Wyre Local Plan Examination

Matters, Issues and Questions

Statements In Response to Matter 1 As It Concerns Proposals For Inskip

Issue 1.1 Is there any evidence that the Council has not met the minimum requirements for consultation and that consultation and publicity has otherwise been inadequate?

Statement 1.1 Yes.

Wyre Borough Council (WBC) in their Statement of Consultation 2017 (SoC) have indicated in Section 3 - Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), that their minimum standard will be a 6-week period of consultation. Whilst this SCI is critically outdated (see Appendix 1.1), the Issues and Options Consultation Process which commenced June 2015 was structured to meet this requirement. However, following an enquiry from the author, WBC replied (L Harris 2nd November 2017) with information that WBC had received just 12 responses from Inskip over the consultation period. To put this into context, just 12 out of 677 adults living in the village at the time (ref Electoral Register) or 1.8% of those eligible, replied.

To a statistical mind such a small return would sound alarm bells that something had gone badly wrong.

One would have hoped that someone within WBC was monitoring the response totals as they grew, to confirm that they fitted with normal patterns. Indeed, checks and balances as matters proceed are taught as fundamental to all experimental techniques so that time and resources are not wasted later, working with invalid results.

WBC list in their SoC document the variety of measures they took to reach residents in advance of the Consultation Process commencing. These are captured in the table below, with a comment alongside concerning their relevance to the village as a means of achieving publicity. Unless villagers were forewarned of these publicity activities the conundrum ‘you don’t know what you don’t know’ applies and villagers would have needed to be lucky to catch the methods with lower graded influence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publicity Method</th>
<th>Potential For Influence Over Inskip (Large, Moderate, Small, Very Small, None + Comment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documents deposited in town libraries</td>
<td>VS. Tiny number would visit, then focussed on books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents deposited in mobile libraries and i-bus.</td>
<td>VS. Tiny number would use, those that do are focussed on books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents deposited in Garstang Tourist Info Centre</td>
<td>VS. Locals have no need to visit as they are familiar with the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents deposited at Wyre Civic Centre</td>
<td>VS. Most people avoid Council Offices as business/ subject matter has a reputation for being dull and voluminous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster on Drop in Events at above locations</td>
<td>VS. See all above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster in shops</td>
<td>VS. No shop in the village. Nearest main shopping centre is Kirkham which is outside Wyre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster in Medical Centre</td>
<td>S. Most residents visit the Medical Centre only a few times per year and then they are usually focussed on medical matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters in Community Halls</td>
<td>N. Village doesn’t have a Community Hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 hr Staffed Exhibition, nearest Gt Eccleston 10th July 2015</td>
<td>S. Fine if you knew it is taking place. Then the need to travel is a negative. Friday night after work is a big negative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices in 3 local newspapers</td>
<td>S. Fine if you take one. Most people prefer a National paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All consultees on Local Plan database contacted</td>
<td>S. Too early in the process for all but a few residents to be on the database.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing for Ward Members</td>
<td>M. Parish Council responds with article in two local publications. However, release date was late being 4 and 5 weeks into the 6-week consultation period. Would have been Large Influence rating if released at start of 6-week period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing for Planning Ambassadors</td>
<td>M. Precipitates response above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing for all WBC Staff</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email to Wyre Engagement Network</td>
<td>S. Minority group for villagers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email to Wyre Together Network</td>
<td>S. Minority group for villagers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email to Wyre E-News Subscribers</td>
<td>S. Minority group for villagers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email to Wyre Up members</td>
<td>VS. Businesses only N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New release of WBC Homepage</td>
<td>VS. Villagers do not generally monitor WBC’s website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press release to various newspapers</td>
<td>S. Fine if you take one. Most people prefer a National paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release on WBC Facebook page about Garstang Event</td>
<td>S. Social Media. Generally, the domain of younger residents who on average have a lower tolerance for Council matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release on WBC Twitter account about Garstang Event</td>
<td>S. As above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article on Garstang Town Council Website</td>
<td>VS The village is not generally connected to Garstang Town Council activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article on Local Voluntary Sector Website</td>
<td>VS. Specialist website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article on 3 local press websites</td>
<td>S. Similar influence to a paper itself (above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table it can be seen that most publicity measures adopted by the Council although laudable, are judged to have a Small or Very Small potential to reach residents of the village for the reasons given and only the Parish Council’s independent initiative to put an article in two local publications which are hand delivered to households in the Parish improved the prospect. For unknown reasons their release was delayed to fairly late in the Consultation Period (week 4 and week 5) which spoiled some of their effectiveness.

Whatever the reasons, the unfortunate facts remain that only 1.8% of those from Inskip eligible to respond to the Issues and Options Consultation, did so. Evidence of this situation was with WBC at the time, yet no action to rectify the anomaly was taken. An easy and cost-effective fix would have
been a WBC letter to every house in the Parish. The tiny response has deprived the survey of significant local opinion and renders both the consultation process and the measures adopted to publicise it inadequate.

Issue 1.2 Has engagement with Parish Councils and Local Communities been acceptable?

Statement 1.2 No

I hope it does not offend but I would like to begin with a quote from the NPPF as it is relevant.

The National Planning Policy Framework states at paragraph 155 (p.37):

"Early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses is essential. A wide section of the community should be proactively engaged, so that Local Plans, as far as possible, reflect a collective vision and a set of agreed priorities for the sustainable development of the area, including those contained in any neighbourhood plans that have been made".

In dealings with Inskip Parish Council (PC) throughout the Local Plan development phase, Wyre Borough Council (WBC) has consistently blocked any desire and need within the PC to engage with and consult the local community it represents on Local Plan development matters. They have done this by repeated calls for information to be treated as ‘confidential’, thereby blocking the PC’s primary function to represent villagers’ views, interests and concerns and cutting across the guidance in the National Framework quoted above. This situation has persisted from March 2014 to the issue of the Publication Draft Local Plan in September 2017. Communication on the Local Plan has been confined to the PC only, a group of 7 individuals out of an adult population of 677 in the village of Inskip, with no scope for meaningful dialogue between the public and their elected local representatives. The reasons for such confidentiality have variously been given as ‘the matter is a work in progress’, it is not for the public at this time’, ‘I cannot have (Borough) Councillors finding out details of plans through the public’. WBC clearly regards Council colleagues as a higher priority than the public whose lives are directly affected by their planning actions. Significant changes have taken place in the development proposals for Inskip over the Local Plan development period, from the PC’s preferred location to the south of the village, to WBC CEO’s advantageous proposal in the mid-village, to the last-minute switch to a massive extension on farmland at the north of the village as a so called ‘more deliverable’ site, all veiled in secrecy for the convenience of plan makers. What price the words above from the National Framework.

It is not overstating the matter to say that residents have been deprived of any detailed information concerning Local Plan development as it affects Inskip for the entire plan development period of 3 years.

By way of evidence to corroborate this statement, a Time Line (TL) has been prepared, attached at Appendix 1.2 A – Communications Time Line Map, which shows the communication which has taken place over the 3-year period between the three parties concerned, WBC, Inskip PC and Inskip Residents. Further evidence is available at Appendix 1.2 B – Timeline Reference Documents Table, (9MB file provided to Programme Officer) in a collation of the key documents and correspondence referenced in the above Time line map.

Appendix 2.1A
Communications Tin
To appreciate the full magnitude of what has been going on, it is important to understand the context/effect of certain entries on the Time Line and these are given in italics below, following a copy of the associated TL entry text. Calls for Confidentiality are highlighted in yellow. The documents in Appendix 1.2 B are arranged in chronological order to concur with the Time Line Document.

You will see the Communications Time Line is produced as a table with Wyre Borough Council represented in the right-hand column, Inskip Parish Council in a middle column and Inskip Residents in the left-hand column. Text between the columns begins with the relevant date throughout and records a summary and / or quote from the communication which took place between the two adjacent parties. Text inside the Inskip Parish Council column is in the same format and represents the PC’s internal activity (e.g. formal meetings).

24/03/14 the communication process began when the Inskip Planning Ambassador (P James, chairman of the PC) attended a meeting with WBC to discuss the Local Plan. He was told that the information provided at all ambassador meetings would be confidential to the PC.

14/08/14 an email was received by the PC Clerk from WBC (D Thow - Head of Planning Services). It contains a link to a protected area on WBC’s website and a password for access to information. The email referred to WBC’s commitment to engage with local people in an ongoing conversation about the plan but then made clear no public were invited at this stage. Last sentence - An unfortunately worded contradiction at the outset. The start would have been an easy time to include the public (as per NPPF guidance) as virtually no detail was known and everything was `fluid’.

04/09/14 the PC Clerk forwarded the email above, (14/08/14) to PC members pointing out that the material on the website was confidential and not for public consumption at that time. Evident from the security applied.

29/10/14 the PC met with WBC CEO and others at Inskip where WBC states that discussions and plans were confidential. Parish councillors present report that the issue of confidentiality was put with some force, that it was a condition in order to receive information and if it wasn’t observed, information flow would stop. Members of the PC report being angered by the constraint this imposition placed on their role, combined with its delivery as a veiled threat.

16/07/15 Two residents attended the monthly PC meeting having picked up on the potential scale of development around Inskip and ask whether a public meeting would be held on the Local Plan issue. The PC, mindful that such a meeting would present them with questions about what they knew and their withholding of information would be evident, they indicated instead there was an In-Focus and Inskip Voice article due out later in the month and that information from the 2014 Housing Survey they conducted (April and Aug/Sept 2014) was sufficient information from residents to work with. The PC had been diverted from the correct course of action by pressure of confidentiality from their meetings with WBC.

09/05/16 PC met with WBC (D Thow and [redacted]) and expressed concerns over the scale of proposed and potential development in the village. WBC respond with an update on the Draft Local Plan. Confidentiality of the information given is reiterated. No minutes were produced (Fol).

19/05/16 PC decided against a leaflet drop to houses and a public meeting on the scale of potential development as it would raise questions they were not at liberty to answer. Again, the PC has been diverted from the proper course of action.

22/08/16 WBC ([redacted]) wrote to Inskip Planning Ambassador re. an earlier communication from WBC (K Oakes) setting up confidential discussions, clarifying that the Local Plan was a work in progress
and to emphasise the purpose is discussions “on a confidential basis” of emerging proposals for his area. The content of the discussions was not to be shared with the public at this stage. Confidentiality is reinforced with some strength by the final sentence after the statement in the penultimate sentence.

16/02/17 The Public are asked to leave a PC Meeting before Councillors are briefed on a recent meeting with WBC on the Local Plan. The PC continues to observe confidentiality of all information relating to the Local Plan.

17/02/17 The PC Clerk informs WBC that the PC is reticent to advise them on the most appropriate land for development in the absence of local consultation. The PC is beginning to react to the constraint placed upon it.

16/03/17 The PC meeting defers the Local Plan to private discussion ‘In Committee’. The Chairman continues to hold WBC’s imposed line by moving the meeting out from potential Public gaze.

20/03/17 At the PC Committee Meeting the PC Clerk gives an update on Local Plan correspondence which WBC have asked remain confidential. At this meeting concern was raised over the degree to which the Local Plan was being developed ‘Out Of The Public Eye’. Parish Councillors are becoming increasingly uncomfortable about the approach being used by WBC (and their involvement within it).

22/03/17 The PC Clerk writes to WBC (redacted) questioning what information can be shared with residents. He confirms that the PC has “Diligently Communicated Nothing” since first involvement in the Local Plan development (March 2014) but with rumours growing, this position is becoming more difficult to maintain as questions are asked. Three words which capture the situation over the previous three years perfectly – ‘Diligently Communicated Nothing’. The PC hands responsibility for their increasingly difficult situation squarely to WBC.

24/03/17 WBC (redacted) replies to the PC Clerk, indicating that “Confidentiality Should Be Maintained For All Matters Not In The Public Domain”.

24/04/17 Meeting with WBC (D Thow, redacted, L Harris) over the sudden switch of site to the north of the village. Farmer at the centre of the previous site had disclosed details to his family. PC chairman asks RP if in the light of this, allocation still confidential. RP replies yes until published for Full Council. Even though some details were in the public domain WBC maintains its demand for confidentiality over this sudden and fundamental change affecting scores of residents. The demand took the Confidentiality requirement up to 30 August 17 when the Draft Local Plan was released to Borough Councillors and just days before the start of the Public Consultation.

13/06/17 PC meets with WBC (GP, DT, RP) for discussions concerning the new location of housing development. WBC emphasises confidentiality of discussions. No Minutes Produced (Foil).

27/06/17 Email from WBC (LH for RP) to PC stating that the allocation will be to the north of the village and requesting “all information in the email be treated as confidential by all concerned”. The Site switch is confirmed as policy and the details wilfully kept secret from those residents affected, until the draft plan was Published in September 2017 and the opportunity to influence the proposal had ‘Timed Out’.

Standing back from the Time Line detail, one can appreciate the relative weight of Communication activity between WBC and the Parish Council, compared with its paucity between them and Residents
(20 meetings, emails and letters between WBC and the PC, cf. 1 Newsletter article warning to prepare for the Draft Local Plan Public Consultation stage in Sept 17 and articles in two local publications highlighting the ongoing I&O Consultation) – a factor 7 difference, without even considering the carefully chosen words and lack of detail in the material supplied to Residents. Overall WBC make at least 14 separate calls for confidentiality to be observed over the development period, instilling in the PC an unwillingness to make any approach to anyone else on Local Plan matters, during the whole development phase, except for a trio of detail less articles flagging approaching or ongoing consultation and where to start digging if you are interested.

One can argue about the reasons why this apparently wilful and long-term exclusion of the neighbourhood from engagement in the plan development process has arisen, who created it and what were their motives etc. but the fact remains that it happened. 670 villagers have been deprived of any meaningful dialogue with their elected representatives, the Parish Council, on the local plan as it developed over a 3-year period. The nett effect has been that final plans were a total surprise to residents, imposed without warning and revealed at the last possible moment, generating anger and resentment, with a host of unanswered questions and concerns – precisely the situation Government set out to avoid in its guidance. Even the late switch to the final allocation site, a step when professionalism should have led planners to want to explain the need and the decision process to residents, was jealously guarded under confidentiality until the bitter end when the plan was released for Full Council. There is no way that the history presented here is what the architects of the National Framework had in mind when they penned the words at the head of this statement.

With due respect, I leave it to you to consider and rule on whether the situation presented here renders the Local Plan’s proposals for Inskip unsound. Residents and the Parish Council feel strongly that it does.

**Issue 1.3** Was engagement with Inskip With Sowerby Parish Council in advance of formal consultation appropriate?

**Statement 1.3 No**

The engagement process with Inskip Parish Council included confidentiality requirements set by WBC at all stages from March 2014, which deprived villagers of any meaningful dialogue with their elected representatives, the Parish Council, concerning the local plan as it developed over 3 years. Statement 1.2 above refers.
# Wyre Local Plan For Development in Inskip

## Communications Timeline

### Key:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviations and Highlights:</th>
<th>Parish Council</th>
<th>Wyre Borough Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WBC</td>
<td>Cllr P James (PJ, Chairman)</td>
<td>G Payne (GP, Chief Executive Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Cllr C Berry (CB)</td>
<td>D Thow (DT, Head of Planning Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Cllr G Carter (GC)</td>
<td>Planning Policy and Economic Development Manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS</td>
<td>Cllr M Delaney (MD)</td>
<td>L Harris (LH, Senior Planning Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FoI</td>
<td>Cllr A Lingard (AL)</td>
<td>T Hirst (TH, Planning Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Cllr C Houghton (CH)</td>
<td>F Riley (FR, Planning Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Text</td>
<td>Clerk M Ainsworth (MA)</td>
<td>K Oakes (KO, Planning Officer)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INSKIP PARISH COUNCIL

- **April 2014**: PC Issues its own Housing Survey to village. 59 out of 250 homes respond.
- **Aug / Sept 2014**: PC repeats Housing Survey due to poor response from previous event.

### Wyre Borough Council

- **20/03/14**: PC informs WBC PJ will be Planning Ambassador.
- **24/03/14**: Planning Ambassador meets with WBC to discuss Local Plan. *Information confidential to PC.*
- **14/08/14**: Email from WBC (DT) including link and password to access maps from CFS and SHLAA key sites. Invitation for PC to meet with CEO, Planners and Ward Councillors but no public at this stage. Claims WBC "committed" to engaging with local people in an ongoing conversation about how the Local Plan will develop!
152 out of 250 homes respond, of which 30 in favour of development, 122 against.

04/09/14 PC Clerk issues DT email to PC, emphasising confidentiality.

18/09/14 PC member resigns. Asked to leave meeting and keep all Local Plan material to date confidential. He agrees.

29/10/14 PC meets with WBC in Inskip. WBC CEO states that discussions and plans are confidential (see minutes).

17/11/14 PC Chair (PJ) writes to WBC (DT) rejecting sites proposed by Metacre Ltd in the CfS Submission and Potential Sites Plans and identifying the PC's Vision for Development in the proximity of the Derby Arms pub.

29/01/15 WBC planners advise PC they have issued a CfS with a deadline of noon on 13th March 15

11/06/15 Planning Ambassador meets with WBC to discuss Local Plan. Information confidential to PC.

17/06/15 WBC publishes Issues and Options paper for public consultation.
16/07/15 Two residents ask PC if there is to be a public meeting of residents over the Local Plan. PC indicates that there is an article in In-Focus magazine and the PC Housing Survey (2014) gave them sufficient opinion to work with.

25/07/15 Inskip Voice and 31/07/15 In Focus published incorporating PC’s article on Issues and Options consultation

12 of 677 residents submit responses to I&O Consultation.

07/08/15 ISSUES & OPTIONS

21/04/16 PC resolves to seek urgent meeting with WBC CEO et al over community concerns at the scale of proposed and potential development

19/05/16 PC decides against a leaflet and public meeting concerning the

29/07/15 PC submits its response to Issues and Options paper to WBC

05/08/15 Planning Ambassador meets with WBC to discuss Local Plan. Information confidential to PC

22/02/16 Planning Ambassador meets with WBC to discuss Local Plan. Information confidential to PC

09/05/16 PC meets with WBC (DT, RP) and express concerns over the scale of proposed and potential development. WBC respond with an update on the Draft
16/02/17 Public asked to leave PC Meeting and Councillors briefed on scale of potential development as would raise questions the PC was not at liberty to answer.

Local Plan. Confidentiality of the information given reiterated. No minutes produced (Foil).

22/08/16 WBC (RP) writes to Planning Ambassador re. earlier notice from KO setting up confidential discussions, clarifying that the Local Plan is a work in progress and to emphasise the purpose is discussions “on a confidential basis” of emerging proposals for each area. The content of discussions should not be shared with the public at this stage.

20/09/16 PC Meets with WBC (GP, DT, RP, TH). RP states that proposals being presented are confidential (see minutes).

20/10/16 PC resolves to liaise with WBC on policies to be included in the Draft Local Plan.

07/11/16 PC Clerk writes to WBC in response to Local Plan policies, highlighting: Village Green, Other Public Land, Need to Expand the Primary School and the Need for Affordable Housing.

08/02/17 PC meets with WBC (DT, RP, LH) for update and discussions on Local Plan. RP asks that details remain confidential (see minutes).
March 2017 – PC Newsletter 12
Published, concerning housing development to date (27 in
construction plus 55 with Outline Planning Approval) and the upcoming
consultation period for the Draft Local Plan later in the year. Includes a
recommendation for those concerned to ‘get organised’.

20/03/17 PC Meeting
O
16/03/17 PC Meeting
defers Local Plan to private
discussion in ‘Committee’.
20/03/17 PC ‘Committee
Meeting’ – PC Clerk gives
an update on local plan
correspondence with WBC
which WBC have asked
remain confidential.
Concern raised in the
meeting over the degree to
which the Local Plan is
developing ‘Out of the
Public Eye’.
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17/02/17 PC Clerk informs WBC that PC is reticent to advise them on the most appropriate land for development in the absence of local consultation.

22/03/17 PC Clerk writes to WBC (RP) questioning what information can be shared with residents as the PC has ‘Diligently Communicated Nothing’ but with rumours growing this position is becoming more difficult to maintain as questions are asked.

24/03/17 WBC (RP) replies to PC Clerk indicating that ‘Confidentiality Should Be Maintained For All Matters Not In The Public Domain’.

24/04/17 PC meets with WBC (DT, RP, FR). Meeting called by PC after WBC correspondence (RP) indicates housing allocation has been switched from around Hodgkinson’s Farm, south of the BS269 to agricultural land outside the current settlement boundary to the north of the village. PC Chair (PJ) asked if the allocation was still confidential. RP replied it was, until published for full Council. (see minutes).

30/05/17 Special meeting of
PC where PJ reported
that WBC planners are
minded to allocate
significant housing north of
the village, contrary to PC
understanding to date.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31/08/17</td>
<td>DRAFT WYR E LOCAL PLAN PU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept /17</td>
<td>PC Newsletter 13 Published. PC “Tells All” and Calls Public Meeting for 13/09/17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/09/17</td>
<td>DRAFT WYR E LOCAL PLAN PL ANOUNCEMENT BEGINS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13/06/17 PC meets with WBC (GP, DT, RP) for discussions concerning the new location of housing development. WBC emphasises confidentiality of discussions. No Minutes Produced (Fol).

27/06/17 Email from WBC (LH for RP) to PC stating that the allocation will be to the north of the village and requesting all information in the email be treated as confidential by all concerned.

18/07/17 PC meets with WBC following email above (27/06/17) from LH/RP. At this meeting it is revealed that the land owner has withdrawn the land previously proposed (to the south of the BS269) from sale!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April /2014</td>
<td>PC's Housing Survey</td>
<td>14/08/14</td>
<td>WBC (DT) Email to PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140814 WBC D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thow Email to PC.dc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug / Sept 2014</td>
<td>Repeat of Housing Survey</td>
<td>29/10/14</td>
<td>Minutes of PC Meeting with WBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/11/14</td>
<td>PJ Letter to WBC (DT) on PC Vision</td>
<td>16/07/15</td>
<td>Minutes of PC Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/07/15</td>
<td>Inskip Voice Published by resident</td>
<td>31/07/15</td>
<td>In Focus Article Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08/15</td>
<td>Note from Phone Call - L Harris WBC (02/11/17) - I&amp;O Response Count From Inskip</td>
<td></td>
<td>INTENTIONALLY BLANK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/05/16</td>
<td>Minutes of PC Meeting</td>
<td>22/08/16</td>
<td>WBC Email to Planning Ambassador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/09/16</td>
<td>Minutes of PC Meeting with WBC</td>
<td>08/02/17</td>
<td>Minutes of PC Meeting with WBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/02/17</td>
<td>PC Clerk Phone Call to WBC (RP) on Reticence to Advise Them on Locations Without</td>
<td>16/03/17</td>
<td>Minutes of PC Meeting and 20/03/17 PC Committee Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Consultation. PC Clerk Will Confirm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/03/17</td>
<td>PC Clerk Email to WBC on What Can be Shared with Residents</td>
<td>24/03/17</td>
<td>WBC reply to PC Clerk’s Email dated 22/03/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBC Reply to PC Clerk Email of 22031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### References From Inskip Communications Time Line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>File Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24/04/17</td>
<td>Minutes of PC Meeting with WBC</td>
<td>Minutes of PC Meeting With WBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/05/17</td>
<td>Special PC Meeting Minutes</td>
<td>Minute of Special PC Meeting Dated 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/06/17</td>
<td>Email from WBC to PC</td>
<td>Email WBC to PC 270618.docx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 2017</td>
<td>PC Newsletter 13 Issued</td>
<td>PC Newsletter 13 Sept 2017.docx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INTENTIONALLY BLANK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inskip with Sowerby Parish Council

Proposed Housing Development
Planning Application: 14/00277/OULMAJ

Metacre Ltd have submitted a major outline planning application to Wyre Council seeking approval for the erection of up to 40 houses on farmland to the south of the B5269 Preston Road opposite its junction with Manor Road. The application states that it is envisaged that this development will consist a mix of 2, 3, 4 and 5 bedroom detached semi-detached and mews properties and will incorporate an element of affordable housing. The application states that the proposed properties will be of a design which is in keeping with the neighbouring residential dwellings and will be built using materials which are similar to the surrounding properties. Metacre Ltd recently distributed an information/survey notice about this proposed development around the core of the village.

Indicative Plan of Proposed Housing Development

In their planning application Metacre Ltd state that the plan above is for illustrative purposes only. This means that at this stage they are simply trying to establish a change of use from agricultural land to land with outline planning permission for a housing development. If this application is approved, any subsequent housing development may differ vastly from the current proposal to one that may result in a much higher density of housing, perhaps of 60 to 80 dwellings. In addition, Metacre owns the majority of the farm land that surrounds the village and is adjacent to the current residential properties and there is a risk that they may subsequently seek to build housing on some or all of this land.

The Parish Council have been asked to comment in response to this to this application by Wyre Council however, before responding the Parish Councillors would like to know how you, the residents of the village, feel about this current proposal and the possibility of any future housing development. As a result they would be grateful if you would complete and return the completed survey form to 17 Nelson Gardens by Sunday 4 May. You can also comment about this planning application on-line by visiting Wyre Council’s website, selecting Planning from the home page and then entering the planning Application Reference: 14/00277/OULMAJ.

PTO
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Application 14/00277/OULMAJ</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you in favour this current proposed housing development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Housing Development</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you in favour of future housing development around the village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| If you are in favour of housing development in the future please indicate by ticking the appropriate box what type and quantity of housing are you in favour of |
|----------------------------|-----|----|
| Single Storey |     |    |
| Multi Storey |     |    |
| Senior Housing |     |    |
| Affordable First Time Buyer Housing |     |    |
| Rented |     |    |
| Shared Ownership |     |    |
| Detached Housing |     |    |
| Semi-Detached Housing |     |    |
| Terraced Housing |     |    |
| Mews Housing |     |    |
| 1 Bedroom |     |    |
| 2 Bedroom |     |    |
| 3 Bedroom |     |    |
| 4 Bedroom |     |    |
| 5 Bedroom |     |    |

| Where in the village would you be in favour of future housing development |
|-----------------------------|-----|----|
|                              |     |    |

| Please use the space below to make any comments that you have either for or against the possibility of future housing developments in or around the village |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|
|                                                                                                                                |     |    |
From: Thow, David
Sent: 14 August 2014 15:04
To: [redacted]
Subject: Emerging Local Plan - Parish and Town Council Engagement

Dear Mr Hill

As you are aware, the Council is currently developing its new Local Plan to guide development in the borough to 2031. The new Local Plan will replace the Saved Policies of the Wyre Borough Local Plan 1991-2006 (adopted in July 1999).

In 2012 we consulted on a Core Strategy (now referred to as a Local Plan) Preferred Options document. Since then the context within which the Plan will operate has changed significantly, including new household and population growth figures emerging from the government and our own Strategic Housing Market Assessment, and changing government planning policy which places an emphasis on economic and housing growth and the promotion of sustainable development. All of this means that more new homes will be required across the Borough than has been the case in the last ten years and more.

Settlement boundaries have been used as a policy tool in the Borough for a long time. A review of the existing Local Plan settlement boundaries (including the possibility of creating new boundaries for settlements currently without one) is required in order to accommodate the required housing and economic growth.

To inform the plan-making process and assist with the identification of potential land allocations for the new Local Plan, the Council recently launched a new “Call for Sites” which supplements a similar exercise carried out in 2012. This produced a strong response from landowners and developers, with some 230 sites submitted (a combination of 2012 and 2014 sites) for a range of uses, particularly residential development.

The Council has also endorsed an Employment Land Review which recommended sites for economic related development, and is in the process of producing an updated Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). As a planning authority we know that many local people will be concerned about the scale of potential change across the borough. We are committed to engaging with local people in an ongoing conversation about how the plan will develop – its vision for Wyre and how this will be delivered through its strategy and policies in a way that delivers growth in a structured way.

It is important that Parish and Town Councils are part of this process of engagement. Accordingly, I would like to ask if you would like the opportunity for members of Inskip-with-Sowerby Parish Council to meet the Chief Executive, officers from the Council’s Planning Policy team and local ward members as soon as practicable to discuss emerging key issues and possible implications for your area.

This would be an informal meeting to be held at a venue and time of your choosing but would not involve the public at this stage. We will be asking all parish and town councils if they would like to take part in an individual discussion (although to manage our resources effectively, we will be spreading these discussions over the next couple of months or so. Our initial focus is on the A6 corridor).

For your information, and to assist with the discussion, there is a password protected link (see below) to a page on the Council’s web site that contains a series of maps showing the Call for Sites submissions across the borough to date (we are still receiving a small number of sites), plus key sites from the on-going SHLAA and from the Employment Land Review.

Password: ConsultLP2014
Link: http://www.wyre.gov.uk/info/200074/planning/891/wyre_local_plan_parish_and_town_councils_and_ward_member_engagement
I must stress, however, that these sites should not be seen as being ‘allocations’ where development will necessarily take place, but will be sites from which allocations to meet the needs of the area will emerge as the plan progresses.

We are happy for you to set the meeting agenda based on the issues you think are important, although I must stress the focus needs to be on the Local Plan rather than the detail of individual planning applications. For your information, we are currently drafting a set of key principles (attached) and it may be useful to consider the appropriateness of these in the discussion.

If you would like to arrange a discussion please contact Elizabeth Berwick by phone on 01253 887238 or e-mail elizabeth.berwick@wyre.gov.uk

If you have any questions about the content of this letter and the local plan process, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards

David Thow
Head of Planning Services
Wyre Council

David.Thow@wyre.gov.uk
01253 887287
Civic Centre, Breck Road, Poulton-le-Fylde, Lancashire, FY6 7PU
Inskip-with-Sowerby Parish Council

Proposed Housing Development

Planning Application 14/00595/OUTMA) - Proposed Housing Development

Earlier this year the Parish Council sought residents' views on a proposal by Mace Ltd, which was an application for the construction of up to 20 dwellings at Oak Hill Road, to convert land at the junction of Oak Hill and Carver Road, which is adjacent to existing housing. The Parish Council then acted in accordance with the residents' response (which was against the development) and made representations opposing the development to Wyre Borough Council, who subsequently refused the application.

The land owners have now responded by submitting a revised application once again to the Parish Council in seeking your views. Full details may be found on the Wyre Borough Council's website at http://www.wyre.gov.uk/planning/Applications/1737 or may be inspected at the Council offices in Reeth Road, Poulton. You may make your views known direct to Wyre Borough Council anytime prior to the application being considered but the Parish Council would also ask for your guidance by completing the following.

Planning Application 14/00595/OUTMA)

Are you in favour of the current proposed housing development?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

In order to enable the responses to this letter we ask you to complete the above question, print it in the accompanying envelope and it will be collected from your property (see instructions in enclosures) or in a prominent location, close to your front door.

If you have a long answer to your views you may deliver it to the Parish Clerk at 17 Market Garth no later than September 15th.

Thanking you for your assistance in this matter.

Inskip-with-Sowerby Parish Council
The meeting was held to discuss issues pertaining to the development of the Wyre Local Plan and was one of a series of discussions with Parish and Town Councils. Cllr Murphy explained that the emerging Local Plan would cover a period to 2031 and Wyre would need to be looking for additional residential development in the range of 350-450 dwellings per annum minimum. DT explained that our RSS housing requirement (206 d.p.a) had been artificially low and that population growth in the borough has been weighted towards older people. We needed to link housing and economic growth, requiring in migration of working age people in order to seek to meet employers future workforce needs. This growth, coupled with declining household size explained why we needed a significant number of new dwellings in the future. GP indicated that we would need to provide family homes in order to prevent out migration which would mean consequential effects upon facilities such as schools (potential decline if families leave, need for new places if new families are attracted).

In the absence of an up to date Local Plan Parish Cllrs expressed strong concerns in terms of Inskip’s vulnerability to development that would change the nature of the village and it was also noted that all land surrounding Inskip was owned by a development company (Metacre). Cllrs felt a responsibility to ensure that the village wasn’t ruined. They were not anti-development but wanted a say in the type of development that would come forward. In relation to the recent affordable housing planning application they had carried out household surveys in the village in relation to what houses may be wanted and where. 83% of residents were against this application (site INS4) as the scale was not considered suitable. Officers noted that the weight to be attached to the Local Plan would increase as it moved towards adoption.

In terms of mix of housing Parish Cllrs indicated that they could support 1st time buyer and single storey retirement accommodation. DT explained that the Fylde coast Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) indicated the borough wide housing mix that was needed.

A discussion took place in relation to future infrastructure provision and officers explained that ongoing discussions were taking place with infrastructure providers. DT mentioned the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Community Infrastructure Levy and S106 agreements and it was noted that United Utilities were reactive in responding to wastewater issues (in other words only once a development had taken place).

The circulated draft site plans were noted and Parish Cllrs considered that these could provide in excess of 500 dwellings (which in the context of above was not
suitable for the village). NM indicated that the sites spreadsheet indicated this was more likely approximately 370 dwellings and it was noted that there was an error on one of the plans. This would be corrected and sent to Cllr Lingard for recirculation (NB this has now been done). Cllrs pointed out that all agricultural land surrounding Inskip was high quality (grade 2) and that there were some drainage issues. They suggested that the Derby Arms site may be a good alternative and volunteered to undertake discrete conversations with landowners in relation to other sites particularly in connection with future local business needs. It was considered that employment development on HMS Nightjar had been a success.

Cllrs also asked about the level of housing development required to sustain a local shop and NM indicated that this was very difficult to specify. He also asked Cllrs to consider the need for a settlement boundary for the village and there was a brief discussion in relation to the purpose of such a boundary.

GP indicated that discussions and plans were confidential and that the deadline for receipt of initial feedback from the parish was the 14th November.
17 November 2014.

David Thow  
Head of Planning Services  
Wyre Borough Council  
Civic Centre  
Breck Road  
Poulton-le-Fylde  
FY6 7PU

Dear Mr Thow,

Emerging Local Plan - Inskip

May I firstly offer our heartfelt thanks for meeting with members of the Parish Council (PC) and listening to our views. Since then we have held our own ‘in house’ discussions and have met with a landowner before finalising the proposals as follows:

As part of a community steeped in agriculture the PC feel duty bound to protect the best of the agricultural land that forms part of our village. With that fundamental principal in mind we totally reject all those sites (except for one small area) currently put forward by Metacre as shown on your plans ‘Call for Site Submission’ and ‘Potential Sites’.

Given the foregoing the PC suggest that there is far more merit, and potential gain to the village, in confining any future development to that land of a lesser agricultural quality in the proximity of the Derby Arms.

We are in agreement with the comment made by Mr Payne that our village lacks quality and see this as an opportunity to address that. Following lengthy discussion and debate the PC has a vision for the future of our community that we ask that you give careful consideration to.

As a principle part of our ‘vision’ we would like to see the Derby Arms become part of a focal point that would give Inskip an identity in keeping with its rural status. In order to achieve that we would like to see the creation of a village green, ideally of a size sufficient to play cricket on similar to that at Wrea Green. We would suggest this should be located on field no 5852 that we understand is in Metacre’s ownership. This site (for a village green) is crucial to our vision.

Housing could then be sited around the ‘green’ both as frontage development and in short cul-de-sacs and we would ask that a suitable mix of cottage and larger executive
style homes would be most appropriate given the status we are seeking to give the
green. We would also ask that consideration be given to a parcel of land fronting the
green being reserved for a Village Hall, an amenity our village has never benefited
from. The siting of a Village Hall here would compliment/dove-tail with many
community uses that could be housed on the green itself.

Such a development would ‘fill the gap’ between Dead Dam Bridge and Laytus Hall
Farm to the east/north-east of the B5269 so now we turn our attention to the opposite
side of Preston Road.

All the land abutting the Derby Arms forms part of Higham Side Farm and following
discussions with the owner, it would be made available for
development. The PC are looking at field No. 4551 immediately north of the car park
with frontage to Preston Road and part of field No. 3345 to the west thereof with
frontage to Higham Side Road (for clarification these are now one field, the original
field boundary being removed). The PC are not advocating that the whole of field
No. 3345 (shown to be 8.94 acres) be developed but perhaps half of it.

We would then suggest that the aforesaid development be linked to the existing
development by frontage development between Dead Dam Bridge and ‘Homestead’,
Mill Lane. That being part of field No. 3460 owned by and put forward by Metacre.
For the avoidance of doubt we should point out that Preston Road becomes Mill Lane
between Dead Dam Bridge and School Lane before reverting to Preston Road again.

That then leaves the land to the south of Higham Side Road and Preston Road and the
PC would be willing to consider some partial frontage development. We understand
these fields are rented, we assume from Metacre, but a Land Registry search would
confirm.

The PC would also ask that ANY development include ‘Starter Homes’ available to
rent and buy (outright and possibly shared) together with an element of single storey
dwellings (bungalows) for sale and rent to help meet the requirements of those elderly
residents who wish to downsize without leaving the village.

In putting forward these proposals the PC have also taken into account other
considerations:

1) When the PC conducted a survey earlier this year in response to the Planning
Application for forty houses on Preston Road a number of residents responded
identifying this part of the village as being best suited for future development.
2) Such a scheme (as proposed) would help safeguard the future of the village
pub (Derby Arms) that has been at risk in recent years by bringing it ‘into’ the
village rather than leaving it isolated ‘outside’ as it is now.
3) It may possibly help the creation of a retail outlet in this vicinity that would
not only serve the village but those employed in the Nightjar Way Industrial
Area.
4) Such development would be within walking distance of Nightjar Way that not
only provides jobs but also has a Children’s Nursery sited there.
5) Would be in closest proximity to the sewage works whereby any sewer
upgrades would not be disruptive to the existing part of the village.
6) Could lead to the properties on Carrs Green being connected to the main sewer alleviating years of drainage issues that remain unresolved despite best efforts of the PC and WBC.
7) This proposal by the PC would have the least impact on the existing residents.

To conclude we hope you will ‘buy-in’ to our ‘vision’ and that we can work together to our mutual benefit and any opportunity to continue this dialogue would be most appreciated.

Yours sincerely

Phil James
Chairman
Inskip-with-Sowerby Parish Council
3 Lodge Court
Preston Road
Inskip
Preston
PR4 0TT

01772 690034
Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on: Thursday 16th July 2015

Present: Cllr Phil James (PJ – Chair)  
         Cllr Carol Berry (CB)  
         Cllr Chris Houghton (CH)  
         Cllr Alan Lingard (AL)  

Clerk: Mike Ainsworth (MA)  

Members of the Public: Seumus Eaves (consultant to Natural England); Dianne Hogarth; Nick Danby; Tom Hastey  

Apologies: Cllr Geoff Carter (GC)  
           Cllr Martin Delaney (MD)  

Cc: Parish Councillors; Joanne Porter (Wyre Council); Wyre Cllr Susan Catterall; Wyre Cllr Sue Pimbley; LCC Cllr Vivien Taylor; PC Dave Kerfoot (Lancs. Constabulary); Garstang Courier; Maureen Nield (In Focus); Margaret Dickinson (Natural England)  

Meeting opened: 20:00  
Meeting closed: 22:25  

Agenda  

1. Open Forum for the general public  
2. Minutes of the last meeting held on Thursday 18th June 2015  
3. Matters arising from the last meeting  
4. Planning applications  
5. Financial matters  
6. Wyre in Bloom  
7. Correspondence  
8. Any other business  

Next meeting Scheduled for: Thursday 17th September 2015 at 8pm  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signed</th>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Inskip – with – Sowerby
Parish Council

1. Open Forum

1.1. Dianne Hogarth explained that she had inaugurated a regular bulletin “Inskip Voice” and the “Inskip Voice” team had a number of questions regards the operation of the Parish Council including how the Parish Council was elected, how residents were informed of the meetings of the Parish Council, and how residents were informed of the decisions of the Parish Council. It was explained that the Parish Council was elected on a four year basis and that a notice seeking nominations to the Parish Council had been posted on the two Parish noticeboards earlier in the year. In fact only six nominations were received by the Returning Officer (Mr. Garry Payne, Wyre Borough Council) and these candidates were therefore elected unopposed; that the meetings of the Parish Council were also advertised in advance on the two Parish noticeboards (including the words: “the press and the public are cordially invited”); as regards the publication of minutes, in the future it was intended that these would be published on a website and currently they are available on request from the Clerk. Cllr. James asked that if “Inskip Voice” included an article on the Parish Council that it include the information that the Parish Council always start with an “Open Forum” section for members of the public to raise any matter of concern. Mr. Danby asked whether it would be a good idea to publicise Parish Council meetings through “InFocus” and the Parish Clerk agreed to take this forward.

Action 7.15/1 – MA to notify “InFocus” of future Parish Council dates and time

1.2. Dianne Hogarth also raised the issue of the Wyre Local Plan and asked whether the Parish Council would be publicising it and whether the Parish Council would be organising a public meeting? It was explained that the Parish Clerk had published an article in the July edition of “InFocus”, which is delivered to every house in the Parish. Cllr. James explained the need for a Local Plan to manage development and highlighted the difference between the “call for land” from landowners and the final identification of land suitable for development in the adopted Local Plan at some point in the future. He explained that the Parish Council carried out two Housing Needs Surveys last year and that as a result the Parish Council felt that it had a good understanding of local opinion on this subject, which was instructing its approach to the planning process. Dianne Hogarth and Nick Danby suggested that the Wyre Local Plan consultation should be included in an upcoming edition of “Inskip Voice”. It was agreed that this was a good idea.

1.3. Tom Hastey asked what further action the Parish Council was taking regards Fracking, as it was likely that Cuadrilla would appeal against one or both planning application rejections. The Parish Clerk explained that Inskip-with-Sowerby Parish Council would only be invited to comment or object if a planning application directly impacted upon the Parish. It was reported that Roseacre Awareness Group were planning to challenge the planning consent for monitoring sites through judicial review and would be seeking funds through crowd-sourcing. Tom Hastey asked whether the Parish Council would be seeking funds also from Broughton Parish Council to cover the costs for the production of the presentation packs handed out to LCC DevCon Committee members – after all nearly half the presentation related to traffic problems in Broughton. It was agreed that the Parish Clerk would write to Broughton PC.
Wyre Local Plan

The Wyre Local Plan is in its consultation period which will end on
7th August 2015. The outcome of this could affect Inskip and the surrounding
area over the next 15 years. The Plan is responding to the projected housing,
employment and retail needs of Wyre Borough till 2031.

There are 3 options for local people to consider:

Option 1) It is envisaged that the development directed
to the Fylde Coast Peninsula would be focussed principally on Fleetwood,
Thornton and Poulton-le-Fylde. The delivery of this option would require
development on greenfield land on the edge of the existing towns and possibly
Green Belt land.

Option 2) This Option would direct a greater proportion of new development
to the A6 Corridor in the settlements of Garstang, Catterall, Bilsborrow,
Bowgreave and Barton. This focus on the A6 Corridor would concentrate
development in a part of the Borough with existing services and facilities and
with good accessibility to the motorway network.

Option 3) A significantly greater proportion of development would be directed
→ rural settlements under Spatial Option 3. In particular, the settlements of
Great Eccleston, Hambleton and Knott End/Preesall, which have a relatively
wide range of services and facilities, would accommodate a greater level of
development under this option.
Inskip and Stalmine, which are relatively unconstrained by flood risk and
which also have some existing services, would also accommodate a greater
level of development under this option.

This map shows land surrounding Inskip which has been identified by the
landowners for potential development
It is very difficult to include sufficient detail for and against each of the Options and individual research is recommended.

Detailed information can be found online at: www.wyre.gov.uk/issuesandoptions2015

Paper copies of ‘Wyre Local Plan Issues and Options Summary’ are available in local libraries. If you don’t have online access and cannot get to a library, please contact Dianne Hogarth (690714) for help and further details.

All comments must be received **no later than 5pm on 7th August 2015**

You can respond in writing to Wyre BC: Planning Policy, Wyre Council, Civic Centre, Breck Rd, Poulton-le-Fylde FY6 7PU (there is a response form available to fill in)

You can e-mail: planning.policy@wyre.gov.uk

You can also post comments in special boxes at local libraries

If you care about the future development of Inskip and other areas of Wyre, please respond to Wyre Borough Council with your comments **before 5pm on 7th August 2015**
Wyre Council have recently published the Wyre Local Plan Issues and Options 2015 for public consultation during period 17th June through 31st July. This document is available for inspection at most libraries in Wyre including the mobile library, the Civic Centre in Poulton-Le-Fylde, Garstang Tourist Information Centre, the i-bus, and online at http://www.wyre.gov.uk/issuesandoptions2015

In addition there will be public exhibitions with planning officials available to answer questions as a drop-in session – including one at Garstang Library on Thursday 25th June and one at the Great Eccleston Village Centre on Friday 10th July, both between 2:30 and 7:30pm

Comments can be submitted at these events or by post (Wyre Council, Civic Centre, Breck Road, Poulton-Le-Fylde, Lancashire, FY6 7PU) or by email (planning.policy@wyre.gov.uk) or alternatively comments can be submitted online via http://consult.wyre.gov.uk

The Issues and Options report describes three scenarios for the development of Wyre over the next 15 years and readers of InFocus resident in Great Eccleston, St. Michaels, Nateby, and Inskip in particular might be interested in commenting on it as at least one of the options may well impact significantly on local communities – for example where landowners are known to be willing to sell farmland for building development

For more details visit http://www.wyre.gov.uk/issuesandoptions2015 or email planning.policy@wyre.gov.uk or phone 01253-891000"
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Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on: Thursday 19th May 2016

Present:  Cllr Phil James (PJ – Chair)
          Cllr Carol Berry (CB)
          Cllr Geoff Carter (GC)
          Cllr Martin Delaney (MD)

Clerk:    Mike Ainsworth (MA)

Members of the Public: Heike Thompson; Jim Hall; John Cookson; Catherine Robinson; Reg McCarthy; Wyre Cllr Susan Catterall; LCC Cllr Vivien Taylor

Apologies: Cllr Alan Lingard (AL); Cllr Chris Houghton (CH); Dianne Hogarth; Nick Danby

Cc:       Parish Councillors; Joanne Porter (Wyre Council); Wyre Cllr Susan Catterall; Wyre Cllr Sue Pimbley; LCC Cllr Vivien Taylor; PCSO Keren Hodgson (Lancs. Constabulary);
          Garstang Courier; Maureen Nield (In Focus); Mark White (LEP)

Meeting opened: 20:15
Meeting closed: 22:00

Agenda

1. Open Forum for the general public
2. Minutes of the last meeting held on Thursday 21st April 2016
3. Matters arising from the last meeting
4. Planning applications
5. Wyre in Bloom
6. Correspondence
7. Any other business
8. Financial matters

Next meeting Scheduled for:  Thursday 16th June 2016 at 8pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signed</th>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1
Inskip – with – Sowerby
Parish Council

8.2. Cheques for signature:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chq. No.</th>
<th>Payee</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>985</td>
<td>Mike Ainsworth</td>
<td>Salary April – 21 hours @ £12 per hour</td>
<td>£201.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>993</td>
<td>HMRC</td>
<td>PAYE</td>
<td>£50.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>994</td>
<td>Andrew Maxfield</td>
<td>Lengthsman – w/c 1st April to w/e 1st May 2016</td>
<td>£288.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>995</td>
<td>British Heart Foundation</td>
<td>Donation</td>
<td>£400.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3. Application for Transparency Funding. The Parish Clerk reported that an application had been submitted claiming a total of £858.90 to fund the Parish Council website delivery and on-costs.

8.4. Parish Councillors returned to the earlier discussion about the risk of widespread property development at Inskip. Cllr. James reported that the development of a Village Plan might protect the community from property development of a scale that could irretrievably alter the nature and ambience of the rural community, but only if the Village Plan were adopted as a constituent component of the Wyre Local Plan. There were several key problems to this approach however. Firstly the Local Plan is a long way from being adopted. Secondly the production of a Village Plan would likely cost upwards of £30K. This would certainly require a significant hike in the Precept that might not be supported by residents. Then there is no guarantee that a Village Plan would be accepted by Wyre Council as a component of the overall Wyre Local Plan. And finally it might be open to legal challenge if it were seen to be set against development, potentially leading to further significant cost.

8.5. It was suggested that it might be appropriate to broadcast concerns through a leaflet drop and calling a public meeting, but there were issues with this approach also. The scale of the threat is as yet unquantified and it might be imprudent to induce unnecessary levels of concern until it was fully understood. Also residents would want to know what action the Parish Council had already taken to alleviate the risk and what further action was recommended. It was agreed that the best initial step would be to lobby our MP about Parish Council concerns of unsustainable development at Inskip and to take advice as to the most effective approach to take.

Action 5.16/5 – MA to request an urgent meeting with Ben Wallace MP to discuss the threat of widespread property development at Inskip and what could be done to alleviate the risk
Dear Planning Ambassador,

You will recall that Kathryn Oakes wrote to you on Monday 15th of August regarding setting up meetings with representatives of your Parish/Town Council to discuss on a confidential basis emerging proposals in your area. Some of you have already responded to Kathryn and it is evident that there has been in some cases some misunderstanding as to the purpose and nature of the meetings hence my reason in writing you.
The Local Plan is still work in progress and as such I have to emphasise that the purpose of the meetings is to discuss on a confidential basis emerging proposals for your area. Plans shared at the meetings will not be made available to take away. The content of the discussion should not be shared with members of the public at this stage.

Please also note that the meeting should be should with a small group (up to four person) of representatives from the PC/TC to include yourself as the planning ambassador. These are not meetings with the whole PC/TC.

As you are aware there are 20 PC/TC and therefore an onerous task for the same officers to attend meetings especially evening meetings. Therefore evening meetings should start no later than 18.30hrs.

To confirm arrangements for a meeting on the emerging local Plan please contact Kathryn Oakes as per earlier e mail via e-mail kathryn.oakes@wyre.gov.uk or phone me on 01253 887282.

Kind Regards

Planning Policy and Economic Development Manager
Wyre Council

01253 887243
Poulton-le-Fylde, Lancashire, FY6 7PU
INSKIP WITH SOWERBY PARISH COUNCIL – LOCAL PLAN MEETING

Committee Room 2, Wyre Civic Centre, Breck Road Poulton-le-Fylde.

20th September 2016 start 6:00 pm, finished 7:10 pm.

Present:

Alan Lingard, Inskip with Sowerby Parish Council
Martin Delaney, Inskip with Sowerby Parish Council
Phil James, Inskip with Sowerby Parish Council
Mike Ainsworth, Clerk to Inskip with Sowerby Parish Council

Cllr. Sue Pimbley, Great Eccleston Ward Councillor
Cllr. Sue Catterall, Great Eccleston Ward Councillor
Garry Payne, Chief Executive, Wyre Council
David Thow, Head of Planning Services, Wyre Council
Planning Policy and Economic Development Manager, Wyre Council
Tracey Hirst, Planning Officer, Wyre Council

RP welcomed the councillors and referred to the meetings which had been held in 2014 with the parish councils to listen to their views and that this meeting was an update. The local plan is driven by evidence and constraints and has to be a hybrid of these two factors. The proposals currently being presented are confidential as there is a danger of developers pre-empting the Local Plan in advance of policies being adopted.

One of the main considerations is highway constraints relating to the A585 and the A6, so both sides of the borough are affected. With reference to the A585 additional work is currently being undertaken to reassess capacity which is due in November. Highways England are currently consulting on the Windy Harbour to Skipool Improvements and detailed information on that highway is needed to be able to assess any additional capacity on the A585 in the future which in turn affects how much new housing can be planned for the area, consultation results will be available in January 2017. The A6 and J1 of the M55 has capacity issues and LCC have been raising concerns over development in the area from Barton to north of Garstang (although it is considered that the area could accommodate in the region of 270 dwellings) but not at Inskip or at the north of the borough where traffic is expected to travel north to J33 of M6.

SP asked for clarification of what is meant by J1, DT explained that it is where the A6 meets the M55.

RP explained where the new J2 would be on the M55 and the capacity that this junction and the Broughton Bypass would create would be factored in to the work being done by LCC/HE. Flood risk will prevent some settlements from growing as would environmental considerations such as the existence of pink footed geese.

It is unlikely that Wyre will be able to meet all its own housing needs of 479 dpa which translates into 9580 dwellings over the whole plan period. It is expected that Wyre might be able to
accommodate about two thirds of that figure and consequently discussions have been held with neighbouring authorities to see if they can accommodate some of Wyre's housing need as the council have to show the Inspector that all options have been considered.

The council had sought legal advice to determine if there was a limit on how much growth there could be in smaller settlements and the response had been that communities would have to accept that things would change and there would have to be a good reason to limit development. It is acknowledged that an increase in housing would sometimes require new facilities such as schools, shops etc. so that development is sustainable and therefore talks are ongoing with service providers to determine if any new services are needed and those too will form part of future allocations. The organic growth of villages is being planned not just housing. The urban peninsula now has limited capacity so there is more focus on development in the rural part of the borough than there had been in previous times. Wyre is proposing some modest figures in comparison to other villages in the region which are expected to accommodate 500+ houses.

GP/RP added that the figures in other LA's were sometimes as high as 900+ dwellings but that there was a need to expect growth and change. Towns in the present day were sometimes considerably larger that they were in the early 1900's and that growth was now accepted as part of the settlement. In due course the new development being proposed would become assimilated into the settlements, as, for example, it had when Great Eccleston was extended in the 1960's and 1970's.

RP continued by explaining that in particular there would be two new policies in the Local Plan which would introduce settlement boundaries for all the towns and villages. Outside the boundary development would be restricted and therefore a degree of certainty would be established about how much development there would be in the future. Areas of separation are also being introduced to prevent the amalgamation of neighbouring settlements.

*The plans for Inskip were circulated at this point.*

DT explained that this was still a work in progress and that proposals were not yet set in stone. RP observed that the settlement boundary is quite tightly drawn but includes an allocation to the west of the existing built form. Originally Highways had suggested that the village could accommodate 380 dwellings (as from March 2016) but that figure had more recently been reduced to 250 based on more recent highway evidence. There is capacity because traffic has several options to access major roads including motorway access through Woodplumpton to a new J2 on the M55. However LCC advised that development should be phased after 2022 when J2 would be completed and there would then be additional capacity.

DT stated that LCC had not objected to the current pending application for 55 houses in Inskip. GP added that the housing figure had already been reduced and that if the 55 dwellings currently being proposed were approved then 55 units would be subtracted from the 250 figure.

PJ was concerned that even a figure of 250 units would be doubling the size of the village and questioned if it would be built in one block.
GP explained that development would be phased to accord with the construction of the new motorway junction and would also be affected by market demand. It was suggested that one developer on site could build around 30 dpa but two developers on site could build around 50/60 dpa so it depends on how the site(s) are built out.

PJ was still concerned that with those figures the whole site could be built in only 5 years

DT clarified that after the 250 were built there would be no more development. In addition the council would want to see a masterplan prepared to ensure that the whole area was comprehensively developed in a co-ordinated fashion especially in relation to road layout and public open space.

RP acknowledged that there is a need for a new school and a convenience store for the village and that the current pending application already proposes a store.

There was some general discussion about whether a store would, in reality, be delivered. DT explained that it was not possible to force a developer to build a store but that the plan could earmark a site.

SP questioned what would happen if a landowner did not want to develop their land.

RP informed the meeting that the council were in the process of contacting landowners to find out if they would be willing to develop their sites. If they were not willing then there would be no point in allocating that land as it would not be realistically available and that situation had already arisen in some areas. If the parish council were not happy about the location of the land proposed to be allocated then there was a possibility that it could be relocated to the north of the village but not other areas as there were constraints in terms of flooding and gas pipelines etc. Consideration had been given to directing development to the area around the pub (which the pc had suggested at an earlier meeting might be suitable for building) but constraints prevented it. The current proposal would result in traffic accessing and leaving the new development from/to the south without obstructing the existing village centre.

PJ confirmed that the parish council had always said they would prefer to see development to the south of the village.

AL was concerned that the village will become a big housing estate with no picturesque centre like Great Eccleston. If there was going to be development the pc’s need would be to ensure that it helps to make the village more attractive, create a focal point, a village green.

DT noted that it would not be possible to create a focal point/green/centre in the middle of the existing settlement.

RP added that a masterplan would assist in creating the best possible development and that even if sites came forward in small parcels it would be possible (with the masterplan) to coordinate the pos contributions to, perhaps, create a larger open space/village green and provide a co-ordinated highway network.

GP commented that with piecemeal development it is not possible to control how development evolves.
PJ observed that that the current application for 55 dwellings is piecemeal development in advance of the local plan and not part of any masterplan and wondered if it was deliberately being held back by the council with the support of the developer.

DT responded that the application had not been decided as officers were still waiting for highway information.

PJ continued that if permission was granted for the pending application then the council would have already lost control to be able to design a co-ordinated scheme.

GP acknowledged that was true but the application had to be decided in due course and a masterplan could be prepared for the remaining area. He stated that he had recently taken over responsibility for planning following an internal reorganisation and would be focussing on receiving the final essential highway evidence, the lack of which had been responsible for delaying the progress of the local plan. The evidence has to be logical and is crucial to ensure the plan is correct before it is submitted to the Inspector.

DT added that if the evidence was not correct then developers would pull it apart and discredit it and even use it to get more development.

PJ asked if the plans as circulated had been discussed with Metacre, the owners of the land.

GP replied that the council had not to try to avoid applications being submitted in a piecemeal fashion. DT added that in an ideal world the council would work with the owners to produce a masterplan but early talks also risked developers submitting small applications early to avoid having to provide facilities.

PJ asked when the plan would be public knowledge but was concerned that the current planning application would be determined imminently.

DT confirmed that the current application for 55 dwellings was an outline application so by the time a reserved matters application was submitted the local plan should be published and adopted for development management purposes which would give the council more leverage in negotiating design detail in accordance with a masterplan.

RP added that by February 2017 the plan with the accompanying suite of policies would be published for consultation and adopted for DM purposes and that contact would be made with the landowners in due course. The parish councillors were dubious whether Metacre would co-operate but GP considered that they would because it would be in their best interest to get maximum development potential.

PJ asked if there would be a new school or remodelling of the existing school.

RP explained that the council is not the education authority and the EA cannot make a church school extend. If the school are agreeable to extending then that would be a solution but if they were not agreeable then a new school would have to be provided.

AL thought that the council had already received money from developers.
DT acknowledged that the council had, through an s106 agreement on an approved housing application, but that money had to be used for the specific purposes as set out in the signed legal agreement.

AL stated that for the first time this year someone had been turned away from the village school and although the school are trying to financially plan for an additional teacher it was not an easy process, if the school knew about the planned growth of the village they could use that information to support their application for more staff. In addition Great Eccleston has also seen some additional development and there was concern that the local schools would not be able to meet demand and children may have to be transported out of the area to other schools.

RP confirmed that the EA were aware of the council’s plans and would be speaking to the schools in the area in due course.

GP asked the parish councillors if they would be able to get an assurance from the school that they would be willing to extend although they would not be able to reveal the circulated plans to them.

MD considered that extending the existing school would be the best and safest option particularly for those walking to school.

AL reiterated that there was any good open space in the village at the moment.

RP suggested that that could be included in a masterplan and asked if there was anything else they would like to achieve through the expansion of the settlement.

DT added that it would be possible for the parish council to be involved in the preparation of a masterplan.

MA suggested that the parish council need to set out in writing what they would like to plan for in the future.

GP agreed that this would be useful and if they could get the school/chair of governors to write to Wyre Council (and cc LCC) to say that they would be willing to extend that would also be helpful.

MA felt that they would have to tell the school that it was significant development.

PJ asked whether the standard requirement for 30% affordable housing would apply to the new developments.

GP said that it would, but across the borough viability would be assessed which is currently being investigated by private consultants and that some areas may not be expected to provide 30%. Developers would be expected to provide a viability assessment which would be considered.

SP asked for confirmation that when the council were talking about schools it was in relation to a primary school not a secondary school and wondered how children would get to secondary school when the bus services were poor in the area.

GP confirmed the new school relates to a primary school and that travel arrangements would be made to transport secondary school students even if it was by taxi or mini bus.
PJ asked if the figure of either 380 or 250 proposed dwellings in the village would be decided imminently and why there was such a big difference in the figures.

DT/RP stated the figure was originally 380 but it was felt that that LCC and HE were perhaps not consistent with what factors they were considering. Consequently a daylong meeting was held in August to consider all the issues/constraints and as a result of the meeting an agreed figure of 250 dwellings was proposed. However the person who is finalising the highway evidence is due to leave soon so the council is pressurising the county for a final decision/report by the end of the month. It is reasonable to assume that the final housing figure for Inskip is 250 dwellings but if it is any higher the council will contact the parish council to let them know. However it is also possible that the figure could be lower.

AL asked if it was proposed that any other villages would extend as much as Inskip as the parish would not want to accommodate other villages housing growth. GP and DT stated that they were not alone, some villages were also growing and others would not see any development because of various constraints, despite wanting some additional development.

PJ thought that the figure of 250 was now cast in stone but GP stated that it seemed fairly certain that this would be the final figure but it might be reduced in Inskip or other settlements, it would all depend on the evidence which needed to be accurate.

AL asked if the tenant farmer and family who currently occupied the land proposed to be allocated for housing would be thrown off.

MD suggested that the situation would depend on the landowner and what is negotiated.

SP enquired if the council still had CPO powers.

GP confirmed that they do but there was no intention to use them. DT added that the Local Plan had to be deliverable in the plan period and that would have to be shown to the Inspector at Examination. CPO’s take time and there is no certainty that they will ultimately be successful so the council would not use this option to acquire land.

RP distributed the draft policies and explained that they were confidential. She highlighted that they included a policy to ask developers to provide a mix of housing types and dwellings suitable for older persons. Policies are flexible and affordable housing provision may be less than 30% in some areas as it might not be viable.

DT suggested that the councillors could send comments to Planning Policy once they had had time to look at them. It was agreed that the information presented could be shared with other parish councillors as long as they kept it confidential.

Action – the council will contact the parish council if the housing figure for Inskip increases above 250 dwellings.

The parish council will send a list of what development they would like to see as part of the growth of the settlement.

The parish council will send comments on the plan and draft policies.
INSKIP WITH SOWERBY PARISH COUNCIL – LOCAL PLAN MEETING

Committee Room 2, Wyre Civic Centre, Breck Road Poulton-le-Fylde.

8 February 2017

Present:

Mike Ainsworth, Clerk, Inskip with Sowerby Parish Council
Martin Delaney, Inskip with Sowerby Parish Council
Phil James, Inskip with Sowerby Parish Council

David Thow, Head of Planning Services, Wyre Council
Planning Policy and Economic Development Manager, Wyre Council
Len Harris, Senior Planning Officer, Wyre Council

Meeting held to further discuss the development of the Wyre Local Plan and implications for the village of Inskip. In this regard a number of issues were discussed:

Local plan update – RP provided an update of the current position emphasising importance of the highway evidence for determining residential allocations. Asked that the details discussed remain confidential as work in progress and discussions needed with WBC members.

School – LCC Education have stated that there is no room for expansion (this was raised as part of the planning application for 55 dwellings straddling Preston Road). PC very concerned that monies for education provision derived from development in Inskip is being spent in Bilsborrow. PC strongly of the view that any education monies generated in Inskip should be spent at the local school. RP explained that there are on-going discussions with LCC education and that preference is for land to be set aside for the expansion of the village school. Said land would have to be defined and agreed with the landowner (Metacre) who owns land around the school boundary.

Village green – PC wish to see a village green developed opposite the Derby Arms PH possibly with residential development in the manner of Wrea Green. Issue of Ethylene Pipeline will restrict opportunity (PC noted potential impact of Health and Safety Executive advice on current Derby Arms application for an extension). Issue of whether or not the landowner would develop a village green within any development. PC of the view that the village green needs to be visible – i.e. have a road frontage. Also of the view that the size needs to be sufficient to accommodate a cricket pitch. Discussed the possibility of the village green also accommodating a village hall and allotments. RP – Issue of space – hall and allotments may need to be on separate parcels of land.

Land south of Preston Road (potential allocation) – occupied by a working farm and building. Views of the tenant farmer – PC will speak to the farmer with regards to his preference (i.e. whether or not allocation would be supported and impact on his business). Agreed that the council will also approach the farmer to seek views.

Agricultural land – general concern expressed by the PC at the loss of agricultural land.
House Types – PC preference for bungalows – 2 bed maximum or sheltered accommodation.

Scale of development – Potentially 200 dwellings over and above existing commitments. However may be more or less depending on highway evidence being finalised.

Design – PC unhappy with the design of the 27 dwellings approved. Would like to see single storey dwellings on the periphery of sites where abuts open countryside.
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April 21st, 2017

Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on: Thursday 16th March 2017

Present:
Cllr Phil James (PJ – Chair)
Cllr Carol Berry (CB)
Cllr Geoff Carter (GC)
Cllr Martin Delaney (MD)
Cllr Alan Lingard (AL)

Clerk: Mike Answorth (MA)

Members of the Public: Wyre Cllr Susan Catterall; Mr. Brian Dearnaley; Mrs. Dearnaley; Mr. John Thompson; Mrs. Margaret Thompson; Mrs. Mary Southwell; Mrs. Chere Oakley.

Apologies: PCSO Kirsty Newson (Lancs. Constabulary).

cc: Parish Councillors; Joanne Porter (Wyre Cunc 1); Wyre Cllr Susan Catterall; Wyre Cllr Sue Pmbley; LCC Cllr V v en Taylor; PCSO Kirsty Newson (Lancs. Constabulary); Maureen Neld (In Focus); Mark Whistle (LEP)
8. **F nanc al Matters** – at th s po nt members of the publ c left the meet ng.

8.1. Payments approved at the meet ng: Clerks Salary, PAYE, NW A r Ambulance donat on.

8.2. Accounts and Aud t. The Par sh Clerk reported that the Internal Aud tor would be on hol day for 6 weeks and th s meant that the approval of accounts would be delayed, leav ng only a narrow marg n to obta n s gn off wh lst meet ng the due dates for publ cat on and then subm ss on for external aud tor rev ew.

9. **Carrs Green Common** – outstand ng act on 6.16/3 refers. Recent correspondence was d scussed n l ght of the earl er d scuss on w th Mr. Thompson. It was proposed that t would be benef c al to seek a mutually agreeable solut on and Par sh Counc llers agreed that the Par sh Clerk should l a se w th the sol c tor to obta n deta ls of nsurance cover so that the Par sh Counc l could cons der any appl cat on to run a slurry p pe across the Common and to ask that the sol c tor could ass st w th regard to the reg strat on of graz ng r ghts.

---

**Note of PC Committee meet ng held on YIPS Centre on Monday 20th March 2017 at 20:15**

**Attendees:** Cllr. Phil James; Cllr. Carol Berry; Cllr. Geoff Carter; Cllr. Martin Delaney; Cllr. Alan Lingard

**Agenda:** Wyre Local Plan (Act on 2.17/4 refers)

**Status:** APPROVED

**Chair:** Cllr. Phil James

**Date:** 20th April 2017
To continue to liaise with Wyre officials and seek further information on the Local Plan (Act on 2.17/4 refers)
The Parish Clerk provided an update on recent correspondence with Wyre Council with respect to the Local Plan, details of which Wyre Council officials have asked remain confidential at this stage. Concerns were raised at the degree to which the Local Plan was developing out of the public eye as it was anticipated that any plans for further development at Inskip were unlikely to have significant support in the local community. It was agreed however that the Parish Council should continue to participate in discussions with Wyre Council and that the Parish Clerk would submit a response to them.
Carried forward

Latest News

Parish Council Meeting Notes - Feb'18 (http:// nsk p-w th-
sowerby.org.uk/2018/03/23/parish-council-meeting-notes-feb18/)

Pash Council Agenda - March 2018 (http:// nsk p-w th-
sowerby.org.uk/2018/03/15/pash-council-agenda-march-2018/)

Roseacre Wood - reopened Public Enquiry (http:// nsk p-w th-
sowerby.org.uk/2018/02/16/roseacre-wood-reopened-public-enquiry/)

News Categories

Latest News (http:// nsk p-w th-
sowerby.org.uk/category/uncategorized)

Meetngs Notes (http:// nsk p-w th-
sowerby.org.uk/category/meeting-notes)

Newsletter (http:// nsk p-w th-sowerby.org.uk/category/newsletter/)
I would also like to take this opportunity to seek your guidance on what Parish Councillors can share with residents with respect to the Local Plan. The fact is that the rumour mill is working overtime in the community here and the top ranking rumour is that a further 600 houses are planned! I cannot say where this figure has come from other than that it was not from the Parish Council who have diligently communicated nothing. But continuing to say nothing is becoming harder as rumours grow and questions are asked. Residents expect the Parish Council to know and to communicate what is known. You will no doubt be having to advise other Parishes who are in a similar situation, and the Parish Council seeks your advice as to what exactly Councillors should say in response to these rumours, and when to say it.

Kind regards, Mike Ainsworth
Dear Mike,

Thank you for your e-mail.

I have shared information with the PC and sought your involvement in the process because I think it is important for the PC to know how work is progressing with regards to Inskip and where appropriate get your steer. Our discussions are in confidence because I have not yet discussed matters with Council Members. It is work in progress until it is put before Members. I cannot have a situation here where Council Members find details in the Local Plan through members of the public or the press. I would therefore ask you to maintain confidentiality for matters not in the public domain.

{Other Content Redacted}

I trust this adequately covers the points in your e-mail.

Kind Regards

[Redacted] Planning Policy and Economic Development Manager Wyre Council

[Redacted], 01253 887243, Poulton-le-Fylde, Lancashire, FY6 7PU
Wyre Local Plan

Last year Wyre Council published “Wyre Local Plan Issues and Options June 2015” for public consultation. This showed all the land put forward by local landowners, like Metacre Ltd., who own all the land adjacent to the village of Inskip and also land adjacent to other local villages, for consideration for development with housing. Whilst Wyre Council have continued to develop their Local Plan the landowners have continued to put forward land for development – here in Inskip 2 developments have already been approved, the 27 houses currently being built at Preston Road and a further 55 next door to that to the north and south of Preston Road.

At some point this year Wyre will publish their draft Local Plan for public consultation prior to it being submitted for government approval. The Parish Council understands that the draft Local Plan will allow Metacre to apply for planning permission to build hundreds more houses in Inskip over coming years – the only constraint on development appears to be how many more residents our country roads can support.

If like Parish Councillors you are appalled that our small farming community might become just another commuter suburb (albeit without any local facilities) then now is the time for members of the public who wish to object to any aspect of the plan to get organised, ahead of the public consultation period. Watch this space....

Parish Council Website

Yes, the Parish Council has finally joined the twenty first century by setting up a website – which can be found at: http://inskip-with-sowerby.org.uk/

This site allows members of the public access on-line to Parish Council agendas, minutes, accounts, and news as well as providing useful contact information, including contact details of Parish, District, and County Councillors and our MP. Recent news items include an update on Inskip in Bloom and details of the subsidies available for satellite broadband provision.

Inskip-with-Sowerby Parish Council

Newsletter No. 12 - March 2017

Education Funding

Residents will no doubt be aware that local landowners Metacre Ltd. have recently been granted outline planning permission to develop a further 55 houses on land to the north and south of Preston Road in Inskip. As a condition for planning approval the applicant had to sign an agreement with Lancashire County Council to provide funding to support education provision. The Parish Council are disappointed to learn that these funds are scheduled to be allocated to Billborrow John Cross Primary School rather than to support the expansion of our own Inskip St. Peters Church of England Primary School, though we understand that this decision might be reversed if we make a fuss about it.

If like us you are unhappy that funds paid to provide school places for children from Inskip will be spent paying to improve a school in Billborrow then we strongly recommend that you lobby our Lancashire County Councillor, Vivien Taylor, who can be contacted by email: vivien.taylor@lancashire.gov.uk or by writing to her at County Hall, Preston, PR1 8XJ, and our MP, Ben Wallace, who you can contact via his website at www.benwallace.org.uk/ by email: WALLACEB@parliament.uk, or by writing to him at the House of Commons, London, SW1A 0AA.

2017/18 Council Tax Bill

The Parish Council can report that the Parish Precept, which forms part of the overall Council Tax Bill that households receive from Wyre Borough Council, has not increased this year and has been maintained at the same level as last year.

Parish Council Meetings

Members of the public are welcome to come along and raise issues, ask questions or simply to observe at Parish Council meetings. These are held on the third Thursday of the month at 8pm in the YIPS Centre, Nelson Gardens (meeting held on the Common in August, no meeting in December).
INSKIP WITH SOWERBY PARISH COUNCIL – LOCAL PLAN MEETING

Committee Room 1, Wyre Civic Centre, Breck Road Poulton-le-Fylde.

24 April 2017 start 5:00 pm, finished 6:15 pm.

Present:

Martin Delaney, Inskip with Sowerby Parish Council
Phil James, Inskip with Sowerby Parish Council

David Thow, Head of Planning Services, Wyre Council
Planning Policy and Economic Development Manager, Wyre Council
Fiona Riley, Planning Officer, Wyre Council

Parish Council requested the meeting to discuss the emerging Local Plan and the location of the housing allocation at Inskip.

PJ – Parish Council (PC) are concerned following last email sent from RP that the housing allocation will be to the North of the village – PC do not support this.

RP – PC raised concerns at the previous meeting regarding the loss of the farm (Hodgkinson Farm) and whether WBC has spoken to the tenant farmer regarding the proposals. PC indicated a preference to retain the farm as it forms an integral part of community. WBC has since contacted the farmer who said he would prefer to see the loss of the land to the north and retain the land around the existing farm buildings to the south. WBC has reflected this in the LP.

MD – PC do not want to see development, but following first meeting excepted the need for growth and supported the planning reasons outlined in the first meeting (land to south balances the settlement; provides alternative access road through the village to alleviate traffic at the school) that land to the South was the preferred location.

PJ/MD – PC met farmer and agent. Farmer told PC that WBC view on approving development at Inskip has altered: previously refused 40 dwellings but once shortfall position established, WBC then approved 27 dwellings.

If land is allocated to the south could still build around existing farm. Also concern regarding school traffic, land to the south with new access road would alleviate this. PC needs to balance views of residents over one farmer.

DT – WBC received different message from farmer. We cannot retain farmsted with livestock adjacent to residential development and there is
insufficient land to provide a sufficient buffer around the farm and still provide dwellings. Understand that PC cannot appease farmer over wider resident's views.

RP – WBC will need to consider PC view. Local Plan allocations have been finalised internally and numerous technical assessments underway and altering allocation could create further delay.

MD – also concern land to north will have drainage problems. There have been previous sewer problems on Manor Road, development to north is lower than Manor Road and foul/surface water would need to be pumped into Manor Road drain.

PJ – Farmer has told their family of the proposals and the wider village is aware. PC is being asked but are unable to tell residents – is the LP allocations still confidential?

RP – Yes, it is still confidential until it is published for Full Council.

PJ/MD - Also concern that if land to north is allocated that it will be easier for Metacre to come back in future and argue the farm is no longer viable and land to south should also be developed.

DT – There will be growth for each Plan period. This Plan period is to 2031. There is a highways capacity constraint which caps development at each settlement. If the highways evidence is found sound and there are no significant improvements to create additional highways capacity, then there will be no further growth in the next plan period (2031 + ). The highways capacity factors in improvements at new Jct 2, Broughton Bypass and Singleton Bypass.

PJ – there is doubt over Singleton Bypass, if this does not go ahead, will this reduce the highways capacity to reduce dwellings to be allocated.

RP – Highways England have stated that the road is going ahead and funding confirmed, WBC have no evidence to indicate otherwise. If the position changes, we will have to consider its implications.

PJ/MD – if the Local Plan allocates land to the south the PC is willing to support and explain proposal to the residents.

PJ – understands farmer will receive greater compensation if land to the north is developed as the land is covered by new tenancy. There is other land available that Metacre do not control, located to south of village towards Nightjar, maybe this should be allocated instead?

RP- there is constraints and land to the south does not consolidate the existing village core.

There was a discussion regarding the timetable. The Local Plan will be approved at Full Council. This is expected early September. The Local Plan has already been considered by the Planning Policy Working Group.
Parish Council meeting
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Parish Council meeting minutes
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July 21st, 2017

Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on: Thursday 22nd June 2017

Present:

Cllr Phil James (PJ – Chair)
Cllr Carol Berry (CB)
Cllr Geoff Carter (GC)
Cllr Martin Delaney (MD)
Cllr Alan Lingard (AL)

Clerk: Mike Answorth (MA)

Members of the Public:
Wyre Cllrs. Susan Catterall and Sue Pimbley (agenda item 1 only)

Apologies:
Cllr Chris Houghton; LCC Cllr Vivien Taylor; PCSO Kirsty Newson (Lancs. Constabulary);
8.2. Payments approved at the meeting: Clerks Salary; HMRC PAYE; Wyre-in-Bloom brochure printing costs; Lengthsman; bill for repair of pulley for tennis post.

Note of special members meeting called by the Parish Council Chair Cllr. Phil James held in YIPS Centre on Tuesday 30th May 2017 at 19:30

Attendees: Cllr. Phil James; Cllr. Martin Delaney; Cllr. Geoff Carter; Cllr. Chris Houghton

Agenda: Wyre Local Plan (Act on 2.17/4 refers)

Wyre Local Plan (Action 2.17/4 refers)
Cllr. James reported that he had recently spoken with a member of the Wyre Local Plan team and it was apparent that planners were now minded to allocate further land to the north of Preston Road for the development of significant additional housing, contrary to how Councillors had been led to understand previously. It was agreed that the Parish Clerk would arrange urgently for talks to be held with the Chief Executive of Wyre Council and with representatives of the landowner.
Carried forward

Meeting closed: 20:30

Latest News

Good afternoon Mike

I am on leave this week but have asked me to provide you with an update on the proposed local plan residential allocation at Inskip. The position is that:

1) The allocation will be focused on land to the north of Preston Road as previously discussed, as on the understood evidence, this has a higher degree of deliverability than land to the south, which, as you know, if occupied by a tenant farmer with an Agricultural Holdings Act (AHA) 1986 "lifetime" tenancy. For the avoidance of doubt, this is a legally different tenancy than the land to the north (which is let on a five-year tenancy agreement under the Agricultural Tenancies Act 1995) and offers a higher degree of protection for the tenant.

2) We are proposing to include land within the allocation east of the school that could be used as a village green (between the school and recent planning permission). This should allow appropriate agricultural access to the fields to the south.

3) We are not proposing to allocate the land opposite the pub as the presence of the pipeline is restrictive and we have sufficient land allocated to the north of Preston Road to meet our requirements.

4) Ultimately the location of the various components of the development, including village green, will be a matter for the masterplan to address.

I would be grateful if you can pass this on to your parish councillors.

I would also be grateful if the information in this e-mail can be treated as confidential by all concerned.

If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards

Len

---

Len Harris
Senior Planning Officer
Wyre Council

Len.Harris@wyre.gov.uk
01253 887231
, Poulton-le-Fylde, Lancashire, FY6 7PU
The Wyre Local Plan

Regular readers of the Inskip-with-Sowerby Parish Council Newsletter will recall that a new Wyre Local Plan has been in the offing for some time and that it will impact on Inskip directly. The previous Wyre Local Plan was baselined in 1999 and the new one was originally scheduled for 2011, so is now 6 years late.

All Planning Authorities are required to develop a Local Plan. It is meant to be a good thing as it allows the local community to control development by establishing exactly where and how much development will be allowed. However the flip side of that coin is that is can allow development to be imposed upon local communities where the Planning Authority argue that development is for the greater good!

255 more houses planned at Inskip between now and 2031

Here at Inskip we seem to be getting the short end of the stick as the Planning Authority, Wyre Council, are looking to double the size of the core settlement of Inskip between now and 2031 (which is as far ahead as the new Local Plan looks). The headline figure of 255 new homes excludes the 27 houses just built or under construction at Ash Meadows off Preston Road, Inskip but includes the additional 55 to the north and south of Preston Road currently in the pipeline for which outline planning permission has already been granted (being marketed by the developer as “St. Peters Fields”) and is made up of a further 200 new homes to be built at Inskip over the next decade or so!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth of Inskip under Wyre Local Plan up to 2031</th>
<th>Total number of dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Settlement at Inskip prior to 2016</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently being built at Ash Meadows</td>
<td>plus 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently planned as “St. Peters Fields” to north</td>
<td>plus 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and south of Preston Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between now and 2031</td>
<td>plus 200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To put this into some sort of context, across the whole area covered by Wyre Borough Council the Local Plan identifies that there is a need to build about 479 new homes across the borough each year between now and 2031.

Discussions with Wyre Council

Since Wyre Borough Council officials first contacted the Parish Council in 2014 about developing a new Local Plan, they have required that all discussions should remain confidential so as not to compromise negotiations that Wyre officials were holding concurrently with landowners. This condition placed the Parish Council in an uncomfortable position throughout this period, but Parish Councillors reluctantly accepted and respected it, believing that engaging with the Planning Authority on the development of a new Local Plan was in the best interests of the residents of the Parish which they represent. Only now are we able to tell you the full story!

Members of the Parish Council have met with Wyre officials on a number of occasions over the last 3 years or so and have consistently advised that there is little demand for additional housing at Inskip other than for affordable housing, social housing for rental, and housing suitable for older members of the community.

The Wyre Local Plan team accept that development is seldom popular but point out that demand for new housing has to be placed somewhere. Owing to lack of available sites in Fleetwood, Cleveleys, Thornton, and Poulton and owing to highway constraints both there and elsewhere they estimate that they may only be able to deliver about two thirds of the target number of new homes across the borough. They would have liked to allocate land at Inskip for up to 380 new homes, however there
are also highways constraints here so they have put forward a reduced target of 255 new homes between now and 2031 including the 55 houses currently in the pipeline. They have consistently assured Parish Councillors that the Wyre policy of 30% affordable homes and for a mix of properties in major developments will continue to be imposed, so our concerns for low cost housing and homes suitable for older members of the community may be met, but that is ultimately beyond the Parish Council’s control.

The Parish Council vision for development at Inskip

The Parish Council were forced to accept that a certain level of development was inevitable and felt that it would be best to put forward ideas as to how we would like to see Inskip develop rather than leave it to the Planners to decide what is best for us!

From the first meeting with Wyre back in 2014 – and remember Wyre insisted that all these conversations remain confidential – the Parish Council put forward a vision to enhance the ambiance of the village by developing a “Wrea Green” style village green opposite to the Derby Arms which would act as a village focal point with residential developments on both sides of the road between Dead Dam Bridge and Laytus Hall Farm. This would protect the high-grade agricultural land adjacent to the core of the existing settlement and another benefit of developing in the area adjacent to the Derby Arms would be to minimise the impact on the existing core settlement. A further potential benefit to development in that location would be the provision of main drainage facilities being brought closer to Carrs Green, enabling existing properties in that vicinity to connect into the system.

From the first the Planning Authority raised concerns with the Parish Council’s ideas, as some of the land proposed was on the flood plain, and there is an Ethylene pipeline and other pipelines crossing the area that would severely constrain the potential to develop there for health and safety reasons. What was clear was that developing land adjacent to the existing village core was seen as a simpler solution by Wyre Borough Council as they would only have to deal with one willing landowner that being Metacre Ltd.

Wyre Council proposal for development at Inskip

In February Parish Councillors met with Wyre officials at the Civic Centre at their request. At this meeting a proposal was tabled that the additional 200 homes proposed in the Local Plan for Inskip should be located to the south of Preston Road on land comprising Hodgkinson Farm. The benefits of this approach would be that it nicely “rounds off” the existing core settlement, balancing the numbers of houses each side of the B5269. The new homes would be on the same side of the main road as the School, and much of the extra traffic generated by the development would emerge from the new estate directly onto Preston Road to the west of the village or onto the main road to the south of the village near Dead Dam Bridge for traffic heading towards Kirkham or Preston. Much traffic would therefore avoid the centre of the village and in particular the sharp bend where Preston Road and Mill Lane meet by the junction with School Lane. This was put forward by Wyre officials as the optimal solution from a planning design perspective. Whilst Parish Councillors accepted that this might prove the ‘least bad’ option, it was felt that the Parish Council could not endorse it in the absence of community consultation.

It is worth noting that even at that point there was still ongoing discussion that some, albeit limited, housing development could take place overlooking a ‘village green’ opposite the Derby Arms. Furthermore, the number of any housing units earmarked for that location would reduce the number required elsewhere.
And then the goalposts were moved!

And then, soon after this meeting, another plan started to emerge. This latest was predicated on a number of planning assumptions:

(i) That it would be unacceptable to allow any further development to the south of Preston Road as it would make Hodgkinson Farm unviable as a business;

(ii) That any development to the east of Inskip was not appropriate owing to problems with access and the presence of the Ethylene pipeline;

(iii) That development in the vicinity of the Derby Arms was not appropriate owing to the Ethylene pipeline and as some of it is flood plain;

(iv) The only viable placement for further housing at Inskip would be to the north of Preston Road and north of Manor Road.

Wyre subsequently adopted this plan against strong objections from the Parish Council, both written and at several meetings between Parish Councillors, Planners, and the Wyre Chief Executive. But at the most recent of these meetings Wyre put forward an additional argument, that Metacre were no longer offering their land to the south of Preston Road for consideration in the Local Plan – though in actual fact Wyre appear to have accepted this plan prior to Metacre formally withdrawing land to the south of Preston Road from consideration.

Full details of the Wyre Local Plan can be found on the Wyre Council website: [http://www.wyre.gov.uk/](http://www.wyre.gov.uk/)

You will note that there are two parcels of land to the south of Preston Road still included in the Local Plan, these are:

a. Additional land immediately to the west of the School that Metacre propose to gift to the School to allow for the expansion that will be required to support the growing population, ensuring that development funds for education are retained locally, and

b. Land to the east of the School that Metacre propose to gift to the Parish Council for provision of a Village Green (an offer made by Metacre of land to the rear of the proposed development to the north of Preston Road was rejected by Parish Councillors as land at this location might not feel like shared community space, nor would it add to the ambience of the village).

Wyre and Metacre propose that these ideas would be included in a Master Plan for development at Inskip once the overarching Wyre Local Plan is approved. This Master Plan may also include a proposal for allotments, another potential local requirement highlighted by the Parish Council. However Metacre will only guarantee offers of land for village green or allotments once they have received planning consent to their developments so really we don’t yet know for sure whether that these promises will actually be delivered.

Public meeting at 7:30pm on Wednesday 13th September at the YIPS Centre

The Parish Council has arranged a PUBLIC MEETING to be held at 7:30pm on Wednesday 13th September at the YIPS Centre, Nelson Gardens, Inskip, PR4 0TR so that all interested residents can have their say and help the Parish Council to establish and represent the views of the whole community. If you want to tell us what you think then please come along.