

PETITION AGAINST THE BAILRIGG GARDEN VILLAGE MASTERPLAN CONSULTATION PROCESS - BRIEFING PACK FOR LANCASTER CITY COUNCILLORS

March 2021

At the City Council meeting scheduled for 24th March 2021, an address is to be delivered summarising the outcome of the petition by local residents opposed to the master-planning consultation currently being undertaken for Bailrigg Garden Village. Here is the opening statement from the petition:

We the undersigned petition the council to withdraw the consultation on Bailrigg Garden Village Masterplan currently being undertaken by JTP Architects and to put in place a consultation process which properly addresses the objections of local residents.

This briefing pack contains evidence in support of the demands of the petition - information which could not be fitted into the 5 minutes allowed for our address to the Council meeting.

Contents

Supporting evidence :

1. Background to the petition.
2. Reasons for concerns of local residents.
3. Comparison of Bailrigg with other garden village schemes.
4. JTP Master-planning Process - Deficiencies of Community Engagement.
5. Local Government Association Statement.

Response to Report from the Director of Regeneration and Planning (submitted to the Council meeting on 24 March 2021)

Appendices :

- Appendix 1 Text of petition against Bailrigg Garden Village Consultation
- Appendix 2 Text of address to the Council meeting on 24th March 2021.
- Appendix 3 Consultation Timeline

1. Background to the Petition

The opening of the JTP Masterplanning on 19 January prompted two Galgate residents to launch a petition to raise concerns about the consultation process around Bailrigg Garden Village over 4 years, and especially about the current Masterplanning consultation. The petitioners were concerned that residents in south Lancaster received no response to the concerns they have raised since 2017 at Local Plan hearings, previous consultations, and council meetings. Since then, JTP has not provided sufficient time for meaningful consideration of residents' views. Many did not receive the JTP consultation leaflet and were therefore excluded from the process, and technical problems prevented others from registering their opinions.

[The petition](#) was launched on Lancaster City Council website on 29 January and by 2 February already had 200 signatures, prompting a concerned email to Louise Hemingway, the petition organiser, from Iain Robertson MRICS / Head of Property, Investment & Regeneration, LCC, saying that the technical difficulties had been rectified and that this was just the start of a process, which would run through the coming months via the Area Action Plan.

Past experience meant the petitioners were not reassured and numbers of signatures rose passing 500 on 6 February, 8 days after it went live. By 8 March, when it closed, it had gained 718 signatures. There were more signatories to the petition than there were comments in the Masterplan Stage 2 consultation in the same period (9th February – 2nd March)

2. Reasons for concerns of local residents

The consultation process surrounding the Local Plan and Bailrigg Garden Village goes back to 2017. There have been numerous consultations as **Appendix 3** below shows residents have not received transparent analysis of the conclusions drawn or how responses have been used. The responses have been passed to JTP but not at any point have they been shared or explained to residents.

3. Comparison of Bailrigg with other garden village schemes.

The current Master Planning also gives cause for concern. Of the 14 Garden Villages approved alongside Bailrigg Garden Village in 2017 all of the other garden villages are at a later stage than Lancaster (see below Table 1). Two critical concerns exist around BGV consultation:

- **Why the rushed Master-Planning of Bailrigg Garden Village ?** Elsewhere, typically Master Planning has been over 1-2 years. A classic example is St Cuthbert's Carlisle where the 2 Stage Master Planning process occurred over 2 years 2018-2020 with what looks like genuine and meaningful engagement (see table below - highlighted in red)
- **Lack of transparency regarding consultation analysis**
Good consultation would include meaningful questions and a transparent analysis of the feedback received. In the current JTP consultation no meaningful questions were asked and we are told of 800+ comments without any robust analysis of what was said. Since 2017 there have been numerous consultations and very little analysis or clarity about how they have been used. Contrast this with Culm in

Devon where detailed questions were asked and clearly analysed to provide a clear impression of how decisions were taken. This is illustrated below.

CONSULTATION COMPARISON

	<h2>BAILRIGG GARDEN VILLAGE</h2>	<h2>CULM GARDEN VILLAGE</h2>																																																																								
Consultation Structure	<p>STAGE 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How do you feel about this place? –Like/Dislike• What specifically do you like or dislike about this location?• What specifically do you like or dislike about this location? <p>STAGE 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comment on the vision <p>STAGE 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comment on the emerging masterplan	<p>Vision & Concept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Q1: 'Culm Garden Village' is a working name for the new settlement to the east of Cullumpton. Do you have any ideas for a name for the new garden village?• Q2: The map on page 9 of the Vision and Concept document shows issues and features that could influence the way the Garden Village is masterplanned. Are there any other issues and features that are not shown?• Q3: The vision for the Garden Village will express the type of place we want the Garden Village to be. Do you agree with the draft Vision shown on page 12 of the Vision and Concept document? If there anything you would like to see prioritised or omitted?• Q4: The 9 key principles shown in the Vision and Concept document will guide the development of the Garden Village. Do you agree these are the right principles?• Q5: Under each of the 9 key principles, the Vision and Concept document (pages 14-31) sets out a series of objectives that explain further what the 9 key principles mean. Do you think these objectives are the right ones? Please provide your comments.• Q6: With reference to Q5, do you think any of these objectives should be prioritised or omitted?• Q7: The Concept Plan on page 21 of the Vision and Concept document sets out how the Garden Village may be developed. Do you have any specific comments on the Concept Plan?• Q8: The Concept Plan shows a green landscape area to act as a buffer between the potential extent of the garden village and the village of Kentsborne. Where do you consider the boundary of this landscape buffer area and the garden village should be located?• Q9: What type of facilities would be acceptable within the green buffer, for example, sports pitches?• Q10: Do you have any other comments on the document?• Q11: Please tell us your postcode <p>East Cullumpton Masterplan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Q1: The map on page 24 of the Masterplan SPD document shows issues and features that could influence the way the East of Cullumpton development is masterplanned. Are there any other issues and features that are not shown?• Q2: Two powerlines cross the East of Cullumpton development area as shown on the map on page 21 of the Masterplan SPD. These could form wide, green corridors as part of a green network running through the development. Do you agree or disagree with this approach?• Q3: The map on page 28 of the Masterplan SPD shows a potential transport, walking and cycling network to serve the East of Cullumpton development with potential to expand this into the wider garden village and improve connections into Cullumpton. Do you agree or disagree with this strategy?• Q4: The network of green corridors and open spaces, rivers and water features shown on the map on page 27 could provide opportunities to provide sports, health and leisure uses. What types of uses do you consider important to promote healthy living and why? Examples could be formal sports, outdoor play areas, cycleways, fitness trails, allotments, water activities.• Q5: The emerging Local Plan policy requires a shopping and community centre and an area of 2ha is required to provide for this. This could include a range of shops and services e.g. local shops, cafe, pub, community building, leisure/sports centre and health care provision. The map on page 26 of the Masterplan SPD shows one potential location for a local centre. Looking at the map on page 26, where do you think the local centre should be located and what key uses do you think it should include?• Q6: What types and features of housing do you think is needed within the allocation? Are there any other types and features of homes you would like to see?• Q7: What types of employment opportunities do you think should be included within the allocation? Are there any other employment opportunities/workspaces you would like to see?• Q8: Is it important for community groups to be able to manage community facilities themselves? Do you know of any existing community groups that might be interested in this or can you suggest how this might work?• Q9: Is the focus on smart and sustainable development the right approach to development? Examples of this could be high energy efficient homes and business units, low carbon and energy efficient construction, climate change adaptation through the natural environment, shared cars, and digital connectivity.• Q10: Do you think the suggestions for development of the East of Cullumpton allocation set out in the Masterplan SPD reflect the draft Vision and Principles for the wider Garden Village shown on page 8 of the Masterplan SPD?• Q11: Overall, do you think that the identified opportunities for the first phase of the garden village shown in the Masterplan SPD document are the right ones to help to start to deliver the Garden Village?• Q12: Do you agree with the potential scope and content of the Masterplan SPD shown on page 37?• Q13: Do you have any further comments on the Masterplan SPD document?• Q14: Please tell us your postcode																																																																								
	Result	<div><div></div><div><p>Unstructured</p><p>No transparency</p><p>Limited analysis</p><p>Cherry picked quotes</p></div></div> <div><div></div><div><p>Success</p><p>Failure</p></div></div>	<div><div></div><div><p>Detailed questions</p><p>Closed questions included free text field</p><p>Quantitative Analysis</p><p>Qualitative Analysis</p></div></div> <div><div></div><div><p>Quantitative Analysis</p><table><tr><th colspan="4">Family homes to buy (3, 4, 5 bedroom)</th></tr><tr><th>Yes</th><th>No</th><th>Don't know</th><th>Total</th></tr><tr><td>80.65% (54)</td><td>11.94% (8)</td><td>7.48% (5)</td><td>67</td></tr><tr><th colspan="4">Smaller/smaller homes (1, 2 bedroom)</th></tr><tr><th>Yes</th><th>No</th><th>Don't know</th><th>Total</th></tr><tr><td>83.33% (60)</td><td>11.11% (8)</td><td>5.56% (4)</td><td>72</td></tr><tr><th colspan="4">Apartments</th></tr><tr><th>Yes</th><th>No</th><th>Don't know</th><th>Total</th></tr><tr><td>54.69% (35)</td><td>31.25% (20)</td><td>14.06% (9)</td><td>64</td></tr><tr><th colspan="4">Affordable homes</th></tr><tr><th>Yes</th><th>No</th><th>Don't know</th><th>Total</th></tr><tr><td>88.42% (70)</td><td>9.88% (8)</td><td>1.70% (1)</td><td>81</td></tr><tr><th colspan="4">Extra care apartments</th></tr><tr><th>Yes</th><th>No</th><th>Don't know</th><th>Total</th></tr><tr><td>76.92% (50)</td><td>13.85% (9)</td><td>9.23% (6)</td><td>65</td></tr><tr><th colspan="4">Self-build</th></tr><tr><th>Yes</th><th>No</th><th>Don't know</th><th>Total</th></tr><tr><td>57.14% (36)</td><td>28.98% (17)</td><td>15.87% (10)</td><td>63</td></tr></table></div></div>	Family homes to buy (3, 4, 5 bedroom)				Yes	No	Don't know	Total	80.65% (54)	11.94% (8)	7.48% (5)	67	Smaller/smaller homes (1, 2 bedroom)				Yes	No	Don't know	Total	83.33% (60)	11.11% (8)	5.56% (4)	72	Apartments				Yes	No	Don't know	Total	54.69% (35)	31.25% (20)	14.06% (9)	64	Affordable homes				Yes	No	Don't know	Total	88.42% (70)	9.88% (8)	1.70% (1)	81	Extra care apartments				Yes	No	Don't know	Total	76.92% (50)	13.85% (9)	9.23% (6)	65	Self-build				Yes	No	Don't know	Total	57.14% (36)	28.98% (17)	15.87% (10)
Family homes to buy (3, 4, 5 bedroom)																																																																										
Yes	No	Don't know	Total																																																																							
80.65% (54)	11.94% (8)	7.48% (5)	67																																																																							
Smaller/smaller homes (1, 2 bedroom)																																																																										
Yes	No	Don't know	Total																																																																							
83.33% (60)	11.11% (8)	5.56% (4)	72																																																																							
Apartments																																																																										
Yes	No	Don't know	Total																																																																							
54.69% (35)	31.25% (20)	14.06% (9)	64																																																																							
Affordable homes																																																																										
Yes	No	Don't know	Total																																																																							
88.42% (70)	9.88% (8)	1.70% (1)	81																																																																							
Extra care apartments																																																																										
Yes	No	Don't know	Total																																																																							
76.92% (50)	13.85% (9)	9.23% (6)	65																																																																							
Self-build																																																																										
Yes	No	Don't know	Total																																																																							
57.14% (36)	28.98% (17)	15.87% (10)	63																																																																							

Table 1 14 Garden Villages announced in 2017

Name of Garden and location of GV	Masterplanning process	Examples of good practice
1. Long Marston in Stratford-upon-Avon	masterplanning by JTP Process begun in 2018	
2. Oxfordshire Cotswolds, West Oxfordshire	<p>Details of activity 2016-date</p> <p>https://www.thegardenvillage.org/milestones/</p> <p>July 2020 Outline Planning permission for 2,200 houses</p>	

	https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-oxfordshire-53335665	
3. Deenethorpe in Northamptonshire	http://www.treshamvillage.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/ALL-Tresham-Exhibition-boards-low-res.pdf 2018 Masterplanning, with redraft in 2019	
4. Culm in Devon	https://culmgardenvillage.co.uk/media/1204/summary-of-public-consultation-responses.pdf carried out during 2019 https://culmgardenvillage.co.uk/masterplanning/	Detailed and transparent analysis of questions asked to consultees
5. Welborne in Hampshire https://welbornegardenvillage.co.uk/masterplan/ Timeline unclear	https://welbornegardenvillage.co.uk/masterplan/ Timeline unclear	
6. West Carclaze in Cornwall	Public consultation began in 2014 https://www.cornwall.gov.uk/environment-and-planning/planning/eco-communities/projects/west-carclaze-garden-village/	
7. Dunton Hills in Essex Seems some doubt over Masterplan https://www.dunton-hills.co.uk/	Comment from Essex contact : Looks like it's still 'taking steps forward'. to use council speak: Brentwood Borough Council says Dunton Hills project has taken a step forward InYourArea News	
8. Spitalgate Heath in Lincolnshire Masterplanning started 9. 2018 completed 2019 http://www.hyas.co.uk/portfolio-items/spitalgate-heath-garden-village/	Masterplanning started 2018 completed 2019 http://www.hyas.co.uk/portfolio-items/spitalgate-heath-garden-village/	
10. Halsnead in Merseyside	Masterplan by Turleys Masterplan adopted 2017	Issues relating to viability and affordable housing https://www.liverpoolecho.co.uk/news/liverpool-news/more-halsnead-garden-village-homes-18713384
11. Longcross in Surrey	No sign of Master Plan https://www.getsurrey.co.uk/news/surrey-news/garden-village-developments-set-change-17144571	
12. Bailrigg, Lancaster Masterplanning 2021	Bailrigg in Lancaster January -March 2021 Masterplanning 2021	

13. Infinity Garden Village in Derbyshire	https://www.derbyshire.gov.uk/site-elements/documents/pdf/council/have-your-say/consultation-search/consultation-search-index/infinity-garden-village-concept-masterplan	Has been problematic https://www.derbytelegraph.co.uk/news/local-news/giant-infinity-garden-village-project-3435448
14. St Cuthberts in Cumbria	Masterplanning was a 2 year process which ran from 2018-2020 https://www.stcuthbertsgv.co.uk/MASTERPLAN/Masterplan-Stage-1 https://www.stcuthbertsgv.co.uk/MASTERPLAN/Masterplan-Stage-2	Measured and high degree of engagement
15. Handforth in Cheshire -	site identified in 2015 and technical and masterplanning in 2016 https://www.roccoconsulting.com/projects/the-garden-village-at-handforth/	

4. JTP Master-planning Process - Deficiencies of Community Engagement

In our address to the Council meeting, we register this criticism of the community engagement process being undertaken by JTP on behalf of Lancaster City Council :

“No meaningful questions have been asked and public responses have not been analysed and published”.

We have therefore undertaken our own analysis of the responses and the results are shown below. Our starting point was JTP's report on their Stage 1 Consultation - as recorded on their website <https://communities.createstreets.com/Bailrigg> with this statement :

“STAGE 1 CONSULTATION - ENDED

As a first step we asked for views about the South Lancaster area, the places and aspects you like and dislike and your dreams for the future of the Garden Village. The first phase of the consultation is now closed but you can see the comments submitted using the Create Communities platform by clicking the box below. Just click on the red or green buttons when you arrive at the platform”

This Create Communities platform is a map of South Lancaster with red and green buttons scattered across it. However you will not find any analysis of the 657 responses represented by these buttons - whether in favour or against the Garden Village or other key issues raised. A further and major impediment is that - contrary to what you might reasonably expect - green buttons do **not** for the most part mean that respondents liked the Garden Village. Many respondents expressed the view that they liked the place as it currently is and didn't want the Garden Village to be developed - but because they recorded their view as a 'like', it is shown on the map as a green button. Other residents recorded their opposition to

the garden village as a 'dislike' and these show as red buttons. Very confusing! Hence the complaint in our address to Council about an absence of properly structured questions.

Our analysis has been undertaken by opening up a sample of buttons, reading the comments recorded there and categorising them as positive or negative about the Garden Village or having other views. The results are shown in these 2 tables - first the split between red and green buttons and then the analysis.

Green buttons "like"	Red buttons "dislike"	Total buttons examined
116	143	259

Positive about Garden Village	Negative about Garden Village	Other Views	Totals
37	154	79	270
14%	57%	29%	100%

The evidence is clear. There is very little support for the Garden Village amongst the local community and the majority are opposed to it - but you will **not** find this evidence on the JTP website. The reports which JTP has provided through Zoom meetings in recent weeks have included a small number of selected quotations from the community responses but no analysis.

Points of detail:

- our analysis is based on a sample of responses to the JTP questionnaire, amounting to 40% of the total red and green buttons on the JTP map. Time didn't permit examination of all the buttons but our sample size is sufficiently large to provide confidence that it is representative of the overall picture.
- "Other views" in the table are respondents who expressed no clear opinion either way regarding the Garden Village. A few respondents expressed positive and negative views and these are both recorded in the table. This is why the total views analysed (270) is slightly higher than the total of red and green buttons (259).

The Stage 2 consultation on 'the vision' managed to attain only double figures of responses, a clear indication that vision and or the totally unstructured consultation process were not considered trustworthy.

5. Local Government Association Statement

A good consultation and master planning process would be transparent and involve local residents and stakeholders as equal partners. As stated on the [Local Government Association's Website](#) ‘

"..if the country is to come back stronger after COVID-19 then local communities must be at the heart of local planning",

Questions asked would be meaningful and analysis clear and language devoid of acronyms unintelligible to the general public. A slower, structured process would secure the best outcomes for the Garden Village on flooding, biodiversity, air quality, infrastructure including transport, education and health facilities and flood mitigation as well as consistent housing numbers and boundaries.

Response to Report from the Director of Regeneration and Planning

It is a shame that the democratic process has not so far permitted a dialogue on the issue at hand. However, we would like to raise the below points in response to the Director's Report :

- The recommendation *"That Council does not refer the Petition for further consideration by Cabinet but encourages the leaders behind the ePetition to engage with JTP Architects and LCC to ensure their concerns are addressed as part of the concluding masterplanning process"* is flawed and misleading. The 'leaders' of the petition have engaged with the JTP process and provided feedback etc. However, the fact that 718 residents signed the petition to register their concerns clearly demonstrate this is not about leaders, but a broad community requirement for the meaningful engagement we have not yet seen.
- While there were many comments raised in stage 1, despite doubling the newsletter drop respondents to the stage 2 consultation were minimal. To date there has been no transparency as to what effect the comments and consultations received have had on the master planning process.
- The options analysis is flawed and insulting
 - There is no 'option' for extending the consultation in a way that preserves current comments while supplementing them with a meaningful structured engagement as was done in Devon. This would have all advantages and the only 'disadvantage' being more time invested to have meaningful engagement, hardly a disadvantage at all.
 - The suggestion that the 'group of petitioners', 718 in total, a considerable swathe of the local population, is refusing to engage in the current JTP consultation is totally baseless and insulting to those who have engaged in the petition process. That these 718 people have not attempted or wanted to engage is a fallacy. Many have tried but believe it is ineffective, while others

desperately want to but have not had the meaningful structure to do so. The petitioners are all involved in the process by virtue of signing the petition.

- Regarding the email from Iain Robertson from LCC (and enclosed as appendix II to the agenda), it was felt inappropriate to take up LCC's offer to meet while the petition was open. Now the petition has closed and demonstrated significant public opposition to the garden village, a positive response to this offer of a meeting has been made.

Signed:

Louise Hemingway, Petition originator,
Rachel Bindless, Petition originator
Andrew Egerton, Petition Signatory, **South Lancaster**
Mary Breakell, Petition Signatory, **CLOUD**
Tony Breakell, Petition Signatory, **CLOUD**
Stephen Constantine, Petition Signatory, **CLOUD**
Barbara Walker, Petition Signatory, **CLOUD**

Appendix 1 Text of Petition

We the undersigned petition the council to withdraw the consultation on Bailrigg Garden Village Masterplan currently being undertaken by JPT Architects and to put in place a consultation process which properly addresses the objections of local residents.

Local residents and local organisations submitted an extensive range of objections to the Lancaster Local Plan and Bailrigg Garden Village, as it was being drafted, from between 2017 and 2019.

These objections were repeated at the 2019 public hearings conducted by the Planning Inspector and additionally, presentations were made to Council meetings in December 2017 and July 2020.

Residents have received no response to these objections which have, in effect, been ignored. In those circumstances JTP's intention to complete their masterplan by March 2021 cannot provide adequate time for proper considerations of residents' views.

The local residents of Galgate, Scotforth and Hala and surrounding areas deserve to be listened to due to a number of reasons and issues, including flooding, air quality, a lack of infrastructure being published and protecting the local environment including bluebell wood that is protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, including protected animals like otters that have been seen along the canal.

The technicalities of arranging such a consultation have not been adequately met by JTP and residents wishing to express their views, found the electronic platform provided to be inadequate. Additionally, whole sections of residents did not receive the JTP consultation leaflet and therefore were unfairly excluded from the process. Additionally, problems were

noted with the email provided. This combined with a ridiculously short deadline has meant that the consultation procedure has fallen short of its role in providing local residents with an opportunity to comment in a constructive and representative way.

We as residents of the surrounding areas do not want our areas to lose their identity.

Appendix 2 Text of Speech

Thank you for allowing me to address the council. There are two things I must make clear.

First, the petition is not the work of one organisation. This speech is the consolidated voice of individuals and local community action groups. It has generated 718 signatories, a sign of the strength of public feeling on this matter.

Second, this is not about preventing Bailrigg Garden Village. It is to ensure that the communities which will be most affected by its construction have had meaningful involvement in its design.

Residents in south Lancaster received no response to the concerns they have raised since 2017 at Local Plan hearings, previous consultations, and council meetings.

Moreover, since then, JTP has not provided sufficient time for meaningful consideration of residents' views. Many did not receive the JTP consultation leaflet and were therefore excluded from the process, and technical problems prevented others from registering their opinions.

We have worked hard to raise awareness of the consultation. Without this, there would not have been the large number of responses sent to JTP during Stage 1.

By contrast, the Stage 2 consultation was only an invitation to provide comments on the 'vision', and this failed to attract more than a handful of responses, showing that it lacked a clear purpose.

In the Stage 3 consultation we learned as much about accommodation for chickens as we did for residents of the garden village. A meaningful engagement was again handicapped by the absence of structured questions.

In sum, the JTP consultation has not enabled the community to respond in a constructive way.

It has been handled better elsewhere.

In 2017 central government agreed to fund the designing of 14 garden villages. We know that considerable time has been spent elsewhere planning garden villages. One example is St Cuthbert's Carlisle where Stage 2 masterplanning occurred over 2 years, with genuine community engagement. Another example is Culm in Devon, where detailed questions were sent to local people. Their responses were published, and this provided a clear impression of how decisions were taken. But in the current JTP consultation no meaningful questions have been asked, and public responses have not been analysed and published.

Lancaster's rushed consultation only cements the conclusion that the views of Lancaster residents are not being sufficiently considered. Our concerns relate to the climate emergency, flood risk, air quality, and biodiversity - plus such matters as road access, sustainable transport, shops, schools, health care, bus transport, cycle routes and footpaths. It is still unknown how many houses, including affordable ones, are proposed, or where they are to be located in an area now including land marked as a possible extension of the garden village west to Conder Green.

We accept that the masterplan is not the end of this process and further detailed planning stages are to take place, including an Area Action Plan and associated Design Codes. However, the masterplan is the foundation on which this whole endeavour is based and therefore it should not be rushed. But with the masterplan being aired for the first time on March 2nd and the final consultation on March 23rd this can hardly be held up as anything akin to a meaningful consultation.

Our request to the Council today is that the current consultation must be replaced by one that is more measured and includes the local community at its heart as equals.

While the garden village would affect directly very few council wards and therefore only a minority of councillors, the matter for debate here is one of democratic consultation that respects local people. This, surely, is an obligation which you all accept.

Appendix 3 Consultation Timeline

Date	Type of consultation/event	Comments
2 January 2017	Announcement of government support for garden villages.	Most Lancaster people first heard of Bailrigg Garden Village when it was announced on the TV News on 2 January 2017 and report in the <i>Lancaster Guardian</i> 5 January 2017 . This included a sketchy map of a proposed 'Bailrigg Garden Village' which alarmed residents.

27 January - 24 March 2017	<p>Developing a Local Plan for Lancaster Consultation</p> <p>BGV was to be the centre-piece of the Local Plan. This development of some 3500 houses (though a Senior Planning Officer did subsequently refer to a potential 5000) Agri-business Centre, Health innovation Campus generating 2,000 jobs.</p>	<p>363 responses. Lancaster City Council Report of June 2017. Acknowledged that 'there remains :</p> <p>1) A lack of confidence in the validity of and robustness of the objectively assessed housing need'</p> <p>2) A 'strong view...that the aspirations for economic growth in the district was [sic] overly optimistic'.</p> <p>3) A 'key concern' was also the 'delivery of infrastructure in terms of how it would be delivered and the costs', these matters relating to 'education, highways, healthcare, open space and other local service provision'.</p> <p>4) Noticeably 'a consistent response from the development industry suggested that the draft Local Plan places a heavy reliance on the delivery of strategic greenfield sites which require infrastructure (in particular Bailrigg Garden Village)'.</p> <p>5) Concern was also raised about the lack of detail about the proposed reconfiguration of junction 33 on the M6, and the cost.</p>
October 2017	<p>Further Drop-Ins specifically relative to BGV. It was stated that these events were 'not directly part of the work taking place to bring forward the Local Plan', but 'they do supplement the Local Plan process'.</p> <p>Indicative topics were advertised, such as managing drainage, housing density, employment, roads and traffic, schools and facilities, the cycle superhighway, bus rapid transit and - a curious one - 'The university in the village'. As far as we know, the university has no intention of opening facilities within BGV</p>	<p>Responses were invited, but those who attended the consultations reported that while questions could be asked little information on matters of key local concern was available. We are not aware of a report on that consultation.</p>
20 December 2017	<p>Local Plan approved by Lancaster City Council</p>	<p>At that meeting officers confirmed more work was needed on the Local Plan, implying that at that stage it was not 'sound'.</p>
21 December 2017	<p>Sent to all on consultation mailing list</p>	<p>List of major matters yet to be addressed: flood risk and ecology; engagement with the community, landowners and developers; work with the Lancashire County Council to plan community facilities, transport and infrastructure for the Garden Village; securing necessary funding. Among the items to be determined, it seems, was 'what land to allocate in South Lancaster, including for the Garden Village'.</p>
9 February - 6 April 2018	<p>Local Plan published, including chapter 12 relating to BGV</p>	<p>Respondents were asked whether they judged it 'legally compliant' (a question hard to answer for lay people) and 'sound', and if judged unsound whether that was because it was 'not positively prepared', 'not justified', 'not effective', or 'not consistent with national policy'.</p>

		CLOUD's response , submitted on 3 April, explained in detail why, in the opinion of its members, elements of the Local Plan were neither 'sound' nor 'evidence-based'.
15 May 2018	Lancaster City Council submitted the Lancaster District Local Plan for independent examination	
24 May 2018	Lancaster City Council invited consultees by email to comment specially and separately on a ' Bailrigg Garden Village Area Action Plan: Issues and Options Paper ', during June 2018	The setting up of the Area Action Plan for Bailrigg Garden Village confused consultees. It was the source of major concern from consultees - outlined above throughout the consultations, yet seemed to be being pulled out of the Local Plan.
19 September 2018	Work continuing on Local Plan	Renaming of Bailrigg Garden Village to South Lancaster
October-November 2018	Consultation on Modifications to Local Plan Proposed date for Hearings on Local Plan by Planning Inspector Richard McCoy expected 8 January 2018	The modifications to previous versions of the Plan were often considerable.
21 November 2018	Announcement that Hearings would not start on 8 January 2018	Correspondence between Planning Inspector and Lancaster City Council
7 January -15 February 2019	Consultation on Evidence and Additional Information	Announcement sent to Consultees with block of documents amounting to 2,000 pages. Summaries posted to consultees 17 January 2019
April-May 2019	Local Plan Hearings	
19 January- 23 March 2021	JTP Masterplanning	