

25A Park Road,
PRESCOT, L34 3LW
12/05/15

To Mr Pike, Planning Inspector
c/o Paul Morris
KMBC Program Officer,
Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy Examination

Dear Inspector Pike,
RE-CONVENED EXAMINATION HEARINGS
KNOWSLEY LOCAL PLAN

Unfortunately I will be unable to attend the re-convened hearings, but I understand you will consider my original submission and I write to expand on my previous submission, (which I consider is still valid and more detailed than the following and assume you have will be able to still take account of, however, I do wish to expand on my evidence through referring to material changes, which affect the evidence base, some of which you will be aware of and as an objector I plead with you to keep investigating until satisfied all the relevant issues have been addressed.

Re - LEGAL COMPLIANCE AND PROCEDURAL MATTERS

As a local resident who submitted representations to the consultation I state **I was previously unaware** of the sites proposed to be removed from the Green Belt. Neither have I seen or heard any new attempts by KMBC to inform the public, either previously or further of their rights to comment or publish further the issues under debate. Certainly none of my neighbours or local contacts (other than Dr. John Sills who alerted me) have had knowledge of any of this, other than those who had previously objected (which does not meet this community consultation requirement).

I therefor submit that *the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy (KLPCS) is not in general accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement? KLPCS has not emerged from an open and transparent process that demonstrates how and why the preferred strategy was selected, in consultation with the public and other stakeholders? Since it is already evident that major sections of the community were not aware - therefor the public awareness and consultation should still be extended further, or KMBC to be required to recall their proposals for developing on Green Belt .*

Re - Safeguarded land at Knowsley Village and SUEs a and c to g

In the light of the reduction in demand for housing land, **because of new figures on significant reduction in the population growth estimates and new household need projections**, show that the proposed use of Green for future housing is massively over estimated need. Also **revisions to PPG regarding Green Belt protection** and directions to fully utilise urban brownfield sites do not leave KMBC Green Belt policy satisfying the **exceptional circumstances test of national policy** – I therefor submit the Green Belt sites are **not now necessary**, and that these proposals **be rejected**.

Re - Housing need and land supply assessments

The implications of the new household projections . . . in relation to . . . assessed need for housing - are that the proposals to utilise Green Belt land in any degree or location are **not justified and should not be approved and that** these proposals do not satisfy the **exceptional circumstances test of national policy** and are **not now necessary**. This is further underpinned by current progress in local housing, which is now **substantially occurring on urban brownfield sites. (eg. Even to my limited knowledge substantial house building is in progress at Prescot Watchworks/Tinlings and Prismian Cables services land. I hear rumours of development on Thingwall Hall land.**

Potential sites such as the failed site for development of huge Kirby Tesco should be introduced into the pool of available urban brownfield sites. Also Huyton Roby leisure and many other urban brown field sites all of which should reduce the need for future development sites, or at least reduce this drastically. Please cross-reference to further info on this on Dr John Sills' submission – para 8.

I wish to add the following further comments:

1. KMBC must be required to demonstrate how they have altered policies to take account of previously over estimated population growth, where the newly calculated housing demand should be accommodated in many new and previously available brownfield sites in Knowsley and also in adjacent Liverpool - and whether they correctly recalculated release of urban

brownfield sites to max capacity to meet the reduced demand and appropriately reduced their policy of reductions in green belt allocations for housing.

2. The large sites abutting M62, and beside Knowsley Lane and the small site (Whitaker's triangle') between St Helens/Prescot bypass and extensions to Knowsley Village: -

2A) if developed for higher income occupants would generate considerably more traffic congestion and noise, which currently affects adjacent occupants and those further away eg. I live some distance away in Park Road, PRESCOT and am awoken extremely early by the M57 traffic noise.

2B) if developed as "affordable housing" for those less well off with low levels of car ownership - will be too far from necessary facilities and make the lasting mistakes of the early years of Kirby and likewise later Netherley high rise blocks, which had to be demolished after a few years because of this among the disadvantages of suffering isolation from access to work school shopping surgeries, etc.

3. KMBC Green Space recent policy AT CABINET - to retain Knowsley's Green Spaces – a) as free healthy opportunities for it's huge population of many disadvantaged, terrace and flat dwellers and b) as an attraction to potential and existing businesses and higher income residents is a contradiction in material change in policy statements, as many of these green areas are in or near planned Green Belt changes, the latter of which, will in fact have the opposite effect to their honourable Green Spaces retention justifications.

4. As above - Central Government's attitude to retaining the **crucial health input of playing fields, etc.** (planning guidance) suggests building houses on them is wrong as they are needed more than ever, especially in a deprived area such as Knowsley, yet many of the sites proposed for future development include fields, games pitches, etc..

These sites should be retained as green space or Green Belt without question.

5. Growing concern re building near water and increased concern re the presntly disregarded lesser flooding danger zones. Many small proposed sites between A57 & M57 and adjacent to east of A57 – are never previously built on (obviously for good reason),

stream valleys, low lying, so not very pleasant for housing and having streams running through them should not be subject to housing development and associated road surfaces and loss of natural land drainage as this could make them a higher flood risk than is at present apparent. Also would result in loss of local wildlife.

6. Taking this land out of the GREEN BELT, even at some date in the future would seem to be contrary to the aims of the GREEN BELT:

1. To check unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another.
3. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
4. To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

7. KMBC should explore newly freed potential housing land availability in adjacent Liverpool.

8. Substantial loss of green belt beside M62 is ill advised. The areas near the M57 & M62 will be unpleasantly affected by even the present levels of noise which are distinct and disturbing - loud enough to wake me unnecessarily early morning and I live a greater distance away.

9. Between the distinct locations of Knowsley Village and Prescott and between Roby and Whiston (and probably elsewhere - which don't know of) - there is still a distinct **Green Belt CORRIDOR – THE VERY CONCEPT OF WHICH IS FUNDAMENTAL TO POLICY – TO RETAIN DISTINCT CORRIDORS SEPARATING LARGE URBAN AREAS** - ONLY to be lost by proceeding with the planned changes to Green Belt.

Release of large amounts of Green Belt land is no longer needed, as population growth has drastically declined and eventual failure to develop, could result in this becoming wasteland - no longer farmed / managed.

10. Prescott Town at present forms a visually distinct historic pinnacle, dramatically crowned by Prescott Parish Church, on the final of series of sandstone escarpments/ridges sequentially rising eastwards from central Liverpool. The A57 rises sharply from the existing green belt wedge/triangle bounded by A57 and A58 by the

M57 roundabout and presents architectural vistas and a sense of the historic presence of the Town. Should this site ("Whitakers' Triangle") be developed - these views and experiences will be lost. This is particularly important now with the development of Prescott THI and the imminent development of the Shakespearean Theatre adjacent to the Church, which is being strongly promoted by Shakespeare North and KMBC. especially since I understand there is heritage evidence of the first Shakespeare theatre, having been located here and of Shakespeare's presence at Knowsley Hall, too.

10. Finally I am concerned for the present and future of public rights/participation in decision-making if these issues cannot now be openly resolved.

I have had sight of the submission from Dr John Sills, which as with his original submission - I endorse.

Thankyou for the opportunity

Jennifer Kokosalakis
jkokosalakis@gmail.com

filename: substantial loss.doc