

From: Tony Burton

Sent: Monday, February 23, 2026 10:56

To: Parish Council Clerk, Huddleston, Eleanor

Cc: Dobson, Gillian

Subject: Re: Scotforth Rural Neighbourhood Development Plan (SRNP) - Examination

This email is from an external email address

Do not click any links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Never disclose your password to anyone.

Thank you for your responses to my earlier questions.

There are two outstanding issues on which I would welcome further information and feedback from Scotforth Parish Council and/or Lancaster City Council.

Development Boundary

Map 7 shows a Development Boundary that differs in the east to that shown on Map 2A (as derived from Appendix A, Maps 8/9/10 of the Landscape Character Assessment) - see below



Map 2A



Map 7

Map 2A is also of a scale and clarity which is insufficient for the detailed boundary to be show. Map 7 is of an appropriate scale and clarity

The additional information describing the parcels of land is helpful although the boundaries of each parcel remain unclear.

What would be most helpful is a revised Map 7 providing:

- a Development Boundary which is then used in all relevant Maps in the Plan and the Landscape Character Assessment
- boundaries for each parcel
- an explanation of the orange line marking Parcel K in the Key.

Promoting Accessibility, Health and Wellbeing Part 2

The final paragraph of Policy SR9 references “*design principles set out in the report*” which are provided in Appendix 3. This is described as being from Part 1 of in the Evidence Base. This content does not appear in Part 1 and thank you for clarifying that the principles come from Part 2. Unfortunately it appears Part 2 of *Promoting Accessibility, Health and Wellbeing* was not included among the documents published with the draft Plan when it was submitted for public consultation to Lancaster City Council. It does not appear on Lancaster City Council's website and I believe it is only available on the Scotforth Parish Council website.

It would be helpful if this could be clarified and, if so, that Part 2 is posted online with the other submitted documents.

It is my view that this is not such a significant issue that additional public consultation should be undertaken, especially given the lack of public feedback on the issues raised in Policy SR9. I would welcome any opinions on this judgement.

Thanks

Tony