Dear Ms Maguire and Mr Macfarlane

BURSCOGH NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN EXAMINATION

Following the submission of the Burscough Neighbourhood Development Plan (the Plan) for examination, I would like to clarify a number of procedural matters.

1. **Examination Documentation**

   I can confirm that I am satisfied that I have received a complete submission of the Plan and accompanying documentation, including the Basic Conditions Statement, the Consultation Statement and the Regulation 16 representations, to enable me to undertake the examination.

   Subject to my detailed assessment of the Plan, I have not at this initial stage identified any very significant and obvious flaws in it that might lead me to advise that the examination should not proceed.

2. **Site Visit**

   I will let you know in due course when I intend to undertake a site visit to the Plan area. This will assist in my assessment of the draft Plan, including the issues identified in the representations.

   The site visit will be undertaken unaccompanied. It is very important that I am not approached to discuss any aspects of the Plan or the neighbourhood area, as this may be perceived to prejudice my independence and risk compromising the fairness of the examination process.

3. **Written Representations**

   At this stage, I consider the examination can be conducted solely by the written representations procedure, without the need for a hearing. However, I reserve the option to convene a hearing if I deem it necessary to ensure the adequate examination of an issue, or to ensure that a person has a fair chance to put a case.

4. **Further Clarification**

   In the annexe to this letter I set out a number of initial questions. I would be grateful if you would provide a written response to these by three weeks from the date of this letter.
5. Examination Timetable

As you will be aware, the intention is to conduct the examination (including the site visit) with a view to providing a draft report (for ‘fact checking’) within 4-6 weeks of submission of the Plan.

However, as I need to allow time for my questions to be answered, the examination timetable will be extended. Please be assured that I will seek to keep any delay to a minimum. The IPe office team will seek to keep you updated on the anticipated delivery date of the draft report.

If you or the qualifying body have any process questions related to the conduct of the examination, which you would like me to address, please do not hesitate to contact the office team in the first instance.

In the interests of transparency, may I prevail upon you to ensure a copy of this letter, and any responses to the questions I have raised, are placed on the parish council and local authority’s websites.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Your sincerely

Bob Yuille

Examiner
ANNEX

Questions to Burscough Parish Council

1. Is the Plan aligned with the emerging West Lancashire Local Plan Review, particularly in its references safeguarded land at Yew Tree Farm?

2. In their consultation responses West Lancashire District Council, Lancashire County Council (the Lead Local Flood Authority), the Environment Agency, the Canal and River Trust and United Utilities have variously made comment on some or all of the following:
   • Section 3 of the Plan;
   • Policies BPI1, BPI2, BPI3 and their supporting text.
Would the Parish Council please respond to these comments? If the Parish Council accepts that the Plan should be modified in response to any or all of these comments would it please let me have the wording of the modifications which it considers to be acceptable?

3. Would the Parish Council please respond to the suggestion that the requirement in Policy BPI1 for Infrastructure Delivery Statements is unnecessary insofar as it applies to Yew Tree Farm because (as page 36 the Yew Tree Farm Final Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document makes clear) infrastructure provision will be co-ordinated and funded across the whole site.

4. Would the Parish Council please respond to the suggestion that Policy BPE1 does not recognise the role of uses such as cafes, gymnasiums, play centres and children's nurseries which can play a complementary role in industrial estates.

5. A number of the Neighbourhood Green Spaces identified in Policy BPEV1 appear to be in Green Belt and thus are protected by that designation. What additional local benefit would be gained by designating such land as a Neighbourhood Green Space?

6. A number of Neighbourhood Green Spaces identified in Policy BPEV1 are school playing fields. While Policy EN3 of the West Lancashire Local Plan 2012-2027 establishes that school playing fields are part of the Green Infrastructure Network, it may be that such land will be required for future school expansion. Policy BPEV1 would, on the face of it, preclude this. Is that correct? If so, is this justified?

7. One of the Neighbourhood Green Spaces identified in Policy BPEV1 is within the Community Hub Opportunity Area identified in Policy BPC2 within which mixed use development will be supported. Are these two policies compatible?

8. The supporting text to Policy BPEV2 makes clear that there are both designated and non-designated heritage assets in the Plan area. However, Policy BPEV2 itself appears to refer only to non-designated heritage assets. Is that correct?

Questions to West Lancashire Borough Council

1. For the purposes of this examination the development plan for the area is the West Lancashire Local Plan 2012-2027 adopted in October 2013. Is that correct?

2. West Lancashire Borough Council is in the process of preparing the West Lancashire Local Plan Review. It consulted on the Preferred Options document of this emerging plan in 2018 but has yet to publish or consult on the Submission Version of this plan. Is that correct?