

OMEGA WEST

PINS REF: APP/H4315/V/20/3265899

SEAN BASHFORTH EVIDENCE ERRATA TO MAIN PROOF OF EVIDENCE

Paragraph 6.34 – for clarity the quote is from the Growth Lancashire Officer not Historic England. The corrected text reads as follows:

*“6.34 As confirmed in their consultation response dated 7 May 2020 [CD34.32], Historic England did not object to the proposals, who stated the “Proposed Development will have minimal impact on key designated assets or their settings” and went on to confirm that Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service has advised that no further archaeological work is required. The Conservation Officer at Growth Lancashire also considered the heritage aspects of the proposals in his 31 March 2020 letter [CD34.16]. In this **Historic England** respect, it was concluded that:*

“Having regard to all of the above, I consider that overall the proposed development would only likely lead to a low level of harm to the significance which I would regard as being slight within the spectrum of less than substantial harm as identified under p.196 of NPPF.....”

Paragraph 6.89 is revised below to make it clear that there is only one connection across the M62:

“6.89 The Park straddles the M62 and provides an attractive gateway to Merseyside and a valuable local recreational resource. The Proposed Development does not encroach on any of the ‘Recreation Hubs’ identified on the AAP proposals map, will facilitate movement over ~~two of the~~ the pedestrian bridge connections across the M62 and will maintain and enhance connectivity within the Park. A ‘Key Walking Route’ shown on the AAP proposals map will be retained and enhanced though planting in the Green Triangle. Whilst the ‘Proposed Bridleway’ route shown on the proposals map would be interrupted, an alternative east-west cycle / footpath was agreed with the Council instead. The draft S106 further commits to £180,000 to fund infrastructure projects within the Park area, with priority given to projects closest to the Application Site.”