

**Wording of the ePetition to Council “Opposed to Bailrigg Garden Village”
(718 signatories)**

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.

Address to Council to be delivered by Mrs Barbara Walker.

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.