



SOUTH RIBBLE SITE ALLOCATIONS & DEVELOPMENT POLICIES

(Inspector: Susan Heywood BSc(Hons) MCD MRTPI)

Ms Yvonne Parker
Programme Officer
2 Priory Court
Burnley
Lancashire
BB11 3RH

Telephone: 01282 450522

Mobile: 0781 333 4305

Email: posltd@virginmedia.com

Dear Sir or Madam

Further to my letter in December I am writing to give you further information regarding the above Examination.

I enclose the following documents:

1. Agenda for the PHM Meeting
2. Guidance Notes for the Hearings
3. The Issues and Matters.
4. The draft timetable.
5. A list of the parties who have asked to participate at the Hearings and the issues that they wish to discuss.

Please note that if you are **not** on the list of participants and **you do** want to participate can you advise me as soon as possible and no later than the PHM meeting.

The PHM meeting is being held on **WEDNESDAY 23 January commencing at 10AM** in The SHIELD ROOM, the Civic Centre, West Paddock, Leyland, Lancashire, PR25 1DH. (Please note the change of room and the confirmation of the day/date that was advised incorrectly to some people in my previous correspondence).

This is procedural meeting only and planning issues will not be discussed. A note of this meeting will follow shortly after the meeting and the programme will be updated with the names of the people attending.

The Hearings will commence on **TUESDAY 5 March 2013** commencing at 10am in the Cross Room. The timetable is attached to this note.

Please note that if you are an agent and have a number of clients I will only be sending this letter to you once and not for each of your clients.

If you wish to keep up to date with what is happening please go to the Examination website at:

<http://www.southribble.gov.uk/Section.asp?sectiontype=listseparate&catid=301274>

Finally can I ask you to give me details of your email address if you have not already provided it?

If you have any questions about the Examination please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Yvonne Parker', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Yvonne Parker,
Programme Officer
16 January 2013

South Ribble Borough Council
Site Allocations and Development Management Policies
Development Plan Document Examination

PRE-HEARING MEETING

To be held at 10am 23 January 2013

Agenda

1. Introductions
 2. Guidance Notes from the Inspector (see separate document):
 - *Inspector and Programme Officer*
 - *Purpose of the Pre-Hearing Meeting*
 - *Purpose and Scope of the Examination*
 - *Hearings Procedure and Examination Programme*
 - *Representations and the submission of further information*
 - *Core Documents*
 - *Site visits*
 3. Procedural Questions for the Authority:
 - *Has the Plan been prepared in accordance with the statutory procedures of the 2004 Act (as amended) and the associated regulations¹, including in respect of the publication and availability of documents, advertisements and notification?*
 - *Has the Authority satisfied the 'duty to cooperate' as indicated by S33A of the 2004 Act? Has the Plan taken account of the plans of adjoining local authorities and the County Authority?*
 - *Has the Plan been prepared in accordance with the Authority's Local Development Scheme (LDS)?*
 - *Has the Plan been prepared in accordance with the Authority's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and met the minimum requirements of the relevant regulations in terms of consultation and publicity?*
 - *Has the Plan been subject to sustainability appraisal with a final report of the findings?*
 - *What is the relationship between the draft Regional Spatial Strategy and the submitted Plan?*
 - *Has the Plan been screened adequately for likely significant effects on any European Wildlife (Natura 2000) sites within and near the plan area and has an adequate appropriate assessment been carried out?*
 - *Does the Plan contain, as relevant, a list of superseded and saved development plan policies?*
 - *Has the Plan taken account of the Authority's other plans, including any relevant Sustainable Community Strategies?*
 - *What is the programme, and is it being met, for the preparation of other development plan documents, if any?*
 - *Is the Authority aware of any fundamental procedural shortcomings in the submitted document?*
 4. Any further questions and other matters arising
 5. Close
-

Public Examination into the South Ribble Borough Council
Site Allocations and Development Management Policies
Development Plan Document

Pre-Hearing Guidance Notes from the Inspector

1 Introduction

- 1.1 These Notes are to assist those involved in the Examination into the South Ribble Borough Council Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (the Plan).

2 Inspector and Programme Officer

- 2.1 The Secretary of State has appointed the Inspector **Susan Heywood BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI** to hold the Examination into the soundness of the Plan.
- 2.2 The Programme Officer for the Examination is **Ms Yvonne Parker**. She is acting as an independent officer for the Examination, under the Inspector's direction. She will be responsible for organising the programme of hearings, maintaining the Examination library, recording and circulating all material received and assisting the Inspector with procedural and administrative matters. She will advise on any programming and procedural queries and any matters which the Authority or participants wish to raise with the Inspector should be addressed to the Programme Officer. Her contact details are set out in the letter accompanying these notes.

3 Pre-Hearing Meeting (PHM)

- 3.1 The Pre-Hearing Meeting will take place on **23 January** at 10 am in The Shield Room, the Civic Centre, West Paddock, Leyland PR25 1DH. The purpose of the PHM is to explain and discuss procedural and administrative matters relating to the Examination of the Plan. This will include details about the programme, further submissions and the procedure to be followed. The content and merits of the Plan and the representations **will not be discussed** at this meeting. **Those who wish to be involved in the subsequent hearing sessions of the Examination should attend the PHM.**
- 3.2 At the PHM the Inspector will confirm the Authority's responses to a series of procedural questions (see 8.2) to confirm that the Plan has been prepared in accordance with the statutory procedures and that regard has been had to relevant documents.
- 3.3 An indicative agenda for the PHM is attached to these notes, it may change. A list of 'Matters and Issues', prepared by the Inspector, accompanies this note for information/comment, it too may change. These will underpin the subsequent Hearing sessions and will likely require the submission of some further written information. A note of the PHM, along with any revisions to the hearing sessions will be made available after the meeting.

4 Purpose and Scope of the Examination

- 4.1 The purpose of the Examination is to examine the soundness of the Plan. The Inspector's role is to consider whether the Plan is 'sound'. The National Planning Policy Framework explains that to be 'sound' the Plan should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. The Inspector will need to check that the Plan meets these requirements

and complies with legislation. The Examination will focus on these 'tests' of soundness. Those seeking changes to the Plan have to demonstrate why the document is not sound and how their suggested changes would make it sound.

4.2 The tests of soundness broadly focus on three main areas:

- Procedural: whether the Plan has been prepared in accordance with the Local Development Scheme & Statement of Community Involvement/Regulations, and has been subject to sustainability appraisal;
- Conformity: whether it is a spatial Plan consistent with national Planning policy and the extent to which regard has been had to relevant plans and strategies of the Authority and adjoining areas.
- Coherence, consistency and effectiveness: whether, with due regard to the adopted Core Strategy, the policies are coherent and consistent and the most appropriate in the circumstances, having considered relevant alternatives; whether they are founded on a robust and credible evidence base, with clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring and whether the Plan is reasonably flexible to enable it to deal with changing circumstances.

4.3 The Inspector is required to consider all the representations made to the submitted Plan but only so far as they relate to the matters of soundness. It is important to note that the Inspector does not consider each "objection" or report on them individually. Further information on the process can be found in the Planning Inspectorate's explanatory booklets: "*A brief guide to examining development Plan documents*" and "*Local Development Frameworks: Examining Development Plan Documents: Soundness Guidance*". (<http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/planningsystem/localplans>).

4.4 National and regional policies as such will not be debated although the Examination will consider the implications of such policies if they directly affect the areas and topics covered by the Plan.

4.5 The starting point for the Examination will be the submitted Plan: this is the South Ribble Borough Council Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (July 2012).

4.6 The Authority should not propose any fundamental changes (known as modifications) to the submitted Plan before the hearing sessions of the Examination. Where the Authority considers minor modifications are necessary, these should not affect the substance of the document, its overall soundness or the submitted sustainability appraisal. If, exceptionally, more major modifications are proposed, these would normally be subject to the same process of sustainability appraisal, publicity and opportunity to make representations as has been undertaken for the submitted Plan.

4.7 The Authority will be asked to maintain a schedule of possible major modifications to the Plan during the remainder of the Examination. This will be published on the Authority's website. The Authority is at liberty to make minor modifications as necessary.

4.8 After the Examination has closed, the Inspector will submit her report to the Authority with her findings and recommendations as regards the soundness of the Plan.

5 Procedure at Hearing sessions

- 5.1 The hearing sessions of the Examination are an inquisitorial process held under the Inspector's direction. They are an integral part of examining the soundness of the Plan. The hearing format provides an informal setting for dealing, by discussion, with a range of 'Matters and Issues' identified by the Inspector. A provisional list of Matters and Issues accompanies this note; due to further clarifications and/or evidence, this is liable to change prior to the Hearing sessions. The Authority and other participants have the opportunity to contribute to the debate on the specific matters identified by the Inspector. Only those parties seeking specific changes to the Plan are entitled to attend the hearing sessions. There is no need for those supporting or merely making comments on the Plan to attend.
- 5.2 There is an opportunity for those who have submitted a duly made representation to submit further information in relation to the Matters and Issues identified by the Inspector in accordance with the details below. This can be done in the following ways:
- by relying on their original submissions which can be supplemented by additional written information responding to the Inspector's Matters and Issues;
 - by relying on their original submissions and participating in a hearing session;
 - by relying on their original submissions, supplementing these with additional written information responding to the Inspector's Matters and Issues and by participating in a hearing session.
- 5.3 There should be no need for people pursuing their cases in writing to expand on their original representations because these should have identified the ways in which the Plan is considered to be unsound and what changes are suggested to make it sound.
- 5.4 However, where participants relying on written representations feel that it is necessary for them to put in further material and respond to the Inspector's 'Matters and Issues', this must be submitted to the Programme Officer in accordance with the same timetable which will be set for the submission of further evidence by those attending the hearing sessions.
- 5.5 The Inspector will not ask or expect the Authority to respond to each and every representation. **Representations made orally or in writing carry the same weight and the Inspector will have equal regard to each.** Attendance at the hearings will only be helpful if participants wish to contribute to the debate.
- 5.6 Participants may bring professional advisers but space around the table may be limited. There will be no formal presentation of evidence or cross-examination and, as the discussion is focussed on the issues identified in the agenda, it is important that the person able to make the most useful contribution should sit forward.
- 5.7 The Inspector will look to draw all relevant parties into the discussion to enable representors to air and explain the nature of their concerns and to help the Inspector gain the information necessary to come to a conclusion on the topic. Daily agendas will be produced.
- 5.8 If participants find that other people have raised the same issues as themselves, they are encouraged to join forces and appoint a spokesperson. This can save time at the Hearings, avoiding repetition of arguments, and often results in a more forceful presentation of evidence.
- 5.9 The Programme Officer will provide name boards for each participant which should be stood on end to indicate a wish to speak. In that way the

Inspector can invite contributions as the discussion unfolds without overlooking anyone with a point to make.

6 Examination Programme

- 6.1 The hearing sessions of the Examination are currently planned to commence at 10.00 on **5th March 2013** in the Civic Centre, West Paddock, Leyland. This is currently a provisional date and may be subject to change; if it alters you will be notified. It is currently envisaged that the hearings will take place over a 2 week period although this may change. A draft programme for the hearings is attached to this note. The hearings will be conducted on the basis that everyone taking part has read the relevant documents.
- 6.2 There will be a break for lunch at about 1.00pm each day, with the intention of finishing no later than 5.30pm. There will normally be a short break during morning and afternoon sessions.
- 6.3 Every effort will be made to keep to the programme, but changes may be unavoidable. The Programme Officer will inform the participants of any late changes to the timetable but it is the responsibility of the participants to keep themselves up to date with the arrangements and programme which will be posted on the Authority's web site.

7 Submission of further written information

- 7.1 The representations already made at submission stage should include all the points, documents and evidence to substantiate representors' cases. It should not therefore be necessary to submit any further material based on the original representations. Please note that, although representations may have been made at earlier stages of the Plan process, the Inspector only has copies of representations made at the Plan submission stage.
- 7.2 From this point, any necessary written information should address the 'Matters and Issues' identified by the Inspector. The Inspector will ask the Authority and those who have made representations to provide their statements of response in hard copy, as necessary, by no later than 5pm on 20 February 2013.
- 7.3 Any further statements from participants need to explain:
 - Which Matter/Issue does it relate to?
 - Which particular part of the Plan is unsound?
 - Which soundness test(s) does it fail?
 - Why does it fail?
 - How can the Plan be made sound?
 - What is the precise change/wording that is being sought?
- 7.4 Submissions should be succinct, avoiding unnecessary detail and repetition of what has already been provided. There is no need for verbatim quotations from Core Documents (see below), cross references will suffice where necessary.
- 7.5 The Inspector will expect brief statements from the Authority in relation to each hearing session stating why it considers the Plan to be sound in respect of the Matter and Issues identified and explaining its response to any changes sought by other parties. This may shorten the length of subsequent discussion at the hearing.
- 7.6 The Programme Officer will require **4 copies of all statements and material and, unless impractical, an electronic copy should be**

supplied. It is the quality of the reasoning that carries weight, not the bulk of the documents. Statements should be stapled and be no longer than 3,000 words. Statements which are excessively long or contain irrelevant or repetitious material will be returned.

- 7.7 All statements should clearly reference the Plan Matter Number (from the Inspector's 'Matters and Issues' paper), the representor's personal ID Number, the relevant policy/paragraph/ page of the Plan to which it relates and the relevant soundness test(s).
- 7.8 Participants should attempt to reach agreement on factual matters and statistics before the hearings start. They are encouraged to maintain a dialogue with the Authority and other participants in order to narrow down any areas of disagreement. The Inspector will seek to avoid any repetition of points because it is not helpful and wastes hearing time.
- 7.9 Statements of Common Ground (or even 'uncommon' ground) between the Authority and participants can be useful in focusing on the issues in dispute and should be submitted before 20 February. There is no need to prepare a further statement on matters/issues if all the points are already covered in the original representation. Participants are asked to notify the Programme Officer if they do not intend to submit any further statements so it is clear their original representation represents their views.
- 7.10 Any technical evidence should be limited to appendices, and should be clearly related to the case. Supporting material should be restricted to that which is essential and need not contain extracts from any documents that are already in the Examination library. Submissions should be on A4 paper, unbound but punched with two holes for filing. Plans or diagrams should fold down to A4 size. It is essential that all statements are marked with the personal reference number and the representation number and they should also be submitted in electronic form, if possible. However, the latter does not remove the need for paper copies to reach the Programme Officer by the deadline.
- 7.11 **All participants should adhere to the timetable for submitting any further material.** Late material will disrupt the hearing timetables, be unfair to others and will be resisted. If material is not received by this date, the Programme Officer will assume that no further representations are to be made by that participant.
- 7.12 For the record, the Inspector will be making necessary unaccompanied site visits throughout the area during the Examination process. The Inspector invites participants to identify any sites which should be visited to the Programme Officer whereupon the Inspector will consider the necessity for an inspection. If any individual considers an accompanied site visit is required then details must be provided to the Programme Officer by 20 February if not before.

8 Core documents and Examination Library

- 8.1 The Authority has prepared a list of key documents (referred to as Core Documents). These are the documents expected to be referred to most frequently and include the National Planning Policy Framework, Background Papers and any other documents to which participants are likely to need to refer. Extracts of these documents should not be attached to statements as they are already examination documents, a clear cross reference should suffice. An Examination Library has been created which can be accessed via the Programme Officer.

8.2 The list of Core Documents is up-dated from time to time and is available from the Programme Officer and will also be posted on the Authority's website. Links to electronic versions of the reference documents are provided wherever possible. The Programme Officer will assist anyone wishing to see any document. The Authority has submitted documentation which indicates that the following procedural matters have been complied with, albeit that the Inspector will likely revisit these matters during the hearing sessions.

- *The Plan has been prepared in accordance with the statutory procedures of the 2004 Act and the associated regulations, including in respect of publication and availability of documents, advertisements and notification;*
- *The Plan is in general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy;*
- *The Plan has been screened for likely significant effects on any European Wildlife (Natura 2000) sites within and near the Plan area;*
- *The Plan has been subject to sustainability appraisal with a final report of the findings?*
- *The Plan does, as relevant, contain a list of superseded saved policies;*
- *The Authority considers that it has satisfied the 'duty to cooperate' as indicated by S33A of the 2004 Act? Has the Plan taken account of the plans of adjoining local authorities and the County Authority;*
- *The LDS is being met;*
- *The Plan has been prepared in accordance with the Authority's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and met the minimum requirements of the relevant regulations in terms of consultation and publicity;*
- *The Authority is unaware of any fundamental procedural shortcomings.*

9 Close of the Examination

9.1 At the end of the hearing sessions the Inspector will give an indication as to when her final report will be issued. The Examination will remain open until the Inspector's report is submitted to the Authority. However, the Inspector will not accept any further representations or evidence after the hearing sessions have finished unless she specifically requests further information. Any late or unsolicited material is likely to be returned.

Planning Inspector

January 2012

Inspector's Matters Issues and Questions

Indicative list – subject to change

Matter 1

Has the Plan been prepared with due regard to the appropriate procedures and regulations? Is the approach of the Plan consistent with the Core Strategy and national planning policy?

1. Has the Plan been prepared in accordance with the statutory procedures of the 2004 Act (as amended) and the associated regulations, including in respect of the publication and availability of documents, advertisements and notification?
2. To what extent has the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) informed the content of the Plan? Is the Council satisfied that the SA adequately summarises or repeats the reasons that were given for rejecting the alternatives at the time when they were ruled out (and that those reasons are still valid)?
3. Has the production of the Plan followed the Statement of Community Involvement? Has this led to timely, effective and conclusive discussion with key stakeholders on what option(s) are deliverable?
4. To what extent has the production of the Plan followed the Local Development Scheme (LDS)? To what extent is the Plan consistent with the Core Strategy (CS)?
5. Has the Plan been prepared in accordance with the relevant legal requirements, particularly with regard to the Duty to Co-operate on strategic matters? What evidence exists in support? Has the Plan taken account of the plans of adjoining local authorities and the County Authority?
6. Is the Plan consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)? Does the content of the NPPF supersede any part of the CS?
7. Has adequate consideration been given to the Habitat Regulations? Will the Plan, alone or in combination, effect adversely any Natura 2000 sites? Is Natural England satisfied with the content of the Plan?
8. What robust flood risk evidence supports the Plan and its allocations? Is the Environment Agency satisfied with the content of the Plan?

Examination of the South Ribble Borough Council
Site Allocations and Development Management Policies
Development Plan Document

Matter 2

Chapter C - Major Sites Allocations.

Are the Major Sites justified by the available evidence with due regard to reasonable alternatives and are they capable of effective and timely implementation?

Policy C1 – Pickering’s Farm

Links with policies A2, D1 & D2

1. What is the likelihood that this site will achieve the contribution to the Borough’s housing land supply (set out in D1) in the short, medium and long terms, given the infrastructure requirements set out in the justification to policy C1?
2. Are the infrastructure requirements sufficiently clear and is it clear how they will be met, when and by whom?
3. How does the information set out in policy D1, relating to the number of dwellings to be provided within the 5, 10 and 15 year periods, correlate to the information in the Housing Land Position Statement and the Council’s letter dated 14.12.12?
4. Where is the evidence that the HCA and the developer have produced a development statement and indicative phasing strategy and initial assessment of viability (as set out in the Council’s letter dated 14.12.12)? Is there evidence of viability?
5. Is the range of uses within the policy appropriate?
6. Is this site justified having regard to alternatives?
7. How will regard be had to biodiversity in the site’s development?
8. Are the requirements for a masterplan clearly set out; is it apparent who is to develop the masterplan and what process this should follow?

Policy C2 – Moss Side Test Track

Links with policies D1 & D2

9. What is the likelihood that this site will achieve the contribution to the Borough’s housing land supply (set out in D1) in the short, medium and long terms, given the infrastructure requirements set out in the justification to policy C2 and the physical constraints on the site (set out in the Council’s letter dated 14.12.12)?
10. Are the infrastructure requirements sufficiently clear and is it clear how they will be met, when and by whom?
11. What progress has been made on site assembly and obtaining developer interest?
12. Is this site justified having regard to alternatives?
13. How will regard be had to biodiversity in the site’s development?
14. Are the requirements for a masterplan clearly set out; is it apparent who is to develop the masterplan and what process this should follow?
15. Is there evidence of viability?

Examination of the South Ribble Borough Council
Site Allocations and Development Management Policies
Development Plan Document

***Policy C3 – Land between Heatherleigh & Moss Lane
Links with policies D1 and D2***

16. Are the infrastructure requirements sufficiently clear and is it clear how they will be met, when and by whom?
17. What is the likelihood that this site will achieve the contribution to the Borough's housing land supply (set out in D1) in the short, medium and long terms, given the infrastructure requirements? Is the number of dwellings sought justified?
18. Is this site justified having regard to alternatives?
19. How will regard be had to biodiversity in the site's development?
20. Are the requirements for a masterplan clearly set out; is it apparent who is to develop the masterplan and what process this should follow? How does this link with the masterplan prepared by the developer of the current housing proposal?
21. Is there evidence of viability?

Policy C4 – Cuerden

22. Are the requirements for a masterplan clearly set out; is it apparent who is to develop the masterplan and what process this should follow?
23. Is a masterplan necessary?
24. Are the infrastructure requirements sufficiently clear and is it clear how they will be met, when and by whom?
25. How will regard be had to biodiversity in the site's development?
26. Is this site justified having regard to alternatives?

Policy C5 – BAE Systems, Salmesbury

27. Are the requirements for a masterplan clearly set out; is it apparent who is to develop the masterplan and what process this should follow?
28. Is a masterplan necessary?
29. Are the infrastructure requirements sufficiently clear and is it clear how they will be met, when and by whom?
30. How will regard be had to biodiversity in the site's development? Has regard been had to the Local Wildlife Site?
31. Is the proposed amendment to the Green Belt justified and consistent with the NPPF and the CS?
32. Is the policy sufficiently clear as to what uses would be acceptable?

Examination of the South Ribble Borough Council
Site Allocations and Development Management Policies
Development Plan Document

Matter 3

Housing – Chapter D

Is the Plan's approach to housing justified, consistent with national planning policy and capable of effective implementation?

General – Policies D1 and D2

1. What is the justification, based on any up to date needs assessment, for not including allocations for Traveller Sites? Is the approach consistent with national planning policy?
2. Is sufficient land allocated to meet the objectively assessed needs over the plan period? Is the approach consistent with the CS? Is there a need to identify additional land for housing?

Housing Sites (pages 34 – 41 of the Plan)

3. Are the allocated sites, on the available evidence, appropriate, justified and deliverable having regard to the alternatives? Have alternatives been subject to adequate sustainability appraisal and consultation?

Inspector's Note: Representors seeking to promote additional sites are asked to demonstrate that the tests set out in this question are satisfied.

Matter 4

Delivering Economic Prosperity – Chapter E

Is the approach of the Plan to employment matters justified, consistent with national policy and capable of effective implementation?

1. Is adequate regard had to biodiversity?
2. Are the allocated sites, on the available evidence, appropriate, justified and deliverable having regard to the alternatives?
3. Is the protection of employment sites consistent with the NPPF?
4. Are the boundaries of the retail areas justified, having regard to the available evidence?

Matter 5 – Other Plan Policies

Does the Plan take a justified approach to all policy matters? Is such an approach consistent with national planning policy?

Chapter A – Infrastructure

1. What implications, if any, will the Community Infrastructure Levy have on the provision of infrastructure having regard to the Plan requirements?
2. Does policy A1 pay adequate attention to the needs of all users of the transport network? Is the approach justified?
3. Is the provision of the Cross Borough Link Road (Policy A2) justified and deliverable having regard to the evidence?

Chapter B – Areas for Development

1. Is there a need to provide for enabling development in order to secure the delivery of local affordable housing under Policy B2?
2. Is there a need for the comprehensive development of South Rings Business Park (Policy B3) through a masterplan?

Chapter G – Natural & Built Environment

1. Does the plan have adequate regard to the need to protect biodiversity? Are designated sites adequately referred to?
2. Are policies G1 and G2 consistent with the NPPF?
3. Are the allocations of safeguarded sites (policy G3), Protected Open Lane (G4) and Green Corridors (G12) justified having regard to the alternatives and the availability of land for housing?

Matter 6

Monitoring and Implementation

What evidence indicates that necessary infrastructure can be delivered in a timely fashion? Will the arrangements for monitoring the implementation of the Plan be effective? What consideration has been given to contingency arrangements?

Infrastructure

1. Are issues of development viability recognised adequately?
2. Is there sufficient clarity regarding how, when and where necessary infrastructure will be provided (and by whom)?

Monitoring

3. Does the Plan deal adequately with uncertainty? Is sufficient consideration given to monitoring and triggers for review? How

Examination of the South Ribble Borough Council
Site Allocations and Development Management Policies
Development Plan Document

have risks and contingency been robustly addressed in the production of the Plan? Where is the supporting evidence?

4. Does the comprehensive list of policies in Appendix 1 need amending in light of the NPPF?
5. Are the arrangements for managing and monitoring the delivery of the Plan clear and will they be effective? Are the targets and monitoring proposed related adequately to the Policy objectives?
6. How will the effectiveness of the Plan and its individual policies be measured/assessed? What are the monitoring indicators for each policy; do these relate to the policy content and objectives?
7. Should the Plan include clearer timescales to assist monitoring, thereby providing milestones to assess policy effectiveness?

Other Matters

8. Other matters to be raised as necessary

Inspector
14 January 2013

South Ribble Borough Council
 Site Allocations and Development Management Policies
 Development Plan Document Examination
 Hearing Sessions March 2013 – Draft Programme

Date		Section/ Policy		Section/ Policy
Week 1	AM		PM	
Tues 5 th March 2013	<p>Opening</p> <p><u>Hearing 1:</u></p> <p>Matter 1 – Overall Approach</p> <p><u>Participants*</u></p> <p>Matter 4 – Chapter E: Delivering Economic Prosperity</p> <p><u>Participants*</u></p>	<p>Whole doc.</p> <p>Chapter E</p> <p>Policies E1 to E5</p>	<p><u>Hearing 1 - Continued</u></p>	
Wed 6 th March 2013	<p><u>Hearing 2 :</u></p> <p>Matter 2– Chapter C: Major Sites Allocations Pickering’s Farm</p> <p><u>Participants*</u></p>	<p>Policies C1, A2, D1 and D2 (in so far as they relate to Pickering’s Farm)</p>	<p>Matter 2– Chapter C: Major Sites Allocations Possible over-run - Pickering’s Farm Moss Side Test Track</p> <p><u>Participants*</u></p>	<p>Policies C2, D1 and D2 (in so far as they relate to MS Test Track)</p>

South Ribble Borough Council
 Site Allocations and Development Management Policies
 Development Plan Document Examination
 Hearing Sessions March 2013 – Draft Programme

Thurs 7 th March 2013	<u>Hearing 2</u> Possible over-run day Moss Side Test Track Site Inspections			
Week 2	AM		PM	
Tue 12 th March 2013	<u>Hearing 3:</u> Matter 2– Chapter C: Major Sites Allocations Land between Heatherlea & Moss Lane <u>Participants*</u>	Policies C3, D1 and D2 (in so far as they relate to this site)	Matter 2– Chapter C: Major Sites Allocations Cuerden Strategic Site BAE Systems, Salmesbury <u>Participants*</u>	Policies C4, C5
Wed 13 th March 2013	<u>Hearing 4:</u> Matter 3 – Housing General and Housing Sites (all day session) <u>Participants*</u>	Chapter D, D1 & D2 Pages 34 -41	<u>Hearing 4 - Continued</u>	

South Ribble Borough Council
 Site Allocations and Development Management Policies
 Development Plan Document Examination
 Hearing Sessions March 2013 – Draft Programme

Thurs 14 th March 2013	<p><u>Hearing 5:</u></p> <p>Matter 5 – Other Plan Policies (see Matters and Issues)</p> <p><u>Participants*</u></p> <p>Close of Public Hearings</p>	Policies A1, A2, B2, B3, G1, G2, G4, G12	Matter 6 – Monitoring and Implementation	Whole Plan
Tues 26 th March	Overrun day if required		Site Visits as Required	

* The list of potential participants for each session to be completed by Programme Officer after Pre-hearing Meeting.
 Morning sessions to generally run between 10.00 and 13.00
 Afternoon sessions to generally run between 14.00 and 17.00
 Some sessions may be liable to overrun and therefore some flexibility as regards attendance may be required.

South Ribble Borough Council
Site Allocations and Development Management Policies
Development Plan Document Examination
Hearing Sessions March 2013 – Draft Programme

Participants at the Hearings					
Reference	ID	Title	Surname	Organisation	Which Policy/Site/Chapter/Paragraph
146	280	Dr	Taylor-Green	Ulnes Walton Bridleways Association	Chapter A - Policy A1 - Developer Proposals
111	206	Mr	Suckley	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Chapter A - Policy A2 - Transport
93	127	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter B - Policy B1
93	128	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter B - Policy B2
93	129	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter B - Policy B3
122	219	Mr	Suckley	Muse Developments Ltd	Chapter B - Policy B3 - South Rings Business Park
93	130	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter B - Policy B4
93	131	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter B - Policy B5
93	132	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter B - Policy B6
108	197	Mr & Mrs	Braddock		Chapter C - Policies C2 and C3
146	281	Dr	Taylor-Green	Ulnes Walton Bridleways Association	Chapter C - Policy C1 - 6.11 section 106 monies
93	133	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter C - Policy C1 - Pickering's Farm
111	203	Mr	Suckley	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Chapter C - Policy C1 - Pickering's Farm
93	134	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter C - Policy C2 - Moss Side Test Track
113	208	Mr	Berry	Local Community - Midge Hall	Chapter C - Policy C2 - Moss Side Test Track
329	597	Councillor	Green	South Ribble Borough Councillor	Chapter C - Policy C2 - Moss Side Test Track
50	572	Mr & Mrs	Mitchell		Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W
85	108	Mr	Braddock		Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W
90	120	Mr	Harris	Wainhomes	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W
90	124	Mr	Harris	Wainhomes	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W
93	135	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W
108	198	Mr & Mrs	Braddock		Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W
116	211	Mr	Codd	Farington Moss Residents Action Group	Chapter C - Policy C3 - Site W
93	136	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter C - Policy C4 - Cuerden Strategic Site
148	285	Mr	Sobic	Brookhouse Group Ltd	Chapter C - Policy C4 - Cuerden Strategic Site
86	111	Ms	Fox		Chapter C - Policy C5 – BAE Systems, Samlesbury
93	137	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter C - Policy C5 – BAE Systems, Samlesbury
93	138	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter C - Policy C5 - Paragraph 6.39
85	107	Mr	Braddock		Chapter C - Residential Led Sites
131	233	Mr	Lane	Redrow Homes Ltd	Chapter D
93	139	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter D - Policy D1
111	204	Mr	Suckley	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Chapter D - Policy D1
131	234	Mr	Lane	Redrow Homes Ltd	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site CC
96	599	Mr	Jopson		Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site N
346	623	Mr	Whittle	Hutton Parish Council	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site N
58	73	Mr	Abbott		Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P
131	236	Mr	Lane	Redrow Homes Ltd	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P
177	321		Darwen		Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P
199	343		Edney		Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P
241	385		Edney		Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site P
86	116	Ms	Fox		Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site Q
90	121	Mr	Harris	Wainhomes	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site Q
331	600	Mr & Mrs	Melling		Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site Q
126	222	Mr	McDonald	Dorbcrest Homes Limited	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S
345	621	Mrs	Preston		Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S
356	633	Mr	Carter		Chapter D - Policy D1 - Site S
86	115	Ms	Fox		Chapter D - Policy D1 - Sites M, V & X
131	235	Mr	Lane	Redrow Homes Ltd	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Sites M, V & X
93	140	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter D - Policy D1 - Table 2 - with permission
111	205	Mr	Suckley	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Chapter D - Policy D2
93	141	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter E - Policy E1
93	142	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter E - Policy E2

Participants at the Hearings					
Reference	ID	Title	Surname	Organisation	Which Policy/Site/Chapter/Paragraph
86	112	Ms	Fox		Chapter E - Policy E5
333	601	Mr & Mrs	Spencer		Chapter G
93	143	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter G - Designated Environmental Sites
93	144	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter G - Designated Environmental Sites
93	145	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter G - Green Infrastructure - Introduction
328	596	Mr	Dawson	On behalf of family/landowners	Chapter G - Policy G1
93	153	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter G - Policy G10
93	154	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter G - Policy G12
93	155	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter G - Policy G13
93	156	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter G - Policy G14
93	157	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter G - Policy G15
93	146	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter G - Policy G2
93	147	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter G - Policy G3
177	411		Darwen		Chapter G - Policy G3
199	433		Edney		Chapter G - Policy G3
241	472		Edney		Chapter G - Policy G3
93	148	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter G - Policy G4
93	149	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter G - Policy G6
93	150	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter G - Policy G7
93	151	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter G - Policy G8
93	152	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter G - Policy G9
93	158	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Chapter H - Policy H1
60	75	Mr	Crompton	BE Group	Chapters D and G - Policies D1 and G3
85	106	Mr	Braddock		Consistency
85	105	Mr	Braddock		Consultation Process
86	113	Ms	Fox		Energy Efficiency of New Developments – page 84
93	159	Mr	Lamb	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	General
111	201	Mr	Suckley	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	General
86	109	Ms	Fox		NPPF
111	202	Mr	Suckley	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Overview
90	122	Mr	Harris	Wainhomes	Site BB
108	195	Mr & Mrs	Braddock		Stages of Production
108	196	Mr & Mrs	Braddock		Vision - Locating Growth - Section 3.4
346	622	Mr	Whittle	Hutton Parish Council	Vision - Locating Growth in South Ribble
86	110	Ms	Fox		Vision - Rural Local Service Centre - page 8