



Dear Councillor,

**CENTRAL LANCASHIRE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK JOINT
ADVISORY COMMITTEE - THURSDAY, 31ST MAY 2012**

The next meeting of the Central Lancashire Local Development Framework Joint Advisory Committee to be held at Preston City Council, Town Hall, Lancaster Road, Preston, PR1 2RL on Thursday, 31st May 2012 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 Thursday, 31st May, 2012 is asked to first contact their substitute to see if he or she can attend instead. Then please contact Julie Grundy 01772 906112 via email (j.grundy@preston.gov.uk) to give apologies and indicate whether the substitute Member will attend.

Yours sincerely

Gary Hall
Chief Executive of Chorley Council

Cathryn Filbin
Democratic and Member Services Officer
E-mail: cathryn.filbin@chorley.gov.uk
Tel: (01257) 515123
Fax: (01257) 515150

Distribution

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

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 - 4)**

To confirm the minutes of the last meeting of the Central Lancashire LDF Joint Advisory Committee held on 30 January 2012.

5. **Community Infrastructure Levy - Outcomes of Preliminary Draft Consultation (Pages 5 - 14)**

Report enclosed.

6. **Central Lancashire Open Space Study (Pages 15 - 22)**

Report enclosed.

7. **Central Lancashire Playing Pitch Strategy (Pages 23 - 32)**

Report enclosed.

8. **Central Lancashire Core Strategy - Outcomes of Resumed Examination (Pages 33 - 44)**

Report enclosed.

9. **Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPDs Updates**

Verbal updates will be given on this item.

10. **Dates of Future Meetings**

The next meeting of the Central Lancashire LDF Joint Advisory Committee is 5.30pm on Thursday 19 July at South Ribble Borough Council.

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

Meeting held at 5.30pm on Monday 30 January 2012 at the Civic Centre, South Ribble Borough Council, Leyland

Present: Chorley Borough Council

Councillors Cullens, Heaton and Lees

Preston City Council

Councillors Cartwright, Crompton (substitute), Shannon and Swindells

South Ribble Borough Council

Councillor Hughes (Chairman)

Lancashire County Council

County Councillor Green

In attendance: Central Lancashire LDF Team

Mr J Jackson - Central Lancashire LDF Team Coordinator
Mr D Porter – Principal Planning Officer

Chorley Borough Council

Mrs L Fenton – Director of Partnerships, Planning and Policy

Preston City Council

Mr C Hayward – Assistant Director - City Planning Officer
Mr M Molyneux – Divisional Manager (Planning Policy)

South Ribble Borough Council

Mr J Dalton - Director of Planning and Housing
Mrs H Hockenhull - Planning Manager
Miss D Holroyd - Principal Planning Officer
Mr J Wallwork - Democratic Services Officer

Lancashire County Council

Mr M Hudson – Head of Planning

30. Appointment of a Chairman for the Meeting

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

31. Welcome by the Chairman and Introductions

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting.

32. Apologies for Absence

An apology for absence was submitted on behalf of Councillor Yates (South Ribble Borough Council).

33. Confirmation of Minutes – 8 November 2011

Julian Jackson, Central Lancashire LDF Team Coordinator, referred to minute no. 22 and that he had now received the Royal Town Planning Institute's regional commendation award for the authorities' Habitats Regulations Screening Report approach. He stated that the award would be rotated between each council. The chairman thanked all officers involved for their hard work.

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the Central Lancashire Local Development Framework Joint Advisory Committee meeting held on 8 November 2011 be approved as a correct record and signed by the chairman.

34. Core Strategy Housing Related Changes – Representations Received and Main Issues for Examination

David Porter, Principal Planning Officer, introduced a report which detailed the number and scope of the representations made on the Core Strategy Housing Related Changes and the main issues raised.

He indicated that a total of 42 parties had made representations on the Housing Related Changes and that the housing developers were generally in support of the proposals to increase the supply of land, although they still sought fewer restrictions on how it would be delivered. Several respondents were concerned about what they thought were adverse impacts of the additional Strategic Locations and queried the infrastructure capacity. Other parties suggested that more scope should be given for development in smaller settlements.

UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED:
That the report be noted.

35. Community Infrastructure Levy - Update

The Central Lancashire LDF Team Coordinator introduced a report which updated members on the progress in introducing the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) across Central Lancashire.

He indicated that the charge rates as recommended by the consultants had been approved by each District Council for consultation. The first consultation stage was an opportunity to engage with the relevant sectors likely to be most affected by CIL. He added that there would be a particular spending role that would come to parish and town councils. The consultation started at the end of January and would finish at the end of March. However, the whole process for completing the preparation of CIL for implementation was envisaged to take the remainder of 2012.

Following a question from Councillor Heaton, Julian Jackson indicated that the levy was due from the developers once they had started development.

Councillor Swindells enquired why the option for 'one size fits all' had been chosen. He referred to the difference between development in rural and urban areas and whether there should be different rates. He also referred to various sizes of convenience retail stores and questioned whether there should be a variable rate. He was informed that CIL was meant to be simple and straightforward and that advice on the viability received indicated that it doesn't vary that much by the floorspace of convenience stores. The consultation to be undertaken will however enable the authorities to review the rates and change them if need be.

Councillor Cartwright enquired how many councils had not opted for CIL and how did our figures compares to other authorities. He was informed that only Pendle and Burnley had agreed not to proceed with CIL in Lancashire and that the charge rates proposed in

Central Lancashire was generally in line with other authorities nationally. Councillor Cartwright responded by asking how the figures were calculated. Julian Jackson indicated that there was a document for each District on the website explaining this.

Councillor Cartwright continued to say that to achieve the housing targets a lot of money would be required to carry out the improvements to the highway infrastructure. He questioned whether there could possibly still be a funding gap as CIL would probably not cover all the required infrastructure costs. The Central Lancashire LDF Team Coordinator stated that CIL was only part of the solution to funding infrastructure requirements. The draft CIL schedule had taken account of current viability and expected the North West Preston Area to bring in money into that area to help deliver the infrastructure requirements but other sources of funding would also need to be secured.

Following a question from Councillor Shannon, the committee was informed that it was possible to have a different rate in each authority. However, this would need to be looked at in more detail if it was to be pursued. The Chairman added that the charge rates were only draft ones at this stage and could be modified before being finalised and thereafter reviewed at any time.

Councillor Lees enquired if neighbouring authorities chose a lower rate, would this have an impact on the economic growth within our areas. Julian Jackson confirmed that it could possibly have an impact and therefore it was important to discuss the proposed rates with neighbouring authorities.

UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED:

That the report be noted;

36. Supplementary Planning Documents

David Porter, Principal Planning Officer, presented a report which informed of the progress in preparing the five draft supplementary planning documents (SPDs). The five areas were affordable housing, design, the re-use of employment premises, rural development and access to healthy food. The documents were intended to guide the interpretation and implementation of specific Core Strategy policies.

Councillor Swindells referred to proposals to extend the Right to Buy Scheme which could include tied cottages that are linked into employment and the implications of the requirement to provide a replacement property on a like-for-like basis.

Councillor Shannon referred to the proposed open space and recreation SPD and asked if Core Strategy Policy 19 would be embedded within it. David Porter replied that officers were currently waiting the final reports from the consultants carrying out the open space study. Further to that, consultation would be carried out on this SPD which would cover Policy 19 along with other relevant Core Strategy policies.

Following a question from County Councillor Green, Julian Jackson confirmed that technically there could be a conflict between protecting employment sites and redeveloping brownfield sites for housing purposes.

RESOLVED: That members note the progress made on the production of the draft Supplementary Planning Documents, in advance of them being presented to each Council for formal approval, and then published for consultation.

37. Progress with Site Allocations and Development Management Plans

Debra Holroyd provided an update on behalf of South Ribble Borough Council. She stated that the Site Allocations Preferred Options consultation period had finished on 22 December 2011. There was also a separate consultation on the Samlesbury Enterprise Zone which finished on 13 January 2012. The council had held ten events throughout the

borough during the consultation and had received 227 separate responses. The team was currently working through all the responses to determine if they were in support or objecting to the proposals. It was hoped that the publication stage would be around June/July and then submitted for examination in Oct/Nov 2012. It was anticipated that the Examination in Public would take place in January 2013, the Inspector's report be received in March 2013 and hopefully the document adopted in May 2013.

Mike Molyneux also provided an update in respect of Preston City Council and that they had recently consulted their councillors on preferred sites and will be consulting the public on the Preferred Options Site Allocations Document in May 2012.

Finally, Councillor Cullens informed those present of the position for Chorley Borough Council. He stated that Chorley had also completed the consultation for the Site Allocations Preferred Options and that the deadline had been extended because of the number of responses they were receiving. The process for dealing with the 2500 separate points raised could delay the process by up to three months but it was anticipated that this would then be in line with South Ribble's timescales. He continued to say that they had received major applications which would create 1700 new residential properties, and that this was equivalent to approximately ten years housing supply. He added that Chorley representatives had been to visit the Department for Communities and Local Government to discuss transitional arrangements regarding the National Planning Policy Framework and the new local plans which will replace the Local Development Framework. They were also informed that there may be a possibility of fast tracking an individual policy to adoption in 6-9 months.

RESOLVED: That the updates be noted.

8. Date, Time and Venue of Next Meeting

The next meeting would be held on Thursday 15 March 2012 at 5.30pm at Chorley Borough Council.

..... (Chairman)

(The meeting finished at 6.24pm)



Report of	Meeting	Date
Joint LDF Officer Team	Central Lancashire LDF Joint Advisory Committee	31 May 2012

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY – OUTCOMES OF PRELIMINARY DRAFT CONSULTATION

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To present the key outcomes of the consultation representations, engagement events and the areas where revisions to the Charging Schedules are likely to be needed.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

2. That the report be noted and the areas to revise the Charging Schedules be endorsed.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF REPORT

3. Extensive consultation and focused engagement has been carried out. The responses received are on predictable lines depending on whether the bodies concerned stand to benefit or experience costs as a result of the levy being introduced. Our consultants have been asked to review their viability work in light of the comments received and accordingly recommend any changes in approach for the next stage of consultation. The outcomes of this work will be reported verbally to Members.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION(S)

(If the recommendations are accepted)

4. To support approval for the next stage Draft Charging Schedules.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

5. None.

BACKGROUND

6. Consultation and engagement on the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedules is the first stage of establishing the charge rates to be levied on new development. The consultation covered the development viability and infrastructure funding gap justifications for the levy as well as the various discretionary elements associated with its operation. The consultation material asked consultees to consider and respond to a series of questions. Not all those making representations offered answers to all the questions, the main focus for developers in particular, was the viability reports produced by our consultants and the proposed charge rates themselves.
7. Over 1000 local organisations were directly contacted and the wider public were invited to take part through public notices in local newspapers. Engagement meetings/workshops were organised with the following groups:
 - Developers
 - Parish and Town Councils
 - Neighbouring local authorities
 - Infrastructure providers
 - Lancashire County Council

ISSUES RAISED

8. A total of 61 parties made formal representations. Appendix 1 quantifies the responses to the consultation questions and these replies generally accord with whether the respondents would stand to gain from the levy being introduced – such as Parish/Town Councils and infrastructure providers or whether there would experience a financial cost – such as developers. The percentage figures are skewed to an extent by non-response to some questions.
9. Appendix 2 reproduces an index of the main status (support or objection) of each respondent's position on the levy proposals and the key points raised. Similar issues came out of the engagement events. So drawing on these two sources of comment the following are the main issues arising from the sectors consulted.
 - a. **Housing developers** – queried the method of development viability appraisal and cost/value assumptions used by the consultants; claiming this over-states the developer's ability to afford the proposed levy charge rates. The house builders also pointed to spatial variations in residential viability across Central Lancashire.
 - b. **Commercial developers** – the main point of concern here is the contended difference in viability between small and large format convenience (food) stores. There are also points raised about the viability of employment and agricultural developments.
 - c. **Parish and Town Councils** – the leading questions raised here are what will the scale be of their 'meaningful proportion' of CIL monies handed over by the District Councils (national decisions on this are still awaited) and what freedoms do these third tier authorities have to spend their money on local infrastructure?
 - d. **Neighbouring authorities** – are supportive of what we are doing. For their part they all intend to introduce the levy locally however few of them have a clear timescale for doing so.

- e. **Infrastructure providers** – those responding/attending the engagement event were in support of the levy proposals, a few have queried the presentation of infrastructure needs and several have sought their areas of provision to be more specifically included.
 - f. **Lancashire County Council** – fully recognise the potential for levy expenditure in their service areas (particularly transport and education plus to a lesser extent green infrastructure). LCC have also expressed concern about the potential impact of the levy being applied in the Samlesbury part of the Enterprise Zone.
10. Our consultants, Roger Tym and Partners have been asked to consider the main viability points raised by the representations and report back on whether the recommended charge rates should be amended as a result for the next stage of consultation, that on Draft Charging Schedules. The outcomes of this work will be reported verbally at the meeting and will then need to go to the respective District Councils for formal decisions on revised charge rates and their proposed application, prior to the next stage of consultation.
11. Members are reminded that setting the charge rates is only part of the preparatory work that is necessary to locally introduce the levy. A pan-Central Lancashire joint officer group has been established to scope the procedural aspects of setting up levy collection mechanisms in the authorities, this will also cover the accounting approach for the expenditure. How decisions are reached on levy spending priorities and funding arrangements with infrastructure providers will also need to be addressed in corporate and joint ways by the authorities.

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 – May 12 - CIL

Appendix 1 - Response to CIL Consultation Questions

Question	Yes/In Favour	No/Object to	Unanswered/Don't Know	Comment
1. Are you aware of any charitable developments held locally for investment purposes where discretionary relief may be appropriate to support broader objectives? If so please specify what and why.	4.9%	44.3%	50.8%	0.0%
2. Do you consider that the charging authorities should adopt a scheme of relief, so that in exceptional circumstances of economic viability, developments that meet all the essential criteria can be exempted from paying CIL?	47.5%	9.8%	42.6%	0.0%
3. Do you consider that the charging authorities should accept payments in kind in lieu of receiving the CIL chargeable amount?	39.3%	11.5%	49.2%	0.0%
4a. Do you consider that each charging authority should have a policy for paying the chargeable amount in instalments?	41.0%	8.2%	50.8%	0.0%
4b. If 'yes' to Q4a do you have any preference for how such a policy should be expressed in terms of the sizes of the chargeable amounts, percentages payable of the total amount and the length of the time periods (expressed in numbers of days)?	27.9%	9.8%	59.0%	3.3%
5. Do you agree that the Districts and Central Lancashire Infrastructure Delivery Schedules show there is sufficient justification for introducing CIL?	32.8%	11.5%	54.1%	1.6%
6. Do you consider that the CIL Viability Reports have accurately assessed the overall economic viability of the development types most likely to	19.7%	16.4%	62.3%	1.6%

occur in Central Lancashire in the foreseeable future?				
7. Do you support the proposed charge rates, their spatial application (the same rates across each District) and the range of uses covered? Please explain your reasoning.	42.6%	52.5%	4.9%	0.0%
8. Do you have a view on how the District Councils should coordinate and work with other infrastructure providers to ensure the delivery of infrastructure prospects funded by CIL?	14.8%	14.8%	59.0%	11.5%
9. Bearing in mind the freedom that authorities have to decide the split in funding infrastructure through CIL or Section 106 do you have any views what this division should be?	9.8%	9.8%	63.9%	16.4%

Appendix 2: Index of Representations on the Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedules

Summary

No	Representation Numbers	Category
4	3, 9, 27, 29,	Individuals
8	25, 26, 31, 37, 46, 48, 51, 54,	Housebuilders, landowners and agents
18	7, 19, 20, 21, 28, 33, 36, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44, 45, 47, 49, 55, 56, 59	Commercial developers, owners and agents
3	1, 2, 5,	Local/County Councillors
4	22, 24, 52, 53,	Community Interest Groups
7	4, 6, 14, 18, 34, 42, 50,	Government Departments, Agencies, Quangos
2	12, 13,	Private Utility Companies
15	8, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 23, 30, 32, 35, 41, 57, 58, 60, 61	Local Authorities and Parish Councils

No	Name	Representation
001	Councillor D.J Harrison	In favour no objections, considers should adopt scheme of relief, payment in lieu and instalments, and used exclusively to improve infrastructure of area being developed
002	Councillor M.Otter	In favour no objections, considers should adopt a scheme of relief, payment in lieu and instalments over a maximum period of two years, and funding should be used to improve a community where it crosses boundaries
003	J. Hampson	Development in town centre should be encouraged without having to contribute towards infrastructure which would deter development. Out of town retail should not be permitted to protect town centres
004	Network Rail	A strategic context should be set requiring developer contributions towards rail infrastructure whereby new development will create a significant change in the usage of part of the transport network, generating the need for new or improved infrastructure and /or station facilities
005	Councillor B. Shannon	In favour and supports a scheme of relief, payment in lieu if appropriate, and some form of spatially zoning of rates for residential developments
006	Sport England	In favour support relief for charitable organisations and revision of the Delivery Plan and Schedule once the Playing Pitch Strategy and Central Lancashire Sport and Recreation Review has been completed
007	Eric Wright	Object in that the viability reports are overly simplistic and make a wide range of assumptions based on limited data. Support a scheme of relief and that for residential development payment should be phased to reflect the phasing of the development and sales
008	Longton Parish Council	In favour and support a scheme of relief, payment in lieu and in instalments
009	J. Coulson	In favour consider infrastructure is very necessary and should be stringently monitored with heavy penalties for failure to complete agreed plans

010	G. Welch	In favour, considers should adopt a scheme of relief, payment in lieu and instalments
011	Bretherton Parish Council	In favour and would prefer use of CIL rather than 106 Agreements and believe that 100% of funds raised should be allocated to the locality in which the development occurs
012	United Utilities	Advise that their aim is to build strong partnerships with Local Planning Authorities to aid sustainable development and growth and share information to assist in the development of sound planning strategies, to identify future development needs and to secure long-term infrastructure investment
013	Homes & Communities Agency	Supports the adoption of CIL as a positive tool to co-ordinate infrastructure delivery across the three councils allowing the collective impact of development on infrastructure to be assessed and mitigated. Consider that it is important that viability considerations are robustly considered
014	Wildlife Trust	In favour, seek clarity on how CIL will relate to their buildings, and place emphasis on ecosystems not having an economic value and uncertainty as to how this fits into CIL and the phasing of payments
015	Bolton Council	Support the proposals on the basis that a pragmatic approach has been taken that provides both simplicity and coherence, all rates are set at a reasonable level and are below the normal allowance made for developers contingency. Flat rates for residential are supported as there is no evidence for variable rates
016	Whittle-le-Woods Parish Council	In favour, support payment in instalments and a flat rate for all types of property with exemptions for affordable housing and charitable buildings
017	Hutton Parish Council	Support the introduction of CIL and a scheme for relief and that District Council's should be encouraged to work closely together
018	English Heritage	No objections are raised, it is suggested that the three district councils should examine whether any heritage related projects should be included in the "infrastructure projects list" and the authorities should be aware of the implications of any CIL rate on viability and effective conservation of the historic environment and heritage assets
019	RPS	Advise that authorities have to strike an appropriate balance between funding the infrastructure from the levy and the potential effects of the levy upon economic viability. Consider that if allowances for quantum of development and discretionary relief is not available it will have a significant impact on viability
020	Campbells Ltd	Advocate flexibility be drafted into policy to allow consideration of site and development characteristics and viability for potential exemptions, or negotiated reduced contributions for developments where justified and agreed with the charging authority
021	Brackenhouse Properties Ltd	Object on the basis that the proposals would seriously jeopardise the objective for growth and be counter to the aims of the LDF. Consider a scheme for relief and payment in instalment should be adopted. Consider a 'one size fits all' approach to be unrepresentative to the realities of development.
022	Theatres Trust	Note that cultural facilities do not benefit from S106 funding and that it will be increasingly necessary to unlock new sources of funding and suggest that theatre and cultural activities are included for consideration within Appendix B of the document
023	Farington Parish Council	Support the introduction of CIL and consider the charge rates should be the same across the districts to avoid the situation where authorities are competing against each other and using CIL as a bargaining tool
024	Woodland Trust	Recognise the important role that the IDP will play in delivering CIL development across the three districts,

		as such pleased to see green infrastructure as part of the plan, however express disappointment that it has been considered as a distinct entity and not more integrated with other elements of infrastructure
025	Redrow Homes Ltd	Raise objection on the basis that the assessment of viability should use the methodology used by housebuilders which will give a proper indication of viability. Also challenge some of the assumptions used in the viability evidence and conclude the current charge will make brownfield development unviable.
026	Primrose Holdings	Consider the charge rates are excessive and will stifle development and economic growth. All development is subject to "rates" and this should be used to fund growth
027	UClan	Support the relief from CIL for charity purposes and nil charge for non-residential institutions. Recommend that student accommodation is added to the charging schedule as a separate development type and subject to a nil charge
028	Northern Trust	Conclude that a number of assumptions are incorrect the methodology for calculating viability on residential schemes is wrong. In respect of non-residential development the use of standardised amounts highlights the inflexibility of the CIL approach. The simplest way to assess impact would be to apply the rates to recent permissions subject to 106 payments- in most cases rendering them unviable
029	National Trust	If discretionary relief is not implemented there would be a direct loss of funding available to undertake the Trust's conservation and access work which benefits everyone. Furthermore, charities also provide important areas of Green Infrastructure and need to be included in partnership arrangements
030	Wyre Borough Council	Support CIL in principle also a qualified discretionary relief, payment in lieu and instalments. Although they do not support the charge rates and their spatial application, stress that it is important District Council's establish a co-ordinated cross boundary approach to ensure the infrastructure delivery
031	Wainhomes	Support in principle but consider the methodology and assumptions are fundamentally flawed and will choke development delivery. Consider a working group is necessary to produce a realistic viability to set an appropriate CIL charge that delivers housing, affordable housing and Core Strategy expectations
032	Croston Parish Council	Support the CIL in principle and consider common rates across the three districts will provide a clear method of operation
033	James Hall &Co Ltd	Challenge some of the assumptions in terms of rental level and concern is expressed that there is a single category of "convenience retail", which merges local and major stores, a distinction should be made between relative size of stores and consequently infrastructure needed as a result of development
034	Community Gateway	Support in principle, but seek clarification in respect of relief for affordable housing. Support payments in lieu, in instalments and consider a number of approaches are required in this regard
035	Eccleston Parish Council	No comments are offered in respect of CIL or viability, consider there should be no provision for relief, payment in kind in lieu of the chargeable amount or payment by instalment
036	Muse Developments	Consider that in its present form the CIL charge rates do not provide the 'appropriate balance' to ensure development proposals can remain financially viable. The CIL charge rates as presented appear overly inflated when taking into account market realities and could seriously stifle growth in the region
037	Bellway Homes Ltd	Challenge the assumptions made to support the draft CIL/charging schedule based on little evidence of appraisal work. Consider the viability work is overly optimistic regarding sales value and therefore have

		concerns over the proposed levy rate
038	William Fulster	Conclude that the suggested CIL is too high and unjustifiable, with the anticipated reduction in Central Gov funding for affordable housing, the CIL charge should be reduced or it will act to deter development and be just another land tax
039	Commercial Estates Group Ltd	Consider there is no justification for the levels and has been based on incorrect information and assumptions. A more detailed cashflow analysis should be undertaken which will indicate reduced viability and the ability to meet the proposed CIL charge
040	De Pol Associates	With CIL a fixed cost will be calculated using assumptions which may not be reasonable for many development schemes. To prevent CIL being a burden to development, the charging rates need to be set at a level which is realistic and will avoid any risk to deliverability of most development schemes
041	Wigan Council	In general consider the proposals are reasonable and appear to be based on sound background evidence and therefore have no objections
042	Environment Agency	No objections raised in principle but request the delivery plan is updated to reflect the fact that the Agency is considering flood defence schemes in the Central Lancashire area
043	Brookhouse Group	Support the CIL, relief, payment in lieu and instalment in principle, but reserve the right to submit further technical evidence in respect of the proposed charge rate when the Draft Charging Schedule is published
044	Lea Hough	Do not comment on the proposed rates but consider given the inter-relationships between authorities at a sub regional level the same rate should be applied across each district to provide consistency and prevent disparity in development terms. Consider information is needed to comment on a range of issues
045	Bae Systems	Agree the basis of the economic viability assessment is sufficiently robust, and shows B Class employment uses are constrained and a CIL charge would be inappropriate in the current climate. Reiterate the need for CIL charging to include payment exemption where the viability of the development would be constrained
046	McCarthy & Stone Ltd	Object as the Charging Schedule would effectively prejudice the development of specialist accommodation for the elderly in Central Lancashire. Request that the position is clarified on specialist accommodation for the elderly by extending a nil CIL level on all such developments
047	Emerson Group	Consider the figures for residential development do seem in line with those adopted elsewhere however, recommend that there should be a minimum threshold whereby developments under 50 dwellings should not pay CIL on the basis that they would not normally put enough pressure onto existing infrastructure
048	Rowland Homes	Consider the viability reports establish that suggested levels of contributions are likely to be unviable in many circumstances, and the level has not been based on evidence of need but at the top end of what might be viable on the best sites in the respective areas
049	P Wilson & Co	Consider that agricultural buildings have little or no impact on local amenities and do not make any demand on publicly funded services so query why CIL is necessary. If levy was to be applied consider it would undoubtedly affect the agricultural industry and many buildings would be unviable
050	Adactus Housing Group	Express concern that the financial viability uses a model that is based on overly high levels of receipt for affordable housing units, this is not realistic and would only increase developers expectation for receipt, and mean that calculations for payment of CIL would be flawed

051	Taylor Wimpey	Do not consider that the viability reports have accurately assessed the economic viability of residential development as it is based on a number of assumptions that are flawed, and are skewed by assessment on the basis of higher value housing sites. The levels are too high and affordable housing will lose out
052	British Waterways	Advise that the document should be amended to indicate that waterway infrastructure and towpath improvements will be secured through CIL and Section 106 monies, under the categories of both Transport Infrastructure and Green Infrastructure/Public Realm
053	Preston Grasshoppers RFC	Object to CIL on the basis that the economic viability of the development types have not been accurately assessed, the consultation process was not transparent or findings conclusive. The development appraisal model is flawed and therefore the proposed rates are overstated
054	David Wilson Homes	Concludes in respect of viability that whilst the methodology has been set out, there are concerns in respect of supporting evidence, methodology, assumptions and appraisal results. The conclusion being that Councils are to reassess the appropriateness of the CIL rate particularly in less favourable market areas
055	Brookhouse Group	The response raises concerns in terms of the approach and highlights that much of the evidence base has not been disclosed. Concludes in respect of both commercial and residential developments that the charge rates are unreasonable and sets out what is more acceptable using a revised approach
056	Tesco Stores Ltd	This response also raises concerns in terms of the approach and highlights that much of the evidence has not been disclosed. Concludes in respect of both commercial and residential developments that the charge rates are unreasonable and sets out what is more acceptable using a revised approach
057	Astley Village Parish Council	Supports the CIL in principle and a scheme for relief, also payment in lieu and instalments
058	Euxton Parish Council	This response does not offer a view in respect of viability or justification for the CIL but does not support a scheme for relief, payment in lieu or instalments
059	Robert Heapsr	Considers that the charge rates are too high and the regime will act as an additional levy to act as a disincentive in austere times, akin to a development land tax. Supports a scheme for relief, payment in lieu and by instalments
060	Lancashire County Council	Consider the approach and assumptions used appear those used across a number of authorities and believe they are a sound basis. Advise that Samlesbury EZ should be exempt and in terms of charge rates to achieve greater accuracy, more costs should be tested, to achieve a level that does not prevent growth
061	Adlington Town Council	Support the CIL in principle and consider that charging authorities should allow payment in instalments, a degree of relief given and payment in lieu depending on local circumstances



Report of	Meeting	Date
Joint LDF Officer Team	Central Lancashire LDF Joint Advisory Committee	31 May 2012

CENTRAL LANCASHIRE OPEN SPACE STUDY

PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1. To summarise the key findings of the Open Space Study.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

- 2. That members note the contents of this report

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF REPORT

- 3. The report was prepared by consultants Knight, Kavanagh & Page for Central Lancashire. It supplements a previous report, produced in 2010 which was not completed as PMP Genesis (the appointed consultants) went into administration. The assessment covers the quantity, quality and accessibility of a wide range of different types of open space. This is particularly important for deciding on the future provision of open space in Site Allocations Development Plan Documents and for on grounds management. The study also considers the application of open space standards across Central Lancashire. It explores how aspects such as quality and value of sites could be strategically improved.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION(S)

(If the recommendations are accepted)

- 4. To help ensure Members are aware of the key findings of the Study.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

- 5. None.

BACKGROUND

6. Members will be aware that consultants Knight Kavanagh & Page (KKP) were engaged to complete the Central Lancashire Open Space Study following the previous consultants entering into administration. KKP have completed their report and this is being considered by Officers before publication. It will include the findings of the research, consultation, site assessments, data analysis and GIS mapping that underpins the study. It also supplements a previous draft report, delivered in 2010 referred to as the Central Lancashire Open Space, Sport & Recreation Study, which predominately focused on identifying local needs in relation to quantity and accessibility.
7. The work centres on an assessment of the **quantity, quality and accessibility** of open space facilities/provision and was carried out in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 and the Companion Guide entitled ‘Assessing Needs and Opportunities’ published in September 2002. The specific objectives of this audit and assessment were to:
 - Review and utilise (as appropriate) work and studies completed to date (including the 2010 local needs assessment/consultation).
 - Verify the audit and carry out site assessments to assess the quality and value of provision.
 - Set and apply locally derived provision standards including quality, quantity and accessibility.
 - Identify open space surpluses and deficiencies and provide evidence to support development of planning policies.
8. This study is an important contribution to the production of Central Lancashire’s Core Strategy and Site Allocations Development Plan Documents. Through recognising the provision of open spaces in plan form, provision can be assessed in terms of quantity, quality and accessibility, strengthening protection and supplementing provision where appropriate.
9. This does not mean that open space outside of the ‘recognised provision’ can be seen as secondary or surplus. Sites can be significant for the neighbourhoods they service and/or be of wider strategic importance to an area. This will be reflected in open space policies proposed in the emerging Site Allocations Development Plan Documents.
10. This study covers the following open space typologies as set out in ‘Assessing Needs and Opportunities: A Companion Guide to Planning Policy Guidance Note 17’.

	PPG17 typology	Primary purpose
Greenspaces	Parks and gardens	Accessible, high quality opportunities for informal recreation and community events.
	Natural and semi-natural greenspaces	Wildlife conservation, biodiversity and environmental education and awareness. Includes urban woodland and beaches, where appropriate.
	Amenity greenspace	Opportunities for informal activities close to home or work or enhancement of the appearance of residential or other areas.
	Provision for children and young people	Areas designed primarily for play and social interaction involving children and young people, such as equipped play areas, ball courts, skateboard areas and teenage shelters.
	Allotments	Opportunities for those people who wish to do so to grow their own produce as part of the long term promotion of sustainability, health and social inclusion.

	PPG17 typology	Primary purpose
	Green corridors	Walking, cycling or horse riding, whether for leisure purposes or travel, and opportunities for wildlife migration.
	Cemeteries, disused churchyards and other burial grounds	Quiet contemplation and burial of the dead, often linked to the promotion of wildlife conservation and biodiversity.
Civic spaces	Civic and market squares and other hard surfaced areas designed for pedestrians including the promenade	Providing a setting for civic buildings, public demonstrations and community events.

11. The report considers the supply and demand issues for open space facilities in Central Lancashire. Each part contains relevant typology specific data.
12. The study also uses household survey information previously gathered by PMP Genesis in Spring of 2010. It also includes those views collected from an internet survey for children and young people which targeted primary and secondary school children.
13. The study sits alongside the Central Lancashire Playing Pitch Strategy which has also been undertaken by KKP in accordance with the methodology provided in the Sport England’s ‘Towards a Level Playing Field – A guide to the production of playing pitch strategies’ for assessing demand and supply for outdoor sports facilities. This has been covered in separate committee report before Members.

STUDY METHODOLOGY

14. In total, 707 open spaces (including provision for children and young people) were identified over Central Lancashire (some 300 in Chorley), plotted on GIS, and assessed to evaluate site value and quality.
15. In accordance with PPG17 recommendations a minimum size threshold of 0.2 hectares was applied to the inclusion of some typologies within the study. This means that, in general, sites that fall below this threshold were not audited. However, some smaller sites (i.e. those that are identified through consultation as being of significance) were included.
16. Data collated from site visits was based upon those derived from the Green Flag Award scheme (a national standard for parks and green spaces in England and Wales, operated by the Green Flag Plus Partnership). This was utilised to calculate a **quality** score for each site visited.
17. Using data collected from the site visits and desk based research a **value** score for each site is identified. Value is defined in PPG17 in relation to the following three issues:
 - Context of the site i.e. its accessibility, scarcity value and historic value.
 - Level and type of use.
 - The wider benefits it generates for people, biodiversity and the wider environment.
18. Quality and value were treated separately in terms of scoring as they are considered to be fundamentally different and can be unrelated. For example, a high quality space may be in an inaccessible location and, thus, be of little value; while, a rundown (poor quality) space

may be the only one in an area and thus be immensely valuable. Accordingly, each type of open space received separate quality and value scores.

KEY FINDINGS OF STUDY FOR CENTRAL LANCASHIRE

Quality

19. Nearly two thirds of assessed open spaces in Central Lancashire score high for quality. More natural and semi-natural sites score low for quality compared to any other typology. This is due to the criteria for assessing these sites which looked at the presence of specific features or facilities such as woodland and open grassland. Such sites also tended to score low for personal security given they are often in isolated locations and not overlooked by other land uses. In addition, they score less for ongoing management or maintenance which was in many cases deliberate in order to provide, for example, unmanaged habitats. Accordingly, their assessment results need to be treated with caution.
20. Amenity greenspaces, provision for children and young people, and parks are generally of a good quality. In particular a significant proportion of allotments and cemeteries are rated as being of a high quality.
21. In general, maintenance of open spaces is regarded as being of a good standard and is seen as a significant contributor to a site's overall quality. This is further reflected in the results from the 2010 household survey; which found nearly all typologies are viewed as being of either good or excellent quality. However, more respondents consider the typologies of amenity greenspace and provision for children and young people to be of a poor quality.

Value

22. The majority of sites were assessed as being of high value. Similar to the quality scores; natural and amenity greenspaces have a higher proportion of low value sites. This reflects the number of sites that lack any particular features, especially for natural and semi-natural greenspaces. However, the value these sites play in providing a visual amenity and a break from the built form remains important in a wider context.
23. To score a high value a site needs to be well used by the local community, well maintained (with a balance for conservation), provide a safe environment and have features of interest; for example play equipment and landscaping. Sites that provide for a cross section of users and have a multi-functional scored better than those that offer limited functions and that are thought of as bland and unattractive.
24. The majority of feedback from the household survey in 2010 views open spaces as being important to people's lives. This reflects the high value placed on open space provision by respondents and supports the findings of the site visit data.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

25. Another element of this study considered the planning policy implications and the application of open space standards across Central Lancashire. It explored how things such as quality and value of sites could be strategically improved.
26. The recommended standards have been applied to each typology for all three central Lancashire authorities in order to assess current need. This has projected to 2026 to assess future need, based on anticipated population growth. (See Appendix 1).

27. The standards, suggested policy approach and associated allocations/de-allocations will be included in the next iteration of the each authority’s Site Allocations Development Plan Document. The study will also inform the proposed Open Space Supplementary Planning Document as well as any necessary strategy and efficiency approaches to tackling issues highlighted.

Background Papers			
Document	Date	File	Place of Inspection
Central Lancashire Open Space Study	May 2012		District Council Offices

Report Author	Ext	Email address	Doc ID
Peter McAnespie	5286	peter.mcanespie@chorley.gov.uk	JAC Report – May 12 – Open Space

Appendix 1

Parks and gardens

Analysis area	Current provision (ha)	Current population	Current standard	Identified deficiencies	Total future provision (ha)	Standard based on current demand	Future population	Total new provision 2026 (ha)
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)
Chorley	199.96	104,700	1.91	-	199.96	1.91	114,200	18.14
Preston	245.29	135,300	1.81	-	245.29	1.81	144,500	16.68
South Ribble	71.19	107,500	0.66	-	71.19	0.66	117,600	6.69
CENTRAL LANCASHIRE	516.44	347,500	1.49	-	516.44	1.49	376,300	42.80

Natural and semi-natural

Analysis area	Current provision (ha)	Current population	Current standard	Identified deficiencies	Total future provision (ha)	Standard based on current demand	Future population	Total new provision 2026 (ha)
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)
Chorley	485.92	104,700	4.64	-	485.92	4.64	114,200	44.09
Preston	240.21	135,300	1.78	-	240.21	1.78	144,500	16.33
South Ribble	212.69	107,500	1.98	-	212.69	1.98	117,600	19.98
CENTRAL LANCASHIRE	938.82	347,500	2.70	-	938.82	2.70	376,300	77.81

Amenity greenspace

Analysis area	Current provision (ha)	Current population	Current standard	Identified deficiencies	Total future provision (ha)	Standard based on current demand	Future population	Total new provision 2026 (ha)
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)
Chorley	76.36	104,700	0.73	-	76.36	0.73	114,200	6.93
Preston	72.81	135,300	0.54	-	72.81	0.54	144,500	4.95
South Ribble	143.20	107,500	1.33	-	143.20	1.34	117,600	13.45
CENTRAL LANCASHIRE	292.36	347,500	0.84	-	292.36	0.84	376,300	24.23

Provision for children and young people

Analysis area	Current provision (ha)	Current population	Current standard	Identified deficiencies	Total future provision (ha)	Standard based on current demand	Future population	Total new provision 2026 (ha)
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)
Chorley	8.60	104,700	0.08	-	8.60	0.08	114,200	0.78
Preston	3.21	135,300	0.02	0.08	3.29	0.02	144,500	0.30
South Ribble	6.59	107,500	0.06	0.04	6.63	0.06	117,600	0.66
CENTRAL LANCASHIRE	18.40	347,500	0.05	0.12	18.52	0.05	376,300	1.66

Allotments

Analysis area	Current provision (ha)	Current population	Current standard	Identified deficiencies	Total future provision (ha)	Standard based on current demand	Future population	Total new provision 2026 (ha)
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)
Chorley	6.84	104,700	0.07	1.60	8.44	0.08	114,200	2.37
Preston	23.34	135,300	0.17	1.60	24.94	0.18	144,500	3.30
South Ribble	8.67	107,500	0.08	1.20	9.87	0.09	117,600	2.13
CENTRAL LANCASHIRE	38.85	347,500	0.11	4.40	43.25	0.12	376,300	7.98

This page is intentionally left blank



Report of	Meeting	Date
Joint LDF Officer Team	Central Lancashire LDF Joint Advisory Committee	31 May 2012

CENTRAL LANCASHIRE PLAYING PITCH STRATEGY

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To summarise the key findings of the Central Lancashire Playing Pitch Strategy.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

2. That members note the contents of this report

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF REPORT

3. The Playing Pitch Strategy was prepared by consultants Knight, Kavanagh & Page for Central Lancashire. It details the findings of the research, consultation, site assessments, data analysis and GIS mapping. The strategy has been prepared in accordance with the methodology provided in the Sport England’s ‘Towards a Level Playing Field – A guide to the production of playing pitch strategies’ for assessing demand and supply for outdoor sports facilities.
4. Developing this strategic approach to the analysis of playing pitch supply and demand is intended to allow the authorities to:
 - ◀ Protect facilities against development pressures, and specifically residential proposals on land in and around urban areas.
 - ◀ Identify facility supply and demand issues in relation to predicted population growth up to 2026.
 - ◀ Address ‘demand’ pressures created as a result of specific sports development pressures eg mini-soccer, increased demand for artificial pitches.
 - ◀ Address issues of cross boundary facility provision.
 - ◀ Stand up to scrutiny at a public inquiry as a robust study.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION(S)

(If the recommendations are accepted)

5. To help ensure Members are aware of the key findings of the Strategy.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

6. None.

BACKGROUND

7. Members will be aware that consultants Knight Kavanagh & Page (KKP) were engaged to prepare a Playing Pitch Strategy and Central Lancashire Open Space Study.
8. The Playing Pitch Strategy was led by a steering group made up of Officers from a range of departments at Chorley, Preston and South Ribble councils and Sport England. It assesses outdoor sport and recreation facilities in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 (PPG17) and its Companion Guide entitled "Assessing Needs and Opportunities" published in September 2002. It covers football, rugby (both league and union), cricket, hockey and educational facilities and includes
 - ◀ An audit of existing provision of outdoor facilities detailing quantity, quality, capacity accessibility and wider value to the community.
 - ◀ An assessment of supply/demand for outdoor sports facilities
 - ◀ A summary of consultation with a variety of stakeholders, including local authority officers, Sport England, national governing bodies of sport, league secretaries, clubs, schools and higher/further education establishments.
9. It reviews existing standards of provision and advises on new local standards for planning purposes, making recommendations on appropriate strategy, objectives and actions, and policy responses. It also establishes an approach for developer contributions.
10. The assessment element of the work incorporates an analysis of outdoor sport and recreation facilities covering:
 - ◀ Football pitches
 - ◀ Cricket pitches
 - ◀ Rugby pitches (union and league)
 - ◀ Artificial grass pitches (AGPs)
11. It provides a quantitative summary of provision of each typology and a map showing the distribution of facilities. It also includes information about the availability of facilities to/for the local community and, the details of the governing body of each sport and regional strategic plans (where they exist). Local league details were provided, where possible, in order to outline the competitive structure for each sport. The findings of club consultation and key issues for each sport are also summarised.
12. The study identifies current levels of provision in the area, across the public, education, voluntary and commercial sectors, and compares this with current, and likely future levels of demand. The supply and demand analysis helps identify the need for new facilities, and also suggests if there are too many facilities, perhaps in the wrong location.
13. It identifies a hierarchy of investment priorities for facility improvements and development and includes an assessment of use and quality of sites and whether they are fit for purpose which will inform decision making for future delivery of pitches. It includes a site-specific action plan (where action is deemed necessary to maintain or improve quality and accessibility).
14. This information informs priorities for pitch, green and court sports and provides robust evidence for capital funding/grants and any need for developer contributions towards facilities.

CONSULTATION

15. A variety of consultation methods were used to collate information about leagues, clubs, county associations and national/regional governing bodies of sport. These were as follows:

Consultation - methods and response rates

Sport	Response rate	Methods of consultation
<i>Football clubs</i>	49%	Survey, face to face and telephone
<i>Cricket clubs</i>	86%	Survey, face to face and telephone
<i>Rugby union clubs</i>	100%	Survey, face to face and telephone
<i>Rugby league clubs</i>	40%	Survey, face to face and telephone
<i>Hockey clubs</i>	100%	Survey
<i>Secondary schools (including independent)</i>	85%	Face to face
<i>Primary schools</i>	81%	Survey

16. In total 154 contacts were consulted as part of this study. Views were sought on how far particular age groups were prepared to travel to pitches, club development, growth and key issues.

SUMMARY OF ISSUES FROM ASSESSMENT REPORT

17. Football

- ◀ A total of 525 teams play on pitches in Central Lancashire.
- ◀ Generally, there is an even distribution of football pitches across Central Lancashire. However, some settlement areas, particularly in the south east area of Preston and north of Chorley, only contain pitches which are not available for community use.
- ◀ 90 sites available for community use, providing a total of 199 pitches. In addition, there are 85 sites providing 125 pitches, which are not currently accessible to the community. The majority of these are located on school sites and tend to comprise mainly junior pitches.
- ◀ The large majority (82%) of football pitches were assessed as good quality, 12% were assessed as average and a further 5% were assessed as poor quality. Furthermore, over three fifths of clubs (63%) rated the quality of their designated home pitch as either good or average.
- ◀ League consultation suggests that changing facilities are, in general, substandard. In addition, there is a lack of segregated changing facilities across Central Lancashire.
- ◀ Six sites (one Chorley, two in Preston and three in South Ribble) are overplayed by 28 matches each week. The large majority of overplay is attributed to high use of Penwortham Holme Recreation Ground mini pitches which accommodated the Mid Lancs Colts League.
- ◀ Clubs report that membership levels have generally remained static at senior, junior and mini level over the three years. However, 40 clubs also cite proposals to increase the number of teams to be provided by an additional 94 junior teams.
- ◀ 22 clubs in Central Lancashire express latent demand for 6 senior, 12.5 junior and 5.5 mini pitches.
- ◀ There is a current deficiency of junior and mini grass football pitches and a surplus of senior pitches across Central Lancashire. The deficiency will be exacerbated in the future because of increasing demand for mini pitches and population increases.

- ◀ **Sport England's Facilities Planning Model identifies that only Chorley has a need for additional pitch space across both artificial grass pitch types (sandbased and 3G).**
- ◀ **The FA provision standard for 3G pitches suggests there is a need for 7.54 pitches in Central Lancashire. On this basis, an additional 4 pitches are needed by 2026 in Central Lancashire.**

18. Cricket

- ◀ There are 31 cricket pitches available for community use in Central Lancashire, accommodating 196 teams (including senior mens and women's and juniors).
- ◀ Site assessments generally score the quality of available cricket pitches as good.
- ◀ Central Lancashire's eight focus clubs support high levels of participation.
- ◀ Capacity analysis shows there are 12 sites being played over their current capacity. One site; Penwortham Sports & Social Club is played at capacity.
- ◀ There is generally a low level of latent demand expressed. However, four clubs report demand for one pitch each.
- ◀ In addition to participation increases due to population growth, it is likely that women's and girls' cricket involvement will increase if the national target to establish two junior girls' and a women's team in every local authority over the next five years is achieved.
- ◀ **New pitches would be required in all local authority areas to meet future demand at peak times.**

19. Rugby union

- ◀ Rugby union pitches are predominately located in Preston.
- ◀ A small number of pitches are located at education sites but are not used for community use as there is no reported demand.
- ◀ With the exception of Preston Grasshoppers RFC the remaining pitches in Central Lancashire have spare capacity to accommodate additional play. However, any significant increase in playing membership at remaining clubs may result in the need for additional pitch provision.
- ◀ Chorley RFC is seeking to replace its pitches and clubhouse.
- ◀ There are enough pitches to accommodate current demand in Central Lancashire. Although there appears to be a general oversupply of pitches, the amount of actual spare capacity (i.e. at peak times) does not to equate to a surplus
- ◀ Latent demand for pitches has been expressed by Preston Grasshoppers RFC to accommodate two junior and five mini teams.
- ◀ **New pitches would be required in Preston to meet future demand at peak times.**

20. Rugby League

- ◀ There are seven rugby league pitches used for community use across Central Lancashire.
- ◀ Four sites (two in South Ribble and two in Chorley) accommodating four pitches are located at education sites and are not used for community use, reportedly due to a lack of demand.
- ◀ Temporal demand for senior rugby league (matches only) is Saturday (63%) with junior and mini demand exclusively on a Sunday.
- ◀ Leyland Warriors has aspirations to have greater security of tenure in order to be eligible for external funding to develop a third pitch on Moss Side Recreation Ground.
- ◀ Latent demand for pitches has been expressed in Preston by Bamber Bridge RFC for one youth team.
- ◀ It is likely that participation in rugby league will increase, particularly in Preston linked to RFL initiatives and linked to the World Cup in 2013.
- ◀ In Chorley Chisnall Lane is overplayed and two other sites are played to capacity and given that these pitches are assessed as good quality, this suggests that additional pitches may be required at these sites in the future. Spare capacity at sites close by may help to alleviate some pressure. (In Chorley, there is spare capacity of 0.5 matches each week on a Saturday at King George V Playing Field, Adlington).
- ◀ **New pitches would be required to meet future demand at peak times.**

21. Hockey

- ◀ Across Central Lancashire, there is a high demand for hockey, particularly in Preston. In total, there are eight hockey clubs playing in the area.
- ◀ There are eight full size artificial grass pitches, suitable for competitive hockey in Central Lancashire, with Preston Sports Arena (UCLAN) accommodating two adjacent to each other. In addition, Longridge High School provides a full size sandbased pitch and is located just outside the Preston local authority boundary.
- ◀ The key issue for hockey clubs in Central Lancashire is the accessibility of existing provision. Although existing pitches are operating at capacity there are three pitches (Longridge High School, Penwortham Leisure Centre and Runshaw College) that are suitable for hockey but predominately accommodating football usage.
- ◀ The large majority of artificial grass pitches in Central Lancashire over recent years have been refurbished. However, Runshaw College is the oldest pitch (built in 1974) and it is likely to be in need of replacing over the next few years.
- ◀ The Facility Planning Model estimates that Preston and South Ribble have sufficient pitches to meet demand. **The model identifies that Chorley has a need for additional pitch.**

22. Education

- ◀ There are 182 playing pitches (including all types) in Central Lancashire, of which 63 are available for community use.
- ◀ In total, 35 secondary and primary schools are regularly used for competitive community use.
- ◀ A quarter of these schools (25%) identify that community use is through competitive play.
- ◀ In the majority of instances, where pitches are available and in use, access to school changing accommodation is limited or non-existent.
- ◀ The quality and quantity of outdoor sports facilities at school sites varies across Central Lancashire but a common theme on secondary pitch provision is poor quality drainage which often dictates the level of curricular, extracurricular and community use.

KEY FINDINGS OF STUDY

23. Area-by-area analyses are detailed in Appendix 1. From 2008 - 2026 there is expected to be a population increase of 28,800 across Central Lancashire when the population is anticipated to rise from 347,500 to 376,300 (Central Lancashire Core Strategy Housing Related Changes paper Nov 2011). The table below applies current standards to future estimated population growth per area to indicate how much provision per 1,000 people is needed to strategically serve Central Lancashire until 2026.

Analysis area	Current provision (ha)	Current population (Mid Year 2008 Estimates ONS)	Current provision (ha per 1,000 population)	Provision to meet latent demand (ha)	Provision to meet deficiencies	Total required to meet current demand (ha)	Standard based on current demand	Future population (2026)	Total new provision requirement by 2026 (ha)
Chorley	93.93	104,700	0.90	8.42	25.88	128.23	1.22	114,200	45.93
Preston	109.11	135,300	0.81	8.96	32.55	150.61	1.11	144,500	51.75
South Ribble	100.51	107,500	0.93	10.52	20.51	131.54	1.22	117,600	43.39
CENTRAL LANCASHIRE	303.55	347,500	0.87	27.90	78.93	410.38	1.18	376,300	140.84

STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK FOR FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS

- 24. The Strategy includes a framework for the Central Lancashire Councils and their partners to maintain and improve their playing pitch facilities. It recommends that each Council adopts 5 strategic objectives (as policy) to enable them to achieve the vision of the Strategy.
- 25. Under each objective the Strategy details how these can be delivered using a range of management objectives, for example a strategic objective to address quantitative deficiencies can be met by adopting minimum levels of provision which are accessible and sustainable, and prioritising new capital development projects etc. These management objectives are then realised by a series of recommended actions.

ACTION PLAN

- 26. The Action Plan included in the Strategy details policy options relating to individual sites in each of the council areas to enhance and develop new sporting provision
- 27. It details some 34 sites across Central Lancashire; 11 in Chorley, 13 in South Ribble and 10 in Preston, explaining the issues to be resolved and the recommended actions. Covering a 10 year period it highlights whether the actions associated with each site are short (1-2 years), medium (3-5 years), or long (6+ years) term priorities.

NEXT STAGES

- 28. As an essential component of the LDF evidence base, the Playing Pitch Strategy analyses current levels of pitch provision in Central Lancashire, across the public, education, voluntary and commercial sectors, and compares this with current, and likely future levels of demand. This allows the authorities to identify the need for new facilities, indicating if there are too many facilities, perhaps in the wrong location, or deficiencies etc. The analysis will be used to underpin planning policy and allocation as set out in the next iteration of the Site Allocations DPDs and the proposed Open Space, Sport and Recreation Supplementary Planning Document.
- 29. The Playing Pitch Strategy will also help to prioritise the actions of other Council departments and support bids for external funding.
- 30. The Playing Pitch Strategy sits alongside the Central Lancashire Open Space Study also produced by KKP. This is covered in a separate agenda item.

Background Papers			
Document	Date	File	Place of Inspection
Central Lancashire Playing Pitch Assessment and Strategy	May 2012	***	Council Offices

Report Author	Ext	Email address	Doc ID
Peter McAnespie	515286	peter.mcanespie@chorley.gov.uk	JAC Report – May 12 – Playing Pitch

Appendix 1 - Area-by-area analysis

Chorley

Summary of surpluses/deficiencies	Key issues	Proposed action
<p><i>Senior football</i> Surplus of 18, estimated to decrease slightly to 15.8 by 2026</p>	<p>The surplus of senior pitches is attributed to spare capacity across 22 sites including significant spare capacity at St Michaels High School, Parklands High School and Buckshaw Playing Fields, Chancer.</p>	<p>Pitches with spare capacity at peak time could help to address the shortfall of junior and mini football.</p> <p>For example, overplay at Dob Bridge could be accommodated on sites with spare capacity such as Croston Sports Club.</p> <p>Seek to maintain at least one pitch to accommodate overplay, three pitches for latent demand and at least four pitches as strategic reserve (i.e. 10% of the stock in the area).</p>
<p><i>Junior football</i> Deficiency of -7.5, estimated to increase to -9.0 by 2026</p>	<p>There are a large number of junior teams playing on senior sized pitches. Please note that in this instance this is fully accepted by the leagues/teams.</p>	<p>Increase community use at school sites (where there is junior or senior pitches) to accommodate junior teams and latent demand.</p> <p>Re-designation of senior pitches for which there is an oversupply to accommodate junior pitches.</p>
<p><i>Mini football</i> Deficiency of -5.5 of, estimated to increase slightly to -6.5 by 2026</p>	<p>The deficiency is as a result of the large number of junior teams (23) playing and the shortage of pitches at peak time.</p>	<p>Increase community use at school sites (where there is junior or senior pitches) to accommodate junior teams and latent demand.</p> <p>Re-designation of senior pitches for which there is an oversupply to accommodate mini pitches.</p>
<p><i>Cricket</i> Deficiency of -2.2, estimated to increase to -3.8 by 2026</p>	<p>The deficiency is attributed to overplay at five sites in the area particularly Chorley, Charnock Richard and Fulwood & Broughton cricket clubs.</p>	<p>It is vital that all sites are protected from development and that clubs/providers are supported to increase the availability of artificial wickets for seniors.</p> <p>In addition, increase community use at school sites such as Christ Church Primary, Parklands High and Our Lady & St Edwards Catholic Primary</p>
<p><i>Rugby union</i> Surplus of 0.5, estimated to decrease slightly to 0.4 by 2026</p>	<p>The slight surplus is attributed to spare capacity at Chorley Rugby Club to accommodate future growth.</p>	<p>Seek to maintain this level of provision to accommodate future increases in participation.</p>
<p><i>Senior rugby league</i> Surplus of 0.5, estimated to decrease slightly to 0.4 by 2026</p>	<p>The slight surplus is attributed to spare peak time capacity at King George V Playing Fields, Adlington (Saturday am).</p>	<p>Seek to maintain this level of provision to accommodate future increases in participation.</p>
<p><i>Junior rugby league</i> Deficiency of -6.0, estimated to increase slightly to -6.6 by 2026</p>	<p>The deficiency results from the large number of junior teams (14) playing at peak time (Sunday) at Chisnall Lane Playing Fields.</p>	<p>Increase community use at school sites at peak time (where there is junior or senior pitches) to accommodate teams.</p>

South Ribble

Summary of surpluses/deficiencies	Key issues	Proposed action
<p><i>Senior football</i> Surplus of 20.5, estimated to decrease slightly to 17.9 by 2026</p>	<p>The surplus is attributed to spare capacity across 31 sites including significant spare capacity at Penwortham Home Recreation Ground, Worden Park, Wellfield Business & Enterprise College and Lostock Hall Community High School.</p>	<p>Overplay at sites; Vernon Carus Sports & Social Club, Penwortham Holme (mini pitches only) and Hurst Grange could be accommodated on sites with spare capacity. Maintain at least 10% of stock as strategic reserve (two pitches) and an additional two pitches to accommodate latent demand. Seek to maintain at least ten pitches to accommodate overplay, two for latent demand and at least two pitches as strategic reserve (i.e. 10% of the stock in the area).</p>
<p><i>Junior football</i> Surplus of 1.0, estimated to decrease slightly to -0.6 by 2026</p>	<p>Small amounts of spare capacity are expressed across a number of sites including St Anne's and Whitefield primary schools. However, this does not equate surplus provision.</p>	<p>Spare capacity should be retained to accommodate future increases in participation.</p>
<p><i>Mini football</i> Deficiency of -9.0, estimated to increase slightly to -11.2 by 2026</p>	<p>South Ribble contains a significant number of mini football teams (83) which are accommodated across 13 mini pitches. Demand is comfortably met on existing provision.</p>	<p>Any future requirements could be satisfied through reconfiguration of the existing stock.</p>
<p><i>Cricket</i> Deficiency of -1.4, estimated to increase to -2.3 by 2026</p>	<p>The deficiency is brought about by the high number of teams playing at two sites; Fox Lane Sports Club and Vernon Carus Sports & Social Club.</p>	<p>It is vital that all sites are protected from development and that clubs are supported to increase the availability of artificial wickets for seniors or as appropriate demand for second home grounds is supported.</p>
<p><i>Senior rugby</i> There is no current shortfall or deficiency of pitches identified, however, this is estimated to decrease to -0.1 by 2026</p>	<p>Spare capacity is expressed at Lancashire Constabulary Police Headquarters.</p>	<p>The surplus of pitches is negligible but should be retained to accommodate future increases in participation.</p>
<p><i>Senior rugby league</i> Surplus of 2.0, estimated to decrease slightly to 1.9 by 2026</p>	<p>Although the sites in South Ribble are played to capacity at there is spare capacity at peak time (Saturday am).</p>	<p>The surplus should be retained as strategic reserve and to accommodate future increases in participation.</p>

Summary of surpluses/deficiencies	Key issues	Proposed action
<p><i>Junior rugby league</i> Deficiency of -3.0, estimated to increase slightly to -3.3 by 2026</p>	<p>At peak times (Sunday) there is a shortfall of junior pitches.</p>	<p>Increase community use at school sites at junior peak times (where there is junior or senior pitches) to accommodate teams.</p>

Preston

Summary of surpluses/deficiencies	Key issues	Proposed action
<p><i>Senior football</i> Surplus of 11.5, estimated to decrease slightly to 9.2 by 2026</p>	<p>The surplus relates to spare capacity at Archbishop Temple and Corpus Christi high schools as well as Moor Park.</p>	<p>Pitches with spare capacity could help to address the shortfall of junior and mini pitches. Seek to maintain at least three pitches to accommodate overplay, two pitches for latent demand and at least one pitch as strategic reserve (i.e. 10% of the stock in the area).</p>
<p><i>Junior football</i> Deficiency of -8.0, estimated to increase slightly to -9.5 by 2026</p>	<p>There are a large number of junior teams playing on senior sized pitches. Please note that in this instance this is fully accepted by the leagues/teams.</p>	<p>The deficiency of junior pitches can be met through greater use of senior pitches.</p>
<p><i>Mini football</i> Deficiency of -7.0, estimated to increase slightly to -7.6 by 2026</p>	<p>Preston has the fewest (two) mini pitches in Central Lancashire.</p>	<p>Increase community use at school sites (where there is junior or senior pitches) to accommodate junior teams and latent demand.</p>
<p><i>Cricket</i> Deficiency of -6.9, estimated to increase to -7.9 by 2026</p>	<p>The deficiency is brought about by overplay across a number of sites, particularly at Preston Sports Arena which accommodates a mid week cricket league.</p>	<p>It is vital that all sites are protected from development and that clubs/providers are supported to increase the availability of artificial wickets for seniors.</p>
<p><i>Senior rugby</i> Deficiency of -2.5, estimated to increase to -3.0 by 2026</p>	<p>Preston Grasshoppers RFC is overplayed by 1.8 matches each week.</p>	<p>Increase community use at school sites (where there is junior or senior pitches) to accommodate junior teams.</p>
<p><i>Senior rugby league</i></p>	<p>There is no current/future shortfall or deficiency of pitches identified.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p><i>Junior rugby league</i></p>	<p>There is no current/future shortfall or deficiency of pitches identified.</p>	<p>-</p>

This page is intentionally left blank



Report of	Meeting	Date
Joint LDF Officer Team	Central Lancashire LDF Joint Advisory Committee	31 May 2012

CENTRAL LANCASHIRE CORE STRATEGY – OUTCOMES OF RESUMED EXAMINATION

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To update Members on the progress of the Core Strategy leading to the Inspector’s Report on the Examination process.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

2. That the report be noted.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF REPORT

3. The Core Strategy Examination resumed with a hearing session on 6 March for the Inspector to consider issues arising in respect of the proposed Housing Related Changes. At the conclusion of this the Inspector announced that his target date for sending his Report for fact checking to the authorities was the week commencing 14 May. However with the subsequent publication of new national planning policy documents an additional consultation on how these relate to the Core Strategy was carried out with a comments deadline of 9 May. The authorities’ case is that the Core Strategy, with the published proposed changes to it, has a high level of consistency with national policy. At the time of writing this report the Inspector’s Report on the Examination was still awaited.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION(S)

(If the recommendations are accepted)

4. To keep Members up to date.

ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

5. None.

BACKGROUND

6. The Examination of the Core Strategy was suspended by the Inspector in July 2011 to enable the authorities to propose and consult on Housing Related Changes to the plan. This consultation occurred in November and December 2011, 42 parties made representations and many of these were represented at the resumed Examination hearing session on 6 March 2012.

ISSUES CONSIDERED SINCE THE EXAMINATION RESUMED

7. The Inspector set a series of matters and questions to be considered at the March hearing session. These are reproduced in Appendix 1. Most time was devoted to the two proposed Strategic Locations however due consideration was given other possible sites raised by representors and to the intended operation of the housing delivery provisions of the Core Strategy.
8. At the end of the session the Inspector announced that he expected to finish his Report by the week commencing 14 May for fact checking by the authorities. However in response to a question from a representor he conceded that publication of new national policy in the interim period may delay matters further. In any event the announced date was later than expected by your Officers and subsequently letters were sent from the authorities to the Planning Inspectorate seeking an earlier date.
9. The replies received from the Inspectorate were not optimistic of an earlier release of the Report and forewarned of the likely need for further Core Strategy consultation in respect of revised national planning policies. The finalised National Planning Policy Framework was published on 27 March. The Planning Policy for Traveller Sites was issued a few days earlier. At the behest of the Inspector a four week consultation on the relationship of these documents to the Core Strategy was started with a comments deadline of 9 May. All parties who had made representations on the Core Strategy from the publication stage onwards (started in December 2010) were invited to take part in the latest consultation.
10. This consultation was soon augmented to also consider a specific model policy (relating to the national policy documents) as the Planning Inspectorate had issued an instruction to all Inspectors in the process of plan examination that such a policy was necessary to be incorporated in to plans to help enable them to be found sound. Appendix 2 reproduces this model policy. The deadline for comments on the model policy was also set for 9 May.
11. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) replaces nearly all the previous guidance typically issued in the form of Planning Policy Statements (PPSs) and Planning Policy Guidance (PPGs) notes. The finalised NPPF accords more closely to the PPSs/PPGs than the draft NPPF issued for consultation last year. This is particularly the case in terms of town centre preferences for locating retail and office development, promoting sustainable transport and also in respect of nature and building conservation as well as promoting good design. Green Belt policy is similar to the previous national guidance as is protection of the wider countryside from development. The NPPF has the following key provisions:
 - a. A presumption in favour of sustainable development
 - b. A positive approach to enabling economic growth and housing delivery
 - c. A need to maintain 5 year housing land supplies with an additional 5% buffer although this should be 20% extra where there is 'a record of persistent under delivery'

- d. No long term protection of employment land where there 'is no reasonable prospect of such a use'
 - e. No national target for housing development on previously developed land although re-use of brownfield land for all types of development is encouraged
 - f. Local discretion on housing density
 - g. Ability to protect residential gardens from development
 - h. Designation of Local Green Space is advocated for open space of particular local importance
 - i. A 12 month period (from publication of the NPPF) to get development plans in line with national policy, although policies saved from Local Plans adopted before 2004 can be given 'due weight according to their degree of consistency with national policy'.
12. The national Planning Policy for Traveller Sites is a separate publication. It sets out how local planning authorities should assess site needs; set pitch/plot number targets; identify and maintain land supplies in appropriate locations bearing in mind access to services and affordability factors; operate specific controls in rural and Green Belt areas; consider mixed use and relocation requirements. An overall objective is to reduce the number of unauthorised developments and encampments.
13. The main body of the Councils' statement on the national policies in relation to the Core Strategy is attached (see Appendix 3). This demonstrates a very high degree of consistency between national policies and the Strategy. The views of other representatives are summarised in Appendix 4.
14. The Coalition Government's reform of the planning system also envisages the revocation of the Regional (Spatial) Strategies. However at the time of writing this report these strategies were still extant. Nevertheless the national policy documents make several references to local planning authorities collecting the necessary evidence of development requirements and doing so in collaboration with neighbouring authorities.

Background Papers			
Document	Date	File	Place of Inspection
Planning Policy for Traveller Sites	24 March 2012		District Council Planning Offices
National Planning Policy Framework	27 March 2012		

Report Author	Tel	Email	Doc ID
Julian Jackson	01772 536774	Julian.jackson@lancashire.gov.uk	JAC Report – May 12 – Core Strategy

Appendix 1

RESUMED EXAMINATION HEARING AGENDA
Tuesday 6th March 2012 at 9.30 am
at
The Gujarat Hindu Society Centre, South Meadow Lane,
Preston, PR1 8JN

1. Introduction. Councils to explain what has happened since the adjournment of Hearings on 12 July 2011, including opportunities for consultation on revised proposals, to be outlined.
2. Any additional representations concerning a Strategic Location at North West Preston, including provision of infrastructure, the likely number of dwellings and its phased and managed release if appropriate.
3. Any additional representations concerning a Strategic Location at South of Penwortham/North of Farington, including provision of infrastructure, the likely number of dwellings and its phased and managed release if appropriate.
4. Any further comments upon any other sites proposed by participants.
5. The implications of the additional sites/dwellings for affordable housing. How many affordable homes are likely to be provided throughout the plan period, and how many more as a result of the proposed changes?
6. Is the 70% target of new housing on previously-developed land still achievable as a result of the proposed changes and would Policy 1 still concentrate over 90% of the proposed new housing in urban locations that occupy the central spine of the plan area?
7. What is the effect on housing supply and requirements of the 340 or so dwellings allowed on appeal close to Mr Shah's land - see his letter of 16 August 2011. Have any other recent permissions for a significant amount of housing had any similar effect?
8. Would the Councils please comment further on the operation of Policy 4c in respect of monitoring and contingencies?
9. Would the Councils please also provide a further explanation of figures contained in Table 1 (Publication Core Strategy page 42).
10. Any other matters.
11. Site Inspections - accompanied if requested.

Richard E Hollox
13 January 2012

Appendix 2***National Planning Policy Framework - Presumption in favour of sustainable development***

When considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. It will always work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.

Planning applications that accord with the policies in this Local Plan (and, where relevant, with policies in neighbourhood plans) will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision then the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise – taking into account whether:

- a) any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole; or*
- b) specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted.*

**CENTRAL LANCASHIRE AUTHORITIES' STATEMENT ON COMPLIANCE OF THE
CENTRAL LANCASHIRE CORE STRATEGY WITH NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES
9 MAY 2012**

Introduction

1. This Statement has been produced in response to the Inspector's/Programme Officer's letters of 11th and 19th April 2012.
2. The Authorities have no comment to make on the proposed introduction of the model national policy into the Core Strategy as referred to in the latter letter. It is suggested that it is included right at the start of the document before the Introduction. It should also be accompanied by some factual text to simply explain that the national policy situation was revised during the Strategy's preparation and that the model policy has been included to clarify the operational relationship between the plan and national policy. Inclusion of the model policy means there is no need to replicate national policy provisions in the Core Strategy policies.
3. This Statement is arranged so as to set out first of all how the Core Strategy, taking account of all the proposed changes to it submitted by the Authorities since the Publication stage in December 2010, compares with national policy in overall terms. Then appended to this Statement is a fully itemised cross check with the National Planning Policy Framework (Appendix 1) and the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (Appendix 2).
4. It is the Authorities' firm conviction that this Statement demonstrates that the Core Strategy, as it has already been proposed to be changed, is highly compliant with the provisions of the national policy documents. There are some areas where the national provisions are not considered to be Core Strategy content matters. These instances either relate to the operation of the planning application decision making process or are matters at this juncture that are intended to be covered by the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Documents each authority is preparing. These documents are well placed to become adopted by the time 12 months have elapsed since the national policy documents were published or will at least be well advanced thereto by then.
5. Currently there are very few references to previous national planning policy in the Core Strategy – commonly referred to as the 'plan' in this Statement. It is envisaged that these can be deleted as minor changes to the document.

Overall Comparison of the Core Strategy with National Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

6. This part of the part of the Statement considers the degree of consistency of the Core Strategy with the broad provisions of the NPPF in turn.
 - a. **Achieving Sustainable Development** – This aspect is fully embedded in the Core Strategy. Sustainability is at the heart of the plan. The three tenants of Sustainability Appraisal – social, environmental and economic are drawn out in the cross cutting themes of the plan which shows how these relate to the achievement of economic growth and place shaping as an appropriate way of addressing the key spatial challenges of the plan area.

- b. **The Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development** – the plan is pro-growth and is wholly based around how this can be sustainably located, this is the central theme of Chapter 5 now complete (through the proposed Housing Related Changes) with its recognition of flexibility in delivery of development.
- c. **Core Planning Principles** – the Core Strategy is founded on joint working, place shaping and a thorough understanding of the character of local places and the roles they play (see Spatial Portrait). Its further chapter titles of ‘Catering for Sustainable Travel’, ‘Delivering Economic Prosperity’, ‘Achieving Good Design’, ‘Tackling Climate Change’, ‘Health and Wellbeing’ demonstrate how embed the Core Planning Principles are. Further provisions of the plan support these principles. They cover conserving and enhancing the natural environment; reducing pollution; re-use of previously used land; promoting mixed development; conserving heritage assets; delivering sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs.
- d. **Building a Strong, Competitive Economy** – is brought together in the Core Strategy Vision where it states Central Lancashire ‘...will play a leading role in Lancashire’s world class economy...’ and in Chapter 5 which is devoted to ‘Managing and Locating Growth’ with its clear exposition of the strategically located development opportunities for business expansion in all its guises.
- e. **Ensuring the Vitality of Town Centres** – the plan has a clear and positive policy approach in this regard, establishing a firm foundation for the Site Allocations etc DPDs.
- f. **Supporting a Prosperous Rural Economy** – receives specific, positive policy coverage in the plan as does the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages.
- g. **Promoting Sustainable Transport** – is underpinned in the plan with the spatial composition of the ‘Locating Growth’ policy and sustainable transport modes through the ‘Travel’ policy.
- h. **Supporting High Quality Communications Infrastructure** – is embedded in the ‘Travel’ policy.
- i. **Delivering a Wide Choice of High Quality Homes** – the plan with its Housing Related Changes aims to meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing. It identifies key sites and locations where many of these will be provided and sets appropriate guidance for rural housing. The Core Strategy also sets a clear steer where the overall amount of housing will be delivered in 5/6 year periods to 2026, with monitoring every year, and a three yearly rolling review periods. Full provision is made for providing affordable housing and measures for bringing empty homes back into use.
- j. **Requiring Good Design** – ‘Achieving Good Design’ is a key cross-cutting theme that is central to the plan’s approach and is a multi-faceted chapter that brings in heritage, green infrastructure, areas of separation/major open space, countryside management/access, landscape character and biodiversity/geodiversity as well as building design.
- k. **Promoting Healthy Communities** – the plan’s ‘Promoting Health and Wellbeing’ chapter fully embraces the spatial planning aspects of health and the related measures of promoting sport and recreation, community facilities and addressing crime and community safety.
- l. **Protecting Green Belt Land** – the plan has not sought to replicate national Green Belt policy but is entirely consistent with its principles which are re-stated in the NPPF.

- m. **Meeting the challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change** – Central Lancashire is not a coastal location but the plan fully addresses the policy requirements of ‘Tackling Climate Changes’ through the use of sustainable resources in new developments, renewable and low carbon energy capture and water management backed up by a robust local evidence base.
- n. **Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment** – biodiversity, geodiversity, soils, Green Infrastructure and landscape character are all aspects that receive appropriate policy coverage in the plan.
- o. **Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment** – has a specific policy addressed to it.
- p. **Facilitating the Sustainable Use of Minerals** – these matters are ‘County Matters’.
- q. **Plan Making** – sustainability is the underlying thread running throughout the Core Strategy and the document has been subject to Sustainability Appraisal, and Screening for Habitats Regulations. The Vision for the document is centred on sustainable growth.
- r. **Using a Proportionate Evidence base** – the preparation of the Core Strategy has been based on adequate up to date and relevant evidence, which includes a SHLAA, SHMA, Employment Land Review, Retail and Leisure Review, Outline Water Cycle Study, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment along with Habitats Regulations Screening.
- s. **Planning Strategically Across Local Boundaries** – the three Central Lancashire Authorities have worked jointly on the preparation of the Core Strategy and as part of this process they have collaborated with external neighbouring authorities as well as the County Council and other public and private sector bodies.
- t. **Examining Local plans** – the Core Strategy has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, and followed all required legal and procedural requirements and it is considered ‘sound’ in this regard.
- u. **Decision Taking** – this relates to the ‘development management’ process and the three authorities have all appropriate procedural requirements in place. In addition to the Core Strategy, the Site Allocations DDP’s will provide the framework to ensure the determination process is plan led.

Planning Policy for Travellers Sites

Policy 8 of the Core Strategy relates to Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation and a Lancashire wide assessment of traveller need assisted in the formulation of this policy, the evidence base established a pitch and plot target including permanent and transit accommodation.

NOTE – appended to the Statement are detailed cross-checks with all the provisions of the NPPF and Planning Policy for Travellers Sites.

Appendix 4 – Index of Representations on the Consistency of the Core Strategy with National Policies

Summary

Representation numbers	Category	No
2, 9, 10, 13	Individuals	4
3, 4, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 24	Housebuilders, landowners and agents	9
5, 6, 7, 15	Commercial developers, owners and agents	4
20, 27	Interest Groups	2
1, 11, 22	Government Departments, Agencies, Quangos	3
26	Private Utility Companies	1
8, 14, 23, 26	Local Authorities and Parish Councils	4

No	Name	Representation
001	Network Rail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cites safety issues associated with sites next to operational railway lines
002	Mr M A Shah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeks to justify development of a site at Clayton-le-woods in terms of not satisfying Green Belt purposes, ability to review Green Belt boundaries, presumption in favour of sustainable development, need to deliver wide choice and mix of housing
003a	Sedgwick Associates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports Core Strategy Traveller policy (8) and the evidence behind it however proposes an additional Green Belt criterion for restricting Traveller sites in such locations
003b	Hollins Strategic Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports inclusion of model policy, Core Strategy Policy 1 should allow more scope for rural housing and Policy 4 should refer to buffers for 5 year land supply
004	Morris Homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refers to need for flexibility in housing delivery, presumption in favour of sustainable development, questions deliverability of major sites, opportunities for other development sites, criticises monitoring arrangements, 5 year land supply buffers needed; as it is Core Strategy is not sound
005	Medicom	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeks to justify more development being permitted in villages such as Grimsargh in terms of recent development proposals, a new pharmacy, the pro-development stance of national policy and need for flexibility
006	Garden Centre Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeks to justify redevelopment of a garden centre at Southport Road, Ulnes Walton in terms of support for economic development in rural areas and retention of local facilities, need to meet full housing needs, use of previously developed land, release of land in employment use with no reasonable prospect of continuing in such a use

007	Campbells	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeks to justify an extension to a park homes site at Cuerden in terms of sustainable development, need to cater for all housing needs including those of older people, should consult with the local community on scheme design, respond flexibly to changing circumstances and plan positively
008	West Lancashire BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further comments to make
009	Ms S Fox	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refers to national policy in terms of town centre and brownfield preferences, localism, transitional arrangements for plan making, balanced approach to sustainable development, protection of Green Belts, intrinsic value of the countryside and stronger emphasis on good design
010	Mr I Counce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeks to justify more development in small villages such as Mawdesley in terms of presumption in favour of sustainable development, need to meet full housing needs, high affordable housing need in Mawdesley
011	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refers to lack of identification of Local Green Space, need to avoid redevelopment of brownfield land of high environmental value, scope to protect and enhance public rights of way, and to identify and protect areas of tranquility
012	Taylor Wimpey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeks to justify more scope of development in small villages such as Charnock Richard in terms sustainability and viability of the village, need to meet local housing needs, need for more flexibility in delivery of housing sites and to reflect scope to provide affordable housing from market housing schemes, would support the economy of rural areas and retain local services and community facilities
013	Mr R Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeks to justify resisting development near Longridge in terms of greenfield, rural character, lack of local facilities, associated road traffic impacts, more sustainable sites elsewhere, potential loss of settlement separation
014	Wyre BC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Queries the appropriateness and need for the model policy
015	Telereal Trillium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeks to justify development of land at Cop Lane, Penwortham by promoting brownfield land here in Policy 1 to accord with the presumption in favour of sustainable development and economic investment, and amend Policy 10 to operate more flexibly to release land in employment use with no reasonable prospect of continuing in such a use
016	Taylor Wimpey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeks to justify development at Pickering's Farm, Penwortham in terms of presumption in favour of sustainable development, need to meet full housing need and for the 5 year housing land supply to be subject to a buffer
017	Commercial Estates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeks to justify development at North West Preston, in terms of presumption in favour of sustainable development, removal of brownfield first approach, limited allowance for windfall housing sites and for Preston's 5 year housing land supply to be subject to a 20% buffer due to persistent undersupply
018	Persimmon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy 1 should refer at the outset to promoting the re-use of 'sustainable, previously developed land' and include a separate criterion to allow previously developed land (not just Major Developed Sites) in the Green Belt to be redeveloped

019	Northern Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeks to justify development at Ingol Golf Club in terms of presumption in favour of sustainable development, authorities should make every effort to identify sites for development, need for Preston's 5 year housing land supply to be subject to a 20% buffer due to persistent undersupply, only Local Green Space with local significance should be so identified and protected not large tracts of land with a lack of robust up to date evidence
020	Lancashire CPRE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comparing the Core strategy to national policies should be limited to a simple cross checked list and for approval not to be held up
021	D'Urton Lane Owners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeks to justify housing development of North West Preston in terms of presumption in favour of sustainable development, authorities should make every effort to identify sites for development, need for Preston's 5 year housing land supply to be subject to a 20% buffer due to persistent undersupply, flexibility to adapt to rapid change, backing for large urban extensions, careful attention to viability and costs; supports inclusion of model policy
022	The Coal Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Points to the continued need for all local planning authorities to take account of minerals safeguarding and land instability arising from past mining
023	Woodplumpton PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brownfield land is still preferred in sustainable locations, concern about ad hoc development being allowed in North West Preston
024	Mr M Mullarkey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeks to justify development at North West Preston in terms of presumption in favour of sustainable development, need to meet full housing need and for Preston's 5 year housing land supply to be subject to a 20% buffer due to persistent undersupply, backing for large urban extensions
025	Haighton PC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presumption in favour of sustainable development should not be taken as a loophole to allow any development and override local concerns
026	United Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cites main provisions of NPPF in terms of local development plan content and emphasises the importance of taking account of water services and management
027	Ingol Golf Village Residents' Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeks to support protection of the Ingol Golf Course as open space as it is not surplus to requirements and there are no overriding benefits of it being released for development. It is unnecessary to include the national model policy but if is added an explanatory paragraph is needed to make clear the provisions of the NPPF as whole should be applied

This page is intentionally left blank