



Report of	Meeting	Date
Joint LDF Officer Team	Central Lancashire LDF Joint Advisory Committee	29 January 2009

## **CORE STRATEGY – UPDATE ON PUBLICITY, ENGAGEMENT AND OVERVIEW OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

### **PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. To explain how the Preferred Core Strategy was publicised, what engagement events were arranged and what other meetings the document was presented to.
2. To briefly set out the scale and range of topics of the representations received.
3. To raise the prospect of the JAC meetings being publicised on the Central Lancashire website.

### **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

4. That the report is noted and Members give their views on JAC publicity.

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF REPORT**

5. Various ways were tried to publicise the Preferred Core Strategy and gain involvement in it through active engagement. The number of representations received is a little disappointing. There is a varied range of topics covered in the submitted comments. Some of them pose major objections but there are also many comments in support. A full report referring to all the representations will be presented to a future meeting of the JAC. It would be feasible to publicise the JAC meetings on the internet.

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

**(If the recommendations are accepted)**

6. To inform Members and seek views.

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

7. None.

## **BACKGROUND**

8. The Preferred Core Strategy was published on 30 September 2008. Representations were requested to be submitted by 19 December 2008. This gave nearly 12 weeks for 'engagement' which can be taken to mean to be a more active involvement process that just the more passive 'consultation' approach.
9. In terms of referring to representations received this report is only intended to provide a brief overview for Members to gain an appreciation of the sorts of comments received. The absence of any mention of some representations should not be taken to imply they are of no consequence. There will be a full report to a future meeting of the JAC referring to all the representations submitted.

## **PUBLICITY AND ENGAGEMENT**

10. The attached report at Appendix A summaries the various ways in which attention was drawn to the Core Strategy. It also sets out the engagement events that were specifically organised to involve stakeholders in the document as well as mentioning other meetings where the Core Strategy was presented. The report also refers to the feedback received on the events along with some comments on the appearance of the document and the characteristics of the respondents.
11. To increase the public profile of the LDF joint working the meeting dates of the JAC could be publicised on the Central Lancashire website. As the meetings are only held as and when needed it is difficult for interested parties to be aware of upcoming meetings in advance. Members views are sought on this.

## **OVERVIEW OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED**

12. A total of about 130 representations have been received. Nearly all of these have been recorded as 'formal' comments, these include representations submitted by Councillors. There are a few informal comments put in by Officers of the four councils covering Central Lancashire. This overall number is a slight increase on the 100 or so representations received on each of the preceding Issues and Options reports.
13. Only about 20 of the representors appear to be members of the public acting in their own private capacity and most of these referred to one of two issues – concerns about the future of Ingol golf course and those asking for the Core Strategy to deal with a perceived need for a light aircraft landing strip.
14. A number of developers have queried the way in which the Core Strategy aims to maintain at least a short term supply of housing land. Several planning consultants have made site specific representations to support development on their clients land. Most of these sites have probably been submitted previous as site suggestions – this needs to be checked.
15. Several neighbouring local authorities have made representations, some pointing out that the Core Strategy wrongly refers to the finalised Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS - see separate report on this agenda) and in particular citing concerns related to the status of Preston and the scale of the Tithebarn scheme. Elsewhere there is support for how the Core Strategy refers to Longridge.

16. The Regional Planning Body (now called 4NW) not surprisingly picks up the RSS issues but overall finds the Core Strategy in general conformity with it suggesting only minor wording changes to address the discrepancies.
17. Officials at the Government Office for the North West have raised some wide ranging queries and proposed improvements. They are particular keen to see that the spatial issues, consideration of alternatives and reasoning more clearly set out. They also refer to the need for the Growth Point to be fully embedded in the Core Strategy (should the Councils agree to this going ahead).
18. Not surprisingly the Growth Point is also picked up other leading agencies and some development interests. A separate report on this agenda refers to these matters in more detail.
19. In terms of more specialist interests there are numerous references of support from leading agencies in terms of tourism, commerce and economic development, heritage, sport, higher education and environmental matters.

<b>Background Papers</b>			
<b>Document</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>File</b>	<b>Place of Inspection</b>
Preferred Core Strategy representations	various		Winckley House, Cross Street, Preston

  

<b>Report Author</b>	<b>Tel</b>	<b>Email</b>	<b>Doc ID</b>
Julian Jackson	01772 536774	<a href="mailto:Julian.jackson@lancashire.gov.uk">Julian.jackson@lancashire.gov.uk</a>	Report Jan 09 – Reps overview