



Dear Councillor,

CENTRAL LANCASHIRE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK JOINT ADVISORY COMMITTEE - MONDAY, 6TH JULY 2009

The next meeting of the Central Lancashire Local Development Framework Joint Advisory Committee to be held in the **Council Chamber, Town Hall, Chorley on Monday, 6th July 2009 at 6.30 pm.** Entrance to the Town Hall during the evening can be gained from the doors on St Thomas's Road, opposite the Police Station.

An agenda and accompanying reports for the meeting are attached.

The formal meeting of the Joint Advisory Committee will be followed by an informal and private workshop session to discuss the impact of current economic conditions on the viability of the Preferred Core Strategy for Central Lancashire. **In view of the importance of this issue, all of the appointed and substitute Councillors for each of the four participating authorities are invited to attend the workshop, as well as the preceding Joint Advisory Committee.** The workshop will continue in the Council Chamber after the close of the Joint Advisory Committee meeting. A discussion note for consideration at the workshop is being sent under separate cover.

We hope that as many appointed and substitute members of the Joint Advisory Committee as possible will be able to attend on 6 July.

Yours sincerely

Donna Hall
Chief Executive of Chorley Council

Tony Uren
Democratic and Member Services Officer
E-mail: tony.uren@chorley.gov.uk
Tel: (01257) 515122
Fax: (01257) 515150

Distribution

All members and Officers of the Central Lancashire Local Development Framework Joint Advisory Committee.

Appointed Councillors

Councillors Harold Heaton (Chorley Council), Roy Lees (Chorley Council), Peter Malpas (Chorley Council), Neil Cartwright (Preston City Council), John Swindells (Preston City Council), Danny Gallagher (Preston City Council), J C Hughes MBE (South Ribble Council), J Hesketh (South Ribble Council), A Ogilvie (South Ribble Council) and County Councillor Keith Young (Lancashire County Council).

Substitute Councillors:

Councillors Geoffrey Russell (Chorley Council), Laura Lennox (Chorley Council), Peter Goldsworthy (Chorley Council), Stuart Greenhalgh (Preston City Council), Carl Crompton (Preston City Council), Alan Hackett (Preston City Council), P Mullineaux (South Ribble Council), B Yates (South Ribble Council), P Stettner (South Ribble Council) and County Councillor Tim Ashton (Lancashire County Council).

Officers:

Julian Jackson (Central Lancashire LDF Team Co-ordinator), Jane Meek (Corporate Director (Business), Chorley Council), Peter Kuit (Director of Development, Preston City Council), John Dalton (Head of Planning and Housing, South Ribble Borough Council), Mike Kirby (Chief Planning Officer, Lancashire County Council) and Tony Uren (Democratic and Member Services Officer, Chorley Council).

AGENDA

1. **Appointment of Chair for the Meeting**
2. **Welcome by Chair and Introductions**
3. **Apologies for absence**
4. **Minutes of last meeting**
 - a) To confirm as a correct record the minutes of the last meeting of the Central Lancashire LDF Joint Advisory Committee held on 6 May 2009 (Minutes enclosed). (Pages 1 - 4)
 - b) Matters arising not otherwise covered on agenda
5. **Central Lancashire City Region - Northern Way Residential Futures Research (Pages 5 - 10)**

To receive and consider the enclosed report of the Joint LDF Officer Team on the findings of the research.
6. **Draft Planning Policy Statement No.4 - Planning for Prosperous Economies (Pages 11 - 20)**

To receive and consider the enclosed report of the Joint LDF Officer Team seeking a response to the published consultation paper.
7. **Date and venue of next Meeting**

This page is intentionally left blank

**CENTRAL LANCASHIRE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK
JOINT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Meeting held at 5.30pm on Wednesday 6 May 2009 at the Civic Centre, South Ribble Borough Council, Leyland

Present: Chorley Borough Council

Councillors Malpas and Russell

Preston City Council

Councillors Cartwright and Collins

South Ribble Borough Council

Councillors Hesketh, Ogilvie (chairman) and Stettner

In attendance: Mr J Jackson - Central Lancashire LDF Team Coordinator

Chorley Borough Council

Ms J Meek - Corporate Director (Business)

Mrs A Marland - Principal Planning Officer

Mr P McAnespie – Planning Policy and Design Team Leader

Preston City Council

Mr P Kuit - Director of Development

Mr M Molyneux - Planning Policy Manager

Mr C Hayward - Assistant Director - City Planning Officer

Mr M Putsey - Principal Planning Officer

South Ribble Borough Council

Mr J Dalton - Head of Planning and Housing

Mrs H Hockenhull - Planning Manager

Mr J Wallwork - Democratic Services Officer

Ms L Chamberlain – Planning Assistant

Lancashire County Council

Mrs J McDonald – Strategic Planning Officer

33. Appointment of a Chairman for the Meeting

RESOLVED: That Councillor Ogilvie be appointed Chairman for the meeting.

34. Welcome by the Chairman and Introductions

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting.

35. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Brown and Morgan (Chorley BC), Hughes (South Ribble BC) and County Councillors Tomlinson and Mein (Lancashire CC). Councillors Russell and Stettner attended the meeting as substitutes for Councillors Morgan and Hughes respectively.

36. Confirmation of Minutes – 17 March 2009

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the Central Lancashire Local Development Framework Joint Advisory Committee meeting held on 17 March 2009, be approved as a correct record and signed by the chairman.

37. Overview Report

The committee received a report explaining the key reasons for having this meeting of the Joint Advisory Committee.

The main reason for meeting at this time was to present the Delivery Supplement version of the Core Strategy. This partly added to and partly replaced the Preferred Core Strategy. There were separate reports on housing land and needs which were important parts of the evidence base and inform the Delivery Supplement. Of wider LDF significance were the relevant outcomes emerging from the affordable housing scrutiny process.

The now to be finalised arrangements associated with the Joint LDF team, were also presented as a memorandum of intent. There was a separate report on the salary and non-salary related savings of joint working. Finally, a further early step on the road to producing Site Allocations was being pursued in the form of a Community Survey.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

38. Staffing Arrangements – Memorandum of Intent

A report was submitted which set out the proposed staffing and financial arrangements for the Joint LDF Team, for inclusion in a formal Memorandum of Intent

The Joint LDF Officer Team was set up in April 2008, initially to produce the Preferred Core Strategy which went out to public consultation in September 2008. Interim arrangements for staffing the officer team were put in place, with the three district councils of Chorley, Preston and South Ribble each seconding an officer to work on the team and with assistance from the County Council. The intention was to formalise these arrangements following the recent permanent appointment of the Team Co-ordinator. Chorley Council's Planning Policy Manager postholder, who was seconded to the role of Team Co-ordinator as part of the interim arrangements, was appointed to the role in April 2009. It was important that a document setting out the projected staffing and financial implications of the Joint LDF Team were understood and agreed by each of the participating authorities.

Councillor Malpas suggested that there should be the ability for councils to withdraw from the arrangement if they wished to do so. Mr Dalton agreed, stating that South Ribble Borough Council's Audit Team had also suggested the same to minimise the risks.

RESOLVED: That subject to the inclusion of an additional paragraph to minimise the risks and give councils the option of a "release clause", the Memorandum of Intent be agreed.

39. Financial Savings of Joint Working

A report was submitted which set out the past and likely future salary and non-salary costs of LDF joint working to reveal the savings that had and could be made through collaboration.

The group was informed that significant savings had already been made over the last two years or so of joint working in terms of non-salary costs. More recently savings had been made in respect of salary costs although it was more difficult to attribute all these to joint working as there were wider efficiencies as well. In addition the professional, administrative and accommodation support received from the County Council in the last 12 months was in effect a further saving. All of these savings could be projected into the future to cover the

three year LDF forward programme and the closer the authorities work together the greater the savings were likely to be.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

40. Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

A report was presented which summarised the content of the March 2009 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) for Central Lancashire.

SHLAAs were required by government and were a key part of the evidence base for Local Development Frameworks (LDFs), particularly for informing the preparation of Site Allocations documents. Central Lancashire authorities had just completed a joint SHLAA which concluded that a five-year supply of deliverable housing could be identified across Central Lancashire as a whole, but that there was a shortfall of deliverable housing land in Preston City. In the longer term a significant number of potential housing sites were identified, but a significant proportion of these sites were on greenfield land and would need to be assessed via the LDF process if they were to be utilised for housing. In the longer term there was a need for more brownfield housing development land in all three authorities, to meet the Regional Spatial Strategy target of 70% of new housing to be developed on brownfield land.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

41. Draft Strategic Housing Market Assessment

A report was presented which informed members of the findings of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.

Mr Jackson indicated that this was still a draft report. He added that the assessment was a required part of the evidence base which was mainly aimed at revealing the need for affordable housing but also to consider wider housing demand issues. Using a households survey and secondary data the study was a comprehensive analysis of recent trends, current and future needs with recommendations that take account of economic viability issues. However it was difficult in these changing times to predict the future with any certainty and it was likely that consultants would need to be retained for a while to map how the market performs in the next year or so.

Councillor Ogilvie indicated that South Ribble already had an affordable housing provision of 20% and that it was important that councils did not agree to a provision that was against their own policies or was not achievable.

Mr Dalton stated that it was more about place shaping as development in some areas was restricted by their boundaries. Mrs Meek agreed in that Chorley members were torn between providing affordable housing and protecting greenbelt and rural settlements.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

42. Affordable Housing Scrutiny Outcomes

The committee received a report which advised JAC members of the work which was being undertaken by the joint scrutiny group set up by Chorley Borough Council, Preston City Council and South Ribble Borough Council.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

43. Community Survey

A report was presented which informed members of the purpose of the Community Survey.

The community survey had been produced in order to gather further evidence to feed into the Site Allocations Development Plan Document work. The survey aimed to gather suggestions for potential uses, or protection of specific areas of land across the three districts. The survey would be distributed to Local Development Framework consultees as well as wider members of the community through citizens' panels and the Central Lancashire website. The results of the survey would complement the site suggestions that had been received since the 'call for sites' in 2007 and it was hoped that suggestions for a wide variety of land uses would be received.

Councillor Malpas suggested that the form should be more concise and if possible fit onto one side of paper.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted and that attempts be made to make the form more concise.

44. Core Strategy – Delivery Supplement

A report was submitted which presented the content of the Delivery Supplement and explained the reasoning behind it.

The Delivery Supplement would partially replace and add to the Preferred Core Strategy. The content related to some of the representations made in the consultation process, but it was not the full response to them. This would come after consideration of the comments made on the Supplement. The document commences with a presentation of the spatial planning issues facing Central Lancashire and how this helps to introduce the Vision, which has been amended, but also helps to remind the reader what else is dealt with in the whole Strategy.

The Supplement focuses on housing because of the particular delivery issues and because of the new evidence done on housing land availability and housing needs. This work postdates the Growth Point submission and underlines what a changing situation there is. Growth expectations may have to be scaled back and/or alternative courses of action contemplated. Examples of this type of flexibility were put forward as possibilities to be consulted on along with the risks involved with such courses of action.

The Supplement also takes into account further work on strategic site options and proposes some changes in the Preferred Spatial Option – that for Locating Growth and Investment. This gives greater recognition of, and attempts to take in account, cross boundary issues.

The committee discussed the content of the draft delivery supplement document at length and focused on strategic sites and locations.

Whilst reservations were expressed, it was left for individual councils to discuss.

RESOLVED: (i) That the report be noted.
 (ii) That individual councils decide whether to forward the document to Cabinet to be approved for consultation and engagement purposes.

..... (Chairman)
 (The meeting finished at 7.25pm)



Report of	Meeting	Date
Joint LDF Officer Team	Central Lancashire LDF Joint Advisory Committee	6 July 2009

THE NORTHERN WAY RESIDENTIAL FUTURES RESEARCH: CENTRAL LANCASHIRE CITY REGION

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1. To set out the findings of the Northern Way Residential Futures Research for the Central Lancashire City Region, in particular the typologies relevant to the Central Lancashire Core Strategy.

RECOMMENDATION

2. That Members note the key findings of the research.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE REPORT

3. The Residential Futures report on the Central Lancashire City Region is one of a series of eight produced by Tribal's Urban Studio team, as part of a commission for the Northern Way. The research programme explores the linkages between housing and economic competitiveness and outlines a suggested policy agenda for the next decade, which aims to ensure that the North develops the right housing offer to meet the needs of an evolving economy.
4. The Central Lancashire City Region report relates to the whole of the Lancashire sub-region and the research findings will ultimately inform the emerging Lancashire Integrated Strategy and Lancashire Housing Strategy. The research looks closely at the role and function of five different 'typologies' of place within Lancashire and the role that each locality may be able to play in the future. The five selected localities are:
 - Leyland, South Ribble – a mid-market area with a good standard of suburban housing performing adequately well in the housing market, with a better quality and range than many urban areas.
 - Fishwick, Preston – an example of a locality in which the general structure exists and can be considered adequate, but with issues which may be holding back potential, such as poor quality public realm and inadequate shops or underachieving schools.
 - South West Burnley – an example of a strategically significant regeneration area of sufficient size and strategic importance that its role and function needs to be considered in a wider city-region context.

- Mereside, Blackpool – an example of a municipally built housing estate which offers many of the attributes of suburban living, but may be underperforming or stigmatised.
 - Lytham St. Annes – a location popular with the retiree market - an area of particular interest to the Central Lancashire City Region but where there is limited knowledge about the contribution it is making at the city-regional level.
5. This report concentrates on the findings related to the two typologies relevant to the Central Lancashire Core Strategy, namely Leyland and Fishwick. However, it also alerts members to the findings related to South West Burnley, as future policy directions suggested by the research findings relate the potential future of this particular location to the future economic potential of Central Lancashire.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

(If the recommendation is accepted)

6. To allow Members to note the findings of the Northern Way Residential Futures Research for the Central Lancashire City Region and its implications for future policy direction in the Central Lancashire area.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

7. None considered.

BACKGROUND

8. Tribal consultants' Urban Studio Team was commissioned by the Northern Way to assess the residential offer within the Central Lancashire City region and how it relates to quality of place and economic competitiveness. Their report is the latest in a series of reports already completed for other Northern City Regions.
9. The report assesses five defined areas within Lancashire, each representative of a particular residential 'typology'. The typologies are the same as those adopted in the research studies undertaken for the other Northern City Regions. The five specific localities and their respective typologies are:
- Locality 1: South West Burnley – an example of a Housing Market Renewal Area (HMRA), which looks at the balance between renewal and planning for economic opportunity.
 - Locality 2: Mereside, Blackpool – an example of typical residential development in Blackpool, that seeks to assess the role of the residential offer in delivering key economic and regeneration objectives for Blackpool.
 - Locality 3: Fishwick, Preston – an example of the housing offer in inner Preston, looking at the opportunities for linking residential offer with the dynamic growth planned for the Preston economy.
 - Locality 4: Leyland, South Ribble – an example of the housing offer in a currently stable suburban area and asking what it should do to remain competitive.

- Locality 5: Lytham St Annes – typifying the housing offer in coastal Lancashire and asking how influential specific sectors, such as the retirement community, are to the housing market.
10. Using these five localities and their respective typologies as examples of the current housing offer in Lancashire, the research looks at where we are now, how the housing offer could evolve over time and who would need to deliver certain aspects for that to happen. The rationale for the report is to test this methodology, developed as part of the residential futures research, and look at the extent to which the findings might begin to act as an interface between the sub-regional policy tier and the emerging Single Integrated Strategy.

RESEARCH FINDINGS RELATING TO THE TYPOLOGIES RELEVANT TO CENTRAL LANCASHIRE

Locality type 3: Fishwick, Preston

11. The definition of locality type 3 areas is 'mixed or transitional areas'. Fishwick, (in particular the area known as 'Inner East Preston') is typical of a neighbourhood in which the general fabric is adequate, yet many issues are holding back its potential, such as access to good schools and the poor quality of the public realm and local shops.
12. The performance of Fishwick against the report's identified liveability indicators is mixed. The quality of the local environment and the provision of open space could be improved to make the area a more attractive place to live. The report considers that the incidence of crime and antisocial incidents related to Ribbleton Park and other open space are negative liveability indicators. However, the availability of regular public transport is an advantage to the residential offer.
13. The report identifies key issues that have an impact on quality of place in this locality. On the positive side, New Hall Lane provides a strong spine around which other development can be focussed. The Victorian terraces provide a template for future development and accessible and well designed local space is available at Ribbleton Park. However the homogeneity creates a monotonous townscape character, heavy traffic along New Hall Lane creates a disjunction between the north and south areas and the quality of the public realm is poor.
14. The report questions what opportunities are present for the residential offer in Fishwick. With simple or low cost interventions its potential can be realised and Fishwick could soon play a more prominent role in the housing market. There is also the opportunity to create a defined residential offer in Fishwick, to link into economic growth sectors that Preston has identified within the City Centre, such as knowledge driven industries. There could be residential opportunities for first time buyers and graduates working in these industries, as well as young families and management employees working in the City Centre. Improvements to the nearby park and local centre would increase the quality of place and residential offer.
15. The report identifies a number of ways to implement change in Fishwick, including a Neighbourhood Master Plan, improving the quality of rented accommodation, tenure management, public realm improvements, skills development, open space improvements and identification of infill development opportunities. This would be

largely implemented by the local authority, RSLs, HCA, neighbourhood and development partnerships.

An example of locality type 4: Leyland, South Ribble

16. The definition of locality type 4 areas are those areas perceived as being mid-market housing areas, but that cannot yet be considered as aspirational or real areas of choice in relation to the City Region housing market.
17. The performance of Leyland against liveability indicators is relatively positive. The quality of public transport is one of the area's strongest assets, alongside low levels of crime. Parks and open space provision is limited and is, perhaps, one improvement that could be made. The local environment, public realm and Leyland town centre could also be improved to a higher standard.
18. The report identifies key issues that have an impact on quality of place in this locality. On the positive side, the housing stock is of good quality and within close proximity to the town centre, rail station, local centres, schools and other facilities. However there is considered to be an over-provision of detached family homes, resulting in an unremarkable townscape and the public realm is described as 'bland'.
19. The report raises the question – what has put this generally well performing area under threat? It lists three possibilities: a significant number of planning applications in South Ribble, demographic change and economic changes. It recommends a process of monitoring and research to identify what may be under threat in market terms, focusing on demographic issues and considering supply and macro-economic conditions. It is noted that the implementation of this should be at the sub-regional level, i.e. the Central Lancashire LDF could adopt this area as a locality type when monitoring the Central Lancashire economy and housing market.

RESEARCH FINDINGS RELATING TO A TYPOLOGY THAT COULD HAVE IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE POLICY DIRECTIONS IN CENTRAL LANCASHIRE

An example of locality type 1: South West Burnley

20. This locality is typical of the Elevate Pathfinder HMRA in Pennine East Lancashire. Burnley Borough Council has produced an Area Action Plan (AAP) for the area, which is located on the south western edge of Burnley town centre, with the M65 and Blackburn to Colne railway line to the north. Residential estates, including a 1960s council estate, are clustered around a large area of underused open space.
21. The report identifies key issues that have an impact on quality of place in this locality. On the positive side, the area has a good local centre and the natural topography creates an interesting townscape. However, the council estates constitute a poor environment and serve to fragment the urban structure. The open space is poorly laid out and the public realm is poor with little in the way of amenity, such as tree planning and children's play space.
22. The report questions what the residential offer in South West Burnley could be in the future and what contribution it could make to quality of place within the wider sub-region. They suggest that, for the area to provide a sustainable housing offer and for it to be competitive within Pennine Lancashire, the area should concentrate on providing a combination of mid-market family housing, together with limited high

quality family housing. It should concentrate on owner-occupier housing, whilst encouraging those in social-rented housing to enter into owner-occupier. Good local schools and easy access to the M65 and rail line provide a strategic advantage in quality of place terms.

23. With regard to the area's role in the wider Lancashire sub-region, the report considers that South West Burnley (and other similar areas within Pennine Lancashire) has a role to play in both underpinning the Pennine Lancashire sub-area's economic objectives, as well as those of the wider Lancashire sub-region. It considers the locality is a place which can achieve regeneration objectives, whilst responding to the needs of an economy which is improving the value of jobs within manufacturing and advanced manufacturing. It considers it also has a wider role as being competitive for workers in higher knowledge sectors in Burnley town centre and Central Lancashire, particularly Preston city centre. Its function could be retaining young families or 'second movers', who may have opted to move to other areas with a better residential offer but less value for money, for example the more rural areas of Ribble Valley, Colne and Chorley.
24. In terms of implementation, South West Burnley is the subject of an Area Action Plan which will be implemented by the local authority. However, the range of partners involved in delivery may need to be widened to include bodies such as the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA). There may be some areas within the Elevate HMRA, of which South West Burnley may be one, which present greater strategic opportunities and potential than other areas. These areas could be prioritised for more comprehensive regeneration and a focus on funding. Improving the residential offer in places such as Burnley is important, as simply using HMR mechanisms may not achieve the changes needed for the area to be sustainable in the economy of the wider Lancashire sub-region over the next 20 years or so.

CONCLUSIONS

25. The report concludes by asking what actions can be taken at the Lancashire level to take the findings forward.
26. It suggests that, in Pennine Lancashire, certain areas which are subject to HMRA focus or local authority level planning could be linked to the more dynamic parts of Lancashire and should have the opportunity and potential to deliver residential opportunities to support economic growth, as well as market renewal.
27. Within Central Lancashire, the report suggests identifying areas close to Preston's dynamic centre, such as Inner East Preston, where the residential offer can link directly into growth sectors (the knowledge economy) and sections of the population where residential offer matters more (e.g. recent graduates who may be considering returning to the City Region). In these areas, and areas where there is real opportunity to link residential offer to economic growth, strategies leading to a carefully considered 'business case' could help to leverage funding from agencies such as the HCA.
28. The report also suggests that there is a need for more detailed understanding of the currently stable but ageing suburban markets across the City Region, particularly focused in Leyland, South Ribble and Chorley. Although stable now, a greater understanding of the population who live there, and what effect the supply of a potentially competing offer nearby, could have in the future.

TAKING THE RESEARCH FORWARD

- 29. The way Lancashire as a whole functions matters when addressing the residential offer and its importance in delivering quality of place and economic growth. The residential offer varies across and within the sub-areas of Lancashire, as demonstrated in this research.
- 30. The report suggests that in some areas the residential offer should be aligned with more local economic and regeneration initiatives. This is particularly the case in areas such as Blackpool and parts of Pennine Lancashire. However, the report suggests that there may also be opportunities for a small part of the residential offer in these areas to link into wider City Region growth opportunities. They may have specific strategic advantages which could allow them to tap into more dynamic labour markets outside their immediate sphere of influence.
- 31. In other areas there are more obvious opportunities for the residential offer to link directly into identified growth areas. This is particularly the case in parts of Inner East Preston, Leyland, Blackpool and the Fylde coast.
- 32. The report suggests ways that the research recommendations could be implemented, particularly seeking to lever in funding from the HCA, as well as HMRA funds. The Growth Point provides a further opportunity to lever funds by way of Growth Fund and Community Infrastructure Fund. The Community Infrastructure Levy on private developers, if the local authorities decide to implement the policy in their areas, provides a further opportunity.
- 33. The findings of this research will add to the evidence base underpinning the Lancashire Integrated Strategy. They illustrate the need to ‘marry opportunity and need’ within Lancashire – a key development principle put forward in the RSS. This principle should be the driver behind Lancashire wide housing policy – a combination of supporting economic growth where realistic opportunities exist, such as Central Lancashire, whilst at the same time supporting regeneration objectives within the HMRA areas and areas in need of regeneration.

Background papers to this report.

The Northern Way Residential Futures: Central Lancashire City Region – Tribal –
 March 2009

Report Author	Tel	Email	Doc ID
Janet McDonald	01772 534160	Janet...mcdonald2@lancashire.gov.uk	JAC Report July 09 Northern Way Residential Futures report



Report of	Meeting	Date
Joint LDF Officer Team	Central Lancashire LDF Joint Advisory Committee	6 July 2009

CONSULTATION ON NEW PLANNING POLICY STATEMENT 4: PLANNING FOR PROSPEROUS ECONOMIES

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To outline Planning Policy Statement 4: Planning for Prosperous Economies (PPS4) as set out in the consultation paper published in May 2009.

RECOMMENDATION

2. To note the contents of the report and support a consultation response being sent to the Department Communities and Local Government as proposed.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. The draft PPS proposes to combine and replace existing national policy statements with a single document which is a move away from the previous practice of producing individual planning policy statements. The document has been given added emphasis due to the recession and in reflection of this it promotes policies capable of implementation in changing economic circumstances. There is an expectation that a comprehensive evidence base will enable local authorities to respond in this way although producing plans for different scenarios is difficult as clarity and direction can be undermined by uncertainty.

BACKGROUND

4. A new draft Planning Policy Statement on sustainable economic development was published in December 2007 to replace Planning Policy Guidance 4, and proposed changes to Planning Policy Statement 6 in July 2008.
5. Neither of these sets of alterations were finalised and in effect are replaced by the new combined draft.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

6. To make members aware of the draft PPS.
-

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

7. To not report the draft PPS to members.

INTRODUCTION

8. The comprehensive new draft Planning Policy Statement brings together in one place all of the Government's key planning policies relating to the economy. The draft aims to create a streamlined, coherent set of policies designed to meet the economic challenges faced both today and in the longer term.
9. The consultation paper draws on recommendations made in the Taylor review of Rural Economy and Affordable Housing and on the Planning White Paper; Planning for a Sustainable future. It should also be taken into account with the Sub-National Review of Economic Development and Regeneration, which brings together, at regional level, economic and spatial planning.
10. The draft Planning Policy Statement proposes to replace Planning Policy Guidance 4: Industrial, Commercial Development and Small Firms (PPG4, 1992), Planning Policy Guidance 5: Simplified Planning Zones (PPG5, 1992), Planning Policy Statement 6: Planning for Town Centres (PPS6, 2005), as well as parts of Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas (PPS7, 2004) and Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport.
11. The policies set out in the draft PPS should be taken into account by regional planning bodies in the preparation of revisions to Regional Spatial Strategies, and by local planning authorities in the preparation of Local Development Frameworks. In considering proposals for development, before development plans can be reviewed to reflect this Planning Policy Statement, local planning authorities should have regard to the policies in this draft PPS as material considerations which may supersede the relevant policies in development plans.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

12. In the draft PPS, economic development includes development within the B Use Classes (offices, research and development, light industry, general industry, storage or distribution), town centre uses and other development which meets at least one of the following objectives;
 - Employment opportunities
 - Generates wealth or produces or generates an economic output or product.
13. The draft PPS confirms that housing can be regarded as a form of economic activity although it does draw attention to Planning Policy Statement 3 as the primary source of policy advice for the housing sector.
14. The main uses to which the town centre policies in the draft PPS apply are;
 - Retail (including warehouse clubs and factory outlet centres)
 - Leisure, entertainment facilities, sport and recreation uses (including cinemas, restaurants, drive-through restaurants, bars and pubs, night-clubs, casinos, health and fitness centres, indoor bowling centres, and bingo halls)
 - Offices
 - Arts, culture and tourism (theatres, museums, galleries and concert halls, hotels and conference facilities)

15. For the purpose of the draft PPS all references to town centres refer to all types of centres identified in development plans, out-of-centre developments do not constitute town centres for the purpose of the statement.

PROPOSED PLANNING POLICIES

16. The draft PPS has a large number of proposed policies separated under two headings, plan-making and decision-making. There are eleven main draft plan-making policies and thirteen draft decision making policies. Each of the policy headings contains a number of sub-policies within them. Each draft policy is briefly outlined below and commented on.

Plan Making Policies

Policy EC1- Using evidence to plan positively

17. Regional planning bodies and local planning authorities should work together (and with county authorities in preparing Local Economic Assessments) to prepare and maintain a robust evidence base on existing business needs and likely changes in the market. The evidence base applies both locally and regionally, and should include assessments of demand for retail, leisure, and office use. The evidence base should underpin development plan policies which support sustainable economic development in both rural and urban areas allowing a quick response to changing economic circumstances to inform decisions on planning applications. The evidence gathered both regionally and locally needs to be proportionate to the scale of the issue.

Comment: Enabling a quick response to the changing economic circumstances is good in theory but in practice even with a comprehensive evidence base given the length of time it takes to implement changes a quick response may not work as well as it is envisaged.

Policy EC2- Regional planning for prosperous economies

18. Regional planning bodies should encourage sustainable economic growth, in line with the principles of sustainable development based on a clear economic vision for the region; they should support existing business sectors and make provision, as necessary, for the location, expansion and promotion of clusters or networks of knowledge driven industry, identify and plan for new or emerging sectors likely to locate in the region, but maintain flexibility in their policies on the supply and use of land to accommodate sectors not anticipated in the plan.
19. Regional Spatial Strategies should set out policies to disaggregate minimum employment land targets down to district level and identify sub-regional priority areas with high levels of deprivation to be prioritised for regeneration investment as well as setting a criteria to identify locations of strategic sites, identify, protect and promote key distribution networks and plan for the delivery of sustainable transport and other infrastructure.

Comment: Disaggregating minimum employment land provision targets down to district level will allow local authorities to plan better knowing their own specific targets for the area. Setting criteria to identify locations of strategic sites would be a beneficial and would speed up the process of selecting suitable sites.

Policy EC3- Regional planning for town centres

20. Regional planning bodies should, through Regional Spatial Strategies, set out a spatial vision and strategy for the management and growth of centres in their region, which should include definitions of relationships between centres and of roles within a spatial hierarchy; the role and function of centres should be generated through the regional spatial strategy rather than through planning applications and must ensure the town centre policies are flexible and able to respond to changing economic circumstances and must recognise that town centre networks and hierarchies will change over time.

Comment: Flexible town centre policies in theory are a good concept but in practice it may not be possible to implement a flexible policy to cover all possible economic circumstances. There may be a danger of having too much flexibility in policies which in turn may not be specific enough to address to the issue.

Policy EC4- Local planning approach to economic development

21. Local planning authorities through Local Development Frameworks should positively and proactively encourage sustainable economic growth in both urban and rural areas, in line with the principles of sustainable development, based on a clear and proactive locally specific economic vision and strategy. This includes giving support to existing business sectors, taking account of the location, expansion, and promotion of clusters or networks of knowledge driven industry, encouraging new users for vacant or derelict buildings and promoting working from home or work/live units. In rural areas, the requirement should take account of the need to protect the countryside.

Comment: Taking account of the location, expansion and promotion of clusters or networks of knowledge driven industry will aid planning for economic development.

Policy EC5- Local planning approach to town centres

22. Local planning authorities, through their Local Development Frameworks, should in their Core Strategy, set out a spatial vision and strategy for the management and growth of the centres in their area over the plan period. As part of the vision local planning authorities should define a hierarchy of lower order centres (those not identified in the RSS) to meet the needs of their catchments and ensure that everyday needs are met locally. In areas where the centres are in decline local authorities need to strengthen these areas by seeking to focus a wider range of services, prompting diversification and improving the environment. Where appropriate in urban areas, encourage high-density development within the existing centres with good public transport, walking and cycling links.

Comment: Defining a hierarchy of lower order centres should enable local authorities to meet more needs locally within their areas.

Policy EC6- Local planning approach to planning for consumer choice and promoting competition for town centre development

23. Local planning authorities should proactively plan for consumer choice and promote competitive town centre environments by supporting the diversification of uses in the town centre as a whole, planning for a strong retail mix, allowing for the contribution that smaller shops can make to the character and vibrancy of a centre, and taking measures to conserve the established character of their town centres.

Comment: Planning for customer choice and allowing the contribution smaller retail units within town centres will, in theory at least, enable smaller businesses to thrive within centres adding to the vitality and viability of centres. However implementation of this may depend on refinements being made to the Use Classes Order.

Policy EC7- Site selection and land assembly for town centre uses

24. In selecting sites for development for town centre uses, local planning authorities should base their approach on the identified need for development, identify the appropriate scale of development, and apply the sequential approach to site selection. They should also give preference to those sites that best serve the needs of deprived areas when considered against alternative sites with similar location characteristics. Having selected sites for development, local planning authorities should allocate sufficient sites to meet the identified need for at least five years from the adoption of the development plan documents.

Comment: This policy switches the consideration of need from individual schemes in the current guidance to the development plan process. Identifying a need for development for at least five years for town centre uses should be flexible to take into account changing

economic circumstances as the town centre uses particularly suffer in downturns in the economy. However bearing in mind lead in times for large schemes and the medium term view of major retailers it is surprising the draft PPS does not specify a longer term projection of need even given the vagaries of the economy.

Policy EC8- Managing the evening and night-time economy in town centres

25. Local planning authorities should prepare planning policies to help manage the evening and night-time economy in appropriate centres, taking account of and complementing the local authority's Statement of Licensing Policy and the promotion of the licensing objectives under the Licensing Act 2003. They should ensure that there is a diverse range of complementary evening and night-time economy uses which appeal to a wide range of age and social groups and set out the number and scale of leisure developments they wish to encourage based on the potential impact.

Comment: This is a laudable aim but one that can be difficult to achieve in practice because it depends on a full range of businesses wanting to operate in an area.

Policy EC9- Local planning approach to rural areas

26. Economic development in open countryside away from existing settlements, or outside areas allocated for development in development plans, should be strictly controlled; most new development should continue to be located in or on the edge of existing settlements as this facilitates best use of existing infrastructure and delivers sustainable development. Subject to recognising the need to protect the countryside, the policies for economic development in this statement apply to rural areas as they do to urban areas. In addition, in rural areas, local planning authorities should set out the criteria to be applied to planning applications for farm diversification, and support diversification for business purposes that are consistent in their scale and environmental impact with their rural location.

Comment: This is largely established planning practice but with a welcome greater discretion in terms of farm diversification..

Policy EC10- Car parking for non-residential development

27. Local planning authorities should set maximum parking standards for non-residential development in their area ensuring alignment with the policies in the relevant transport plan. There should be no minimum standards for development, other than for parking for disabled people.

Comment: This is established planning practice.

Monitoring

Policy EC11- Monitoring

28. Regional planning bodies and local planning authorities should use their annual monitoring reports to keep under review the network and hierarchy of centres (at both the regional and local levels), the need for further development, and the vitality and viability of centres (at the local level). In order to measure the vitality and viability and monitor the health of town centres and how they change over time, local authorities should also regularly collect market information and economic data.

Comment: This is largely established planning practice.

Decision Making PoliciesPolicy EC12- Planning applications for economic development

29. Local planning authorities should adopt a positive and constructive approach towards planning applications for economic development as defined for the purposes of the statement in both urban and rural areas and must not accept proposals which fail to secure a high quality and inclusive design or which fail to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the areas and the way it functions.

Comment: This is established planning practice.

Policy EC13- Village and local centre shops and services

30. Local planning authorities should seek to protect and strengthen village and local centre shops, services and other important small scale economic uses (including post offices, rural petrol stations, village and church halls and rural public houses). They must ensure the importance of shops and services to the local community is taken into account and respond positively to proposals for the conversion and extension of shops which are designed to improve their vitality.

Comment: This is established planning practice but by itself does not prevent local services from declining..

Policy EC14- Local development frameworks: re-use or replacement of buildings in the countryside

31. Local planning authorities should support the conversion and re-use of appropriately located and suitably constructed existing buildings in the countryside, particularly those adjacent or closely related to towns or villages, for economic development.

Comment: This is established planning practice.

Policy EC15- Local development frameworks: tourism in rural areas

32. To help deliver the government's tourism strategy, local planning authorities should support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit rural businesses, communities and visitors which utilise and enrich, rather than harm, the character of the countryside, its towns, villages, buildings and other features.

Comment: This is established planning practice.

Policy EC16- Nationally designated areas

33. Major developments should not take place in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), except in exceptional circumstances. Major development proposals should be demonstrated to be in the public interest before being allowed to proceed.

Comment: This is established planning practice.

Policy EC17- Application of car parking standards for non-residential development

34. In most circumstances, local parking standards should apply to individual development proposals.

Comment: Regional standards are being developed in the North West.

Policy EC18- Supporting evidence for planning applications for main town centre uses

35. Sequential and impact assessments should accompany a planning application for a main town centre use which is not in an existing centre nor allocated in an up-to-date development plan.

Comment: This is established planning practice.

Policy EC19- The consideration of sequential assessments for planning applications for town centre uses

36. In considering sequential assessments, local planning authorities should ensure that all in-centre options have been thoroughly assessed before less central sites are considered in line with Policy EC18 of this draft PPS.

Comment: This is established planning practice.

Policy EC20- The impact assessment for planning applications for town centre uses not in accordance with the development plan

37. In taking account of evidence in the impact assessment, local planning authorities should consider whether the assessment sets out clear conclusions on all town centre and wider impacts; assessments should focus in particular on the first 5 years after the implementation of a proposal.

Comment: This is sensible advice.

Policy EC21- The consideration of planning applications for development for town centre uses not in a centre nor allocated in an up to date development plan

38. Local planning authorities should refuse planning permission where the applicant has not demonstrated compliance with the the sequential approach, where there is clear evidence that the proposal could lead to significant adverse climate change impacts, but should consider proposals favourably where any adverse impacts are not significant and these are likely to be outweighed by significant wider economic, social and environmental benefits.

Comment: This is a balanced approach.

Policy EC22- The consideration of applications for extensions to existing town centre development in edge-of-centre and out-of-centre locations

39. Local authorities should give the impact on existing town centres particular weight, especially if new and additional classes of goods or services for sale are proposed, and should only apply the sequential approach where the gross floor space of the proposed extension exceeds 200 square metres.

Comment: This is established planning practice.

Policy EC23- The consideration of applications for ancillary retail and office uses

40. Where shops are proposed as an ancillary element to other forms of development (for example, petrol filling stations), local planning authorities should ensure that the retail element is limited in scale and genuinely ancillary to the main development, and should seek to control this through the use of conditions (see 24 below), but where office development is ancillary to other forms of economic development not located in the town centre there should be no requirement for such offices to be located in the town centre.

Comment: This is established planning practice

Policy EC24- The effective use of conditions for town centre uses

41. Local planning authorities should use planning conditions to secure the provision of units suitable for smaller business, by specifying the maximum size of units and to resolve issues relating to the impact of the development on traffic and the amenity of neighbouring residents.

Comment: This is established planning practice but has not been set in national policy before.

CONCLUSION

42. The draft PPS proposes to combine and replace existing national policy statements with a single document which is a move away from the previous practice of producing individual planning policy statements. The document has been given added emphasis due to the recession and in reflection of this it promotes policies capable of implementation in changing economic circumstances. There is an expectation that a comprehensive evidence base will enable local authorities to respond in this way although producing plans for different scenarios is difficult as clarity and direction can be undermined by uncertainty.

43. The draft polices promise a less restrictive approach to economic development and a more flexible approach to change of use applications and applications within town centres. This in turn should lead to a reduction in planning applications being refused and appealed against.

44. In terms of out of centre retail development, the draft PPS proposes two tests, the sequential test (the same as PPS6) and an impact test. The impact test is much more wide ranging and includes new elements such as considering climate change and carbon emissions.

45. In terms of other applications not within centres, the evidence based approach allows a balancing off all issues including the economic benefits of a scheme. Where this results in a proposal being contrary to the development plan, local authorities need to consider whether the benefit of a scheme outweighs the policy and material weight could be added to any economic benefits.

46. The draft PPS poses a number of consultation questions, these and proposed responses are set in Appendix 1 attached.

There are no background papers to this report.

Report Author	Tel	Email	Doc ID
Rachael Hulme	01772 536776	Rachaelkay.hulme@lancashire.gov.uk	JAC Report July 09 – PPS4

PPS4 Consultation Questions

1. **Do you support the consolidation and streamlining of national policy on economic development into a single policy statement? What do you think are the costs and benefits of the approach?**

We support the consolidation and streamlining of national planning policy on economic development into a single policy statement. The single statement will enable local authorities to locate all guidance in one place with ease as apposed to the current system of having numerous policy statements/guidance notes which are sometimes contradictory.

2. **Does the draft statement include all that you understand to be policy from draft PPS4, PPG5, PPS6 and PPS7? If not, please be specific about what paragraphs in any of these documents you feel should be included in this document? Please can you explain why this should be the case?**

The draft statement includes everything from draft PPS4, PPG5, PPS and PPG7 as far as we understand to be policy although the previous format did not clearly distinguish policy references. Two omissions to the draft PPS which, would have been helpful, would be guidance relating to home working and live/work units. These can also have a significant impact on the economy. There also doesn't appear to be much said about offices. Offices are listed as a town centre uses but there isn't much guidance giving them encouragement in town centres and resisting them out-of-town.

3. **Other than where specifically highlighted, the process of streamlining policy text previously in draft PPS4, PPS6 and PPS7 to focus on policy rather than guidance is not intended to result in a change in policy. Are there any policies, which you feel have changed in this process? Please tell us what you think has changed and provide alternative wording that addresses your concerns.**

No major changes to policy are evident. Our understanding is that retail need is now intended to be dealt with at the development plan level.

4. **Does the structure of the draft statement make it easier to understand what is required at different stages in the planning process? Are there any improvements you would like to see made?**

Yes the structure split into plan making and decision making policies makes the document easy to navigate round.

5. **Do you think the restructuring of the impact test from the consultation draft of PPS6 achieves the right balance and is it robust enough to thoroughly test the positive and negative impacts of development outside town centres?**

The impact test seems to be robust enough to achieve the right balance.

6. **Should more be done to give priority in forward planning and development management to strategically important sectors such as those that support a move to a low carbon economy, and if so, what should this be?**

It is understood that the Government intends that climate change policy (PPS1) and renewable energy (PPS22) guidance is to be combined this should help with the example cited.

7. **Is the approach to the determination of planning applications set out in policy EC21 proportionate?**

Yes

8. **Do you think the requirement for regional spatial strategies to set targets for employment land targets for each district in their area should be imposed? Please give reasons for your view.**

Employment land targets for each district set out by regional spatial strategies should be imposed as currently it is very difficult for local authorities to be accurate on the amount of employment land allocated when preparing core strategies and other associated documents. We would welcome further guidance from CLG on how this regional target setting process is to be implemented; the criteria to be used; and the opportunity for district consultation.

9. **Do you agree the policies do enough to protect small or rural shops and services, including public houses? If no, please explain what changes you would like to see.**

The policies in the draft PPS aims to protect local services well but obviously it can't prevent such outlets closing and once that occurs there is inevitable pressure on LPAs to approve a change of use.

10. **In response to Matthew Taylor, we have altered the approach to issues such as farm diversification. What do you consider are the pros and cons of this approach?**

The approach proposed gives more discretion to LPAs which is helpful in taking account of local circumstances but the disadvantage of this is that inconsistent approaches to farm diversification could arise in neighbouring authorities and this lead to conflicts with applicants.

11. **Do you think that the proposals in this draft PPS will have a differential impact, either positive or negative, on people, because of their gender, race or disability? If so how in your view should we respond? We particularly welcome the views of organisations and individuals with specific expertise in these areas.**

We consider the draft PPS does not have a differential impact on people due to gender, race or disability.