

Questions to Cabinet

Responses for the Cabinet Meeting on 2 February 2023

| 1. | Questioner: County Councillor Kim Snape | Respondent: County Councillor Jayne Rear |
|----|--|--|
| | <p>Item 17 - Update on the School Place Planning Delivery Programme 2023-25</p> <p>In regard to the new Chorley & South Ribble planning area for school place provision the report advises there will be a 10 place increase from Parklands Academy and a 15 place increase for Albany Academy. My residents are concerned that because you have merged the two districts together for school place provision this now appears to give a skewed picture of the progress that has been made on secondary school place provision in Chorley Borough. The report fails to mention forthcoming plans from Southlands to reduced their admissions by 30 pupils and plans from Albany to allow up to 15 secondary school places to children from Chorley New Road Primary School in Horwich. Therefore potentially seeing a reduction in minus 45 secondary school places over the next couple of years in Chorley Borough.</p> | <p>In developing the delivery programme 2023/25, expressions of interest to expand were sought from all secondary schools in Chorley and South Ribble. No Chorley schools expressed an interest at the time. The delivery programme secures a 97 permanent place increase to the combined published admission number (PAN) from 2023/24 and 25 places where there is an agreement to exceed PAN.</p> <p>Regarding Southlands, the council objected to the Trust proposals to reduce the published admission number and subsequently made representation to the Schools Adjudicator. The objection was upheld.</p> <p>Regarding Albany Academy, the council has raised an objection to the proposal and awaits the outcome.</p> |



| | | |
|-----------|---|--|
| | Therefore can the cabinet member please tell me does this report provide a truly accurate update around secondary school place provision in Chorley Borough? | |
| 2. | County Councillor Erica Lewis | Respondent: County Councillor Aidy Riggott |
| | <p>Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility</p> <p>In considering the realignment of the Galgate bypass, was further consideration given to a route running along the eastern side of the M6? An eastern alignment would take the road further from homes in the village & the Environment Agency has previously advised that alignment would optimize the flood risk reduction potential of the road.</p> | <p>The report before Cabinet concerns an alteration to the preferred route option approved by the Cabinet in February 2021. Importantly, the alteration proposed under this report keeps to the same broad alignment for the preferred route option.</p> <p>It is important to understand this distinction between the 'strategic' exercise undertaken to choose amongst the six route options in February 2021, and the relatively modest alteration to the preferred option that is the subject of this report.</p> <p>You will recall that the county council assessed, consulted and concluded on six possible route options, each markedly different and each showing a broad alignment. The alignments shown at the consultation stage were based on largely desk-based information available at that stage in the development of this scheme. The consultation exercise during 2020 and the decision taken by Cabinet in February 2021 was informed by engineering, environmental and traffic assessments as to their relative benefits and challenges.</p> |



| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>The approval of this route in February 2021 provided the authority with the means to progress more detailed survey and design work, commence environmental impact assessment and initiate land assembly activity. It is not uncommon, and indeed should be regarded as a beneficial and necessary part to the scheme's evolution, that alterations are made to the alignment to reflect new information as it's collected and assessed.</p> <p>This should not trigger a reopening of the relative merits of the strategic options. Ordinarily, the authority could view this type of alteration as part of the design evolution and not treat it with this formality.</p> <p>In this instance, it is not the scale or impact of the alteration so much as the removal of new slip roads to serve the M6 as the factor to reporting this matter to the Cabinet. You will recall that the scheme was specifically referred to as 'the M6 junction 33 reconfiguration with link road' and so the removal of the new slip roads is relevant to our understanding of what the scheme now entails.</p> <p>Accepting that it is not appropriate to reopen consideration of the strategic options, it is worth reminding ourselves that the Eastern route options, alongside Western and Central Options, were considered through the public consultation in 2020. These Eastern options were the least preferred options of the 2020 public consultation with only 7% of respondents voting for</p> |
|--|--|--|



| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Eastern 1 and 3% of respondents voting for Eastern 2 as their preferred route option.</p> <p>The Eastern route options would not have reduced traffic through Galgate, which is one of the objectives of the scheme.</p> <p>As well as a lack of local support, there were, and remain, engineering and environmental challenges to the Eastern options. The climbs on the two Eastern routes reach the maximum permissible under design standards and there is the possibility that HGVs would be dissuaded from using the Eastern route options and continue through Galgate.</p> <p>The drainage on the preferred route option would be superior in contrast to the Eastern route options as there are convenient watercourses along the route, which could be used after drainage flows are attenuated.</p> <p>It is also important to note that the Eastern route options fall within the setting to the Forest of Bowland AONB and at their closest are within c.800 metres of its boundary. As such, a new link road of this nature would likely have significant adverse landscape and visual effects on the area that forms part of the setting to the Forest of Bowland AONB and potentially to the designated area itself.</p> |
|--|--|--|



| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | In conclusion therefore, I don't see the value of reopening consideration of the already previously discounted route options. |
|--|--|---|

Questions asked by members of the public

28 questions and comments had been received by the Cabinet in relation to **Agenda Item 5 - South Lancaster to M6 Road Scheme: Link Road and Park and Ride Facility.**

Some of the questions and comments fall outside of the "Questions for Cabinet" rules, and normally therefore would not have been considered. However, in order to ensure transparency on this issue, they were all included and the answer to these questions and comments have been compiled into a FAQ document which is attached.

