area. |
| | | If any development should take place, it should be next to the major networks of M6 corridor, A6 road and major West Coast train line. |
| | | Alternative: |
| | | Stop building houses |
| | | Make better what we already have in terms of cultural, sports and social facilities. |
| | | Stop going for growth. We physically do not have the infrastructure nor ever will to support it. |
| 488 | 2 | If all these houses are built, Option 2 would better provide the vision and strategic objectives. It is recognised the A6 corridor with its |
| | | linkages to the national motorway and Preston Growth area offers opportunities for sustainable growth. Possibly a Park and Ride for |
| | | Preston, Manchester and Lancaster. |
| | | Alternative: A new town near Garstang with rail and M6 connection. |
| 489 | 2 | Option 1 is not possible to achieve without serious adverse impacts. |
| | | Option 2 offers the best hope of good transport links to support development. |
| | | |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|---|
| | | Alternative: Housing in this area is more valuable due to better connectivity and more scope for developer contributions to |
| | | infrastructure. |
| 491 | 2 | Option 2, to put a park and ride for Preston, Lancaster and Manchester using the existing buses. |
| | | Build a new town near Garstang and Broughton: easy access to railway links to London, Manchester and Scotland, plus it would have easier access to the M6. |
| 492 | N | Option 2 best supports the strategic objectives. Put a park and ride for Preston, Lancaster and Manchester using the existing bus routes. |
| | | Build a new town near Garstang with rail links and connection to the M6. |
| 495 | 2 | Thornton does not have the infrastructure to support the level of building. The A6 corridor including Garstang does and has the space |
| | | to absorb additional housing. The Fylde peninsular does not. |
| 499 | Option 2 | There are no real advantages to adding any more development on the Fylde coast peninsula especially if ONLY looking over a 15 year |
| | | period. |
| | | |
| | | As a percentage of loss of remaining countryside this option results in close to 100% of existing countryside in the FCP being lost to |
| | | development whereas option 2 would see only a small percentage of loss of countryside by comparison. |
| | | It is recognised that the A6 corridor (Option 2) and its linkages to the national motorway network and Preston Growth area offer opportunities for sustainable growth. |
| | | Suggest a new town near Garstang with rail and M6 connection. Housing more valuable in this area due to the far better connectivity and so more chance of developer contribution to infrastructure, plus lower cost of key infrastructure necessary |
| | | Proximity to new M55 J2 and road to Enterprise zone at Warton. Broughton by pass is progressing. Such a policy would also offer opportunity for future growth. |
| 502 | Option 1 | Would benefit the greatest people and businesses. |
| 505 | Option 1 | Option 1 would benefit the most amount of people and businesses in an area of current deprivation. |
| 508 | Option 1 | IO_80 |
| | | Unacceptable amount of greenfield development. |
| | | Use brownfield land and existing buildings. |
| | | - Ose brownine a ratio and existing bandings. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|--------|---|
| | | • If Winmarleigh was chosen for development, then High Quality housing in proportion with the existing population and facilities able |
| | | to maintain this expansion, then 10% growth would be acceptable. |
| | | • Family Homes or Bungalows would best the location and match the outlined issues. |
| | | Best siting would be adjacent to the current Village Hall and Recreation Area on Broad Lane, as this expands the current Village |
| | | without damaging the existing settlement and its special character. |
| | | Village locations not appropriate for young people who require affordable housing. |
| 509 | 2 | There are no advantages in over developing Thornton and areas around this village |
| | | A6 Corridor as links to motorway network is more accessible than A558 |
| 516 | 2 | Option 2 seems to be more suitable for the proposed development, as the Fylde Coast is choked up already. The infrastructure to |
| | | motorway networks is more accessible from the A6 area. |
| 517 | 2 | No additional comments submitted. |
| 518 | 2 | Object to option 1. |
| | | Option 3 is unlikely to be viable. |
| | | Option 2 would only see a small loss of FCP to development in comparison. This has the least chance of serious adverse and |
| | | irreversible impact, and best hope for better transport links to support development. This option would comply with NPPF |
| | | requirements. |
| | | Maybe a new town near Garstang, with rail and M6 connection will fulfil the requirements. |
| 519 | 2 | Option 1 risks housing viability and is optimistic about job creation where there are poor highway links. Preston is better located and attractive to businesses, evidenced by demand for premises on the A6 corridor Option 2 capitalised on proximity to Preston and the M6 and there is no doubt about the viability of development. |
| | | By 2031 option would mean FCP is completely developed with no scope for further development. Option 2 would enable further development in the FCP beyond 2031. |
| | | In Option 1, the proposed link road to Garstang east would be an inadequate solution. |
| | | • It is doubtful that option 2 would require more development of agricultural land than option 1 as option 2 still requires |
| | | moderate development in the FCP, which would enable the used of PDL rather than Greenfield in the FCP. Greenfield |
| | | development would be transferred from the FCP to the A6 corridor. |
| | | Development along the A6 corridor would reduce development in flood risk areas and would provide a better prospect for long |
| | | term sustainability than the FCP where there is much decline. |
| 520 | 2 | Accessibility, infrastructure, environmental footprint. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|-------------|---|
| | | Garstang is the better option as the A6 area has better infrastructure and space to accommodate the proposed number of houses |
| 524 | 2 | Option 1 will impact on the existing population, limiting access to open spaces and increasing pollution due to traffic congestion. Option 2 the A6 corridor could have access to the M6, M55 and the main rail line, and business will be attracted to this area. |
| 530 | Option 2 | Option 2 has the advantage of having a better infrastructure and the development will support the community. There are also further opportunities for employment, possibly in the leisure industry. |
| | | There is also much more space available for housing, with sympathetic planning it would bring Garstang back to life. |
| 534 | Option 2 | No support for option 1 and option 3 - not sustainable/achievable. |
| | | New motorway junction would improve A6 / M6 corridor - would attract employment to the area. Most sustainable option - land for development without impacting on recreational / greenspace and identity of the town. |
| | | Option 1 - roads already at gridlock. Lack of suitable employment would mean more people commuting out of the area to work and therefore exacerbating the problem. Loss of recreational / greenspace - impact on health and wellbeing. No infrastructure to support proposed development. Local schools already full - children having to commute more than 3 miles, some siblings being split up as a result. Lack of amenities. |
| | | Option 3 – not sustainable. |
| 547 | Option 1 | Monitoring of the rate and distribution of increasing housing provision is vital. |
| | | If only market forces apply, there will be an increasing number of developers encroaching on cherry-picked sites. Supply of housing in the more modest price range is going to be very limited. |
| | | • An additional effect of squeezing in lots of developments in the Rural areas is that the existing housing stock becomes less attractive and stagnation of the market can occur. |
| | | • The A6 corridor is already being put under pressure of development with no infrastructure going alongside the granting of planning permission. |
| 549 | 1 with mods | Development is not needed for Churchtown, nor should development move onto the West side of the A6 at Catterall onto open countryside. |
| | | Wyre Council should focus on FCP with high unemployment and deprivation and develop brownfield sites there, rather than building on the open countryside. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|--|
| | | Oppose large scale low quality development on the A6 corridor at Garstang, and oppose the options for development at Churchtown / |
| | | Catterall, as this will increase congestion, and result in the loss of agricultural land. |
| | | Housing needs should be assessed and suitable housing provided for local families, rather than luxury homes. |
| 551 | 2 | Economic growth and job creation is paramount. |
| | | Health and wellbeing is important. |
| | | Minimise traffic going to Preston. |
| 552 | None | A hybrid option which combines Options 1 and 2 would be preferable. This would direct growth to a wide range of settlements. |
| | | It is recognised that development at settlements along the A6 corridor is likely to be required. Greenfield sites and/or sites outside of |
| | | historically defined settlement boundaries should be considered as they could represent sound development options. |
| 553 | 2 | Forton should not be further built upon. |
| | | We have seen numerous new planning permissions granted – we need no more. |
| | | This is a lovely rural village which is a pleasure to live and work in. |
| | | New jobs in the Garstang and surrounding area would be advantageous for our young people, so they don't need to find work |
| | | further afield in the cities, towns etc. |
| | | Traffic problems will increase if local jobs are not secured. |
| | | Alternative: |
| | | Forton should not be include in the options – we don't need more housing. |
| | | It would be advantageous to have retirement dwellings in the area added. |
| 559 | Option 2 | For Option 1 to be viable, transport links would need to be improved to the Thornton and Fleetwood areas. |
| | | With an increase in commuters out of the area the current road capacity is insufficient and these roads are currently required when |
| | | travelling to the train station at Poulton as well. |
| | | Reasonable that some of the villages between the peninsular and should take some of the development as in option 3 however may |
| | | require improving road links at great expense if there was a lot of development. Improving the transport links, particularly rail links to |
| | | wherever the majority of the houses are built is absolutely essential. |
| 563 | 2 | Garstang appears to have the space to cope with some development and does not have the traffic problems of Wyre. |
| | | There should be a junction from the M6 to service Garstang if option 2 goes ahead. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|--------|---|
| 564 | 3 | Halite's Gas Storage Scheme has approval; therefore, the 15 year Plan for the area (Preesall) has been achieved in one stroke. If the Knott End Ferry service received dredging attention, an uninterrupted service would be provided for the workforce living in Fleetwood, and Thornton-Cleveleys avoiding the Shard Bridge route. |
| | | It might be practical during construction to deliver large or awkward loads to Fleetwood, then offload onto a pontoon barge and tow to a site area. Dredging the Arm Hill channel would be required. |
| | | New Housing requirement |
| | | a) Area/corridor between St. Michael's and Myerscough/Billsborrow might be investigated. Riverside zone between St. Michaels and Out Rawcliffe, along with Bridge to access the south side of River Wyre and the Blackpool-Garstang main road could be used to complete the loop. |
| | | b) Fig. 2.4, Land to the East of the M6 exceeds that of the FCP and yet for the purposes of the plan the boundary falls along the M6. Over Wyre (the centre) has the best land availability. |
| 565 | 2 | Thornton/Poulton areas are already densely populated. |
| | | Fleetwood is inaccessible. |
| | | There are no plans to make major road improvements from/to the motorways, or around the indentified new housing sites. |
| | | Lambs Road/Skippool road are at capacity, often gridlocked and often dangerous for pedestrians/cyclists. |
| | | Inland areas (incl. Garstang) are much more accessible and suitable for expansion. |
| 567 | 2 | Garstang and the A6 Corridor does not suffer the same congestion as Thornton and has better road links the North and the South. |
| | | A new town could be built south of Garstang with a link to the M6 motorway where there is better access to more types of employment. |
| 568 | 2 | Option 2 offers the least chance of serious adverse impacts, and the best hope for better transport links to support development. |
| 569 | 2 | It makes more sense to develop the Garstang area carefully as: |
| | | it is easier to provide a better transport system and road network. |
| | | it is in close proximity to the railway, motorway and canal. |
| 570 | 2 | Amendments: |
| | | A new town at Garstang with more room, and increased infrastructure. |
| | | Business and building land is available and roads should not be blocked by traffic. |
| 571 | 2 | Amendment: |
| | | New railway station at Garstang with adequate car parking. |
| | | Small reduction at Garstang made up by development at Poulton, either side of Garstang Road East between Singleton lights and |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|------|----------|---|
| | | Poulton Industrial Estate. |
| 572 | 2 | The option offers better infrastructure. Development is needed to support rural communities and the area has the space to absorb the |
| | | proposed number of houses with necessary road links, which the FCP does not. |
| 572_ | Option 2 | The option offers better infrastructure. Development is needed to support rural communities and the area has the space to absorb the |
| 1 | | proposed number of houses with necessary road links, which the FCP does not. |
| 573 | 2 | Option 3 - Waste of money. |
| | | Option 1 – Road links to Fleetwood cannot be made better as side roads are already being used as rat runs due to main road traffic. |
| | | Option 2 – Garstang A6 does have problems but there is space and access to motorway/rail, and for A6 to be adjusted/re-routed. |
| 574 | 3 | Garstang has already seen a development of 1,000 houses recently, schools/doctors services are at capacity. |
| 575 | 2 | Option 2 offers the least chance of serious adverse impacts and best hope for better transport links to support development. |
| | | There is insufficient infrastructure to support growth in Thornton, what is the justification for the housing targets? |
| | | Option 2 could create a new town along the A6 corridor with rail and motorway networks. This would offer the opportunity for future growth. |
| 576 | 2 | Amendments: |
| | | Wyre peninsular does not have capacity to absorb further large scale development. |
| | | Greenbelt must be protected. |
| | | Transport infrastructure is under great strain. |
| | | • A6 provides good links to employment centres in Preston and Lancaster and can create opportunities for small businesses. |
| | | Whilst some greenfield sites will be built on, development must not encroach on the AONB. |
| | | Rural housing crisis will be eased. |
| 577 | 2 | No comment |
| 578 | 2 | Option 1 |
| | | Impact on residents' quality of life, |
| | | • Land is squeezed between estuary and the sea. It is difficult to suggest improvement without significant demolition of businesses |
| | | and properties. |
| | | Option 2 |
| | | More opportunities for development |
| | | Located close to transport corridors (incl. West Coast Mainline and M6) |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----------|--------|---|
| | | Potential for more sustainable development |
| 578_ | 2 | Option 1 |
| 1 | | Impact on residents' quality of life, |
| | | • Land is squeezed between estuary and the sea. It is difficult to suggest improvement without significant demolition of businesses |
| | | and properties. |
| | | Option 2 |
| | | More opportunities for development |
| | | Located close to transport corridors (incl. West Coast Mainline and M6) |
| | | Potential for more sustainable development |
| 579 | 2 | Option 1 – will aggravate traffic problems and push more traffic through housing estates to avoid traffic jams. Amounderness Way cannot be widened to cope with additional traffic. |
| | | Option 3 – waste of time and money. |
| | | Option 2 – Improved access form A6, M6 and rail access. Major access points can take haulage and cars. |
| 580 | 2 | There is space to build a new major road which will benefit everyone. |
| | | It will create jobs for the owners. |
| 580_ 1 | 2 | A6 offers better access and would ease flow out of the Thornton area where roads are at capacity. |
| 581 | 2 | No additional comments submitted. |
| 582 | 2 | There is ample room for extension along the A6 corridor without a significantly detrimental effect on the urban area. |
| | | Small scale expansion could accommodate new roads, schools and services. |
| | | FCP has no more space for development, whereas Garstang is equidistant to the M6 and M55. |
| | | Alternative: |
| | | Perhaps the Borough could develop a new village similar to Buckshaw Village near Chorley along the A6 corridor. |
| 582_ | 2 | There is a demand for employment sites in Garstang and Catterall. |
| 1 | | The area has access to the A6, M6 and M55 compared to Thornton sites which only have access to A roads and B roads. |
| | | Alternatives: |
| | | Brown field sites or growth in other areas (not Thornton) should be considered for development first. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|--|
| | | A new small town community like Buckshaw could be built in a new expansion area. |
| 583 | 2 | Least chance of serious adverse impacts and best hope for better transport links to support development. |
| | | There is insufficient infrastructure to support growth in Thornton, what is the justification for the housing targets? |
| | | Option 2 could create a new town along the A6 corridor with rail and motorway networks. This would offer the opportunity for future growth. |
| 584 | 2 | Least chance of serious adverse impacts and best hope for better transport links to support development. |
| | | There is insufficient infrastructure to support growth in Thornton, what is the justification for the housing targets? |
| | | Option 2 could create a new town along the A6 corridor with rail and motorway networks. This would offer the opportunity for future growth. |
| 585 | None | All options have a big impact. |
| | | Fleetwood, Cleveleys and Thornton have little greenbelt and further loss would have a negative impact upon heritage sites and compromise the strategic objectives (4, 5, 9, 10 and 12). |
| | | Option 2 will cause more congestion on the A585 which is the only route out from these areas. |
| 586 | None | No additional comments submitted. |
| 587 | 3 | Garstang (IO_100, IO_102) Sites should be removed from allocation and preserved for present and future residents. Vehicular access should only be permitted for agricultural purposes. |
| | | Areas surrounding the A6 should be used for commuting residents. The new Broughton Bypass will increase the number of people commuting out of the Borough. |
| 588 | Option 2 | No comment |
| 589 | 2 | No comment |
| 590 | 1 & 3 | Options 1 and 3 could indicate loads of development in terms of housing proportionate to existing communities which would be less likely to socially destabilise those communities particularly small rural hamlets like Winmarleigh and Nateby. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|---|
| | | The advantages of some aspects of 1 and 3 together would help offset some of the identified disadvantages and would contribute to |
| | | preservation without undue adverse impacts upon small rural communities. |
| 591 | 1 | Option 1 does not involve development in the Winmarleigh area (IO_80). Development in the area should be limited (see questions 6 |
| | | and 7). |
| 592 | 1 & 2 | Both options 1 and 2 are considered, both these areas need developing to sustain growth and investment. |
| 593 | 2 | No additional comments submitted. |
| 595 | Option 3 | Option 3 is not ideal as no one wants development. |
| | | Option 2 is the worst option. |
| | | Nateby and Winmarleigh have no infrastructure. |
| | | The A6 is already full and the area along it overdeveloped. There needs to be green space between North Preston and Garstang. |
| 601 | Option 3 | Suggests infrastructure improvements to support option 3: |
| | | Develop a faster/more direct route to the M55 |
| | | A new motorway junction in the Garstang area |
| | | A new railway station serving the Garstang area |
| 603 | Option 2 | Option 2 supported: |
| | | Garstang and the A6 area has better infrastructure. |
| | | The area has more space to accommodate the proposed number of new houses, and the increase in population. |
| | | It would create an opportunity to develop the rural community. |
| 606 | Option 3 | No additional comments submitted |
| 608 | Option 3 | Comment on Option 1 |
| | | Not supported. |
| | | Limited opportunity for major development remaining on the Fylde Coast Peninsula |
| | | • Development should take place on the Peninsula to take advantage of the supporting services and facilities available (which are not available to the same degree or at all in the rural areas.) |
| | | A review of Green Belt should be undertaken but its total removal would not be supported owing to loss of open space and distinction between communities. |
| | | Comment on Option 2 |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------------------|--|
| | | Not supported. |
| | | Highways and local educational and health (doctor and dentist provision) infrastructure will not support the number of homes |
| | | contained in those applications already approved or in the pipeline (and exacerbate existing problems). |
| | | Concern that the police and other emergency services lack the capacity to deal with the issues brought by an increased population. |
| | | The centre of Garstang is ringed by residential properties and has little room to expand. |
| | | • Option 2 would significantly change the character of the area contrary to the vision statement (see paras 4.4, 4.7 and 4.10). |
| | | Option 3 |
| | | Option 3 is supported. |
| | | Catterall and other rural towns and villages need to take their share of new development |
| | | Would welcome a housing mix that provides for older people and young people and families starting out. |
| | | Development must be proportionate and bring with it the infrastructure improvements that are already required. |
| | | Would also like to see development in small pockets, where possible. Development should be sympathetic to preserve the local village character and provide necessary infrastructure. |
| 609 | Option 2 Option 3 | Support for options 2 and 3. Objection to objective 1 (see Q6) – opposed to large concentration of development in Poulton-le-Fylde. |
| 613 | Option 2 | Option 2 supported - the area has better infrastructure to be able to cope with the proposed development. |
| 615 | Option 1 | Support for Option 1. |
| | | Need to focus on tackling deprivation in Fleetwood. |
| | | • Focus development on the peninsula. Wrap a green belt around rural and semi-rural communities. |
| 632 | Option 2 | Option 1 is not supported - close to 100% of existing countryside in the Fylde Coast Peninsula (FCP) being lost to development. |
| | | Option 2: |
| | | Would see only a small percentage of loss of countryside compared to option 1. |
| | | Least chance of serious adverse impacts |
| | | Best hope for better transport links to support sustainable development. |
| | | • The A6 corridor and its linkages to the national motorway network and Preston Growth area offer opportunities for sustainable growth. |
| | | Alternative or hybrid options? |

| Option | Matters raised |
|----------|--|
| | |
| | A more strategic option - develop an entire new town near Garstang with rail and M6 highway connections. |
| | Housing is more valuable in this area due to the far better connectivity and so more chance of developer contribution to infrastructure, |
| | plus lower cost of key infrastructure would be necessary. |
| Option 2 | Option 1 is not supported - close to 100% of existing countryside in the Fylde Coast Peninsula (FCP) being lost to development. |
| | Option 2: |
| | Would see only a small percentage of loss of countryside compared to option 1. |
| | • Least chance of serious adverse impacts |
| | Best hope for better transport links to support sustainable development. |
| | •The A6 corridor and its linkages to the national motorway network and Preston Growth area offer opportunities for sustainable |
| | growth. |
| | Alternative or hybrid options? |
| | A more strategic option - develop an entire new town near Garstang with rail and M6 highway connections. |
| | Housing is more valuable in this area due to the far better connectivity and so more chance of developer contribution to infrastructure, |
| | plus lower cost of key infrastructure would be necessary. |
| Option 3 | Option 3 has some merit. Some rural communities may accommodate small scale developments to improve their viability. But: |
| | The amount of housing needs to be proportionate to the location. |
| | • Garstang is an ancient market town the centre still has character and should remain so. |
| | The proposals for Catterall are out of proportion for a rural village with few resources. A prior by and the adversal for by vilding a proposal space of and production and appears are a second as a proposal space. |
| | Agricultural land used for building removes green areas, food production and open aspects. The land was a base in absorbing water during because sinfall. |
| | The land may have its uses in absorbing water during heavy rainfall. The land may have its uses in absorbing water during heavy rainfall. The land may have its uses in absorbing water during heavy rainfall. |
| | Historic flood events from the Calder and Canal (impacting upon IO_116 and IO_117). Lack of appropriate educational and heath infrastructure. |
| | Traffic congestion - Bowgrave and Garstang road. Inadequate footpaths. |
| | Question whether the impact of rising sea level and the tidal reach of the Wyre moving further inland been taken into account |
| | |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|--|
| | | when including building in St Michaels, Churchtown and parts of Catterall. |
| | | Mixed use schemes will be mostly housing. |
| | | Will existing commitments be taken into account in the Plan? Loss of views will diminish the ambience of the area. |
| 636 | Option 2 | Option 2 is supported on the basis of: |
| | | • Garstang and the A6 area has better access and transport infrastructure including closer access to the M6 motorway than the Wyre Peninsula |
| | | Development is needed to support rural communities. |
| | | • The area has the space to absorb the proposed number of houses. |
| | | Countryside and views will be retained. |
| | | Option 1 is not supported: |
| | | • Loss of 95% of the existing areas of open green spaces remaining in the Wyre Peninsula. |
| | | • Loss of rural/countryside character that defines the Thornton area, removing the rural character and quality of Raikes Road and Underbank Road. |
| | | Would increase out-commuting and congestion (A585) owing to limited employment opportunities in the Fylde Coast Peninsula. Very little green open space – the Peninsula is heavily urbanised. Current green open space contributes greatly to the health and well-being of local communities. |
| | | • Flood risk. |
| | | Potential for conflict between new housing development and the Halite gas storage proposals. |
| 640 | Option 2 | Option 2 supported. Opposed to Option 1. |
| 641 | Option 3 | Option 3: |
| | | • Provides for the development of an area which is currently underdeveloped and which lies between the two areas in Wyre which are more developed. |
| | | • A more logical growth of the Wyre area and its infrastructure as well as helping to maintain its character of a mixture of communities of different size. |
| | | Would spread the impact of development more widely. |
| | | • Building an infrastructure to support this would not only make these communities more viable but would also assist the objective of building tourism. |
| | | Option 1: |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|--|
| | | Next most desirable option. Carries forward existing plans to develop this area and builds the coastal community which is already |
| | | benefitting from the investment in it. |
| | | |
| | | Option 2: |
| | | Least desirable option - disproportionate impact on Garstang effectively doubling it in size. Biffig. It is a sea began the infrared and the sea of it. Output Description: |
| | | Difficult to see how the infrastructure could support it. |
| | | Combining options 1 and 3 would deliver the advantages of option 3 whilst continuing with the development of the coastal communities under option 1. |
| 643 | Option 2 | No advantages to Option 1 - not possible to achieve without serious adverse impacts. |
| | | Option 2 - least chance of serious adverse impacts and best hope for better transport links to support development. |
| | | Para. 6.5 Housing numbers 6800 - 9700 dwellings – unworkable – no justification. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) of 2013 has serious flaws in its logic. |
| | | The A6 corridor (Option 2) and its linkages to the national motorway network and Preston Growth area offer opportunities for sustainable growth. |
| | | It has been mooted at various public meetings that perhaps a new town near Garstang with rail and M6 connection. |
| | | Housing more valuable in this area due to the far better connectivity and so more chance of developer contribution to infrastructure, plus lower cost of key infrastructure necessary. Perhaps a Park and Ride for Preston, Manchester and Lancaster. Proximity to new M55 J2 and road to Enterprise zone at Warton. Broughton by pass is progressing. Such a policy would also offer opportunity for future growth. |
| | | It is understood that Highways England have finance available to be able to offer match funding to facilitate improvements to Strategic Highways network to support developments. |
| | | It is understood the Police would support a new M6 junction between J32 and J33. |
| 644 | Option 2 | No advantages to Option 1 - not possible to achieve without serious adverse impacts. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|--|
| | | Option 2 - least chance of serious adverse impacts and best hope for better transport links to support development. |
| | | Para. 6.5 Housing numbers 6800 - 9700 dwellings – unworkable – no justification. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) of 2013 has serious flaws in its logic. |
| | | The A6 corridor (Option 2) and its linkages to the national motorway network and Preston Growth area offer opportunities for sustainable growth. |
| | | It has been mooted at various public meetings that perhaps a new town near Garstang with rail and M6 connection. |
| | | Housing more valuable in this area due to the far better connectivity and so more chance of developer contribution to infrastructure, plus lower cost of key infrastructure necessary. Perhaps a Park and Ride for Preston, Manchester and Lancaster. Proximity to new M55 J2 and road to Enterprise zone at Warton. Broughton by pass is progressing. Such a policy would also offer opportunity for future growth. |
| | | It is understood that Highways England have finance available to be able to offer match funding to facilitate improvements to Strategic Highways network to support developments. |
| | | It is understood the Police would support a new M6 junction between J32 and J33. |
| 645 | Option 2 | Option 2 has least chance of serious adverse impacts and best hope for better transport links to support development. |
| | | • A6 corridor provides linkages to the national motorway network and Preston Growth area offer providing opportunities for sustainable growth. |
| | | Consistent with the NPPF. |
| | | Potential for a new town near Garstang with rail and M6 connection. |
| | | Park and Ride for Preston, Manchester and Lancaster. |
| 646 | | New M6 junction between J32 and J33 given the current distance between these junctions. |
| 646 | None | Needs to be greater emphasis on Fleetwood to reverse its deprivation and make it into a more vibrant town and centre. More development of brownfield sites and empty houses rather than green belt and green fields. Garstang & surrounding villages is |
| | | being seeing too much development and is losing its identity |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|---|
| | | No value being put on agriculture and its contribution to food production. |
| | | Need to address individual villages and communities. |
| | | Need for bus service to develop to accommodate any growth. |
| | | Options 2 &3 will increase congestion on the A6 - impact on rural communities & the environment. |
| | | Is there an alternative or hybrid option which would be more appropriate? |
| | | One that promotes: |
| | | Greater development around Fleetwood. |
| | | Greater emphasis/inclusion of agriculture. |
| | | ■ The retention of village identity. |
| | | ◆Ann emphasis on schools and amenities for the villages and rural communities. |
| | | • More sheltered, older person and social housing provision for local people in all areas. |
| 654 | Option 1 | Consideration for areas such as Out Rawcliffe to be developed as there is a school building that is currently empty and village hall that could be opened again. |
| 655 | Option 1 | See question 6 |
| 660 | Option 1 | Need to focus development on brownfield sites. |
| 667 | | If there were to be substantial development in the A6 corridor/Garstang, active consideration must be given to ensuring the rural infrastructure and supporting bodies are adequately funded to enable them to provide for this increase in the population. |
| 669 | Option 2 | No advantages to Option 1 - not possible to achieve without serious adverse impacts. |
| | | Option 2 - least chance of serious adverse impacts and best hope for better transport links to support development. |
| | | Para. 6.5 Housing numbers 6800 - 9700 dwellings – unworkable – no justification. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) of 2013 has serious flaws in its logic. |
| | | The A6 corridor (Option 2) and its linkages to the national motorway network and Preston Growth area offer opportunities for sustainable growth. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|--|
| | | It has been mooted at various public meetings that perhaps a new town near Garstang with rail and M6 connection. |
| | | Housing more valuable in this area due to the far better connectivity and so more chance of developer contribution to infrastructure, plus lower cost of key infrastructure necessary. Perhaps a Park and Ride for Preston, Manchester and Lancaster. Proximity to new M55 J2 and road to Enterprise zone at Warton. Broughton by pass is progressing. Such a policy would also offer opportunity for future growth. |
| | | It is understood that Highways England have finance available to be able to offer match funding to facilitate improvements to Strategic Highways network to support developments. |
| | | It is understood the Police would support a new M6 junction between J32 and J33. |
| 670 | Option 2 | No advantages to Option 1 - not possible to achieve without serious adverse impacts. |
| | | Option 2 - least chance of serious adverse impacts and best hope for better transport links to support development. |
| | | Para. 6.5 Housing numbers 6800 - 9700 dwellings – unworkable – no justification. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) of 2013 has serious flaws in its logic. |
| | | The A6 corridor (Option 2) and its linkages to the national motorway network and Preston Growth area offer opportunities for sustainable growth. |
| | | It has been mooted at various public meetings that perhaps a new town near Garstang with rail and M6 connection. |
| | | Housing more valuable in this area due to the far better connectivity and so more chance of developer contribution to infrastructure, plus lower cost of key infrastructure necessary. Perhaps a Park and Ride for Preston, Manchester and Lancaster. Proximity to new M55 J2 and road to Enterprise zone at Warton. Broughton by pass is progressing. Such a policy would also offer opportunity for future growth. |
| | | It is understood that Highways England have finance available to be able to offer match funding to facilitate improvements to Strategic Highways network to support developments. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|---|
| | | It is understood the Police would support a new M6 junction between J32 and J33. |
| 673 | n/a | • Insufficient local infrastructure (see above) |
| | | Negative impact of development on highway capacity. |
| 674 | None | None of the options are preferred but Option 2 provides good road links with the motorway network – important as 50% of new residents will be working outside of the borough. |
| 678 | Option 2 | Garstang and the A6 area has better infrastructure. |
| | | Development is needed to support rural communities. |
| | | • The area has the space to absorb the proposed number of houses whereas the Fylde Coast Peninsula does not. |
| 670 | 0 11 2 | Offers the best hope for better transport links to support development. |
| 679 | Option 2 | Garstang and the A6 area has better infrastructure. |
| | | Development is needed to support rural communities. The state of |
| | | • The area has the space to absorb the proposed number of houses whereas the Fylde Coast Peninsula does not. |
| 600 | 0 11 2 | Offers the best hope for better transport links to support development. |
| 680 | Option 2 | Option 2 has least chance of serious adverse impacts and best hope for better transport links to support development. |
| | | • A6 corridor provides linkages to the national motorway network and Preston Growth area offer providing opportunities for sustainable growth. |
| | | • Consistent with the NPPF. |
| | | Potential for a new town near Garstang with rail and M6 connection. |
| | | Park and Ride for Preston, Manchester and Lancaster. |
| | | New M6 junction between J32 and J33 given the current distance between these junctions. |
| | | Option 1 – not supported – almost 100% of existing countryside would be lost. |
| 681 | Option 3 | ◆Options 1 and 2 do not take into account traffic growth (A6). |
| | | No rail or motorway links in Garstang. |
| 683 | Option 2 | Area around Garstang and the A6 has better infrastructure |
| | | Development is needed to support such rural communities |
| | | More space to absorb the proposed level of housing development. |
| | | Fylde Coast Peninsula does not have the same amount of space. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|---|
| 687 | Option 2 | • Question the need to build between 6,800 and 9,700 houses in the period 2011-2031. |
| | | • The projected increase in the population of Wyre according to the ONS is from 108,000 to 114,000 i.e. 6,000 in the Plan Period - |
| | | average of 2 people per dwelling equals 3,000 additional houses. |
| | | • The Strategic Housing Market Assessment needs to be critically examined and not just accepted at face value. Query increase in the |
| | | population to 125,000 by 2031? - an increase of 16% which is well in excess of any projection based on the last 5 or even 10 years. |
| | | • No option is available for residents to choose anything but significant or moderate for the FCP. No figures are provided for what is |
| | | significant or moderate which means that residents are not being made aware of the implications of their choices. |
| | | • The choice of Options which puts the FCP, the A6 corridor and the villages in conflict is a reflection of the poor construction of this document. |
| | | What will the Planners do with the results? Of what significance will they be? |
| | | • If it is decided that the number of houses to be built is 6,800 to 9,700 then there is only one solution. The FCP is almost full and the |
| | | villages can only take a limited expansion. Therefore the only sustainable answer is Option 2, i.e. Garstang and the A6 corridor where |
| | | there is demand for housing and employment land and where it is possible to improve the infrastructure so as to produce a well- |
| | | planned and coordinated expansion. |
| 689 | Option 2 | Garstang and the A6 area has better infrastructure. |
| | | Development is needed to support rural communities. |
| | | • The area has the space to absorb the proposed number of houses, unlike the Fylde Coast Peninsula. |
| | | Best option for better transport links to support development |
| 690 | Option 2 | Garstang and the A6 area has better infrastructure. |
| | | Development is needed to support rural communities. |
| | | • The area has the space to absorb the proposed number of houses, unlike the Fylde Coast Peninsula. |
| | | Best option for better transport links to support development |
| 693 | Option 2 | The three option maps highlight sharp division in the borough not only between the coastal urban strip west of the river and the rural |
| | & 3 | hinterland but the distinction within that hinterland between the villages of the A588 and those either side of the A6. |
| | | All areas suffer with problems of road transport capacity. |
| | | The burden will have to be shared although the coastal area is limited by the green belt. |
| | | , , , |
| | | Garstang and near neighbours is in danger of being overwhelmed on all sides. Development on the east of the A6 north of the town |
| | | should be considered before other forays into the countryside. |
| | | Unless significant development was felt appropriate in the rural centre, a watered down option 2 and 3 with more focus on the A588 |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|--|
| | | and A586 would seem to be the least worse option keeping development both housing and employment in Garstang east of the A6. |
| 694 | Option 1 | Focus should be on the rejuvenation of Fleetwood. |
| | | Growth in the East of the borough will occur organically as North Preston grows. |
| 698 | Option 2 | ◆A6 corridor meets criteria for employment improvement and diversity – close to the A6 and M6. |
| | | Linear development cheaper than in restricted and confined pockets. |
| 699 | None | Impossible questions. Undemocratic to call this a consultation. |
| 700 | Option 1 | The Fylde Coast Peninsula has the infrastructure and workforce of appropriate age and number to attract growth. |
| | | Alternative option – Option 1 combined with a Nateby "new town". |
| 701 | Option 1 | Query need for A6 residential development when 8,000 homes are planned in Preston. |
| | | Regenerate West Wyre. |
| 702 | None | Focus should be off the A6 and on creating better links with West Wyre. A6 focus only benefits Preston residents. |
| 703 | None | Countryside should be protected. |
| 704 | None | No additional comments submitted |
| 705 | Option 1 | • Should be a focus on Fleetwood to reduce or eliminate poverty. Development should be focused on the Peninsula not ribbon development along the A6. |
| | | Concerned about the impact of development of the attractiveness of the rural area. |
| | | •Should increase the green belt around rural and semi-rural communities – Churchtown, Garstang, Catterall, Winmarleigh, Nateby etc. |
| | | ◆Could allow some restricted high quality building but not on the green belt. |
| | | • Supports the provision of cycle paths off the A6. |
| 706 | Option 1 | Option 1 – IO_33 too large for Poulton – increased traffic congestion. |
| | Option 2 | |
| 707 | Option 2 | • Inadequate roads for the traffic. |
| | | Query availability of government finance for new roads. |
| 708 | Option 2 | Option 2 provides the best chance of encouraging industrial development to the area – proximity to motorway access. |
| 710 | Option 3 | No additional comments submitted. |
| 711 | None | No additional comments submitted. |
| 712 | None | Option 1 has greatest potential to develop along sustainable lines – population density and public transport links. Easier to develop |
| | | walking, cycling and other sustainable modes of transport. |
| | | Greater development should not take place in Garstang without improvements to public transport, ideally with a rail station. |

| None Option 1 has greatest potential to develop along sustainable lines – population density and public transport links. Ea walking, cycling and other sustainable modes of transport. Greater development should not take place in Garstang without improvements to public transport, ideally with a rail possible development must be on a smaller scale. Option 3 Major concerns about the viability of the current road network to support development. Need to use brownfield land in Thornton for housing. Option 1 Amend option 2 and 3 to remove potential development (124 acres on a community of 140 dwellings) at Winmarleig support stated visions and objectives – contradicts them. If decided to include – should be very limited development – maximum of 10% and sympathetic to the local village enheritage. Option 1 No additional comments submitted. | I station. If not gh – does not |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Greater development should not take place in Garstang without improvements to public transport, ideally with a rail possible development must be on a smaller scale. 714 Option 3 Major concerns about the viability of the current road network to support development. 715 n/a Need to use brownfield land in Thornton for housing. 717 Option 1 Amend option 2 and 3 to remove potential development (124 acres on a community of 140 dwellings) at Winmarleig support stated visions and objectives – contradicts them. If decided to include – should be very limited development – maximum of 10% and sympathetic to the local village en heritage. | gh – does not |
| possible development must be on a smaller scale. 714 Option 3 Major concerns about the viability of the current road network to support development. 715 n/a Need to use brownfield land in Thornton for housing. 717 Option 1 Amend option 2 and 3 to remove potential development (124 acres on a community of 140 dwellings) at Winmarleig support stated visions and objectives – contradicts them. If decided to include – should be very limited development – maximum of 10% and sympathetic to the local village en heritage. | gh – does not |
| 714 Option 3 Major concerns about the viability of the current road network to support development. 715 n/a Need to use brownfield land in Thornton for housing. 717 Option 1 Amend option 2 and 3 to remove potential development (124 acres on a community of 140 dwellings) at Winmarleig support stated visions and objectives – contradicts them. If decided to include – should be very limited development – maximum of 10% and sympathetic to the local village enheritage. | |
| 715 n/a Need to use brownfield land in Thornton for housing. 717 Option 1 Amend option 2 and 3 to remove potential development (124 acres on a community of 140 dwellings) at Winmarleig support stated visions and objectives – contradicts them. If decided to include – should be very limited development – maximum of 10% and sympathetic to the local village enheritage. | |
| Option 1 Amend option 2 and 3 to remove potential development (124 acres on a community of 140 dwellings) at Winmarleig support stated visions and objectives – contradicts them. If decided to include – should be very limited development – maximum of 10% and sympathetic to the local village enheritage. | |
| support stated visions and objectives – contradicts them. If decided to include – should be very limited development – maximum of 10% and sympathetic to the local village en heritage. | |
| If decided to include – should be very limited development – maximum of 10% and sympathetic to the local village en heritage. | nvironment and |
| heritage. | nvironment and |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| None Proposals based on submissions by owners and interested parties. Should be based instead on where plan objectives | s can be achieved. |
| Need to focus on brownfield land. | |
| 722 Option 1 • Greatest need for development – urban area – economy needs revitalising. | |
| Puts the least pressure on the countryside and protects the rural heritage of the borough. | |
| • The urban area has existing infrastructure and is easier to expand rather than creating new infrastructure. | |
| 723 Option 1 • Priority to focus on the Fylde Coast and economic revitalisation of Fleetwood. | |
| Opportunity to promote tourism and coastal leisure. | |
| A6 has existing congestion and pollution problems. | |
| • The rural economy does not provide the quality or quantity of employment for young people. | |
| Housing built in rural areas will become part of the commuter belt. | |
| 724 Option 3 • Fylde coast peninsula is already heavily industrialised and developed with regards to housing. | |
| • Little Green Belt and what remains is needed to support the health and well-being of residents. | |
| Better balance needs to be struck between the peninsula and the rest of the borough. | |
| 725 None No additional comments submitted. | |
| 726 None No additional comments submitted. | |
| 727 Option 2 • Should develop along a corridor between St. Michaels and Churchtown as it has A road access, as opposed to Winn | narleigh/Nateby. |
| Should not develop in the west of the borough which is already too dominant. | l l |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|---|
| 729 | Option 3 | No additional comments submitted. |
| 731 | None | No additional comments submitted. |
| 732 | Option 1 | Expect a hybrid option to emerge from the consultation process. May be a case for specific limited development in rural areas and |
| | | Garstang if a strong case is made locally. |
| 733 | Option 2 | The infrastructure of Garstang and the A6 is better – this area has the space to absorb the proposed number of houses. The Fylde |
| | | Coast does not. |
| 735 | Option 2 | The infrastructure of Garstang and the A6 is better. Development needed to support local communities. The area has the space to |
| | | absorb the proposed number of houses. The Fylde Coast Peninsula does not. |
| 738 | Option 2 | Consideration should be given to: |
| | | |
| | | Extending the rail link from Poulton-le-Fylde to Fleetwood. |
| | | Building the Fleetwood/Knott-End Barrage. |
| | | Ease planning controls in the rural area for local people and business needs related to the countryside. |
| 739 | Option 2 | The infrastructure of Garstang and the A6 is better. Development needed to support local communities. The area has the space to |
| | | absorb the proposed number of houses. The Fylde Coast Peninsula does not. |
| 740 | Option 2 | • Impact of concentrating development in the peninsula – intolerable traffic issues/congestion. |
| | | Need to limit new retail development e.g. at Norcross. |
| | | Should prioritise previously developed land. |
| | | • Option of development which brings forward a new road at Poulton supported but would only exacerbate problems at the five-way junction at Mains Lane. |
| | | Removal of countryside around Thornton would devastate its character. |
| | | Option 3 – worse of all worlds. |
| | | • Hybrid of options 2 and 3 likely to have the least significant impact – new M6 junction and railway station/siding on the West Coast |
| | | Main Line would support the significant development strategy of Option 2 coupled with the moderate development of other eastern |
| | | areas of Option 3. |
| 741 | Option 2 | Impact of concentrating development in the peninsula – intolerable traffic issues/congestion. |
| / | Option 2 | Need to limit new retail development e.g. at Norcross. |
| | | Should prioritise previously developed land. |
| | | Option of development which brings forward a new road at Poulton supported but would only exacerbate problems at the five-way |
| | | - Option of development which brings forward a new road at Fourton supported but would only exacerbate problems at the five-way |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|---|
| | | junction at Mains Lane. |
| | | Removal of countryside around Thornton would devastate its character. |
| | | Option 3 – worse of all worlds. |
| | | • Hybrid of options 2 and 3 likely to have the least significant impact – new M6 junction and railway station/siding on the West Coast Main Line would support the significant development strategy of Option 2 coupled with the moderate development of other eastern areas of Option 3. |
| 742 | Option 2 | Option 2 has the least chance of serious adverse impact and best hope for better transport links to support development. |
| | | Supports a new town near Garstang with new rail and M6 connection. |
| 743 | Option 2 | Option 2 is the only sustainable option. Other options would have adverse impacts on all areas in the peninsula. Option 2 complies with the requirements of NPPF. |
| 744 | Option 2 | Option 2 is the only sustainable option. Other options would have adverse impacts on all areas in the peninsula. |
| 745 | Option 2 | Option 2 has the least chance of serious adverse impact and best hope for better transport links to support development. Links with Preston and Lancaster. Complies with NPPF requirements. |
| 746 | Option 2 | Option 2 is the only sustainable option that meets NPPF requirements. |
| 748 | Option 2 | Option 1 – Fylde Coast is a cul-de-sac – grid lock with delays. Only so much land to build on. |
| | | Option 2 – Close to three m-way junctions and on way to Manchester. Could build a railway station. Plenty of room for building unlike the peninsula. |
| 751 | Option 2 | Option 2 – good road network links – A6/M6 corridor. Space available without major impact on Garstang. Option 1 – see previous responses. Option 3 – not sustainable. |
| 752 | Option 2 | Option 2 – road infrastructure in place. Option to develop a new motorway junction. Available land without detrimental impact on Garstang. |
| 753 | Option 2 | Option 2 – road infrastructure in place. Option to develop a new motorway junction. Available land without detrimental impact on Garstang. |
| 755 | Option 3 | Option 1 and 2 should only be considered with access restricted to the A585. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|---|
| | | Option 1 – access via Hardhorn Road and Fairfield Road – significant impact on local traffic situation (IO_33). Will completely change |
| | | the character of the town. |
| 756 | Option 2 | No additional comments submitted. |
| 758 | Option 1 | Invest in development in Fleetwood to address deprivation. |
| 759 | Option 3 | No additional comments submitted. |
| 760 | Option 1 | Need to put amenities in place before expanding housing development. Needs to be local work for local people to avoid issues of increased extra traffic generated by additional commuters. |
| 761 | Option 2 | A6 and M6 links already in place. |
| 701 | Option 2 | Further development in the peninsula would put transport links under strain. |
| | | Option would have the advantages of restricting over-development in the Over Wyre villages. |
| | | Option would have the advantages of restricting over-development in the Over Wyre villages. Option 3 not supported – limited employment opportunities in the Over Wyre villages and additional traffic congestion. |
| 762 | None | Option 3 not supported – innited employment opportunities in the Over wyre vinages and additional traffic congestion. Green Belt under threat. |
| 762 | None | |
| | | Village life important – development changes dynamics. Discription and the address as a second to be address as a second to be address. |
| | | Plan is too generic – needs to address communities individually. |
| 760 | 0 0 | Housing should be focused on existing areas with good public transport links. |
| 763 | Option 2 | Option 2 makes use of the existing transport network. Need an M6 junction between Preston and Lancaster and railway station. |
| 704 | Oution 2 | Progressive industry will need to link with the rest of the UK and the EU. |
| 781 | Option 2 | Development alongside the A6 is sustainable. |
| | | • Serious traffic issues in the peninsula. |
| | | Commuter traffic on a major scale would make local roads around Thornton impassable. |
| 782 | None | All options show the same amount of development in the Rural East – not acceptable. Forton does not have the infrastructure to |
| | | support development over and above existing permissions. Scale of development over and above that needed to meet ONS population |
| | | projections. Would not be sustainable. Fleetwood needs to be revitalised. |
| 783 | Option 2 | No room left in the peninsula without compromising dwindling green areas. |
| | | Should focus on the A6 corridor around Garstang because of current and potential (M6 junction and railway station) transport |
| | | infrastructure. |
| 784 | Option 2 | Option 2 more appropriate to commuters. Motorway is an access point to be used. |
| 785 | Option 2 | Thornton lacks the room for more growth. Existing population under stress owing to development that has already taken place. |
| 700 | 0 | Option of shifting focus to Blackpool Enterprise Zones instead? |
| 786 | Option 2 | ◆ Option 1 – could not be achieved without serious adverse impact. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|--|
| | | Option 2 – best hope for better transport links to support development – i.e. new junction on the M6. |
| | | ◆Garstang has the space for a new town development and has rail and motorway connection. |
| 787 | Option 2 | Option 1 – could not be achieved without serious adverse impact. |
| | | ● Option 2 – best hope for better transport links to support development – i.e. new junction on the M6. |
| | | ◆Garstang has the space for a new town development and has rail and motorway connection. |
| 788 | Option 2 | ● Option 1 – could not be achieved without serious adverse impact. |
| | | ● Option 2 – best hope for better transport links to support development – i.e. new junction on the M6. |
| | | ◆Garstang has the space for a new town development and has rail and motorway connection. |
| 792 | Option 1 | Supports a hybrid option that spreads development evenly across the borough – would minimise the creation of intensive development |
| | | and help to preserve the identity of villages and communities. |
| 793 | Option 1 | Significant development not needed for Churchtown or Catterall. |
| | | Option 1 focuses on an area of high unemployment and which contains pockets of deprivation. Will allow brownfield sites to be used. |
| | | Large-scale and low quality development on the A6 corridor and in Churchtown not needed and not sustainable – will create congestion and involve the loss of good quality agricultural land. |
| | | Need to view greenfield sites/open countryside and agricultural land as having high importance. |
| | | Building unaffordable houses in and around village is not the solution. |
| | | Developments are bringing in commuters to local cities. Need affordable housing for local people. |
| 795 | Option 2 | Option 2 offers better facilities – nearer the A6 – better infrastructure and access to the motorway. |
| | | Option 1 = more congestion on busy roads. Only one way out of the area – A585. Loss of green space for recreation. |
| 796 | Option 2 | A6 corridor has better infrastructure – able to support more homes. |
| | | Areas can accommodate more housing without adversely affecting existing communities. |
| 806 | Option 1 | Peninsula – better prospects for work and services. |
| | | Winmarleigh – limited services. Those in Garstang are under pressure. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|--|
| 809 | Option 2 | A6 and M6 links already in place. |
| | | • Further development in the peninsula would put transport links under strain. |
| | | Option would have the advantages of restricting over-development in the Over Wyre villages. |
| | | Option 3 not supported – limited employment opportunities in the Over Wyre villages and additional traffic congestion. |
| 810 | Option 2 | Development should be near main arterial routes such as M6, A6 and west coast mainline. |
| | | Option 1 – none starter – peninsula already over populated. |
| | | Query why need up to 9,700 dwellings. Population increase 2001 – 2011 2.5% = 2,700 people. Over next 17 years will be 4,600 people |
| | | – well below the estimated 18,000 to fill all of the new dwellings. |
| 812 | None | Don't build on greenfield sites. |
| 813 | Option 1 | Option 1 provides the opportunity to expand marine industries. |
| 814 | Option 3 | • Will provide housing where people have existing links rather than introducing more people into high density areas – will create more congestion. |
| | | Transport networks need to be addressed to improve connectivity. |
| | | • Dispersed population will provide more choice. Stalmine, Pilling, Forton etc have good proximity to Lancaster and its transport links |
| | | and employment. |
| | | Need affordable housing to retain and attract families. |
| | | Building cheaper and smaller houses that families can afford may also encourage older people to downsize and release a larger property. |
| 815 | Option 1 | No additional comments submitted. |
| 817 | N | No option for Forton or Hollins Lane – identical in all options. |
| | | No value placed on the role of agriculture. |
| | | Biggest asset is the countryside – under threat. |
| | | Increasing the size of villages will devalue the quality of life. |
| | | • Essential that the plan focuses on the needs of each community – communities are different from each other. |
| | | Fleetwood is deprived and needs extensive development. |
| 818 | Option 3 | Encouraging development in Over Wyre should attract younger families to villages. |
| 819 | None | No option for Forton – identical in all options. |
| | | Each community should be assessed individually. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|---|
| | | No consideration to the main employment – agriculture. |
| | | Countryside and village life under threat. |
| | | • Fleetwood is the place to start employment improvement and needs new housing. |
| 820 | Option 2 | Gartang and A6 have better infrastructure. |
| | | Rural communities would benefit by the support of development. |
| | | • A6 – direct access to Lancaster, Preston and Manchester for employment. |
| | | Fylde coast cannot take more development. |
| 821 | Option 3 | No additional comments submitted. |
| 822 | Option 3 | No additional comments submitted. |
| 823 | n/a | Mixture of all three needed. |
| 824 | Option 1 | Option 1 has the advantage of suitable supportive infrastructure. |
| | | Option 2 – population would put heavy demands on existing roads unless new access to M6 built. Railway station near Garstang would |
| | | help communities. |
| | | Option 3 – worst – lack of suitable roads, bus services etc. |
| 826 | Option 1 | Option 1 – better road and rail links and greater potential for affordable housing and employment. |
| | | Option 2 – serious issues for road infrastructure. No railway station. Poor bus routes. Lack of medical and educational infrastructure. |
| | | Option 3 – smaller villages relay on A6 – has serious transport issues. Small country lanes. No bus services. |
| | | Limit housing in Gatstang and integrate into all communities. |
| | | Keep villages separate to retain individuality rather than becoming urban sprawl. |
| | | Keep as much greenfield land as possible – focus on brownfield. |
| 827 | Option 2 | Develop a new town near A6 corridor/Garstang – better access for commuters and businesses. |
| 828 | Option 2 | Preferred option would be option 1 but nothing can be done with any of the options until the problem of the A585 has been dealt with. |
| 829 | Option 3 | Consider need for a new town in rural Wyre (between Hambleton/Stalmine/Pilling/Garstang) |
| 830 | Option 3 | Supports the development of rural settlements plus Nateby and Winmarleigh into satellite townlets. |
| 831 | Option 1 | Options 2 and 3 involve more commuting. Locations such as Garstang and Catterall do not have the infrastructure and |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|------|----------|---|
| | | health/education services to cope with more development. |
| 832 | Option1 | Option cannot be sustainable without major infrastructure expenditure in health, education and subsidised transport. Would do the most damage to Garstang. |
| | | Alternative is to determine local wishes and professionally assess future needs. |
| 833 | Option 1 | No additional comments submitted. |
| 834 | Option 1 | Option 1 – better roads and rail links and greater potential for new jobs. Option 2 – unacceptable – impact on road network especially A6, lack of public transport, lack of educational and health infrastructure. Will increase the number of commuters. Serious lack of parking in Garstang. Option 3 – still does not address A6 issues. Alternative – limited (development) in the Garstang area better integrated into the community. Separation of villages essential to retain individuality. |
| 835 | None | Garstang and surrounding areas should be left as they are – enough houses for sale. Should develop the towns where there is the infrastructure. |
| 836 | None | Oversupply of existing houses that cannot sell. Issues of inadequate health, educational and road infrastructure. Unaffordable housing. |
| 837 | Option 1 | Develop where there is employment – reduced congestion. |
| 838 | Option 3 | No additional comments submitted. |
| 839 | Option 1 | Option 1 – has better road and rail links. Will not destroy the countryside. Build where there are jobs. Option 2 – Unacceptable. Cannot look at Garstang in isolation. Highway infrastructure issues, lack of health and educational infrastructure. Would create few local jobs, will create more commuters, will not bring more shoppers as insufficient parking, many houses for sale – do not need more. Option 3 – dispersal is a better plan but does not address the A6 issue. |
| 840 | Option 3 | Spread the load – each community will need to grow. |
| 841 | Option 2 | If option 2 – Garstang road system and parking needs considerable changes – A6 junctions need improving particularly Nateby and lights at Croston Road. Aim for m-way access and rail station at Barton. |
| 0.10 | | Option 3 – too much pressure on roads unless Fleetwood Knott-End bridge planned. |
| 842 | Option 1 | Keep industry in urban areas and concentrate on the agricultural nature of other areas. Don't turn rural into urban. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|--|
| 843 | Option 3 | Concerned about the impact of development along the A6. Need more bus services between Preston and Lancaster – same for |
| | | coastal communities and between Poulton and Fleetwood. |
| | | Need to focus on affordable housing. |
| 844 | Option 2 | No additional comments submitted. |
| 845 | Option 2 | • All of the options have drawbacks. Garstang is becoming an urban sprawl. A6 struggling to cope. |
| | | • Issues – education and health infrastructure. House prices very high. No work opportunities for young people. |
| | | Garstang needs a railway station and motorway link at Barton Grange. |
| | | • Access to the Fylde is an issue – e.g. issues at Singleton lights. |
| | | Need more bungalows for the older generation. |
| | | No direct bus link to the out of town doctor's surgery. |
| 846 | Option 1 | No additional comments submitted. |
| 847 | Option 2 | No additional comments submitted. |
| 848 | n/a | Would like to see more employment opportunities in Garstang. |
| | | Rapid increase in housing development could have an adverse effect on Garstang. |
| | | No indication of the number of houses required under each option. |
| 854 | 1 | Fylde Coast is perfect for development. New roads in the area are underway. |
| | | The bottom of the A6 cannot support further development. |
| 863 | 2 | There are no advantages to developing the FCP. |
| (a) | | Option 2 will see comparatively less greenspace loss than other options. |
| | | Option 2 is more sustainable. |
| | | A long term sustainable new town on the A6 could be a testament to 'proper planning'. It could also provide sustainable growth |
| | | opportunities. |
| | | Hybrid: |
| | | A strategy which ends in 2031 is too short sighted. |
| | | Consideration of greener development and sustainable technologies should be promoted. |
| 865 | Option 3 | Option 3: |
| | ' | Most appropriate strategy for a balanced distribution of development. |
| | | A6 corridor settlements can be developed in a sustainable, co-ordinated way are reduce the pressure to release greenbelt along |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|--------|--|
| | | the FCP. |
| | | Garstang offers more facilities. |
| | | Limited opportunities for new development in urban areas of settlements along A6. |
| | | Amendments: |
| | | Development should be deliverable and sustainable across the Local Plan period. |
| | | Balanced Spatial Strategy should include sustainable urban extensions. |
| | | Smaller settlements (incl. Stalmine) have limited opportunities for scale of sustainable development. |
| | | Focus should be on FCP and A6 with limited development of rural communities. |
| | | Significant development along A6 should be around Garstang and Catterall. |
| 900 | 3 | Plans for a form of public transport need to be included. |
| 901 | 2 | No comment |
| 902 | 2 | Consultee lives in Thornton |
| 903 | 3 | Supports gradual development of housing and industry throughout the Borough rather than concentration in particular areas. This will: |
| | | Retain character of existing villages and bring local services to residents. |
| | | Developments must be proportionate and bring infrastructure improvements. |
| | | • Extension of a range of services to rural areas will maintain areas as thriving communities and not create 'dormitory towns'. |
| | | People should be encouraged to become part of the community. |
| | | Farming was previously a dominant economic sector. With the changes to agriculture there is likely to be many vacant agricultural |
| | | buildings which could be converted for homes and small businesses. |
| 904 | n/a | Objective 1 – refers to the fact that land south of Poulton-Le-Fylde (IO_33) requires the development of a new road to facilitate its |
| | | development. |
| | | It is noted that from the description of the route of this proposed road it is clear that it will be located in Fylde, in open countryside to |
| | | the west of Singleton. Whilst the construction of this road cannot be ruled out at this stage, it would be a major development with |
| | | serious implications for the open landscape character of this rural area of Fylde. |
| | | The construction of the associated development sites south east of Poulton Le Fylde (IO_32 and IO_33) would also have implications with respect to increasing the volumes of traffic moving to and from the M55 on the already congested A585. |
| | | |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|--------|--|
| | | Option 2 and 3 do not mention the road therefore it is assumed that it does not form part of them. |
| | | The advantages of Option 2 and 3 do not mention that a greater proportion of increased traffic associated with new development would be generated in the east of Wyre rather than on the congested A585 in the west. Another advantage is that land in the A6 Corridor is at a lower risk of flooding than land on the coast and development here is less likely to impact on bathing water quality. |
| | | Under the disadvantages of Option 2 final bullet it would be clearer if the Junction with the M6 motorway was labelled as Junction 1 M55/ Junction 30 M6. |
| 905 | None | Loss of greenbelt and agricultural land at too high a scale. |
| | | Needs of individual communities have not been considered (incl. types of housing). |
| | | Fleetwood needs investment. |
| 908 | None | No comment |
| 909 | 1 & 2 | Hybrid: Options 1 and 2 need to be considered, both areas need developing to sustain growth and attract investment. |
| | | Option 2 |
| | | Advantages: |
| | | Will bring sufficient growth to support Garstang town centre |
| | | Option 3 |
| | | An additional disadvantage in the rural settlements would be the provision of education/doctors surgeries and lack of facilities to sustain growth. |
| 911 | None | No regard for farming. Development of greenfields devalues farming and villages. |
| | | Each small settlement should be assessed separately. |
| | | The large towns in West Fylde (Garstang and Fleetwood) have excellent services and would flourish with new development and |
| 045 | 4 | services. |
| 915 | 1 | The plan must reflect the individual character of the areas concerned. |
| | | Some areas can cope with development whilst others cannot. |
| | | Winmarleigh: |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|---------|---|
| | | does not have infrastructure provision, |
| | | small town identity would be lost. |
| | | Area is made up of small villages and hamlets and development will alter the makeup. |
| | | Plan seeks to encourage younger people and increase diversity in the area. However, the area is chosen for its size of hamlet/village, type/size of house and social/economic background of residents. |
| | | Suggested benefits of increased people in the area (incl. Job opportunities) are pointless if existing residents leave as a result of changes. |
| 916 | 2 | No comment |
| 919 | 1,2 & 3 | Mixture of all three |
| | | Fleetwood to be revitilised; |
| | | Knott End Preesall has great potential for quality housing; |
| | | Garstang must not be ruined by new housing developments near the river. |
| 920 | None | A hybrid of all options should be delivered – spreading development across key settlements and rural areas to meet identified local needs. |
| | | Greenbelt land separating the western peninsular should be protected at all costs and not developed. The erosion of this protected land would result in sprawl and loss of character. |
| | | Overdevelopment and concentration of growth on the western peninsular is not supported, due to pressures on existing infrastructure and transport. |
| | | Options to encourage growth of key eastern settlements should be fully explored due to the good transport connections. This should be accompanied by growth in employment opportunities to ensure sustainability. The range of sites available would ensure flexibility in the choice of development sites, to bring forward sustainable development schemes. |
| | | The expansion of rural settlements should also be fully explored to meet identified local housing needs and support the sustainability of these rural locations. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|--------|---|
| 921 | 1 | Rural Wyre Way of Life (in the East of the Borough) should be protected, it is an economic driver and is under threat. Focus should be on conservation as opposed to economic development. Labour moves where it is required. Wyre must not turn into Blackpool/Lancaster/Preston, its niche is the serving the rich economic hinterlands of Lancaster. |
| | | Planners must devise a strategy to protect rural character and not 'kowtow' with Whitehall. Planners are worthless if they do not represent those paying their council taxes. Local population are passionate about preservation. |
| | | Tourism and associated service based industries should be built. |
| | | Development should be pushed to areas which need it and of a size and scale commensurate to demand. |
| | | Economic development does not equal house building. |
| 922 | 2 | All options score negatively against environmental sustainability appraisal. |
| | | More emphasis should be place on conserving and enhancing biodiversity, limiting development on open countryside, to ensure that there are no adverse effects on species or the character of the area. |
| | | Development is rarely sustainable and nearly always impacts negatively on the environment and biodiversity. |
| | | Alternative |
| | | Instead of large scale unnecessary new housing (particularly on the FCP) areas of open countryside could be developed for community initiatives such as allotments, community gardens, wildlife areas. This would retain the character of the area, create community cohesion, jobs and possibly increase visitor numbers. |
| | | WB Council should lead the way in promoting sustainable development with initiatives like the Centre for Alternative Technology where people come to learn about sustainable technologies, energy and resource efficiency, planting for carbon capture and flood mitigation schemes. |
| 923 | 1 | There should be further development of urban areas. |
| | | Fleetwood should be prioritised for development as it seriously lacks good employment, infrastructure and housing, while making use |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|--------|---|
| | | of the surrounding infrastructure, road networks and public transport. |
| | | Strongly against option 2: |
| | | Barton heath is already being developed and should be included in site allocations. There are still plots available for housing (as is the case with Garstang). |
| | | The A6 is over capacity. If it gets any worse It will negatively affect tourism, emergency services and access to coastline. Concerned that the 46-54 demographic will be tempted to leave the area. |
| 925 | None | There are no choices for the individual communities to discuss what is best, for their specific community. |
| | | Agriculture is not mentioned. Suggested sites, would theoretically, build over many successful farms. |
| | | It would also put pressure on the infrastructure: small schools, lack of shops, poor public transport as well as an increase in car use. The latter is especially dangerous because of small poorly lit roads. |
| | | Forton has seen an adequate number of new housing in recent years and anymore would give rise to traffic and alter the nature of the village negatively. |
| | | Fleetwood needs desperate regeneration, similar to Salford, Manchester and Liverpool. Creation of wealth and local jobs will reduce travel. |
| 926 | None | Needs of different communities must be met and their character preserved. |
| | | Forton's village nature will be lost in all three options. There is no proposed infrastructure for the village, just houses. |
| | | Myerscough college is an important institution for Wyre offering land based courses. What is the point in recognising the college in the Plan if the Plan puts agriculture, greenbelt and the countryside under threat. |
| | | Alternative: |
| | | The plan should concentrate on Fleetwood which is deprived and requires enormous development. Development should not be spread extensively over Greenfield sites and rural areas. |
| 927 | 1 | Fylde Coast Peninsula Main Urban Area is the most appropriate focus for development. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|--------|---|
| | | Existing infrastructure capacity, |
| | | Employment opportunities, |
| | | Areas urgently require urban regeneration. |
| | | Hybrid 1&2: |
| | | Development of the A6 corridor with the Broughton Bypass. |
| | | Option 3: |
| | | Greatest impact upon Inskip. Some development of Inskip is inevitable and desirable. Significant development, however, would be |
| | | unsustainable due to lack of existing infrastructure and services. Any expansion of the core Inskip settlements should be restricted to a maximum growth of 20%. Any more than this will lead to loss of |
| | | character. |
| 928 | Hybrid | Proposal for housing on IO_35 is supported by land owner. |
| | | Option 1: |
| | | 'limited development' is not defined. |
| | | • Key service areas (incl. Knott End/Preesall) are given the same distribution of housing (limited) as small rural villages in the Borough. |
| | | This is not logical as Knott End/Preesall is a much more sustainable settlement than small villages and can easily accommodate more growth. |
| | | Settlement is constrained by flood risk like most of the Borough. |
| | | • "Striking an appropriate balance between managing flood risk and ensuring the continued sustainability of our settlements will be a key challenge for the Local Plan" (para. 3.27) – is supported. |
| | | Knott End and Preesall have an aging population and need family housing to ensure a vibrant settlement. |
| | | Whilst a preference for developing brown field sites should remain important, excessive dependence on sites which have proved unattractive to the market would perpetuate under delivery. |
| | | Towns within the Fylde Coast Peninsula are constrained by Green Belt which should only be released under exceptional circumstances. |
| | | Some greenfield land is available in Poulton-le-Fylde, this requires major highways infrastructure which is not feasible. |
| | | Option 2: |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|--------|---|
| | | 'Limited development' is not defined. |
| | | Concerns over lack of infrastructure provision in Knott End/Preesall. |
| | | Development is directed to Winmarleigh and Nateby which are minor unsustainable settlements. |
| | | Detachment from the A6 will reinforce car dependency further. |
| | | Option 3: |
| | | Development should be directed towards key service centres rather than small rural villages. |
| | | Knott End has a relatively wide range of services and facilities and can therefore accommodate more development. |
| | | Dispersal is not sustainable, it directs too much development to the periphery of villages (incl. Stalmine and Inskip) which have no |
| | | ability to secure complementary services and facilities. Smaller sites will be less appealing to developers due to lower sales rates. |
| | | Conclusion: |
| | | Hybrid of proportionate development surrounding key service centres should be adopted (incl Knott End/Preesall). |
| | | Regeneration of the FCP should be promoted. The majority of new development should be located here. |
| | | A 'moderate' amount of development should be directed to Knott End/Preesall. |
| 929 | None | None of the options are supported as they stand but Option 1 would be preferable if it incorporates the following: |
| | | • Priority should be given to revitalising Fleetwood so that it becomes an attractive place to live and visit. Health inequalities must be addressed. |
| | | • Large brownfield sites should be developed for housing as well as business use. Every effort should be made to protect Green Belt |
| | | Development in Fleetwood will be more difficult than in rural areas but the preferences of developers should not direct the plan. |
| | | Development in rural areas should be concentrated in larger settlements such as Garstang which there is an existing infrastructure framework. |
| | | Development in villages should be limited to ensure vitality but not cause irreversible damage to their character. |
| 933 | 3 | An OAN should be established before seeking locations for new development. |
| | | Option 3 is the only viable option for delivery of housing required. There are limited deliverable or developable sites on the Fylde Coast |
| | | Peninsula. |
| | | Sites should be judged according to the criteria: 'housing should be located where it will enhance the vitality of rural communities', rather than a development hierarchy. |
| | | |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|--|
| | | Paragraph 6.9 (development of rural communities to support long term sustainability) is supported. |
| 937 | 2 | Option 2 is most likely to fulfil the aims of the Plan. |
| | | It would encourage development where there is an identified need (Garstang and Catterall). |
| | | • A new M6/A6 junction at Brock would encourage more industry into the A5 corridor and rural Wyre, where there is more need. |
| | | Development of greenfield land would have less impact upon rural areas. |
| | | Greenbelt would not be threatened as there is none to the East. |
| | | Area benefits from improved access due to M6. |
| | | Option 1 would deprive the urban west Wyre area of what little countryside is left. |
| | | Alternative: |
| | | Moderate development on PDL sites rather than greenfield sites, in the Fleetwood/Poulton/Thornton corridor should be prioritised and |
| | | promoted. This would achieve the regeneration priorities identified in the SA. |
| | | Bottle neck and congestion on the A585 must be resolved prior to new development. |
| | | There is mention of a possible new road to ease pressure on Poulton, but this would not benefit Thornton and Fleetwood. |
| 938 | Option 3 | No comment |
| 944 | 3 | There are greenfield sites around the Kenlis Arms which would be much more suitable for development. |
| | | At this location there is already an access road and is much closer to amenities than the proposed sites in Calder Vale. Nor is the site an AONB. |
| 945 | Option 3 | Prefer none but not realistic. Option 3 spreads development across all areas. Still issues of infrastructure capacity including additional traffic at Garstang. |
| | | Don't take green belt. Ruinous impact on the countryside. Impact on the village feel of Garstang. Should build where there is m-way access – land between Gt Eccleston and Blackpool would service the M55 and land nearer J33 of the M6 is also an option. |
| 946 | 3 | Option 3 provides the most appropriate strategy for a balanced distribution of development. It requires an amendment, however, to ensure that development is sustainable across the Local Plan period. Smaller settlements such as Stalmine and Inskip present limited |
| | | opportunities to deliver a scale of development which will result in a step change in sustainability. |
| | | Option 3 should be revised as a balanced approach with an even focus on both the FCP and the A6 Corridor together with limited |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|--------|--|
| | | development in rural communities. Under the revised option the significant development along the A6 will be around Garstang and Catterall. |
| | | Garstang is one of the four main towns in the Borough with a range of facilities and acts as a service centre for the wider rural hinterland. |
| | | A6 corridor settlements may be extended in a sustainable, planned and co-ordinated way whilst taking pressure away from the need to release greenbelt along the FCP. |
| | | The Balanced Spatial Strategy should refer to sustainable urban extensions. These should be in accessible locations with access to facilities and provide a mix of housing. |
| 947 | | |
| 948 | 3 | Dispersal is preferred as the burden will not fall in one place leading to the over-development of an area. |
| | | There are already a lot of planning applications for areas proposed in options 1 & 2. Highways will be the main problem in these areas. |
| | | Proposed development of Winmarleigh, Scorton and Forton would allow some traffic to be directed North. |
| | | Options 2 & 3 would be assisted by the Broughton bypass and support the settlements/communities of Winmarleigh, Forton and Scorton to survive. |
| | | Option 1 has the disadvantage of limited land and may lead to greenbelt release. |
| 949 | n/a | The Local Plan should be screened under Regulation 102 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) at an early stage so that outcomes of the assessment can inform key decision making on strategic options and development sites. |
| | | It may be necessary to outline avoidance and/or mitigation measures at the plan level, including a clear direction for project level |
| | | Habitat Regulations Assessment work to ensure no adverse effect on the integrity of internationally designated sites. |
| | | It may also be necessary for plans to provide policies for strategic or cross boundary approaches, particularly in areas where designated sites cover more than one Local Planning Authority boundary. |
| | | |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|--------|--|
| | | Environmental impacts are not mentioned under the 'disadvantages' for any of the spatial options even though the SA has identified potential environmental issues with all of the options. This is a big gap and it is unfortunate that this information has not been presented when requesting opinions on preferred options. |
| | | It is essential that the outcomes of a thorough HRA and SA are used to inform the process of selecting the most sustainable option and evidence of this needs to be clearly presented in the preferred options report. |
| 953 | 2 | Option 1 Appraisal A proportion of growth should take place within the Main Urban Area; however, it should not be excessively relied upon. Recent housing land supply has been excessively dependent upon Fleetwood and Thornton which has not come forward at the anticipated rate. Brownfield land developments should remain an important part of the Plan but not depended upon in areas which have proved unattractive to the market. |
| | | Poulton-le-Fylde is in multiple-ownership and requires major highways infrastructure which has not been shown to be feasible. This would require a longer lead-in time to achieve housing completions. |
| | | • Towns within the FCP are constrained by greenbelt and growth would require release. The greenbelt here still serves 4/5 purposes (incl. Restricting sprawl, preventing merging of settlements, safeguarding the countryside and encouraging recycling of derelict urban land). |
| | | • Sites in need of regeneration (incl. Poulton-le-Fylde, Cleveleys and Thornton) would not benefit from growth if greenbelt is released elsewhere. |
| | | Option2 Appraisal |
| | | The Corridor offers potential for sustainable development; it can centre development on existing towns and links with neighbouring authorities. |
| | | Highlighted sites are unconstrained and attractive to the market. |
| | | • Infrastructure, amenities and services are already accessible in Garstang. Catterall would benefit from additional services and amenities associated with development. |
| | | • Expansion of smaller settlements to the West (incl. Winmarleigh and Nateby) is unsustainable. They will not achieve the critical mass for mixed-use development. Detachment from the A6 will also increase car usage. |
| | | • Viability issues have prevented affordable housing from being delivered on regeneration sites near Fleetwood and Thornton. Affordable housing should be supplied in unconstrained sites which are attractive to the market. |
| | | Proposed Broughton Bypass will improve strong linkages and relieve capacity issues to the East. Links to the North Preston Growth |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|--------|--|
| | | Area will also be beneficial. |
| | | • Option 2 does not rely upon: new highway links with unknown feasibility; the release of greenbelt; or, questionable brownfield sites. |
| | | The A6 corridor focus would complement a moderate level of development on the FCP and enable early delivery of housing. |
| | | It is the most realistic means of achieving the planned supply and ensures choice and competition in the market. |
| | | Option 3 – least sustainable option |
| | | Least sustainable option: |
| | | Requires the greatest use of land subject to flood risk, |
| | | Increases the need to travel by car, |
| | | Substantially increases the population size of minor villages (incl. Stalmine and Inskip) with no ability to secure complementary services and facilities. |
| | | Suggestions: |
| | | Development of small villages should be limited to infill and conversions. |
| | | Flood risk sites and greenbelt land should be avoided. |
| | | Limit growth in rural areas to the main settlements. |
| 955 | 1 | No comment |
| 956 | 2 | Option 2 Is more sustainable in transport terms. There is potential for a new motorway junction and train station near Garstang, this would reduce pressure on the A6/Broughton Interchange. |
| | | Option 1 must not go ahead due to loss of greenbelt. |
| | | Alternative, limited development on the FCP could improve employment opportunities and transport links. |
| 957 | 1,2 &3 | All three options are capable of providing the level of development currently identified by the Council. |
| 958 | 3 | No comment |
| 959 | None | Support for: |
| | | Development within the FCP and the release of greenfield/greenbelt land in order to facilitate sustainable development. |
| | | • Development around the A6 (Garstang) focused on greenfield land to the west of the A6 due to high flood risk to the south and east of the settlement. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|--------|--|
| | | Great Eccleston and Hambleton should take the highest levels of growth. Existing population would be able to grow alongside the provision of local services and infrastructure whilst providing strong commuter settlements for the FCP and Garstang. Knott End/Preesall should not be brought forward due to flood risk and limited opportunities for development. |
| | | Hybrid: Focus should be split equally between the FCP and the A6. This would be more balanced as both areas have a different market with their own commuter influx. 40% of development should go to the FCP, 40% to the A6 corridor and 20% to the rural settlements (Great Eccleston and Hambleton). |
| 960 | 1 & 2 | Option 1 may achieve brownfield regeneration whilst failing to take advantage of the growth opportunities in the rural areas. Option 2 provides the opportunity for delivering viable mixed use growth. Option 3 would spread development too thinly. Growth Strategies should address the objectively assessed needs of people and businesses across the Borough. They must ensure that |
| 064 | Nava | services, infrastructure and facilities are available to support growth. The strategy should regenerate the Peninsula and underpin economic growth in the A6 corridor. |
| 964 | None | Option 3: Individual developments are too large, The number of mixed developments are optimistic, The greenfield site for industrial development (IO_05) is contrary to the vision. The broad thrust of development around Garstang is supported but more needs to be done to support residents concerns over infrastructure. |
| | | Option 2: is considered to be the worst of the proposals. Alternative/Hybrid |
| | | A combination of Options 1 and 3 is the best way of achieving the Vision and Strategic Objectives and provide the flexibility to enable the plan to evolve as the employment situation in the Borough may evolve. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-----|----------|--|
| | | This will allow: The initial focussing of economic development on the urban areas which are most deprived; The enhancement of Garstang as a clearly defined market town, servicing the surrounding countryside and providing the required educational and medical infrastructure; and, The reduced pressure to extend the Garstang conurbation southwards. |
| | | Agriculture: The Plan should take the consolidation of holdings and redundancies of farm buildings into account. Conversion of farm buildings to dwellings across the Borough could provide hundreds of new homes. |
| | | Development around Garstang should be controlled and not spread out. There will then be potential to create a larger hub with a full range of facilities (incl. Educational, medical and possibly a public transport infrastructure) |
| 974 | | Bourne leisure has no strong preference for any of the options because it is not clear in any of the options how the tourism objective will be met. A greenbelt review would help the council comprehensively plan to meet the vision and strategic objectives. Regardless of the chosen option, more support should be given to existing tourism facilities. In parallel, housing, employment and retail should be planned to negate any negative impacts upon tourism. |
| 980 | Option 2 | Questions whether or not building 6,000 houses is realistic. Options 2 – could enabled more organic growth to take place – will not overpower local communities but still enable sufficient growth to support local amenities. Infrastructure – especially health and utilities – should be developed at the same rate. |
| 981 | Option 1 | Option 1 would maximise opportunities for developing on previously-developed land. However recognise need for development on greenfield land and need to review the Green Belt. |
| 985 | Option 2 | Substantial highway works in the local and wider area will allow the A6 corridor option to come forward. Also a hybrid option combining options 2 and 3 would satisfy highway concerns. |
| 989 | 1 & 2 | Difficult to comment without further information on the housing requirement, deliverability and split between settlements. Important that the Council allocates sufficient sites to meet the housing requirement and to work with the development industry. |
| | | In support of sustainable development, it is important that development is focused on larger settlements close to employment and transport opportunities. Also important that the needs of the rural community are met. Hybrid option that combines options 1 and 2 |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-------|----------|---|
| | | is the most appropriate. |
| | | Important that the council does not phase the delivery of sites. Increasing housing delivery will require a wide variety of sites across as wide an area as possible early in the plan period. Restricting sites to later in the plan period would not provide the right conditions to ensure that a step change in delivery can be achieved. |
| 995 | Option 1 | Would concentrate development in settlements that are the most accessible and sustainable. Option 2 and 3 would frustrate the revitalisation of Fleetwood. |
| | | • Key regeneration areas should be highlighted - including Fleetwood where the Port should be recognised as a significant growth opportunity and economic driver for the town. |
| | | • Diverting growth to other, less sustainable, settlements under other options would be contrary to the NPPF |
| 996 | | Note that infrastructure is integral to new development and must include services such as education. |
| 1,002 | None | Option 1 is the most preferable – focus growth in the western part of the borough – most sustainable location, will protect the AONB, will complement economic aspirations in that area, will encourage a Green Belt review, will provide for proportionate growth elsewhere. |
| | | Option 2 is not supported – disproportionate growth in an unsustainable location, would exacerbate social disparities, fail to protect the AONB, no demand from the housebuilding industry, high values mean affordable housing won't be. |
| | | Option 3 – would provide for more proportionate growth but concerned that the necessary infrastructure is not in place. Focused growth around Garstang would see key infrastructure delivered. |
| 1,005 | Option 2 | For the avoidance of doubt the first sentence under paragraph 6.20 should be amended to say: "Option 2 would direct a greater proportion of new development to the A6 Corridor in and on the edge of the settlements of Garstang, Catterall, Bilsborrow, Bowgreave and Barton. |
| 1,012 | Option 1 | Option 1 accords with the majority of the Strategic Objectives and is the most consistent with the objectives of the NPPF. |
| 1,013 | | Support for joint working with the Council to ensure that the Strategic Highway Network is given appropriate consideration. |
| | | Option 1 presents the most sustainable location in terms of existing public transport and services but high car usage would need to be tackled. However this option may provide the critical mass that enables sustainable measures to be focused and deliver the greatest benefits. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-------|----------|--|
| | | Option 2 would focus the main Strategic Road Network impacts at M55 Junction 1. Appropriate consideration will also need to be given to the A585. Likely to result in increased commuting by less sustainable modes. However this option may provide the critical mass that enables sustainable transport measures to be focused and deliver greater benefits. |
| | | Option 3 would still involve impacts on the A585 and M55 Junction 1 and increased commuting by less sustainable modes. The greater spread of impact may provide less opportunity to focus targeted measures to deal with these impacts. Specific measures aimed at rural accessibility would be required. |
| 1,015 | None | Option 1 is focused on a part of the borough that is isolated and heavily congested and without the necessary infrastructure to allow sustainable development. |
| | | Although part of the A6 needs upgrading, the settlements along it are sustainable locations that offer greater scope for growth. Option 2 would, however, not allow for the western parts of the settlement to grow and for regeneration to take place. |
| | | Option 3 would direct development to some unsustainable and unsuitable locations. Reduces the likelihood the plan including strategic development sites which could provide the potential for new infrastructure. |
| | | Should take the key and best elements of Option 1 and 2, including a focus on Fleetwood, Thornton and Poulton-le-Fylde in the west of the borough, and Garstang, Catterall and Bilsborrow in the east. |
| 1,021 | Option 1 | Option 1 is the most viable. Offers the potential for the development of brownfield land and regeneration of Fleetwood. Area has established infrastructure. |
| 1,022 | Option 2 | Option 2 would ensure housing is delivered. Market in the main urban areas has proven challenging. High level of demand in Garstang and strong local housing market. |
| 1,025 | n/a | Difficult to choose. Major developments along the AS6 would create urban sprawl. Would dwarf existing towns. Not in line with Vision relating to protection of character. Would require more services and put strain on local routes. |
| | | Suggestions of developing on greenfield farmland should be avoided – increasing food needs. |
| | | Encourage the development of existing buildings and brownfield land to preserve farmland and the Green Belt. |
| 1,026 | Option 2 | No room for development in the peninsula without compromising green areas. |
| | | Piecemeal development will increase commuter congestion. |

| ID | Option | Matters raised |
|-------|----------|---|
| | | ◆A6 corridor is more suitable – access to m-way and rail connections. |
| | | New M6 junction and re-opening of Garstang Station would solve the commuter problem. |
| 1,027 | None | Too much agricultural land would be lost and green belt would be lost. The needs of separate communities need to be taken into account, e.g. types of housing etc. Could include some retirement bungalows. |
| | | Fleetwood needs investment. |
| 1,033 | Option 2 | A6 and M6 links already in place. |
| | | Further development in the peninsula would put transport links under strain. |
| | | Option would have the advantages of restricting over-development in the Over Wyre villages. |
| | | Option 3 not supported – limited employment opportunities in the Over Wyre villages and additional traffic congestion. |
| 1,034 | Option 2 | Substantial highway works in the local and wider area will allow the A6 corridor option to come forward. Also a hybrid option |
| | | combining options 2 and 3 would satisfy highway concerns. |