



Date: 8 March 2011  
Your reference :  
Our reference : LAS/JG/LT  
Ask for : Julie Grundy

Member Services  
Governance Directorate  
Town Hall  
Lancaster Road  
Preston PR1 2RL  
[www.preston.gov.uk](http://www.preston.gov.uk)  
tel. 01772 906112  
fax. 01772 906126  
[j.grundy@preston.gov.uk](mailto:j.grundy@preston.gov.uk)

To: Members and Substitutes of  
The Central Lancashire Local Development Framework Joint Advisory  
Committee  
cc Four Chief Officers and LDF Joint Team  
Dear Sir/Madam

Central Lancashire Local Development Framework Committee - 15 March 2011  
Joint Advisory

The next meeting of the Central Lancashire Local Development Framework Joint Advisory Committee is to be held on Tuesday, 15th March, 2011 at the Town Hall, Preston, commencing at 5.30 pm.

The Agenda and accompanying reports for consideration at the meeting are enclosed.

The agenda papers are being sent to both appointed and substitute Members. Any appointed Member who cannot attend on Tuesday, 15th March, 2011 is asked to first contact their substitute to see if he or she can attend instead. Then please contact Julie Grundy on 01772 906112 or via email ([j.grundy@preston.gov.uk](mailto:j.grundy@preston.gov.uk)) to give apologies and indicate whether the substitute will be attending.

Yours faithfully  
Julie Grundy  
Head of Member Services

## AGENDA

1. **Appointment of Chair for the Meeting**
2. **Welcome by Chair and Introductions**
3. **Apologies for absence**
4. **Minutes of last meeting (Pages 1 - 6)**

Minutes of the last meeting held on 30 November 2010 are attached.

5. **Publication Core Strategy - Representations Received and Main Issues for Examination (Pages 7 - 30)**

Report enclosed.

6. **Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document - Overview of Issues and Options Engagement and Representations (Pages 31 - 34)**

Report enclosed.

7. **Community Infrastructure Levy (Pages 35 - 40)**

Report enclosed.

8. **Local Development Scheme (Pages 41 - 70)**

Report enclosed.

9. **Dates of Future Meetings**

The next scheduled meetings of this Committee are as follows:-

Thursday 9 June 2011 at 5.30pm at South Ribble Borough Council

Thursday 1 September 2011 at 5.30pm at Chorley Borough Council

Thursday 8 November 2011 at 5.30pm at Preston City Council (Provisional)

Monday 30 January 2012 at 5.30pm at South Ribble Borough Council

Thursday 15 March 2012 at 5.30pm at Chorley Borough Council

## Central Lancashire Local Development Framework Joint Advisory Committee

**Tuesday, 30 November 2010**

**Present:**

Councillor J C Hughes MBE (South Ribble Council) (Chair)  
Councillors Harold Heaton, Peter Malpas, Roy Lees, Neil Cartwright, Danny Gallagher and J C Hughes MBE, Carl Crompton (Substitute Member) (Preston City Council)  
County Councillor Michael Green (Lancashire County Council)

**Also in attendance:**

Julian Jackson (Central Lancashire LDF Team Co-ordinator)  
David Porter and Christina Taylor (LDF Central Lancashire Team)  
Lesley-Ann Fenton (Director of Partnerships, Planning and Policy), Jennifer Moore (Head of Planning Services) and Peter McAnespie (Policy and Design Manager) (Chorley Council)  
Chris Hayward (Assistant Director/Chief Planning Officer) and Mike Molyneux (Planning Policy Manager) (Preston City Council)  
John Dalton (Director of Planning and Housing), Helen Hockenhall (Planning Manager) and Mike Eastham (Forward Planning Team Leader) (South Ribble Council)  
Marcus Hudson (Head of Planning) (Lancashire County Council)

### **10.CCS.01 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR FOR THE MEETING**

**RESOLVED – That Councillor J C Hughes MBE of South Ribble Council be appointed to act as Chair for the meeting.**

### **10.CCS.02 WELCOME BY CHAIR**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting of the Central Lancashire LDF Joint Advisory Committee held at South Ribble Council's Civic Centre, Leyland.

### **10.CCS.03 MINUTES OF LAST MEETING**

The minutes of the last meeting of the Central Lancashire LDF Joint Advisory Committee held on 21 September 2010 were confirmed as a correct record.

### **10.CCS.04 DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT PREPARATION PROGRAMME**

The Joint Advisory Committee received a draft programme showing the envisaged dates of the various stages leading to the formal adoption of both the Central Lancashire LDF Core Strategy and the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Documents, which were required to be published.

Julian Jackson reported that it was expected that the Core Strategy would be published on 8 December 2010 allowing a deposit period up to 31 January 2011. The Joint LDF Officer Team would need to prepare a report on the representations received during the deposit period for submission to the Government Inspector, in advance of the Examination Hearing. Following receipt of the Inspector's report, formal adoption of the Core Strategy was envisaged in November 2011.

The Site Allocations “Issues and Options” Discussion Papers had now been issued for public consultation purposes. Representations received during the consultation period up to January 2011 would be assessed and a preferred approach for sites and policies would be set out in the “Preferred Options” document to be produced in the summer of 2011. The process was expected to culminate in the formal adoption of the Documents in December 2012.

**RESOLVED – That the Document Preparation Programme, as now submitted, be approved for publication.**

#### **10.CCS.05 NOTIFICATION, PUBLICATION AND DEPOSIT ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CORE STRATEGY**

The Joint Advisory Committee received a report of the Joint LDF Officer Team which contained the purpose and processes involved in the publication and deposit arrangements for the Central Lancashire LDF Core Strategy. The Core Strategy was to be published in early December 2010 to allow formal representations to be made prior to its submission to a Government Inspector. The Strategy document had been produced in various digital and paper formats and would be available to view on-line, as well as in Council offices, libraries and rural post offices, along with other numerous supporting documents.

The deposit stage of the Core Strategy was being undertaken in conjunction with public consultation on the Site Allocations “Issues and Options” Discussion Papers, with an extended period up to 31 January 2011 being allowed for the receipt of representations.

**RESOLVED – That the report be noted.**

#### **10.CCS.06 CORE STRATEGY PERFORMANCE MONITORING FRAMEWORK**

The Joint LDF Officer Team presented a report seeking endorsement of the 13 identified indicators and targets proposed to be used to monitor the effective delivery of the Central Lancashire LDF Core Strategy.

The Core Strategy was to be delivered by a range of public, private and voluntary organisations working in partnership and application of the specific indicators would enable the authorities to monitor the effectiveness of the Strategy in achieving the desired actions and outcomes.

The report detailed each of the 13 key performance indicators and the respective targets to be monitored during the plan period of the Core Strategy, which had been chosen in line with Government guidance. The Core Strategy would be monitored annually to ensure that its policies were an effective reflection of changing national and local circumstances.

In answer to an Officer’s comment on the indicators and target to measure the sub-region’s skills base and economic inclusion standards, Julian Jackson confirmed that, whilst it would be appropriate for each of the three authorities to monitor performance in their own District, for the purposes of the Core Strategy, the regional average would be used as the target statistic.

**RESOLVED – That the indicators and targets to be used to monitor the delivery of the Central Lancashire LDF Core Strategy, as identified in the submitted report, be approved for adoption.**

**10.CCS.07 GENERAL UPDATE**

The Joint Advisory Committee received a report of the Joint LDF Officer Team on the current situation in respect of the evidence base required to inform the LDF work; the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule; and the Growth Point.

The report referred to (i) the opportunities that were being pursued to develop renewable energy initiatives through the use of a variety of technologies; and (ii) the securement of £30,000 from the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) to support studies to examine the prospects for the re-use of disused and under-used brownfield land across Central Lancashire authorities for assessment by consultants appointed by the HCA.

The report commented on the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule which identified the key infrastructure schemes likely to be required to support the residential and employment developments envisaged over the next 15 years to deliver the Core Strategy. Electricity North West Limited was assessing how increases in demand and capacity could be programmed and funded and the Water Cycle Study would provide information on water supply and waste water treatment requirements.

The report also clarified the allocation of the £4m awarded to the Central Lancashire and Blackpool Growth Point over the past two years, in addition to which £3.3m had been secured from the Community Infrastructure Fund to complement developer contributions for Buckshaw Railway Station. The prospect of future Growth Point funding nationally had been terminated, so bids for infrastructure funding and similar projects would need to be directed to other funding sources (eg the Regional Growth Fund) in future years.

**RESOLVED – That the report be noted.**

**10.CCS.08 STRATEGIC SITES AND LOCATIONS ASSESSMENT - UPDATE**

The Joint Advisory Committee considered a report of the Joint LDF Officer Team on the outcome of work to identify potential Strategic Sites and Strategic Locations for inclusion in the publication version of the Central Lancashire LDF Core Strategy.

Whilst both designations referred to spatially specific proposals, a Strategic Site contained a more precisely defined area of land and firmer development proposals than Strategic Locations and was expected to be developed more imminently.

A comprehensive assessment of 14 potential sites had been undertaken and, after taking account of the strategic importance of each site and other relevant factors, the following sites and locations had been put forward for inclusion in the Publication Core Strategy in line with the recommendations of the assessment:

Strategic Sites:

- Buckshaw Village;
- Cuerden;
- BAe Systems, Samlesbury

Strategic Locations:

- Central Preston – including the inter-related sites; Inner East Preston; the new central business district for Preston; and Tithebarn Regeneration Area;
- Cottam – including Cottam Hall and Brickworks.

The following sites were not considered strategically significant, but some were recommended for further consideration in the Site Allocations Development Plan Documents:

- Botany/Great Knowley;
- Former Whittingham Hospital Site;
- Broughton/Land at Eastway;
- Park Hall/Camelot;
- Higher Bartle;
- Pickering's Farm, Kingsfold;
- Moss Side Test Track.

An attached Assessment Background Topic Paper clarified the reasons for the selection of the proposed Strategic Sites and Strategic Locations and the revisions from the Preferred Core Strategy, together with justification for the omission of other sites from the suggested list.

Councillor Harold Heaton questioned whether the text relating to the potential development site at Park Hall/Camelot should be specific in stating that the site could accommodate between 500 – 1000 dwellings, with the implication that the figure could be interpreted as the minimum site capacity. It was agreed that the text should be amended to explain that even the lowest end of this dwelling number range was an aspiration on the part of the landowner and also to emphasise the uncertainty of delivering this site for development.

**RESOLVED – (1) That the report be noted.**

**(2) That the document text in relation to the potential development site at Park Hall/Camelot, Charnock Richard be amended to explain that a dwellings capacity figure in excess of 500 was an aspiration of the landowners and that. In any event, the overall delivery of the site was uncertain.**

## **10.CCS.09 REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY - REVOCATION UPDATE**

The Joint LDF Officer Team submitted a report on the implications, particularly in relation to the Core Strategy, of the recent successful High Court challenge of Cala Homes to the Government's announcement to abolish Regional Spatial Strategies. The Government did, however, intend to pursue its intention to abolish Regional Spatial Strategies through the enactment of the new Localism Bill. Members received a verbal update on the latest position with the High Court action at the meeting.

The proposal would have short term implications for the determination of planning applications, but it was not envisaged that any revocation of the North West Regional Spatial Strategy would have a significant impact on the Core Strategy.

The Central Lancashire authorities had agreed that, despite the current period of uncertainty, it was appropriate to proceed with the publication of the Core Strategy in the agreed form at this stage. It was expected that the situation would be clearer by the time of the Examination Hearing, predicted in early summer, 2011.

**RESOLVED – That the report be noted and that the previously agreed approach to the content of the Publication version of the Core Strategy be endorsed.**

**10.CCS.10 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

The Joint Advisory Committee noted that the next two Committee meetings were scheduled as follows:

Tuesday, 18 January 2011 at Chorley Council offices at 5.30pm;  
Tuesday, 15 March 2011 at Preston City Council offices at 5.30pm.

Chair

This page is intentionally left blank





Report of	Meeting	Date
Joint LDF Officer Team	Central Lancashire LDF Joint Advisory Committee	15 March 2011

## **PUBLICATION CORE STRATEGY – REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED AND MAIN ISSUES FOR EXAMINATION**

### **PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. To advise Members of the number and scope of representations made on the Publication Core Strategy, and to draw out the main issues raised.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

2. Members are asked to note the contents of this report, and endorse that the Core Strategy is submitted for examination as the District Councils have previously resolved to do.

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF REPORT**

3. This report summarises the representations made on the Publication version of the Core Strategy, including the key issues raised. The main challenges to the Core Strategy concern some aspects of the evidence base, and the soundness of some policies, including Policy 4 on housing delivery. The report explains the procedures required to ensure compliance with the regulations, in preparation for the Core Strategy examination later in the year.

### **REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION(S)**

**(If the recommendations are accepted)**

4. To ensure that work on the Core Strategy continues to the next stage, the examination.

### **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

5. None

### **BACKGROUND**

6. The Core Strategy was published on Wednesday 8<sup>th</sup> December 2010 and placed on deposit until Monday 31<sup>st</sup> January 2011. During the deposit period interested parties were invited to make representations on the soundness and legal compliance of the Core

Strategy, and on any matter contained in the document, its related background papers or other evidence. This report summarises the representations made.

## SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

7. A total of 120 representations were received by 31<sup>st</sup> January (and so were duly made, a few were received late and are not referred to in this report), and between them they raised over 415 separate matters in connection with some aspect of the Core Strategy. The most contentious matters for the examination are likely to relate to those where the representors consider the Core Strategy 'unsound'. This 'fit for purpose' aspect is fundamental to whether the document can be approved and finally adopted. It is the Inspector who will decide on soundness.
8. The precise intention of all representors concerning the matters raised requires more detailed analysis. It is important that we understand fully the intentions of those who have made representations because to be adopted the Strategy must be found sound by the Inspector at the forthcoming public examination.
9. Representations have been received from the following:
  - 4 from local elected Members
  - 3 from private utility companies
  - 5 from local authorities
  - 7 from government departments and agencies
  - 8 from parish councils
  - 9 from non-governmental organisations, national charities, pressure groups and regional organisations
  - 15 from house builders
  - 24 from individuals, of which:
    - 9 support the area of major open space at Ingol
    - 4 oppose the potential western extension of Longridge
    - 3 favour less development in Clayton-le-Woods, and 1 wants more
    - 2 in favour of recreational flying sites
    - 5 others
  - 45 from other land owners or organisations with commercial or development interests
10. Most of the detailed technical representations have been received from house builders, other land owners or organisations with commercial or development interests. Of the 60 representations received from these organisations, only 11 of them consider the Core Strategy to be sound. A full list of the duly made representations is attached at Appendix 1 with brief summaries of the points raised.
11. The main issues arising from the representations concern:
  - Policy 1: various aspects concerning where growth should be located in Central Lancashire, including the settlement hierarchy (65 references received).
  - Policy 4: housing delivery, especially focusing on the proposal to reduce house building requirements (44 references received).
  - Policies 2, 9, 10, and 11: representations on infrastructure, economic growth and employment, employment premises and retailing, many of which make the case for more flexibility and less onerous criteria.
  - The need for up to date and compete evidence for the Strategy, including in relation to Habitats Regulations Assessment, and an audit and assessment of open space, recreation and sports needs.

- Questioning whether the Core Strategy is right to delay or protect sites from development at locations including Ingol (area of major open space), Pickerings Farm, Higher Bartle and Camelot.
  - The role of Preston in respect of the Regional Spatial Strategy.
12. Of these, the most contentious issues are around Policy 4 concerning the amount of house building required in Central Lancashire over the next 15 years. The research approved at the time the District Councils resolved to publish the Core Strategy has found that the economic circumstances have significantly changed since the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) was prepared and were taken account of in the proposals of that plan. The research report demonstrates how these circumstances have affected recent housing delivery and how such a situation is likely to endure in the short term. This evidence therefore supports the precautionary approach of applying lower than RSS housing requirement figures at least over the 2010-2012 period.
  13. Members are reminded that the intention is to fully review the housing requirements in the Core Strategy after it is adopted. In the meantime further support for the approach to pursue housing requirements other than those in the (RSS) can be drawn from the latest position with the Cala Homes court action. The High Court has decided that the Secretary of State's intention to revoke regional strategies is a material consideration for planning decision makers. However Cala Homes have appealed to the Court of Appeal.
  14. A small number of the issues raised might be more appropriately considered as part of the site allocations work at the three councils, including matters connected with Safeguarded Land, recreational flying and the cited need for sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.
  15. Your Officers have considered what scope there is to propose changes to the Core Strategy so as to try to meet the concerns of some objectors. Some representations suggest such amendments, others are less precise. It is normal practice to try and agree minor un-contentious changes with objectors so as to reduce the matters in dispute. In the case of minor changes of a factual or clarification nature these can simply be made public and submitted to the Inspector for approval. More major changes that would significantly alter to approach in the Core Strategy would need to be first consulted on and this would delay submission. There are no issues arising from the representations about which Members will be asked to approve such significant changes.
  16. It is therefore not proposed to pursue anything other than minor changes but some of these may relate to major issues – such as a point of clarification although these are unlikely to completely satisfy such objectors. The exact changes will need approval from the District Councils using existing delegated powers to individual Members. The need to put forward further minor changes may arise during the examination stage.

#### **FORMAL SUBMISSION PROCEDURES**

17. Regulation 30(d) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008 requires the Councils to publish a Statement of Consultation alongside the Core Strategy. This document was produced and placed on deposit at the same time that the Core Strategy was published. It provides details of the consultation carried out during preparation of the Core Strategy, including who was consulted, how they were consulted, a summary of the main issues raised, and how those issues have been addressed. The document will require updating in respect of the deposit period, prior to submission to the Secretary of State.
16. A second document will be prepared in accordance with Regulation 30(1)(e). The purpose of this document is to set out:

- how many representations were made on the Core Strategy in accordance with Regulation 28(2); and
- a summary of the main issues raised in those representations (based on paragraph 11 of this report).

17. Notification and public advertisement will need to be given to the Core Strategy's submission.

#### **NEXT STEPS**

18. The examination stage starts immediately after the Core Strategy is submitted (target date end of March) and a Planning Inspector appointed. The Inspector will decide which matters will be the focus of the examination and will ask a series of questions of those parties invited to take part in the public hearing sessions (envisaged in June). These parties will generally be those who have made representations but the Inspector's deliberations will not be limited to matters raised in representations. A programme officer will be appointed to assist the Inspector with the examination arrangements.

There are no background papers to this report.

<b>Report Author</b>	<b>Tel</b>	<b>Email</b>	<b>Doc ID</b>
David Porter	01772 536775	david.porter2@lancashire.gov.uk	JAC Report – Mar 11 – Core Strategy Reps

Central Lancashire Publication Core Strategy - Representations

Appendix 1

No.	Objector	Agent	Brief Summary of Issues Raised/Change Sought
1	Councillor Shannon		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General support (Ingol)</li> </ul>
2	Mr B Ellison		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General support (Ingol)</li> </ul>
3	Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 25/SO19/para 11.15 – amend to recognise role of religious organisations</li> </ul>
4	Mr AG Brookes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 19: support Area of Major Open Space at Ingol</li> </ul>
5	Sustrans		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 3g: amend managing car use to also favour other road users</li> </ul>
6	Mr R Fletcher		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General support</li> </ul>
7	Mr C Langham		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 19: support</li> </ul>
8	Mr J Hally		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 19: support</li> </ul>
9	Mrs A Miller		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 19: support</li> </ul>
10	Mr B Turner		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 19; support</li> </ul>
11	Kiernan Construction	Janet Dixon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 1/Key Diagram – amend to include/show Preston East/ Millennium City Park</li> </ul>
12	Mr E Derbyshire	Janet Dixon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 4: housing delivery not in line with PPS3, PPS12, RSS, Strategic Market Hosuing Assessment (SHMA)</li> <li>SO5/table 1: support housing distribution</li> </ul>
13	Mr & Mrs PW Swift	Janet Dixon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 1/Key Diagram: amend Cottam to wider NW Preston Strategic Location, and show more clearly on key diagram</li> <li>Chapter 8/Policy 4: housing delivery not in line with PPS3, PPS12, RSS, SHMA: Cottam</li> <li>SO5/table 1: support housing distribution</li> </ul>
14	Mr W Dobson	Janet Dixon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 1/Key Diagram – amend to include/show Preston East/Millennium City Park</li> <li>Policy 9: support</li> </ul>
15	Heine Planning Consultancy		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 8: inadequate policy provision of sites for the gypsy and travelling community</li> </ul>
16	Mr B Light		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 13: shortage of recreational flying sites</li> </ul>
17	Trustees for the Worden Estate	Steven Abbott Associates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 1b: role of greenfield development in Chorley and Leyland</li> </ul>
18	Broughton Parish		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 3: amend to give greater clarity to route of Broughton by-pass</li> </ul>

	Council			
19	Mr W Freestone		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vision/Paras 1.6 – 1.9: "What might the future hold" section is too optimistic</li> </ul>	
20	Wrightington Parish Council		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policies 3, 23, 24, 25/paras 7.7 and 7.8: amend to make reference to multi-purpose links or bridleways (<i>nb see policy 13d</i>)</li> </ul>	
21	Natural England		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chapter 2: support improved wording</li> <li>Whole Core Strategy: Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Report requires revision to provide robust evidence for all policies</li> <li>Performance Monitoring Framework: insufficient indicators to monitor policies in line with Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)</li> <li>Policy 13: amend to reduce impacts of change on the landscape</li> <li>Policy 17: amend to <i>enhance</i> landscape/nature</li> <li>Policy 18c: amend to avoid impact before mitigation/compensation</li> <li>Policy 2: amend to include stronger references to green infrastructure</li> <li>Policy 20: support</li> <li>Policy 21: support</li> <li>Policy 22: support</li> <li>Policy 28: amend to recognise nature conservation significances outside formally designated sites</li> <li>Policy 3: support</li> <li>Policy 8: amend to include natural environment</li> <li>Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report: amend various sections in line with the SEA Directive requirement</li> <li>Chapter 3: amend to include greater reference to natural environmental assets of main urban areas</li> <li>Spatial Strategy/Policy 1: amend policy to include more specific references to biodiversity, geodiversity and landscape</li> <li>Chapter 4/Vision: amend to include reference to protecting and enhancing biodiversity, geodiversity and landscape</li> <li>Strategic Objectives/para 4.3: to amend SOs to include stronger references to biodiversity, geodiversity and landscape</li> </ul>	
22	Theatres Trust		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 12: support</li> </ul>	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include Saved Policies and Monitoring Framework in CS</li> </ul>	
23	Maxey House Farm, Bartle	Emery Planning Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 1.4: amend plan period to 2031</li> <li>• Policy 4: housing delivery not in line with PPS3, PPS12, RSS and SHMA: increase housing requirements beyond RSS</li> <li>• Policy 4: add extra housing requirements for Growth Point</li> <li>• Policy 1a(ii): re-instate NW Preston Strategic Location to include Maxey House Farm</li> </ul>	
24	Leyland Garden Centre (Garden Centre Group)	GGA Associates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1: amend to emphasise opportunities on previously developed rural sites</li> <li>• Chapter 8/Policy 4: amend - use of previously developed rural sites will help meet brownfield targets and minimise use of greenfield sites</li> </ul>	
25	Mr B Ellis		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1c(i)/para 1.15: BAE Systems strategic site is contrary to PPG13, but part of site may be suitable for recreational aviation</li> <li>• Policy 3/para 7.3: amend to say that locally available recreational opportunities will negate need for out-of area travel</li> <li>• Policy 13c/para 9.41: amend to refer to recreational aviation sites in keeping with PPG13 (B6)</li> <li>• Policy PCS11(now policy 23): amend to refer to recreational aviation</li> <li>• Policy PCS12 (now policy 24)/para 11.13: amend to refer to recreational aviation</li> <li>• Policy PCS12 (now policy 28): amend to encourage the development of large wind turbines and groups of large turbines</li> </ul>	
26	Mr C Hebson		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 4: amend, no need for greenfield development, meet housing needs through allocations and brownfield sites</li> <li>• Para 10.12: amend Green Belt to include land at Clayton-le-Woods</li> <li>• Policy 1b and d: focus more development on Key Service Centres and Buckshaw</li> <li>• Policy 1d and e: amend Clayton-le-Woods from Urban Local Service Centre to Rural Local Service Centre</li> <li>• Policy PCS26 (now Policy 22): protect Cuerden ponds from development by including them in the Green Belt</li> </ul>	
27	Jane Hewitt (Preston College)	DTZ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies 14/15/para 9.49: amend to include reference to Preston College</li> </ul>	
28	Wyre Borough		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 7.19: amend, delete reference to new junction on M6 between</li> </ul>	

	Council		J32 and 33	
29	Mr D Hall		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1b(iii): amend, delete Longridge as a Key Service Centre</li> </ul>	
30	Highways Agency		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 1: amend to make reference to role of Strategic Road Network (SRN) and its link with economic growth</li> <li>• Chapter 3: amend to refer to the need for modelling of cumulative travel impacts of travel from new developments</li> <li>• Policy 1: detailed comments on impacts of proposed developments on SRN</li> <li>• Chapter 2: amend to improve clarity of developer responsibilities with regard to transport infrastructure provision</li> <li>• Policy 3: amend to clarify funding and other mechanisms to improve travel and/or reduce car use</li> <li>• Infrastructure Delivery Schedule: amend so that all proposals affecting SRN are included in the schedule</li> <li>• Policy 4b: seeks clarification of under and over provision</li> <li>• Policy 5: support</li> <li>• Policy 6: support</li> <li>• Policy 9: concerns about impact of development at Preston East/Millennium City Park on SRN, specifically M6, junction 31a</li> <li>• Policy 10: support</li> <li>• Policy 11f: support</li> <li>• Central Lancashire Transport Model: emphasis on the need for this model to inform the sustainability of site allocations</li> </ul>	
31	Central Lancashire Friends of the Earth		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 1.21/Figure 2: cross cutting themes not consistent</li> <li>• Para 1.26: amend fourth sentence to delete "habitat" and insert "protection area"</li> <li>• Chapter 2: amend to refer to Lancashire Biodiversity Action Plan</li> <li>• Figure 7: amend notation for two country parks</li> <li>• Chapter 3: amend to include description of physical features</li> <li>• Chapter 4: amend to include reference to biodiversity within the Vision</li> <li>• Chapter 7: amend to include reference to alternative fuels</li> <li>• Chapter 9: amend to include reference to sustainable economics</li> <li>• Policy 17: amend to refer to sustainable housing</li> <li>• Para 10.10: support</li> </ul>	



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 10.16: amend Ribble Estuary <i>is</i> National Nature Reserve</li> <li>• Para 10.21: amend details on biodiversity designations</li> <li>• Policy 22: amend in respect of adapting to the effects of climate change</li> <li>• Chapter 11: need for more allotments and composting</li> <li>• Chapter 11; apply "access to natural greenspace" standards</li> <li>• Para 12.1: amend to include policies to encourage people to stop use of fossil fuels now</li> <li>• Policy 27: comment on examples of sustainable energy use</li> <li>• Policy 29: amend to stop all development on land below 10 metres above sea level, and to deal more effectively with sewage</li> <li>• Para 12.26: comment on intensive farming practices and peat</li> </ul>	
32	Sport England		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 1.12/background papers: no evidence of PPG17 compliant audit and assessment of open space, recreation and sports needs, including an up-to-date Playing Pitch Strategy</li> <li>• Policy 2/Infrastructure Delivery Schedule: amend policy to include reference to sport and recreation facilities as infrastructure, use Sports Facility Calculator</li> <li>• Chapter 5: figures provided which relate the anticipated growth of recreational facilities in line with population growth</li> <li>• Policy 12/para 9.29: amend to overcome duplication with Policy 24</li> <li>• Policy 14: amend to promote community uses of schools</li> <li>• Policy 24: amend to distinguish playing fields from other facilities</li> </ul>	
33	Northern Trust	Drivers Jonas Deloitte	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paras 2.4/8.4: amend wording in respect of RSS and Localism Bill</li> <li>• Policy 4/Paras 8.12/8.13: delete, not in conformity with PPS3</li> <li>• Policy 19: amend to allow some development in Areas of Major Open Space</li> </ul>	
34	Mr & Mrs R Semley		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 4: amend, no need for greenfield development, meet housing needs through allocations and brownfield sites</li> <li>• Para 10.12: amend Green Belt to include land at Clayton-le-Woods</li> <li>• Policy 1b and d: focus more development on Key Service Centres and Buckshaw</li> <li>• Policy 1d and e: amend Clayton-le-Woods from Urban Local Service Centre to Rural Local Service Centre</li> </ul>	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy PCS26 (now Policy 22): protect Cuerden ponds from development by including them in the Green Belt</li> </ul>	
35	Blackpool Council		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vision/Policy 11: amend proposed role for Preston which conflicts with RSS</li> <li>• Chapter 7: amend, role of Preston is at odds with the capacity of its transport infrastructure</li> <li>• Chapter 9: amend employment land provision in line with housing reduction, to meet lower demands as a result of the recession</li> </ul>	
36	National Farmers Union		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 9.10: support live work wording</li> <li>• Para 9.38: disagree with idea of switch to bio-fuels and extensive farming</li> <li>• Chapter 8 Sustainability Appraisal (SA): support</li> <li>• Policies 27/28: support, with amend to support renewable energy proposals on farms</li> <li>• Policy 29: amend to allow for possible water storage reservoirs to assist with irrigation of crops</li> </ul>	
37	The National Trust		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vision: not sufficiently environmentally focussed. Amend reference to Leyland in respect of its industrial heritage</li> <li>• Policy 11/Paras 9.20 and 9.21: amend to include reference to site specific heritage and landscape based tourism</li> <li>• Policy 16: support</li> <li>• Policy 18: support</li> </ul>	
38	West Lancashire Borough Council		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support</li> </ul>	
39	Sainsburys	Turley Associates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 9.26: disagree with findings of Retail and Leisure Review regarding need for additional food store at Bamber Bridge</li> <li>• Policy 11: support Bamber Bridge and Penwortham as District Centres, but recommend focus for new retail growth be at Penwortham</li> <li>• Policy 11f: amend wording in line with PPS4 (wording supplied)</li> <li>• Policy 16: support</li> </ul>	
40	Mr F Holden		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1b(iii): amend, delete Longridge as a Key Service Centre</li> </ul>	
41	Grimsargh Parish Council		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1: support but concern about traffic growth in Grimsargh</li> <li>• Policy 7: no need for affordable housing in Grimsargh, but current need for extra care housing</li> </ul>	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 19: support Area of Separation around Grimsargh</li> </ul>	
42	Mrs M Holden		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 1b(iii) and c: include land at Halfpenny Lane, Longridge with Whittingham Hospital site so that both may be ruled out as a strategic site for development</li> </ul>	
43	Ulmes Walton Parish Council		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General support</li> </ul>	
44	Mr G Love		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 1a(iii): amend to include land South of Penwortham/North of Farington (Pickering's Farm)</li> </ul>	
45	Lancashire Blackpool Tourist Board		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 1.19: amend to include reference to visitors</li> <li>Chapter 2: amend to refer to Lancashire &amp; Blackpool Visitor Plans</li> <li>Para 3.10: amend to refer to potential role of Brockholes scheme</li> <li>Policy 11: amend to show linkages with visitor economy and transport (LTP3)</li> <li>Policy 12: support</li> </ul>	
46	University of Central Lancashire	DPP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 1: support</li> <li>Policy 2: support, infrastructure required to achieve vision</li> <li>Policies 14 and 15: support</li> <li>Policy 27: evidence required to justify movement to reduce CO2 emissions by 15%, and 20% from 2015, rather than 2019 as set out in PPS1</li> </ul>	
47	Tetrad plc	HOW Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 1a(i): support client's site being included in Inner East Preston</li> <li>Policy 4: housing delivery not in line with PPS3, PPS12, RSS, SHMA and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)</li> <li>Policy 7: support principle but seek amendment to allow flexibility on occasions of restricted viability</li> <li>Policy 10: amend to clarify criteria of marketing and viability</li> </ul>	
48	Bovis Homes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 1: support with minor amends regarding the need to develop brownfield land before releasing greenfield sites at Penwortham</li> <li>Policy 2: amend to reflect evidence base including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan</li> <li>Policy 4: housing delivery not in line with PPS3, PPS12, RSS, SHMA and SHLAA. Cross-reference to economic growth aspirations in Chapter 9.</li> <li>Policy 5: support but amend to refer to SHLAA preference for 3 and 4</li> </ul>	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>bed dwellings</li> <li>Policy 6: redraft policy to relate more clearly to objective of improving housing quality</li> <li>Policy 7: amend in line with PPS3</li> <li>Policy 23: amend in line with circular 05/2005 (section106/CIL)</li> <li>Policy 23c: delete</li> <li>Policy 25d: amend or add extra criteria concerning the loss of facilities and the need for regeneration</li> <li>Policy 27: amend to bring Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH) and carbon dioxide reduction targets in line with national guidance</li> </ul>	
49	Councillor Buttle		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 5.39: amend in respect of infrastructure needs at Cottam</li> <li>Policy 19: define boundary of Cottam Strategic Location and define Area of Separation between Cottam and Higher Bartle</li> </ul>	
50	Whittingham Parish Council		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 1b(iii)/Para 3.13: delete reference to potential development west of Longridge</li> </ul>	
51	Taylor Wimpey	HOW Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 1c/a: amend to include Pickering's Farm as a Strategic Site or Location suitable for mixed use development</li> <li>Policy 4: housing delivery not in line with PPS3, PPS12, RSS, SHMA and SHLAA, and is out of step with employment land delivery</li> <li>Policy 5: support</li> <li>Policy 7: amend to accommodate site specific financial viability and community benefits issues</li> <li>Policy 2: amend to accommodate site specific financial viability</li> <li>Policy 3: amend to accommodate site specific financial viability</li> <li>Policy 9c(ii): support identification of Cuerden for major employment development</li> <li>Policy 11: amend to allow for retail development as part of urban extensions</li> <li>Policy 14: support</li> <li>Policy 22: amend to align with PPS9</li> <li>Policy 23: amend to accommodate site specific financial viability</li> <li>Policy 25: amend to accommodate site specific financial viability</li> <li>Policy 28: support</li> <li>Policy 29: amend to accommodate site specific mitigation measures</li> </ul>	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 30: amend so that development does not worsen air quality</li> <li>• Policy 31: amend to balance loss of best quality agricultural land</li> </ul>	
52	Muse Developments	HOW Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 9e: amend to include South Rings Business Park, Bamber Bridge</li> </ul>	
53	Arley Homes	HOW Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1d(i): support so long as Adlington Urban Local Service Centre includes the site of Weldbank Plastics, Westhoughton Road</li> <li>• Policy 4: housing delivery not in line with PPS3, PPS12, RSS, SHMA and SHLAA, and is out of step with employment land delivery</li> <li>• Policy 7: amend to accommodate site specific financial viability and community benefits issues</li> <li>• Policy 10: amend to clarify criteria of marketing and viability</li> </ul>	
54	Environment Agency		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapters 1/12: support scope of policies</li> <li>• Policy 29d: amend in line with PPS25</li> </ul>	
55	Mrs S Groves	CAPanning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1d and e: amend to include the group of settlements of New Longton, Longton, Hutton and Walmer Bridge as an Urban Local Service Centre</li> <li>• Policy 4: housing delivery not in line with RSS</li> </ul>	
56	Bee Lane Consortium	P Wilson & Co	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1c/a: amend to include Pickerings Fram as a Strategic Site or Location suitable for mixed use development</li> <li>• Cross reference to representation no.51</li> </ul>	
57	Taylor Wimpey – Eaves Green	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1: spatial strategy inconsistent with un-justified housing requirement in relation to housing development at Eaves Green, Chorley</li> <li>• Policy 2: amend to include accurate evidence base, including relevance, viability and need for the infrastructure</li> <li>• Policy 4: housing delivery not in line with PPS3, PPS12, RSS, and SHLAA</li> <li>• Policy 6: amend to show how good quality housing can be secured</li> <li>• Policy 7: amend targets in line with Housing Viability Assessment</li> <li>• Policy 27: amend to bring CSH and carbon dioxide reduction targets in line with national guidance</li> <li>• Policy 31: amend in line with sustainability criteria in PPS7</li> </ul>	
58	Taylor Wimpey – Cottam	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1a(ii)/para 1.17: amend to include land at Tabley Lane, Cottam (and at Higher Bartle) in a NW Preston Strategic Location</li> </ul>	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 2: amend to include accurate evidence base, including relevance, viability and need for the infrastructure</li> <li>• Policy 4: housing delivery not in line with PPS3, PPS12, RSS, and SHLAA</li> <li>• Policy 6: amend to show how good quality housing can be secured</li> <li>• Policy 7: amend targets in line with Housing Viability Assessment</li> <li>• Policy 27: amend to bring CSH and CO2 reduction targets in line with national guidance</li> <li>• Policy 31: amend in line with sustainability criteria in PPS7</li> </ul>	
59	Taylor Wimpey – Haydock Grange	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1a(ii)/para 1.17: amend to include land at Haydock Grange Cottam (and at Higher Bartle) in a NW Preston Strategic Location</li> <li>• Policy 2: amend to include accurate evidence base, including relevance, viability and need for the infrastructure</li> <li>• Policy 4: housing delivery not in line with PPS3, PPS12, RSS, and SHLAA</li> <li>• Policy 6: amend to show how good quality housing can be secured</li> <li>• Policy 7: amend targets in line with Housing Viability Assessment</li> <li>• Policy 27: amend to bring CSH and CO2 reduction targets in line with national guidance</li> <li>• Policy 31: amend in line with sustainability criteria in PPS7</li> </ul>	
60	Northern Trust	Pegasus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 10: amend to allow greater flexibility in re-use of employment land</li> <li>• Policy 11: amend to include Rural Local Service Centres as a tier in the retail hierarchy, as in Policy 1</li> </ul>	
61	Morris Homes	McAteer Associates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1a(iii): amend to permit greenfield development at Lostock Hall</li> <li>• Policy 4: housing delivery not in line with RSS</li> <li>• Policy 7: amend targets in line with Housing Viability Assessment</li> <li>• Policy 9e(i): extend scope for development in Lostock Hall</li> </ul>	
62	A&J Bamford R&N Nuttall	England & Lyle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1a(iii): include Gregson Lane in list of settlements</li> </ul>	
63	Taylor Wimpey	Dickman Associates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SO1: amend to encourage rural regeneration</li> <li>• Policy 1f: reference to opportunity to develop land at Mawdesley</li> <li>• Para 8.10: challenges assumptions</li> <li>• Policy 4: housing delivery not in line with RSS, SHMA</li> </ul>	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 5/para 8.21: policy conflicts with evidence base which indicates need for 3 or 4 bed houses and bungalows</li> <li>• Policy 7: conflicts with Policy 5 and is contrary to PPS3</li> </ul>	
64	Woodplumpton Parish Council		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 29e: add Woodplumpton to list of settlements affected by sewage flooding</li> <li>• Policy 19: create Area of Separation between Bartle and Cottam</li> </ul>	
65	Land4Homes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 2.6/Policy 4: Housing Strategy differs from Policy 4 levels of housing delivery. 20% reduction is arbitrary and contrary to RSS and PPS3</li> <li>• Para 3.4/Policy 1d(i): support in respect of Adlington</li> <li>• SO1: supported</li> <li>• Table 1: support providing the figures are not used as a bar to development</li> </ul>	
66	Tatton Settled Estates	HOW Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Table 1: restrictive for growth in Urban Local Service Centres (land adjacent to Coppull Enterprise Centre)</li> <li>• Policy 4: housing delivery not in line with PPS3, PPS12, RSS and SHLAA, inconsistent with economic development0</li> <li>• Policy 7: amend to accommodate site specific financial viability</li> <li>• Policy 10: amend to be more flexible and avoid dereliction</li> <li>• Policy 27: amend to allow for site viability</li> </ul>	
67	The Wildlife Trust		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vision: amend to refer to rich wildlife in Central Lancashire</li> <li>• Policy 1: clarify that Cottam Brickworks is no longer a brownfield site</li> <li>• Policy 22: amend to allow scope to maintain ecological networks</li> </ul>	
68	Mr M Mullarkey	CAPanning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1a(ii): amend Cottam Strategic Location to include land between Lightfoot Lane and the M55(Higher Bartle)</li> <li>• Policy 4: housing delivery not in line with RSS</li> </ul>	
69	United Utilities Property Services		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1e: amend to show Grimsargh as a Rural Local Service Centre</li> <li>• Policy 13: amend to reflect PPS7 on the re-use of rural buildings for residential conversions</li> <li>• Para 12.11: check reference to Policy 17</li> </ul>	
70	Fox Land Property		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 2.6: amend in line with Regional Housing Strategy</li> <li>• Chapter 3: support role of Clayton-le-Woods, but amend to show strong links with Leyland and Farington</li> </ul>	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 4/Vision: amend to correspond with Policy 1</li> <li>• Para 5.14: wording is contrary to 20% reduction in housing requirements in Policy 4</li> <li>• Table 1: support in principle, provided that it is not used as a bar to development</li> <li>• Policy 1b(i): amend to include Clayton-le-Woods as part of Leyland/Farindon</li> <li>• Policy 1d(iii): support</li> <li>• Policy 4: housing delivery not in line with RSS, PPS3 or RHS</li> <li>• Para 10.12: clarify approach to Green Belt</li> </ul>	
71	David Wilson Homes NW	DPP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1: support</li> <li>• Policy 2: amend with respect to Circular 05/05 (s106/CIL)</li> <li>• Policy 4a: housing delivery not in line with RSS</li> <li>• Policy 4c: amend brownfield target in keeping with Figure 11 (housing trajectory)</li> <li>• Policy 5: support</li> <li>• Policy 7: amend to cross refer to Policy 2, and be subject to scheme viability</li> <li>• Policy 27: CSH targets duplicate building regulations</li> </ul>	
72	Hallam Land Management	Sigma Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 1.20: amend to align economic growth with housing growth</li> <li>• Para 1.23: define Key Service Centres and Areas of Separation</li> <li>• Para 5.4: support Preston as a new emerging economic force</li> <li>• Paras 5.7/5.8: amend housing provision in line with these paras</li> <li>• Para 5.10: comment about loss of Growth Point funding</li> <li>• Para 5.11: mistaken to base housing requirements on short term economic downturn</li> <li>• Para 5.13: qualified support for the removal of barriers to housing delivery</li> <li>• Para 5.37: concern that CS places over-reliance on Cottam for housing delivery in Preston</li> <li>• Para 5.45/Key Diagram/Policy 1: amend Local Service Centres to include settlements near Preston</li> <li>• Chapter 8/Policy 4: housing delivery not in line with RSS</li> <li>• Policy 5: support</li> </ul>	



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 7: amend to accommodate flexibility and viability</li> <li>• Chapter 12/Key Diagram: amend to include renewable energy targets and areas of search</li> </ul>	
73	Taylor Wimpey	HOW Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 1.18: amend to re-instate Whittingham Hospital as a Strategic Site in line with PPS12</li> </ul>	
74	Fox Land Property		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 2.6: amend in line with Regional Housing Strategy</li> <li>• Figure 7: amend to show Longridge (specific representation concerns land off Whittingham Lane, Longridge)</li> <li>• Vision: amend to correspond with Policy 1</li> <li>• Policy 1(b)iii supported, especially with regard to Longridge</li> <li>• Para 5.14: wording is contrary to 20% reduction in housing requirements in Policy 4</li> <li>• Table 1: support in principle, provided that it is not used as a bar to development</li> <li>• Para 5.23/Policy 1b(iii): support</li> <li>• Policy 4: housing delivery not in line with RSS, PPS3 or RHS</li> </ul>	
75	Mrs A Dalton		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1e: amend to show Croston as a Rural Local Service Centre</li> <li>• Policy 29d: amend to deal with flood risk at Croston on a site by site basis</li> </ul>	
76	Mrs Liz Williams		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 5.23/Policy 1b(iii): amend, deleting reference to westward extension of Longridge</li> </ul>	
77	Wainhomes and Hollins Strategic Land	Sedgwick Associates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 4: housing delivery not in line with RSS, SHMA, SHLAA or the Core Strategy SA</li> </ul>	
78	Brookhouse Group	Alyn Nicholls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paras 9.21 and 9.25/Policy 11: amend to include reference to Queens Retail Park, Preston, and its suitability for food retailing</li> </ul>	
79	ASDA	Osborne Clarke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 1.10/SO11/Policy 11: support</li> </ul>	
80	Royal London Asset Management	Indigo Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1a: amend in respect of the Capitol Centre, including promoting retail development on brownfield sites</li> <li>• Policy 2: amend to relate to CIL regulations and to mitigate development impacts</li> <li>• Para 9.27: delete</li> <li>• Policy 11f: amend and word more positively in respect of PPS4</li> </ul>	
81	BAE	GVA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SO1/Policies 1,9,27/Chapter7: support</li> </ul>	

82	Lancashire County Council Property Group		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SO2/Policy 2: support</li> </ul>	
83	First Investments	Indigo Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 9: amend to refer to PPS4, in respect of Botany Bay</li> <li>• Policy 11f: amend to assess out of town proposals against PPS4 criteria and on their merits</li> </ul>	
84	Telereal Trillium	Indigo Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1: amend with respect to potential brownfield development at Cop Lane, Penwortham</li> <li>• Policy 10: amend to apply flexibly to avoid restricting development</li> </ul>	
85	Deepdale Co-Ownership Trust	Indigo Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1: amend to include Deepdale Shopping Park as a location for growth</li> <li>• Policy 2: amend to relate to CIL regulations and to mitigate development impacts</li> <li>• Para 9.27: delete</li> <li>• Policy 11f: amend and word more positively in respect of PPS4</li> </ul>	
86	Ms L Wilson		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1d(iii): remove Clayton-le-Woods as an Urban Local Service Centre</li> </ul>	
87	Commercial Estates Group	Indigo Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1: amend to show larger growth area in the Cottam Strategic Location (Hoyles Lane), in accordance with PPS3</li> </ul>	
88	Lancashire County Council		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic Objectives/Para 1.15/Chapters 5 and 7: support</li> <li>• Chapter 5: amend to refer to challenge of deprivation and unemployment</li> <li>• Paras 3.11 and 3.15: amend to explain wider external links</li> <li>• Para 5.28/5.37: incorporate references to biological significances</li> <li>• Policy 3: amend to include reference to 20mph zones</li> <li>• Paras 8.10 and 8.11/Policy 4: amend negative wording</li> <li>• Policy 13a: support</li> <li>• Chapter 10: amend to include built heritage significance in green infrastructure</li> <li>• Para 10.6: amend to refer to Historic Environment Records</li> <li>• Policy 16b: amend to refer to structures at risk</li> <li>• Policy 16d: amend to refer to mitigation of adverse impacts</li> <li>• Policy 18: amend to improve explanation of Green Infrastructure (GI), and to link it with Ecological Infrastructure</li> </ul>	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 22: amend to refer to Natural Heritage Zones</li> </ul>	
89	Campbells Limited	Leith Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vision/Strategic Objectives: amend to recognise needs of ageing population</li> <li>• Policy 1: clarify whether Nell Lane, Cuerden, is part of an Urban Local Service Centre</li> <li>• Strategic Sites: amend Cuerden Strategic Site to include an extension of Cuerden Residential Park</li> <li>• Policy 2: amend in respect of PPS12</li> <li>• Para 8.4: amend in respect of RSS being a material consideration</li> <li>• Policy 7: amend to reduce onerous nature and increase flexibility</li> <li>• Chapter 11/Policy 24: Nell Lane site meets the policy requirements</li> </ul>	
90	National Grid	Entec	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1c(ii): reference to high voltage overhead electricity line running across Cuerden Strategic Site</li> </ul>	
91	The Coal Authority		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 2: amend to cross-refer to Lancashire Minerals and Waste DPD</li> <li>• Policy 1: Growth Locations to be consistent with National Minerals Policy Statements and PPG14 (Development on Unstable Land)</li> <li>• Policy 17: amend in respect of unstable ground (PPG14)</li> </ul>	
92	Blackburn with Darwen BC		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 3.11: amend to reconsider implications of cross boundary impacts on Blackburn with Darwen</li> <li>• Vision/SO4/Policy 3: amend in respect of RSS, capacity of highways network to accommodate growth, and re-location of Preston bus station</li> <li>• Policy 9: amend to clarify employment land requirements in respect of RSS</li> <li>• SO11/Policy 11: amend references to Preston as an alternative to Liverpool and Manchester: delete Policy 11b</li> </ul>	
93	Lancashire CPRE		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 8.15/Policy 4: support 70% brownfield development and reduced housing requirements</li> <li>• Policies 7/11f/13/16/19/23f: support</li> <li>• Policy 18: amend to refer to the preparation of a GI strategy for Central Lancashire</li> <li>• Policy 27: amend to ensure all council and community schemes use sustainable resources</li> </ul>	

94	Mr PCWatson	Mr P Robinson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1: amend to include land between M55 and Lightfoot Lane for housing development (Higher Bartle) in respect of RSS, PPS3 and PPS12</li> <li>• Paras 8.12 to 8.16/Policy 4: housing delivery not in line with RSS or PPS3</li> </ul>	
95	Persimmon	RPS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paras 1.14 to 1.18: Amend to identify more Strategic Sites: identify Camelot Theme Park as a Strategic Site with capacity for 500 dwellings</li> <li>• Para 2.4: amend to indicate status of RSS as part of the development plan</li> <li>• Paras 5.8 and 5.11: amend drafting to avoid implication that housing requirements be reduced</li> <li>• Para 5.20/Table 1: amend as a result of allocating Camelot Theme Park as a Strategic Site</li> <li>• Para 5.46: assertion that Camelot is an exceptional development site in the Green Belt</li> <li>• Para 8.4: amend - places too much emphasis on the recession</li> <li>• Para 8.5: delete or produce evidence to support</li> <li>• Para 8.6: delete paragraph</li> <li>• Para 8.7: deletion and redrafting of the paragraph</li> <li>• Para 8.8/Table 3: amend by explaining steps required by the planning authorities to improve the situation</li> <li>• Para 8.9: redraft with accurate description of SHLAA purposes</li> <li>• Paras 8.10 and 8.11: replace with a more balanced treatment of the issues</li> <li>• Paras 8.12, 8.13 and 8.14: delete because it is inconsistent with PPS3</li> <li>• Para 8.15: amend or supply evidence to support that 70% brownfield development figure is achievable</li> <li>• Table 4: delete – 20% reduction is contrary to RSS/PPS12 and does not constitute legal conformity</li> <li>• Policy 4: amend - housing delivery not in line with RSS, PPS3 or PPS12</li> <li>• Para 10.12: amend to explain implications of the 70% target for the provision of dwellings on brownfield land for the extent to which</li> </ul>	

			safeguarded land might be needed to meet development needs	
96	Taylor Wimpey	GVA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 5.46: amend treatment of "other settlements", with respect to housing development at Charnock Richard</li> <li>• Policy 1: amend to include Charnock Richard as a Rural Local Service Centre</li> <li>• Policy 1f: amend to enable a more flexible approach</li> <li>• Paras 8.12 to 8.16/Policy 4: amend - housing delivery not in line with RSS or PPS3</li> <li>• Policy 7: amend to explain exception sites</li> </ul>	
97	Rowland Homes Limited	De Pol Associates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1: amend to clarify that greenfield development may be permitted at places other than at Cottam Strategic Location, Penwortham and Chorley Town</li> <li>• Policy 4: amend - housing delivery not in line with RSS , PPS3 or PPS12</li> </ul>	
98	P Wilson & Co		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 1.17/Policy 1a(ii): amend to include reference to development at Higher Bartle and Eastway</li> </ul>	
99	Eastway Nurseries	De Pol Associates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1: amend to clarify that greenfield development may be permitted at places other than at Cottam Strategic Location, Penwortham and Chorley Town</li> <li>• Policy 4: amend - housing delivery not in line with RSS , PPS3 or PPS12</li> </ul>	
100	Owners of land: North of Durton Lane	De Pol Associates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1: amend to clarify that greenfield development may be permitted at places other than at Cottam Strategic Location, Penwortham and Chorley Town</li> <li>• Policy 4: amend - housing delivery not in line with RSS , PPS3 or PPS12</li> </ul>	
101	Redrow Homes	Turley Associates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1a(ii): amend to include Higher Bartle</li> <li>• Policy 1b(i): amend to include greenfield development</li> <li>• Policy 1b (iii): delete</li> <li>• Policy 4: housing delivery not in line with RSS , PPS3, PPS12, SHLAA, SHMA and others</li> <li>• Policy 1c(iii), d(iii) and (vi): support</li> </ul>	
102	The Ramblers Association		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1b(ii): amend to delete reference to greenfield development</li> <li>• Policy 3(b): amend to include bridge linking Chorley bus station and</li> </ul>	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>railway station</li> <li>Figure 11: amend to show smaller proportion of new housing on Greenfield sites by 2023/24</li> <li>Paras 2.17, 2.18, 3.17, 11.2/Strategic Objectives 2,3,16,17,19/Chapter 7/ Policies 18(b), 19(g) and (h), 20, 28(a) : support</li> <li>Para 7.2: suggested cycle route</li> <li>Chapter 12: expect wind turbines to be small and discreet</li> </ul>	
103	Mr R Fletcher		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 19: support</li> </ul>	
104	Mr C Homer		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 19: support</li> </ul>	
105	Mrs P Homer		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 19: support</li> </ul>	
106	DKH Developments Limited	Steven Abbott Associates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 10: amend to apply flexibly to avoid restricting development, in keeping with PPS4</li> <li>Policy 4: housing delivery not in line with RSS , PPS3, PPS12, SHLAA, SHMA</li> </ul>	
107	James Harts	Steven Abbott Associates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 10: amend to apply flexibly to avoid restricting development, in keeping with PPS4</li> <li>Policy 4: housing delivery not in line with RSS , PPS3, PPS12, SHLAA, SHMA</li> </ul>	
108	Fairport Developments Limited	Steven Abbott Associates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 10: amend to apply flexibly to avoid restricting development, in keeping with PPS4</li> <li>Policy 4: housing delivery not in line with RSS , PPS3, PPS12, SHLAA, SHMA</li> <li>Policy 11: amend to add a category "Local Centres" in accordance with PPS6 (actually PPS4)</li> <li>Para 5.45/Policy 1(d): amend to refer to other forms of development in the interests of settlement viability, in respect of land at Adlington</li> </ul>	
109	Staplefields Ltd	Steven Abbott Associates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 4: housing delivery not in line with RSS , PPS3, PPS12, SHLAA, SHMA</li> </ul>	
110	Network Rail		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy 3: additional information on improvements to rail services</li> </ul>	
111	English Heritage		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vision/Cross Cutting Themes/SO16 and SO17: support</li> <li>Para 5.14: amend to include reference to enhancing environmental assets in keeping with PPS5</li> <li>Policy 1: amend with extra information on local character</li> <li>Policy 5, 6, 11, 12, 16(b), 17: support</li> </ul>	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 13: support, policy should refer to English Heritage guidance on the Conversion of Traditional Farm Buildings</li> <li>• Policy 16: amend to refer to the wider historic environment, significance of historical assets, and to clarify meaning of inappropriate development</li> <li>• Policy 16c: expand to cover matters of local identity and the means of managing the historic environment</li> <li>• Policy 18: amend to recognise the importance of the historic environment in planning for GI</li> <li>• Policy 21: amend to refer to the Lancashire Historic Landscape Characterisation</li> <li>• Appendix B: amend to refer to the need for appropriate treatment of historic assets in or close to the strategic sites</li> </ul>	
112	TB Planning		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 2.12: delete reference to Growth Point</li> <li>• SO1, Paras 5.20 and 5.25, Table 1: amend to state that developments will not be permitted which undermine Strategic Sites and locations</li> <li>• Paras 5.26, 5.27, 6.3 and 6.4: insert policy for developers to provide proportionate infrastructure</li> <li>• Policy 4: support, but that reduction of house building should be for five years</li> <li>• Policies 7 and 18: support</li> <li>• Policy 19: support Areas of Major Open Space with minor wording amendment in respect of neighbourhood attractiveness</li> <li>• Policy 24: support, but amend to consider future requirements for sport and recreation</li> </ul>	
113	Mrs K Motley, Parr Hall Farm		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1(e)ii: support development within area of safeguarded land at Eccleston</li> </ul>	
114	Civil Aviation Authority		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advice on CAA standards in respect of civil aerodromes, telecom installations, wind turbines, high structures, venting and flaring</li> </ul>	
115	Mr M Shah		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1d(iii): include site within Clayton-le-Woods Urban Local Service Centre. Reference to SHMA need for property types.</li> </ul>	
116	Coppull Parish Council		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1(d)iv: objection to Coppull as an Urban Local Service Centre</li> </ul>	
117	Mrs J Chessell		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 1: support</li> </ul>	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 7: object to affordable housing at Grimsargh</li> <li>• Policy 19: Area of Separation contradicts site suggestions on land between Grimsargh and Red Scar</li> </ul>	
118	Cllr. M Devaney		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 7: amend affordable housing percentage from 30% to 20%</li> </ul>	
119	Cllr. M Muncaster		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 7: amend affordable housing percentage from 30% to 20%</li> </ul>	
120	Haighton Parish Council		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 19: supports Areas of Separation between Grimsargh and Red Scar and Whittingham</li> <li>• Policy 22: renewable and low carbon energy sources must be sensitive to the surrounding area</li> </ul>	

**Key:**

1, 49, 118, 119	Councillors	4
69, 90, 110	Private Utility Companies	3
28, 35, 38, 88, 92	Local Authorities	5
21, 30, 32, 54, 91, 111, 114	Government Departments, Agencies, Quangos, NDPBs	7
18, 20, 41, 43, 50, 64, 116, 120	Parish Councils	8
5, 22, 31, 36, 37, 45, 67, 93, 102	NGOs, National Charities, National Pressure Groups, Regional Organisations	9
48, 51, 53, 57, 58, 59, 61, 63, 71, 73, 77, 95, 96, 97, 101	House Builders	15
2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 19, 25, 26, 29, 34, 40, 42, 44, 75, 76, 86, 103, 104, 105, 115, 117	Individuals	24
3, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 23, 24, 27, 33, 39, 46, 47, 52, 55, 56, 60, 62, 65, 66, 68, 70, 72, 74, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 87, 89, 94, 98, 99, 100, 106, 107, 108, 109, 112, 113	Other Land Owners or Organisations with Commercial or Development Interests	45





Report of	Meeting	Date
Joint LDF Officer Team	Central Lancashire LDF Joint Advisory Committee	15 <sup>th</sup> March 2011

## **SITE ALLOCATIONS AND POLICIES DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT – OVERVIEW OF ISSUES AND OPTIONS ENGAGEMENT AND REPRESENTATIONS**

### **PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. To present an overview of how the Issues and Options stage of consultation went for the three District Councils and the main points raised in the representations received.

### **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

2. That the report be noted

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF REPORT**

3. This first consultation stage for Site Allocations and Policies has been done concurrently by the three District Councils using broadly consistent approaches. Attempts were made to notify as many people as practically possible and offer a range of ways to engage and respond. Many hundreds of representations have been received by each authority and these, in numerical terms, are predominantly from residents especially where local development proposals are already in the public eye.
4. Residents have been generally sceptical of the need for development and concerned about predicted adverse impacts. Other parties have typically focused on their specific sites/areas of interest. Community engagement appears to have worked best where opportunities were given to properly discuss matters arising in considered ways. However a challenge for the next stage of consultation will be to find ways of explaining to the public at large why some development is needed, what the associated benefits could be and what safeguards can be secured.

### **REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION(S)**

#### **(If the recommendations are accepted)**

5. To keep Members informed.

### **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

6. None.

## BACKGROUND

7. Issues and Options is the first full consultation stage of producing a LDF Development Plan Document (DPD). At this stage the local authority's position is that it has made no decisions on the content of the plan. It is seeking to stimulate interest and responses from a wide range of parties on how the local planning issues being faced could be resolved in site and policy-specific ways, taking the Core Strategy as a broad indicator as to what is needed where.

## ENGAGEMENT

8. The three Central Lancashire District Councils collaborated to produce similar Issues and Options Discussion Papers to present key local planning matters, raise questions and indicate potential sites (for development and other uses) selected from those areas of land previously suggested (mainly by landowners and developers) in the earlier 'call for sites'. The process was also designed to stimulate views on how, through policies, development should be managed and 'sensitive' sites protected from being developed.
9. The consultation was timed to occur at the same time in each District and was also coincident with the public deposit of the Core Strategy. This enabled a joint mail out of letters (over 3000) to all interested parties referring to both types of plans. Attention was also drawn to the availability of the information using press releases, articles in Council newspapers and locally displayed posters. All three Councils produced leaflets advertising upcoming events but only Preston Council tried to get them to all local residents.
10. Copies of the Discussion Papers were available to view in libraries and rural post offices as well as at the Council offices and on the authorities' websites. An on-line interactive map (seamless across Central Lancashire) showing the locations of the sites was created and designed to enable comments. Paper forms were also available for respondents to use.
11. Various efforts were made to take the engagement process out to local people using venues such as local markets, supermarkets and on-street locations. South Ribble and Preston Councils used the established Area Committee/Forum arrangements to meet local people. Some parish council meetings were attended by Planning Officers, this method was extensively used in Chorley Borough. Public attendances at these different events varied from just a few people to over 200.

## REPRESENTATIONS

12. The volume of responses in each District was quite high, running to many hundreds in each case. Unlike the Core Strategy representations (that came from approximately 120 different parties) the numbers were swelled by many more local resident representations compared to landowner/developer and agency interests. This was particularly so where there was (coincidentally in terms of timing) already on-going large development planning applications/appeals.
13. Across all three Districts common concerns/views expressed by residents were:
  - Loss of greenfield sites/open space to development and concerns about settlements coalescing
  - A belief there is adequate brownfield land to cater for foreseeable development needs
  - Scepticism that significant numbers of new houses need to be built

- Concern about increase pressure on various types of local infrastructure but particular fears of increased road traffic congestion
- Increased risk of flooding
- Loss of wildlife habitats to development

14. Landowners' and developers' representations not surprisingly generally focussed on the development potential of specific sites. Official agencies tended to limit their points to their own areas of interest/expertise.

**COMMENTARY ON THE HOW THE STAGE WENT AND NEXT STEPS**

15. Some residents claimed to be unaware of the consultation until very late in the process so actual or de facto extensions to the response deadline were granted. Even in Preston many householders claimed not to have received notification leaflets and attempts here to pass the word via community radio, Facebook and Twitter media seems to have had only limited success. A solution could be more personalised contact but a mass mail out of letters for example would be very expensive.
16. The best forms of face to face engagement in terms of receiving constructive considered feedback came at events that included facilitated round table discussions with residents and in situations where people were willing to stop and devote time to talk.
17. The on-line response forms were of limited benefit with concerns about them timing out and being too text space restrictive. Web access proved difficult for some people in terms of navigation and the interactive mapping was often found complicated to use. Clearly there is scope to improve the design of all these features for future rounds of consultation.
18. Perhaps the most fundamental aspect to take account of at the next (Preferred Options) stage of engagement is to find better ways of explaining why new development is necessary, the benefits it can bring and what safeguards can be put in place to minimise the impact of development/improve its design.

There are no background papers to this report.

Report Author	Tel	Email	Doc ID
Julian Jackson	01772 536774	Julian.jackson@lancashire.gov.uk	JAC Report – Mar 11 – Site Allocations

This page is intentionally left blank



Report of	Meeting	Date
Joint LDF Officer Team	Central Lancashire LDF Joint Advisory Committee	15 March 2011

## COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To update Members on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and provide information on the advantages and disadvantages of it. The report advises the District Councils should adopt the CIL approach and for Officers to start to prepare a Draft Charging Schedule which would set the levy rates and therefore be the means by which developer contributions towards infrastructure should be collected within Central Lancashire.

### RECOMMENDATION

2. To adopt CIL and to prepare a Draft Charging Schedule.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE CIL

3. On the 18 November 2010 the Government confirmed that CIL (first introduced by the previous Government) would, with a few changes, be continued as a national approach to collecting developer contributions. It is considered to provide a fairer, more transparent system for funding new infrastructure than the current use of obligations under Section 106 of the Planning Act 1990. The use of the levy is at the discretion of local authorities but the scope to use Section 106 is being curtailed. Unfortunately the full details and regulations as to how CIL is intended to operate have not been finalised. However it is apparent that the process of adopting levy rates will be quite involved and will need to be backed by more evidence, particularly on financial viability. There will be a cost implication of commissioning such research but the option of not pursuing CIL would more than likely mean that monies collected from developer contributions would not be optimised.

### REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

4. To provide the basis for a consistent approach to preparing for CIL across Central Lancashire.

## ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS AND OPTIONS

5. To not adopt CIL.

## BACKGROUND

6. CIL is a levy that local authorities in England and Wales can choose to charge on new developments. The money can be used to meet both the capital and revenue costs of infrastructure that the Councils, local communities and neighbourhoods want. The system is in essence a simple process and would apply to most new buildings. The charges are based on the size (floorspace) and type of the new development set at levels that would still leave the development economically viable to carry out.

## DISADVANTAGES OF NOT ADOPTING CIL

7. If the Central Lancashire authorities do not adopt CIL, after April 2014 the regulations restrict the local use of planning obligations for pooled contributions towards infrastructure which will only be collectable from up to 5 separate obligations for infrastructure capable of being funded through the levy. Therefore without a CIL system in place the Councils would likely miss out on some developer contributed infrastructure funding.

## ADVANTAGES OF ADOPTING CIL

8. Central Lancashire's Publication Core Strategy Policy 2 identifies that, in order to deliver the growth of housing and employment it is necessary that the essential infrastructure be delivered by both the public and private sectors. The Councils would normally secure developer contributions towards infrastructure using obligations under Section 106 of the Planning Act 1990. The use of CIL is encouraged because it would provide the following benefits;
  - deliver additional funding for local authorities to carry out a wide range of infrastructure projects (not necessarily connected with the contributing development) that support growth and benefit the local community;
  - give local authorities the flexibility and freedom to set their own priorities for what money should be spent on as well as create a predictable funding stream that allows them to plan ahead more effectively;
  - provide developers with more certainty 'up front' about how much money they will be expected to contribute which in turn should encourage greater confidence and higher levels of inward investment, and;
  - ensure greater transparency for local people because they will be able to understand how new development is contributing to services and facilities in their community.

## CHARGING SCHEDULE

9. There is the ability to charge variable levy rates depending on development type and locality. The Charging Schedule sets out the levy rates to be applied. A local authority must aim to deliver an 'appropriate balance' between the desirability of funding infrastructure

from the levy and the potential impact, taken as a whole, of the imposition of the levy on the economic viability of development across its area.

10. The Charging Schedule is initially produced as a draft document. It should be informed by appropriate evidence regarding the infrastructure funding gap (the difference between already available funding from whatever sources and what the full infrastructure costs are) and the general development viability. The formal process leading to adoption of the levy involves public consultation and consideration by an independent examiner by way of an examination process open to public scrutiny. The national guidance issued does not envisage the Charging Schedule to be produced ahead of the Core Strategy being adopted as the Government expects the appropriate evidence base to include an up-to-date development strategy.
11. The possibility does exist for an authority to advance a Draft Charging Schedule alongside a proposed Core Strategy, but that is not a practicable option for the Central Lancashire authorities as it would not be possible to 'catch up' with the Publication Core Strategy. However the authorities could undertake all the work necessary to prepare a Draft Charging Schedule in expectation of the Core Strategy being adopted.
12. Under the current regulations any changes to a Council's proposed levy rates required by the Inspector are binding. However the Government intends to include provisions within the Localism Act to give authorities more discretion as to how Charging Schedules are finalised. On adoption of the finalised levy, the regulations restrict the use of Section 106 obligations to ensure that individual developments are not charged for the same infrastructure items through both obligations and levy. A Charging Authority (District Councils in shire County areas) should set out a list of the infrastructure items it intends to fund from levy revenue.
13. By producing such a list the authorities cannot then seek a contribution towards those same items by way of Section 106 obligations. If the authorities do not publish such a list then this would be taken to mean that the authority was intending to use levy revenue for any type of infrastructure that could be funded by the levy and thus could not seek an obligation contribution towards any such infrastructure. The regulations permit up to 5% of the revenue arising from the levy to be used on administrative expenses.
14. The Localism Bill aims to enable local authorities to allocate a share of the levy raised in a neighbourhood to deliver infrastructure identified by the neighbourhood community itself. The CIL regulations remain to be finalised but what is set is the levy will be expressed as a rate of pounds sterling per square metre of a building's floorspace and will be chargeable on most new developments that involve the creation of floorspace although a nil rate may apply if a charge would render that type of development unviable. Social housing and developments for charitable purposes are completely exempt from CIL. Section 106 obligations remain the method for securing affordable housing although consideration is being given to including this within CIL through the Localism Bill.

## **ISSUES TO CONSIDER**

15. CIL is promoted as being faster, fairer, more certain and more transparent than the use of Section 106 obligations. While these perceived benefits may be debatable in some respects, adoption of the levy should assist in the provision of infrastructure in Central Lancashire. Increases in total funding would arise from the introduction of CIL as it would apply to many more developments than are currently made the subject of obligations. Although there is no compulsion on local authorities to adopt the levy, because it is the

Government's preferred vehicle for the collection of pooled infrastructure contributions the regulations introduce restrictions that will reduce the effectiveness of obligations as a means to secure infrastructure. From the 6 April 2014 (or adoption of the levy) the pooling of contributions towards an item of infrastructure will effectively be limited to that arising from a maximum of five obligations. This would be likely to significantly prejudice the delivery of some infrastructure items in Central Lancashire which would depend upon contributions from numerous developments especially with the likelihood of only severely limited or nil public sector funding being available .

16. In an area where there is two tiers of local government, as in Central Lancashire, decisions would need to be made as to how much money would be passed from the District Councils as Charging Authorities to the County Council as a provider of specific 'County Matter' services and facilities. Wider than this, CIL monies could be passed to other agencies/providers as well being collected by one District Council but spent in the administrative area of another. Much of this would be decided on the basis of infrastructure priorities identified in the approved list of items needing funding.
17. CIL is intended to provide infrastructure to support the development of an area rather than to make individual planning applications acceptable in planning terms. As a result there may still be some site specific mitigation requirements without which a development should not be granted planning permission. Some of these needs may be provided for through the levy but others may not be, particularly if they are very local in their impact. Consequently there would still be scope for development specific (Section 106 type) obligations to enable the Councils to be confident that the specific consequences of development proposals could be mitigated.
18. The proposed Central Lancashire Local Development Scheme (elsewhere on this meeting's agenda) envisages that a single CIL Charging Schedule will be produced to operate across the three District Council areas. The three authorities would need to formally agree to that approach. The advantages of joint preparation are economies of effort and monies but also the benefit of having a complementary rather than conflicting approach to setting levy rates across the area. The rates however may still be set to vary from place to place depending on local differences in economic viability. Such variations would need to relate to the research evidence which would also consider a range of uses, not just housing developments.

## **CONCLUSION**

19. Now that the Government has confirmed its intentions to continue with CIL it is a timely moment to consider the merits of adopting the levy in Central Lancashire, and begin to prepare a Draft Charging Schedule.
-



<b>Report Author</b>	<b>Tel</b>	<b>Email</b>	<b>Doc ID</b>
Christina Marginson	01772536776	christina.marginson@lancashire.gov.uk	JAC Report – CIL
<b>Background Papers</b>			
Document	Date	File	Place of Inspection
The Community Infrastructure Levy Guidance: Charge Setting and for changing schedule procedures.	March 2010		<a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk">http://www.communities.gov.uk</a>
The Community Infrastructure Levy: Summary	November 2010		<a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk">http://www.communities.gov.uk</a>
The Community Infrastructure Levy: Overview	November 2010		<a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk">http://www.communities.gov.uk</a>
Planning Act	2008		<a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk">http://www.communities.gov.uk</a>
Localism Bill	January 2011		<a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk">http://www.communities.gov.uk</a>

This page is intentionally left blank



Report of	Meeting	Date
Joint LDF Officer Team	Central Lancashire LDF Joint Advisory Committee	15 March 2011

## LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

### PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To inform members of the outcome of progress in preparing a joint Local Development Scheme (LDS).
2. To outline the key timescales of the Local Development Framework (LDF) over the next three years.

### RECOMMENDATION(S)

3. That the attached joint Scheme be supported.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF REPORT

4. The LDS is the timetable for the production of the LDF. It identifies a series of milestones for the production of the various planning documents (including the proposed Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule) and sets out the various community engagement/preparation stages.
5. The LDS also includes the risks and resources in producing an LDF and the link between the old style Local Plans with their 'saved policies' and the documents in preparation.
6. It is a statutory requirement to produce an LDS and intended to remain so with the enactment of the Localism Bill.

### REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION(S) (If the recommendations are accepted)

7. To make Members aware of the LDS and the timescales for the production of the LDF, over the next three years.

### ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

8. None as it is a required document.

## BACKGROUND

### What is a Local Development Scheme?

9. The LDS is the business plan for the production of an LDF. It identifies and sets out the timescales for the production of Development Plan Documents (DPD's) and can include as is proposed here timescales for the production of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's) and other associated planning documents such as the Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule. The LDS covers a three year period and should ideally be updated annually to provide realistic and up to date timescales. Once agreed the LDS is a publicly available document, which will be placed on the Councils' websites, as well as in paper form, if requested in that format.
10. There are currently three LDS's – one for each of the Central Lancashire District Councils.
  - Chorley's LDS currently runs from 2009 to 2012
  - South Ribble's LDS currently runs from 2007 to 2012
  - Preston's LDS currently runs from 2007 - 2010

However, due to recent planning changes at the national level there have been a number of delays in the production of the LDF documents and as a result all three LDS's need to be updated.

### What has been carried out so far?

11. A draft joint LDS for the three teams has now been produced, covering the period up until 2014 – see attached Appendix 1. This document is intended to replace the three individual LDS's and provide an update of the timescales for the production of the documents, the level of staff resources available, a risk assessment of meeting the timescales and preparation progress.
12. This document would be the first joint LDS for the three authorities and has been produced arising out of joint working on the Core Strategy and forthcoming Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's).

## KEY ISSUES

13. The LDS provides a timescale for the continuing production of the Core Strategy. The key milestones including its submission by the end of March 2011, the examination hearings during June 2011 and adoption in November 2011 is the timetable previously agreed with Members.
14. The LDS also provides timescales for the three individual Site Allocation and Development Management Policies DPD's. However, the timescales for the production of these DPD's varies between authority and as such the periods of community engagement would occur at different times of the year, as a result it is likely there would be individual examinations.
15. Included within the LDS are potential timescales for the proposed Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule, which if accepted, is likely to be out for draft consultation in September/October 2011, examination in February 2012 and adoption in June 2012.

- 16. Although not a requirement of an LDS, the authorities have chosen to include anticipated dates for the production of SPD's to enable clear project management of these documents and provide transparency. There are a number of proposed SPD's, some relating specifically to one authority and others are going to be prepared jointly. With the exception of the New Central Business District, Preston SPD (which has been drafted and is due for adoption in April 2011), the draft SPD's are programmed for consultation in September/October 2011 and adoption in February 2012.
- 17. As well as providing an update on anticipated timescales, the LDS also covers such issues as the resources required to produce the LDF and the risks associated with its production. These have been updated and additional risks included such as: the risk of changing legislation and financial restrictions.
- 18. The LDS also covers the link between other plans such as the Lancashire Waste and Minerals Strategy and existing Local Authority Local Plans and provides information on how the 'saved policies' from the three Local Plans are being taken forward into the LDF.

There are no background papers to this report.

Report Author	Tel	Email	Doc ID
Kezia Henderson	01772 538198	kezia.henderson@lancashire.gov.uk	JAC Report March 2011 – Local Development Scheme (LDS)

This page is intentionally left blank

Central Lancashire Local Development Framework

Appendix 1

**Central Lancashire  
Local Development Scheme**

**March 2011**

Draft

Prepared jointly by Preston, South Ribble and Chorley Councils

Logos

# The Central Lancashire Local Development Scheme 2011

## Introduction

This document is a joint Local Development Scheme (LDS) prepared by Preston City Council, South Ribble Borough Council and Chorley Borough Council. It was decided to produce a single LDS because of the joint working between the three authorities, specifically the Core Strategy and forthcoming Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs).

This document describes what the authorities are going to do over the next three years to prepare new and revised planning policy to form their Local Development Frameworks.

## Purpose of the Document

This document covers the three year period between April 2011 and March 2014. It supersedes the previous LDS's which have been operating separately in the three authorities.

The Local Development Scheme includes the following information:

- ▶ Details of the Development Plan Documents (DPDs) to be prepared from 2011 onwards; and timetables for their preparation, including the Joint Core Strategy DPD and the three individual authorities Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD's.
- ▶ Details of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's) to be prepared from 2011; and brief timetables for their preparation.
- ▶ Details of the 'saved policies' from the Preston City Local Plan, South Ribble Local Plan and Chorley Borough Local Plan Review.
- ▶ Information about the resources available, within Central Lancashire, for preparing the LDF documents.
- ▶ The risks associated with situations that might arise that could adversely impact on the achievement of the work programme set out in the LDS and how these risks are to be managed.



## Hierarchy for Existing and Proposed Planning Documents

**North West Regional Spatial Strategy** (intended to be revoked through the enactment of the Localism Bill)

**Central Lancashire Joint Core Strategy**    **Saved Local Plan Policies**    **Minerals and Waste\***

**Preston Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD**  
**Chorley Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD**  
**South Ribble Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD**

**Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule LDD**

### Proposed SPD's

- Affordable Housing
- Design
- Open Space, Sport and Recreation
- Controlling re-use of Employment Premises
- Rural Development
- Access to Healthy Food
- New Central Business District, Preston
- Inner East Preston
- Cottam Hall Masterplan, Preston

\* Please note that Minerals and Waste DPD's are the responsibility of Lancashire County Council working with Blackpool and Blackburn with Darwen Councils. Such DPD's are also part of the statutory development plan and progress on their preparation can be checked via the following link – <http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/environment/lmwlp/lancsmwdf/index.asp>

### Current Supplementary Documents

#### Preston

- ▶ Design Guide – converting buildings in countryside
- ▶ SPG No. 1 Falkland Street/Ringway
- ▶ SPG No. 2 Hill Street/ Ringway
- ▶ SPG No. 3 Public Art
- ▶ SPG No. 4 Avenham Street
- ▶ SPG No. 5 Design guide on the repair and replacement of traditional doors and windows
- ▶ SPG No. 6 Housing Guide
- ▶ SPG No. 7 Extensions

#### South Ribble

- ▶ Four Interim Planning Policies –
- ▶ IPP Housing
- ▶ IPP Affordable Housing
- ▶ IPP Open Space
- ▶ IPP Retail

#### Chorley

- ▶ Sustainable Resources
- ▶ Design Guidance
- ▶ Development involving horses
- ▶ Conversion of rural buildings in the countryside
- ▶ Protection of employment sites in the countryside
- ▶ Protection of community facilities in rural areas
- ▶ Market Street Development Brief
- ▶ New equipped play areas
- ▶ Outdoor playing space design guidance
- ▶ Rural housing needs schemes
- ▶ Shop fronts and signs
- ▶ Trees and development
- ▶ Guiding principles for development of Botany bay/Great Knowley site
- ▶ IPP Private garden development
- ▶ Waste storage and collection guidance for new developments

## Development Plan Documents

Development Plan Documents (DPDs) are the highest level of local planning policy. They form the Development Plan, along with the Regional Spatial Strategy (North West), although until all the DPD's proposed in this LDS have been adopted, the 'saved policies' from the three authorities Local Plans will remain part of the Development Plan.

Chorley Council has an adopted DPD: Sustainable Resources DPD (adopted September 2008)

### Core Strategy DPD

	December 2010	January 2011	March 2011	May 2011	June 2011	September 2011	October 2011	November 2011
Core Strategy Publication								
Submission								
Pre Hearing Meeting								
Examination Hearing								
Inspector's Report								
Council Approval								
Adoption								

The Core Strategy is the strategic document of the plan covering all three Central Lancashire authority areas. The Core Strategy is already under preparation and completed the Publication representation stage on 31 January 2011. The next stage is the formal submission, leading to the Examination in Public and Adoption, if found sound by an independent Planning Inspector.

**Other Proposed DPD's**

	Dec 2010	Jan 2011	Feb '11 – May '11	June 2011	July 2011	Aug '11 – Sept '11	Oct 2011	Nov 2011	Dec '11 - Feb '12	Mar 2012	Apr - May 2012	June 2012	July 2012	Aug – Sept 2012	Oct 2012	Nov 2012	Dec 2012
Chorley Site Allocation and Development Management Policies DPD	I and O	I and O	Preparation	PO	PO	Preparation	P	P	Preparation	S		PHM	EH		IR		A

	Dec 2010	Jan 2011	Feb '11 – Aug '11	Sept 2011	Oct 2011	Nov '11 – May '12	June 2012	July 2012	Aug '12	Sept 2012	Oct '12	Nov 2012	Dec 2012	Jan '13	Feb 2013	Mar '13	Apr 2013
Preston Site Allocation and Development Management Policies DPD	I and O	I and O	Preparation	PO	PO	Preparation	P	P	Preparation	S		PHM	EH		IR		A
South Ribble Site Allocation and Development Management Policies DPD	I and O	I and O	Preparation	PO	PO	Preparation	P	P	Preparation	S		PHM	EH		IR		A

Key Stages = I and O = Issues and Options PO = Preferred Options P = Publication S = Submission PHM = Pre Hearing Meeting  
 EH = Examination Hearing IR = Inspector's Report A= Adoption

The authorities are producing three separate Site Allocation and Development Management Policies DPD's – each will combine the allocation of land for development uses and protection of land as well as Development Management criteria policies including local car parking standards. The preparation of these three DPDs is currently underway with the Issues and Options consultation having taken place in December to January 2011. The next stage of the documents; Preferred Options is expected in summer (2011) in Chorley and in autumn (2011) in Preston and South Ribble.

Changes to the Proposals Map will track the progress of the Core Strategy, the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD's and the Minerals and Waste Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD being produced by Lancashire County Council with Blackpool and Blackburn with Darwen Councils.

Draft

## Saved Policies from Local Plans

A full list of 'saved policies' can be found in Appendix 1, shown by each individual authority.

The 'saved policies' from the three local plans will remain until such time as the Core Strategy is adopted, for those policies that will be replaced by the Core Strategy, or the individual Site Allocations and Development Management DPD's as they are adopted.

## Proposed Supplementary Planning Documents

The preparation of SPD's will be shared between the Planning Policy Teams at Preston, Chorley and South Ribble authorities, along with assistance from their respective Regeneration/Economic Development, Urban Design and Development Management colleagues, where applicable.

The table below sets out the list of proposed SPD's, the lead council (where there is one), the anticipated drafting time, consultation period and expected date of adoption.

### Proposed SPD's for Central Lancashire

Topic	Lead Council	Drafting	Consultation	Adoption
Affordable Housing	Preston	March to August '11	Sept – Oct '11	Feb 2012
Design	Joint	March to August '11	Sept – Oct '11	Feb 2012
Open Space, Sport and Recreation	Preston	March to August '11	Sept – Oct '11	Feb 2012
Controlling re-use of Employment Premises	South Ribble	March to August '11	Sept – Oct '11	Feb 2012
Rural Development	Chorley	March to August '11	Sept – Oct '11	Feb 2012
Access to Healthy Food	Preston	March to August '11	Sept – Oct '11	Feb 2012
New Central Business District, Preston	Preston	Completed	End Jan – Mar 2011	April 2011
Inner East Preston	Preston	March to August '11	Sept – Oct '11	Feb 2012
Cottam Hall Masterplan, Preston	Preston	March to August '11	Sept – Oct '11	Feb 2012

Please see Appendix 2 for further details on the scope of the proposed SPD's.

### Community Infrastructure Levy – Charging Schedule

Drafting	March to August '11
Consultation	Sept – Oct '11
Publication	December '11
Examination Hearing	Feb '11
Inspector's Report	April '12
Adoption	June '12

The Schedule will set the levy rates to be applied for different types of development.

## Monitoring and Review

Each authority's LDF is monitored on an annual basis through the preparation of an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). The AMR reviews document preparation progress over the preceding year compared to the targets and milestones set out by the authorities in the LDS. It also monitors policy achievement and uses indicators to monitor actual performance against targets.

Currently each local authority prepares an individual AMR, which they submit by the 31<sup>st</sup> December each year. Due to the joint working approach there will need to be some continuity between the three individual AMRs.

The latest AMR's (2010) can be viewed at each of the authorities' websites:

### Preston

<http://www.preston.gov.uk/environment-and-planning/planning/planning-policies/local-development-framework/annual-monitoring-report/>

### South Ribble

<http://www.southribble.gov.uk/Section.asp?sectiontype=listseparate&catid=1022&docid=260>

### Chorley

<http://www.chorley.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=608>

## Resources

The following in-house resources will be made available for preparing Local Development Documents:

### Central Lancashire LDF Team

- Team Leader
- Principal Planning Officer
- 2 x Planning Officers
- Planning Assistant

### Preston

- Planning Policy Manager
- Principal Planning Officer (LDF)
- Senior Planning Officer
- Planning Officer
- Research Officer

### Chorley

- Planning Manager
- Team Leader
- Principal Planner
- 2 x Planning Officers
- Planning Assistant

- Research Officer

### South Ribble

- Planning Manager
- Team Leader
- Principal Planning Officer
- 2 x Planning Officers
- Technical Support Assistant

Joint working between the above teams is coordinated through an LDF Officer Working Group, comprising lead officers from all relevant departments of each Council, and a formally constituted Joint Advisory Committee of Members from the three authorities and Lancashire County Council. Regular meetings are held of these groups to progress work on the Local Development Frameworks.

Consultants have been, and will be engaged on specific projects where there is a lack of expertise or capacity in-house, for example the production of studies as part of the evidence base.

### Risk Assessment

In preparing the Local Development Scheme, it was found that the main areas of risk relate to:

- **Staff turnover/absence.** This potential problem has been mitigated by the allocation of responsibility for production of the LDF to all members of each planning policy team, to allow for cover if required. Also the three authorities have established good working relationships with consultants with a view to employing them from time to time, subject to mutual agreement and financial arrangements.
- **Political delay.** The potential for delays due to the political process is increased by the requirement for joint/aligned documents to be endorsed by the relevant decision making structure of each of the authorities of Preston, South Ribble and Chorley. This has been mitigated by involving Members from all three authorities in a Joint Advisory Committee informed by LDF Working Groups in each District Authority enabling Members to be fully involved in LDD production at an early stage.
- **Capacity of the Planning Inspectorate and other agencies to cope with demand nationwide.** The authorities have given early warning of the LDF programme and invited comments on time-scales. However, this risk is largely out of the authorities' control.
- **Joint Working.** Although there are considerable benefits in joint working, there are risks in terms of programming work and political decision making. The three authorities are seeking to minimise this risk through a memorandum of understanding.
- **“Soundness” of DPDs.** Joint and independent working, this risk will be minimised by liaising closely with relevant partners and agencies, neighbouring authorities and having regard to the soundness toolkit and procedural implications
- **Programme Slippage.** The risk of political delays has been minimised by building some slack into the later part of the programme as a contingency allowance. The LDF timetable for the Core Strategy may be affected by the Parliamentary legislative programme for the revocation of RSS. Any slippage here is outside of the control of the authorities involved.
- **Changing Legislation.** The risk of changing legislation during the preparation of the LDF is a challenge. This risk will be minimised by attending events, liaising with the relevant

Government Department, keeping up to date with new policy and legislation and assessing how this may impact on the LDF.

- **Finance/Resource Availability.** Finance and resource availability will be a significant challenge in the forthcoming years. This will need to be considered by the three authorities and assessed on a yearly basis. The risk of lack of finance has been mitigated by advance budgeting and joint working savings.

## What progress has been made?

Outlined below is recent progress on the LDF incorporating joint working and individual authority programmes.

### Joint working

Progress on the Joint Core Strategy – The Core Strategy has been deposited as a Publication version (Dec – Jan 2011)

### Preston

Interim Planning Statement 3: Reducing carbon emissions in new development (Jan 2010)

Issues and Options Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (Dec – Jan 2011)

### Chorley

Sustainable Resources DPD and SPD adopted 2008 and 2009.

Issues and Options Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (Dec – Jan 2011)

### South Ribble

Issues and Options Site Allocations and Development Management DPD Policies (Dec – Jan 2011)



## Appendices

### Appendix 1 'Saved Policies'

The following table outlines the 'saved policies' and how they will be taken forward into the Local Development Framework or deleted.

- CS = Proposed to be replaced by the Core Strategy
- SA = Proposed to be replaced by Site Allocations or other DPD/SPD
- DG = Proposed to be deleted: covered by national policy guidance
- D = Proposed to be deleted: no replacement

#### Chorley Council: Local Plan saved policies – proposed future LDF coverage

- **General Policies**

Policy no.	Policy title	Decision
GN1	Settlement policy: main settlements	CS
GN2	Royal Ordnance/Buckshaw	CS SA
GN3	Development in Ecclestone	CS SA
GN4	Development in various settlements	CS SA
GN5	Design and impact of development	CS
GN6	Priority urban fringe areas	D
GN9	Transport accessibility	D

- **Development in the Countryside**

Policy no.	Policy title	Decision
DC1	Green Belt	DG SA
DC2	Open countryside	CS SA
DC3	Safeguarded land	SA
DC4	Rural infilling	CS
DC5	Rural affordable housing	CS
DC6	Major developed sites in Green Belt	CS SA
DC7A	Rural conversions in Green Belt	CS
DC7B	Rural conversions elsewhere	CS
DC8A	Rural replacement dwellings and extensions in the Green Belt	CS
DC8B	Rural replacement dwellings and extensions elsewhere	CS
DC9	Landscape character areas	CS
DC10	Rural community facilities	CS

- **Environmental Protection**

Policy no.	Policy title	Decision
EP1	Sites of Special Scientific Interest	CS
EP2	County Heritage Sites and LNRs	CS
EP3	Nature geological sites of local importance	CS
EP4	Species protection	CS
EP5	Wildlife corridors	CS
EP6	Agricultural land	CS
EP7	Agricultural development	CS

EP8	Development involving horses	CS
EP9	Trees and woodland	CS
EP10	Landscape assessment	CS
EP11	Structural landscaping belts	SA
EP12	Environmental improvements	D
EP13	Under-used, derelict and unsightly land	SA
EP15	Unstable land	DG
EP17	Water resources and quality	CS SA
EP18	Surface water run-off	CS
EP20	Noise	DG
EP21	Air pollution	CS
EP21A	Light pollution	DG
EP22	Energy conservation	CS
EP23	Energy from renewable resources	CS SA
EP24	Wind farms	CS SA

• Heritage

Policy no.	Policy title	Decision
HT7	Conservation areas	SA
HT8	Control of demolition in conservation areas	SA
HT9	Trees in conservation areas	SA
HT10	Locally important buildings	SA
HT11	Archaeological sites	SA
HT12	Sites of regional and local archaeological importance	SA
HT13	Historic parks and gardens	SA

• Housing

Policy no.	Policy title	Decision
HS1	Housing allocations	CS SA
HS2	Highway improvements	SA
HS4	Design and layout	CS SA
HS5	Affordable housing	CS SA
HS6	Housing windfall sites	SA
HS7	Redevelopment for housing	SA
HS8	Local needs housing within rural settlements excluded from Green Belt	CS SA
HS9	Residential extensions in settlements excluded from the Green Belt	CS
HS10	Multiple occupancy	SA
HS11	Flats above retail and commercial premises	SA
HS12	The inclusion of flats in retail and commercial schemes	SA
HS13	Protection of existing flats and the potential for flats	SA
HS16	Removal of agricultural occupancy conditions	DG
HS17	Special needs housing	CS
HS19	Public open space requirements in housing developments	CS SA
HS20	Ornamental open space requirements	CS
HS21	Playing space requirements	CS
HS22	Established residential areas	SA

- **Employment**

<b>Policy no.</b>	<b>Policy title</b>	<b>Decision</b>
EM1	Employment land allocations	CS SA
EM1A	Royal Ordnance/Buckshaw	CS
EM2	Development criteria for industrial and business development	CS
EM3	Diversification of the rural economy	CS SA
EM4	Protection of employment sites in rural settlements	CS SA
EM4A	Additional employment in rural areas	CS SA
EM5	Extensions to rural enterprises	CS
EM6	Financial and professional services	SA
EM7	Employment development in residential areas	SA
EM8	Redevelopment of identified employment sites	CS SA
EM9	Redevelopment of employment sites for non-employment uses	CS SA

- **Transportation**

<b>Policy no.</b>	<b>Policy title</b>	<b>Decision</b>
TR1	Major development tests	D
TR3	Road schemes	SA
TR4	Highway development control criteria	D
TR13	Rail facilities	CS SA
TR14	Rail electrification and improvement	CS SA
TR17	Cycle routes	CS SA
TR18	Pedestrian and cycle facilities in new development	SA
TR19	Improved cycling and pedestrian facilities	CS SA
TR22	Development Access Points	SA

- **Shopping**

<b>Policy no.</b>	<b>Policy title</b>	<b>Decision</b>
SP1	Locations for major retail development	CS
SP2	Retail allocations	CS SA
SP4	Primary shopping area	SA
SP5	Secondary shopping area	SA
SP6	District, neighbourhood, local shopping areas	CS SA
SP9	Local shops on housing development sites	D
SP10	Shopfronts	CS SA

- **Leisure and Tourism**

<b>Policy no.</b>	<b>Policy title</b>	<b>Decision</b>
LT2	Leisure allocations	SA
LT3	Small scale tourism and visitor facilities	CS
LT4	Caravan and camping sites	CS
LT5	Farm based visitor attractions	CS
LT6	Visitor facilities at historic buildings	CS
LT7	Historic Parks and Gardens	D*
LT8	Valley Parks	CS
LT9	Leeds and Liverpool canal	CS SA
LT10	Public rights of way	CS SA

LT11	Allotments	CS SA
LT12	Outdoor sport and related development	CS SA
LT13	Playspace allocations	SA
LT14	Playing fields, parks and recreational open space	CS SA
LT15	Amenity open space	SA
LT16	Dual use of education facilities	CS

- Public Services**

Policy no.	Policy title	Decision
PS1	Hospital land allocation	CS SA
PS2	Community centres and village halls	CS
PS3	Community facilities change of use	CS
PS4	Pre-school playgroups and nurseries	CS
PS5	Nursery education	CS
PS6	Primary school allocations	SA
PS7	Further and higher education facilities	SA
PS10	Chorley Town Hall extension	SA
PS11	Crematoria and burial facilities	SA
PS12	Utility services development	CS
PS12A	Hazardous installations	DG
PS12B	Development near hazardous installations	DG
PS13	Travelling showpeople	CS SA
PS14	Gypsies and other travellers	CS SA
PS15	Church and related uses	SA

(\*) Policy duplication: please refer to Policy HT13

### Preston City Council: Local Plan saved policies – proposed future LDF coverage

- The Development Strategy**

Policy no.	Policy title	Decision
DS3	Density of Housing Development	CS

- Development in the Countryside**

Policy no.	Policy title	Decision
DC1	Green Belt	DG
DC4	Agricultural Diversification	DG
DC7	Nature Conservation: Locally Important Sites	CS
DC8	Wildlife Corridors	CS SA
DC10	Rural Villages	CS SA
DC14	Existing Rural Workers Dwellings	SA
DC15	Protection of Rural Shops and Businesses	CS
DC16	Surface Water and Ground Water Supplies	CS

- Development and Pollution**

Policy no.	Policy title	Decision
DP2	Development on Landfill Sites	DG
DP3	Development and Flood Risk	CS

- **Greenspace**

<b>Policy no.</b>	<b>Policy title</b>	<b>Decision</b>
G1	Parks and Public Open Space	CS SA
G2	Amenity Open Space	CS SA
G3	Private, Educational and Institutional Greenspace	CS SA
G4	Small Amenity Greenspace in Housing Areas	SA
G5	Road Verges and other Incidental Greenspace	CS
G6	Golf Courses	CS SA
G7	Cemeteries and Crematoria	CS SA
G9	Proposed Public Open Space	SA

- **Conservation of the Historic Environment**

<b>Policy no.</b>	<b>Policy title</b>	<b>Decision</b>
C1	Development and Conservation Areas	CS
C2	Demolition of Listed Buildings or Buildings in Conservation Areas	CS
C3	Conservation Areas – Changes of Use	CS
C4	Setting of Listed Buildings	CS
C5	Use of Listed Buildings	CS
C6	Alteration of Listed Buildings	CS
C7	Listed Buildings and S.106 Agreements	CS
C8	Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest	CS
C9	Archaeological Features	CS

- **Transport**

<b>Policy no.</b>	<b>Policy title</b>	<b>Decision</b>
T1	Park and Ride Bus Services	CS
T3	Public Transport: Railway Lines and Stations	CS SA
T5	Highway Improvements - Broughton- by- pass	CS SA
T6	Completion of Motorway Junction 31A	SA
T9	City Centre: Traffic Management/ Pedestrian Priority Proposals	D
T11	City Centre: Public Off-street Car Parking	CS SA
T13	City Centre – Private Non-Residential Car Parking	CS SA
T14	Public Off-street Car Parking Outside the City Centre	D
T19	General Transport Considerations	CS SA
T21	Development in relation to Trunk Roads	DG

- **Housing and Residential Areas**

<b>Policy no.</b>	<b>Policy title</b>	<b>Decision</b>
H3	Affordable Housing in Rural Areas	CS SA
H4	Caravan Sites for Gypsies	CS
H5	Development proposals in existing residential areas	SA
H6	Backland Development	SA
H8	House Extensions	D
H10	New Business and Employment Uses in Residential Areas	D
H11	Business And Commercial Restraint Area	D
H12	Community and Other Non-residential Uses	D

H13	Day Nurseries and Play Groups	D
-----	-------------------------------	---

- Business and Industry**

Policy no.	Policy title	Decision
W1	Provision For New Business And Industrial Development	CS SA
W3	Uses Falling Outside a Use Class Order	D
W5	Telecommunications	SA

- Shopping**

Policy no.	Policy title	Decision
S1	City Centre – Retail Development in the Principle Retail Core	SA
S2	City Centre – Retail Development within the City Centre Shopping Area outside the Principal Retail Core	SA
S3	City Centre - Primary Retail Frontages	SA
S4	City Centre Shopping Area - Secondary Frontages	SA
S5	City Centre Shopping Area - Development of Premises outside Defined Retail Frontages	SA
S6	Major Retail Development within the City Centre outside the Principal Retail Core	SA
S7	New Small Scale Retail Development within and outside Local Centres	SA
S8	Local Centres – Non-retail Uses	SA
S9	Other Shops in the Urban Area	D
S11	Hot Food Shops	CS SA

- Community and Leisure Facilities**

Policy no.	Policy title	Decision
CLF1	Large Scale Leisure Facilities	DG
CLF2	Small Scale Leisure Facilities	DG
CLF4	Amusement Centres	DG
CLF5	Water-Based Recreation	D
CLF6	Public Rights of Way	SA
CLF7	Caravan and Chalet development	CS SA
CLF8	Horses	SA
CLF9	Community Facilities	DG
CLF10	Allotments	CS SA

- Design**

Policy no.	Policy title	Decision
D1	Design Criteria	CS SA
D2	The Local Context	CS SA
D3	Daylight and Sunlight	CS SA
D4	Safety and Security	CS SA
D5	Tall Buildings	CS SA
D6	Vistas	CS SA
D7	The Layout of Development	CS SA
D9	Works of Public Art	CS SA

D11	Landscape Treatment	CS SA
D12	Housing Development	CS SA
D13	House Extensions	CS SA
D14	Shop Fronts	CS SA
D15	Retail Warehousing and Industrial Development	CS
D16	Advertisements	DG
D17	Advertisement Hoardings	DG
D18	Rural Development	SA
D19	The Conversion of Rural Buildings	CS SA

- Renewable Energy**

Policy no.	Policy title	Decision
RE2	Wind Energy	CS

- Site Specific Policies**

Policy no.	Policy title	Decision
SS1	Mixed Use Frontages	DG
SS2	Appropriate City Centre Uses	DG
SS3	Land adjacent to Ringway/Falkland Street	CS SA
SS5	Avenham Street	D
SS6	University of Central Lancashire	CS
SS7	St Joseph's Hospital, Mount Street	D
SS9	Hill Street/Ringway	CS SA
SS10	Site of former St. Mary's Church, Friargate Brow	D
SS11	Hope Street/Corporation Street	D
SS12	Walker Street/Great Shaw Street	CS
SS15	Manchester Road / Grimshaw Street	CS
SS18	Queen Street / Dale Street	CS
SS20	Leighton Street (Gypsy Site and adjacent land)	CS
SS22	Centenary Mill, New Hall Lane	CS
SS23	Deepdale Street / Fletcher Road Coal yard	CS
SS24	Deepdale Mill, Deepdale Mill Street	DG
SS25	Brockholes View / Birley Bank	D
SS26	Aqueduct Mill	D
SS31	Riversway Phase B	D
SS33	Sharoe Green Hospital	D
SS34	Fulwood Barracks	SA

### South Ribble Borough Council: Local Plan saved policies – proposed future LDF coverage

- Development Policies**

Policy no.	Policy title	Decision
D1	New Development	CS
D3	Existing Built-up Areas	CS
D4	Green Belt	SA
D5	Development in the Green Belt	DG
D7	Major Development Site – Whitbread Brewery	SA
D8	Safeguarded Land	SA
D9	Local Needs in Villages	SA

D10	Green Wedges	CS
D11	Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land	CS
D12	The Re-use and Adaptation of Rural Buildings	CS SA

- Housing Policies**

Policy no.	Policy title	Decision
HP1	Allocation of Housing Land	CS SA
HP3	Affordable Housing – Site Specific Targets	CS
HP5	Rural Areas Exception Policy	CS
HP7	Agricultural Workers Dwellings	DG
HP8	Removal of Agricultural Occupancy Conditions	DG
HP9	Caravan Sites for Gypsies	CS

- Employment Policies**

Policy no.	Policy title	Decision
EMP1	Allocation of Employment Land	CS SA
EMP2	Major Inward Investment Site	CS
EMP3	Main Existing Employment Areas	CS SA
EMP4	Other Existing Sites	CS SA
EMP5	Business Use	CS SA
EMP6	Mixed Use Schemes	CS SA
EMP7	Land at West Paddock, Leyland	SA
EMP8	Land at Samlesbury Aerodrome	CS SA
EMP9	Strategic Landscaped Areas in Employment Areas	SA

- Retail Policies**

Policy no.	Policy title	Decision
LTC1	Land at Southern Towngate	SA
LTC3	Other Development within the Town Centre	CS
LTC4	Criteria for Determining Applications	SA
LTC5	Hough Lane and Chapel Brow Improvements	SA
LTC6	Linking of Chapel Brow and Hough Lane	CS
LTC7	Car Parking in Leyland Town Centre	CS SA
FR1	Definition of District Centres	CS SA
FR2	Capitol Centre, Walton-le-Dale	SA
FR3	Development Elsewhere in the Urban Area	CS
FR4	Other Retail and Commercial Development	CS
FR5	Loss of Local Shops	SA

- Environment Policies**

Policy no.	Policy title	Decision
ENV1	Landscape Protection and Enhancement	CS
ENV2	Sites of Special Scientific Interest	CS
ENV3	Protecting Other Sites and Features of Nature Conservation Interest	CS
ENV4	Wildlife Habitats	CS
ENV5	Habitat Creation	CS
ENV6	Wildlife Corridors	CS
ENV7	Protection of Trees and Woodlands	SA
ENV8	Trees and Development	SA



ENV9	Unstable or Contaminated Land	DG
ENV10	Derelict Land Reclamation	SA
ENV11	Environmental Improvement	SA
ENV12	Listed Buildings	CS
ENV13	Alterations and Additions to Listed Buildings	CS
ENV14	Setting of a Listed Building	CS
ENV15	Development in Conservation Areas	CS
ENV16	Article 4 Directions	CS
ENV17	Development of Archaeological Sites	CS
ENV18	Development and Historic Parks and Gardens	CS
ENV19	Coastal Zone	CS
ENV20	Flood Risk	CS
ENV21	Groundwater Resources	CS
ENV22	Pollution	CS
ENV23	Water Resources and Development	CS
ENV24	External Lighting and Development	CS SA
ENV25	Hazardous Substances and Installations	D
ENV26	Development of Renewable Energy Schemes	CS

- Open Space and Recreation Policies**

<b>Policy no.</b>	<b>Policy title</b>	<b>Decision</b>
OSR3	New Sites	CS SA
OSR4	Parks and Other Public Open Spaces	CS SA
OSR5	Amenity Open Spaces	CS SA
OSR6	Private, educational and Institutional Recreation Open Spaces	CS SA
OSR7	Allotments	CS SA
OSR8	New Facilities	CS SA
OSR9	Golf Courses	CS
OSR10	Commercial Stables	CS
OSR11	Priority Areas	CS
OSR12	Recreational Routes	CS
OSR13	Disused Transport Routes	CS
OSR14	Footpath Network	CS
OSR15	Tourism Developments	CS
OSR16	Small Scale Tourism	CS
OSR17	Holiday Caravans	SA

- Transport Policies**

<b>Policy no.</b>	<b>Policy title</b>	<b>Decision</b>
T1	Protection of New Highway Routes and Schemes	CS
T3	Link Road	CS SA
T5	Road Hierarchy	CS
T6	Control of Development Affecting Trunk Roads	SA
T7	Implications of Development for Non-Trunk Roads	CS
T8	Traffic Management	CS
T9	Traffic Calming	CS
T10	Parking Standards	CS SA
T11	Cycling	CS
T12	Footpaths and Bridleways	CS
T13	Pedestrian Movement	CS
T14	Facilities in Highway Schemes	CS

T15	Pedestrianisation	CS SA
-----	-------------------	-------

- Quality of Development Policies**

Policy no.	Policy title	Decision
QD1	Design Criteria for New Development	CS SA
QD2	Design of Residential Extensions and Free Standing Structures	CS SA
QD3	Design of New Shop-Fronts	CS SA
QD4	Crime Prevention	CS SA
QD5	Security Shutters	CS SA
QD6	Noise Sensitive Developments	CS
QD7	Landscaping in New Developments	CS SA
QD8	Landscaping Along Major Highway Routes	CS SA
QD9	Advertisements	DG
QD10	Personal Mobility	CS SA
QD11	New Agricultural Buildings	CS SA
QD12	Telecommunications	DG

- Community Services Policies**

Policy no.	Policy title	Decision
C1	Community Facilities	CS
C2	Existing Community Services	CS
C3	School Sites	SA
C5	Public Utilities	CS SA

- Implementation Policies**

Policy no.	Policy title	Decision
IMP1	Community Benefit	CS

- Interim Planning Policies**

Policy no.	Policy title	Decision
HP2R	Affordable Housing	CS
HP4R	Affordable Housing	CS
HP6R	Affordable Housing	CS SA
H1R	Housing	CS
H2R	Housing	CS SA
H3R	Housing	CS
H4R	Housing	DG
H5R	Housing	CS
OS1	Open Space	SA
IPP	Retail	SA

**Appendix 2 'Schedule of content for proposed SPD's'**

Title	1. Affordable Housing
Core Strategy Policy	Policy 7: Affordable Housing
Relevant evidence	Central Lancashire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2009
National policies	PPS3: Housing CLG: Delivering Affordable Housing, 2006
Existing local guidance	Chorley: Rural Housing Needs Scheme, 2004 Preston: The Provision of Affordable Housing in Preston, 2007 South Ribble: Affordable Housing, 2009
Good practice and examples from elsewhere	Golden Triangle Partnership: Affordable Housing Good Practice Manual, 2005 CCHPR: Good Practice Guide to delivering new affordable housing on S106 sites, 2008
Anticipated form and content of consultation	Residential social landlords Council housing departments
Envisaged timescale for completion	12 months
Outline of scope	To establish the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cost at and below which housing is considered to be affordable.</li> <li>• The proportions of social rented and shared ownership housing that will typically be sought across Central Lancashire.</li> <li>• Specific spatial variations in the levels and types of affordable housing need in particular localities.</li> <li>• How the prevailing market conditions will affect what and how much affordable housing will be sought.</li> </ul>
Lead author(s)	Preston (Mike Molyneux)

Title	2. Design
Core Strategy Policy	Policy 17: Design of New Buildings
Relevant evidence	By Design Urban Design Compendiums 1 and 2 Car Parking – What works where (English Partnerships), 2006 “Building in Context” (English Heritage/CABE) NW Regional Planning Guidance, 2008
National policies	PPS1 : Delivering Sustainable Development PPS3 : Housing PPG 13: Transport
Existing local guidance	Chorley: Design Guidance, July 2004 Chorley Householder Design Guidelines SPD, Feb 2008 Chorley Planning Guidelines for Trees and Development Sept 1999 Preston Design Guide – Converting Buildings in the Countryside Preston - SPG No5 – Design Guide on the repair and replacement of traditional doors and windows Preston SPG No6 – Housing Guide Preston SPG No3 – Public Art
Good practice and examples from elsewhere	Sheffield City Centre Urban Design Compendium, 2004 St Helens Urban Design Guide, 2007

	Oldham and Rochdale Urban Design Guide, 2007 West Lancashire Design Guide, 2008 Harlow Design Guide, 2010
Anticipated form and content of consultation	<b>Months 1 and 2</b> – Preparation and presentation of emerging guidance to Developers/Agents/ Stakeholders/LDF Member Working Group/JAC/ SA/HRA Screening <b>Months 3 to 5</b> - Draft Design Guidance <b>Months 6 to 8</b> – consultation period (4-6 weeks formal consultation). Press release, consultation letters to stakeholders and Statutory Consultees and internal consultation. Exhibition posted in main local libraries with leaflets and questionnaires. Staffed exhibitions, leaflets, questionnaires. Timetable of exhibition venues. Council website link Presentation to Town Centre workshop etc Parish Councils, LDF Member working group, JAC Articles published in press <b>Month 9</b> - Post consultation amendments compiled. Response report prepared <b>Month 12</b> - Revised version prepared and reported to Exec and Full Council
Envisaged timescale for completion	12 months
Outline of scope	The aim of the design guide is to give an overview of the design principles that will be employed when considering applications for planning permission and related car parking issues. It will set out a series of principles of good design, a process through which this can be achieved, and then how general objectives can be applied to specific issues. It will encourage high quality design of places, buildings and spaces (including car parking) and landscaping; identifying how best to integrate new development into the existing settlement patterns and landscape character across Central Lancashire in order to reinforce local distinctiveness.
Lead author(s)	Chorley (Peter McAnespie, South Ribble (Mike Eastham)
Assistance from	Preston (Matthew Edwards), (Nigel Roberts)

Title	3. Open Space, Sport and Recreation
Core Strategy Policy	Policy 19: Areas of Separation and Major Open Space Policy 24: Sport and Recreation
Relevant evidence	Central Lancashire Open Space Study, 2010
National policies	PPG17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation
Existing local guidance	Chorley: Interim Guidelines – New equipped play areas, 2010 Outdoor Playing Space Standards/ Design Note, 2004 Outdoor Playing Space Provision, 2002 South Ribble: Open Space, 2009
Good practice and examples from elsewhere	ODPM: Assessing needs and opportunities: a companion guide to PPG17, 2006 Sport England: Good Practice Guide and Local Authority Examples (website)
Anticipated form and content of consultation	Engagement with sport and recreation interests and parish Councils
Envisaged timescale for completion	12 months (including consultation)
Outline of scope	Develop robust minimum local sport and recreation standards based on quantified needs, accessibility and qualitative factors.

Lead author(s)	Preston (Mike Molyneux)
Assistance from	South Ribble (Mike Eastham), Chorley (Katherine Howarth)

<b>Title</b>	<b>4. Controlling re-use of Employment Premises</b>
Core Strategy Policy	Policy 10: Employment Premises and Sites
Relevant evidence	Chorley, Preston and South Ribble Employment Land Review, 2009
National policies	PPS4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth
Existing local guidance	Chorley: Proof of Marketing (EM4) – The Protection of Employment Sites in Rural Settlements Proof of Marketing (EM9) – Redevelopment of Existing Employment Sites for Non-Employment Uses
Good practice and examples from elsewhere	Planning for Economic Development, A Scoping Study, 2002
Anticipated form and content of consultation	Engagement with commercial property agents and business sector.
Envisaged timescale for completion	12 months (including consultation)
Outline of scope	Proposals for the re-use or redevelopment of land or premises (other than for B use class employment uses, but including housing), will be assessed under Policy 10. A balanced criteria based approach will be developed to include marketing and an assessment of the viability of employment development.
Lead author(s)	South Ribble (Jennifer Clough)
Assistance from	Chorley (Alison Marland)

<b>Title</b>	<b>5. Rural Development</b>
Core Strategy Policy	Policy 13: Rural Economy
Relevant evidence	Central Lancashire Core Strategy Rural Proofing, 2010
National policies	PPS7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas
Existing local guidance	Chorley: Development involving horses, 2003 Chorley: Conversion of Rural Buildings in the Countryside, 2004 Chorley: Proof of Marketing (DC10) – The Protection of Existing Employment Sites for Non-Employment Uses, 2004 Preston: Replacement Dwellings and Extensions to Dwellings in the Open Countryside, 2007
Good practice and examples from elsewhere	Good Practice in Rural Development: Scottish Government, 2008
Anticipated form and content of consultation	Engagement with land agents, agricultural and tourism sectors, horse riding interests, local service providers, Parish Councils.
Envisaged timescale for completion	12 months (including consultation)

Outline of scope	Enable ways of appropriately accommodating genuine rural development in rural areas.
Lead author(s)	Chorley (Alison Marland)
Assistance from	Preston (Chris Blackburn), South Ribble (Rachel Peckham)

<b>Title</b>	<b>6. Access to Healthy Food</b>
Core Strategy Policy	Policy 23: Health
Relevant evidence	Health Impact Assessment, 2010 Sustainable Communities Strategies Central Lancashire Joint Strategic Needs Assessment, 2010 Local Authority Health Profiles, 2009
National policies	Health Act 1999 Local Government Act 2000 Choosing Health White Paper 2004 Strong and Prosperous Communities 2006 Spatial Planning for Health (TCPA), 2010 Healthy Lives, Healthy People White Paper, 2010 Draft PPS: Planning for a Natural and Healthy Environment
Existing local guidance	Health & Urban Planning Toolkit (HUDU), 2008 RTPI Healthy Communities Network
Good practice and examples from elsewhere	LB of Waltham Forest: SPD on Hot Food Takeaways 2008 (see PAS website) Sandwell Borough Council: SPD on Takeaways (under consultation)
Anticipated form and content of consultation	Schools questionnaire (used by Sandwell)
Envisaged timescale for completion	12 months (including consultation)
Outline of scope	To work with health care and other partners to control the concentration of fast food takeaways and promote access to healthy food choices.
Lead author(s)	Preston (Martin Putsey)

<b>Title</b>	<b>7. New Central Business District, Preston</b>
Core Strategy Policy	Policy 1a(i) Locating Growth Policy 9b Economic Growth and Employment Policy 11: Retail and Town Centre Uses and Business Based Tourism
Relevant evidence	Chorley, Preston and South Ribble Employment Land Review, 2009 Central Lancashire Retail and Leisure Review, 2010 Central Lancashire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), 2009 Central Lancashire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), 2010
National policies	PPS4: Planning for Sustainable Growth PPS3: Housing
Existing local guidance	None
Good practice and examples from elsewhere	
Anticipated form and content of consultation	

Envisaged timescale for completion	Prepared and available. Consultation Jan to March 2011. Adoption April 2011.
Outline of scope	To plan for the development of over 100,000sq.m of office development, supported by complementary mixed uses.
Lead author(s)	Preston (John Crellin)

<b>Title</b>	<b>8. Inner East Preston</b>
Core Strategy Policy	Policy 1a(i): Locating Growth
Relevant evidence	Multiple deprivation indicators. Central Lancashire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), 2009 Central Lancashire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), 2010 Central Lancashire Open Space Study, 2010 Chorley, Preston and South Ribble Employment Land Review, 2009 Central Lancashire Retail and Leisure Review, 2010
National policies	PPS3: Housing PPS4: Planning for Sustainable Growth PPG17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation
Existing local guidance	The Provision of Affordable Housing in Preston, 2007 Housing Provision in Preston, 2008
Envisaged timescale for completion	12 months
Outline of scope	To plan for the regeneration of an area to the north east of the city centre, which exhibits some of the highest levels of deprivation in the city.
Lead author(s)	Preston

<b>Title</b>	<b>9. Cottam Hall Masterplan, Preston</b>
Core Strategy Policy	Policy 1a(ii): Locating Growth
Relevant evidence	Central Lancashire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), 2010 Central Lancashire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), 2009 Central Lancashire Open Space Study, 2010 Chorley, Preston and South Ribble Employment Land Review, 2009 Central Lancashire Retail and Leisure Review, 2010
National policies	PPS3: Housing PPS4: Planning for Sustainable Growth
Existing local guidance	Preston: Cottam Development Area, 2006
Envisaged timescale for completion	12 Months
Outline of scope	To plan for all aspects of spatial development of land at Cottam Hall and Cottam Brickworks, to the north west of Preston City Centre.
Lead author(s)	Preston

This page is intentionally left blank