

EX18

EXAMINATION HEARINGS

AGENDA

THURSDAY 14 NOVEMBER 2013 at 10.00 am

Matter 5 GREEN BELT

Issue: Whether the selection of broad locations for development in the Green Belt is justified by the evidence and whether the mechanisms for release are clear and effective.

INDIVIDUAL GREEN BELT LOCATIONS (continued)

5.25 KGBS19 and KGBS20 East of Halewood (north and south).

Is the selection of these sites based on robust evidence of all the environmental and other impacts?

5.18 KGBS7 Knowsley Lane, Huyton.

Is the selection of this site based on robust evidence?

5.23 KGBS16 Edenhurst Avenue.

Is the selection of this site based on robust evidence of all the environmental and other impacts?

5.26 Alternative site A, Shrog's Farm.

Is the rejection of this site for employment development based on robust evidence?

Would development of this site be viable having regard to flood risk and highway access constraints?

2.00 pm or later

5.27 Alternative site B, Axis Business Park.

Is the rejection of this site for employment development based on robust evidence?

5.28 Alternative site C, Epicentre adjacent to M57.

Is the rejection of this site too simplistic and based on robust evidence?

Is the availability of this land markedly better than alternative employment locations?

5.29 Alternative site D, Lydiate Lane.

Is the adjoining land to the north and north-west (in Liverpool City) in the Green Belt?

Does the current unavailability of the sewage treatment works land change the assessment and if so, in what way?

How significant a constraint is the adjoining sewage treatment works?

Does the analysis in Green Belt Technical Report (TR03) give sufficient weight to the overall benefit when assessed against the Strategic Objectives?

5.30 Other alternative sites.

Is the rejection of land at Burtons Way for housing development based on robust evidence?

Are there other sites which, based on the evidence, justify release from the Green Belt for development?