

ISSUES RAISED AT THE CENTRAL LANCASHIRE JOINT CABINETS MEETING, 31ST MARCH 2010, AND POSSIBLE RESPONSES (ALL REFERENCES ARE TO VERSION 4 OF THE CORE STRATEGY)

1. Specific issues

- **Page 13, para 2.15:** need to be consistent with Growth Point bid, to say that there will be no overall increase in RSS levels of housebuilding and reflect this in a consistent manner throughout the document including in para 5.9 on page 25.
Response: proposed re-wording of this and other relevant paragraphs to make clear the distinction between RSS and Growth Point, and the "re-phasing" aspect of Growth Point development.
- **Page 15, para 3.3:** importance of distinguishing Farington from Leyland.
Response: minor rewording to make this clear.
- **Page 16, para 3.4:** Penwortham is not a settlement it is a town.
Response: the word "settlement" was used as a generic term, to capture towns, villages and suburbs in one concise sentence. Minor rewording to avoid misunderstanding.
- **Page 36, policy 2:** need for improved emphasis in the first sentence of the last paragraph for infrastructure provision to be tied to local authority requirements.
Response: turn the sentence around and re-write to give greater emphasis to the role and priorities of the authorities.
- **Page 45, para 8.13:** query the expression that there will be "no compromise on overall design standards".
Response: no change, this is what we should aspire to, particularly through Policy 17 (Design of New Buildings) and backed up by the proposed Design SPD.
- **Page 47, para 8.22:** important to stress the need to bring empty properties back into occupation.
Response: minor re-wording of the first bullet point to cross-refer to the role of the Mid-Lancashire Housing and Sustainable Communities Strategy and Investment Plan, plus the empty homes strategies.
- **Page 48, para 8.23:** important to refer to Lancashire County Council's "Civilised Streets" publication in raising the quality of housing development.
Response: minor rewording to incorporate reference to "Civilised Streets" (and other key publications such as CABI's "By Design" and the Department for Transport's Manual For Streets).
- **Page 52, policy 7a:** South Ribble target for affordable housing to be 30%
Response: change policy so that 30% target applies to all three Districts.
- **Page 52, policy 7b:** question raised about the proportion of affordable housing to be built on sites in rural areas and in the green belt.
Response: define "exception sites" in the glossary.
- **Page 61, policy 11:** need to include Lostock Hall as one of the district centres.
Response: no change proposed. Lostock Hall is not a big enough shopping centre to be defined as a district centre.

- **Page 74, policy 19:** need to include area of separation between Farington, Lostock Hall and Penwortham. Important to note that not all the areas of separation in the south/central areas are in the green belt.
Response: amend policy to include the area of separation between Farington, Lostock Hall and Penwortham and to more accurately describe other areas of separation in South Ribble, and delete reference to the green belt where it defines the areas of separation in the north and the south/central areas.
- **Page 74, policy 19:** Extend remit of policy to prevent neighbourhoods merging within Preston at Ingol and Fulwood
Response: add justification and policy text to refer to named Major Open Space areas in Preston
- **Page 74, policy 20:** amend policy to avoid giving the impression that we will be encouraging new development in the Ribble Coast and Wetlands Regional Park.
Response: amend policy with the wording proposed and circulated at the meeting ie "Support the continued development of plans and proposals for ...".

2. General issues

- Why do we have to wait until June 2011 before implementing the policies contained in the Core Strategy?
Response: We are following government guidance on the necessary procedures for adoption of the Core Strategy. No changes proposed however from the date of publication the Core Strategy Can start to be used for development control purposes and will have further weight in respect of those parts that are not objected to
- Can we be careful to distinguish between greenfield and green belt?
Response: We will prepare a glossary of terms used, and will include definitions of these and other terms used in the Core Strategy.