



South Ribble Borough Council / Pickering's Farm Planning Inquiry

Financial Viability in Planning Proof of
Evidence Summary

Planning Ref: 07/2021/00886/ORM &
07/2021/00887/ORM

PINS: APP/F2360/W/22/3295498

July 2022

**Inspiring Built
Environments**

Viability in Planning
Development Management
Regeneration
Planning Consultancy

Summary

I (Murray Lloyd) have been asked to provide expert advice based on the following reasons for refusal (no. 11) which states:

“No viability evidence has been submitted to enable an assessment of whether necessary infrastructure can be provided to support this important housing land allocation. As such the proposals are contrary to Policies A1 and C1 in the South Ribble Local Plan” (CD8.3; Decision Notice, 2021: pg. 2).

From a detailed review of all the case information, I can conclude that the justification behind reasons for refusal 11 are as follows:

- The allocation of the subject site was based on the requirement to deliver key infrastructure as seen in Policy C1’s justification text and evidence base behind the policy during examination.
- The approach being taken by the Appellants, is that the financial burden for delivering all of the infrastructure requirements for the allocation, including that of the Cross Borough Link Road (CBLR) and enhancement of the bridge over the West Coast Main Line would be left to the remaining parcels (18.5% of dwellings) and the Council to fund.
- If for example, the full contribution towards the CBLR bridge enhancements were to be sought from the remaining 18.5% of dwellings not in the applications, this is very likely going to result in a viability issue for these parcels of land and call into question the deliverability of both the CBLR and remaining residential dwellings not in the applications (18.5% of units). This scenario could mean the allocation does not deliver its anticipated full amount of dwellings.
- The Appellants are seeking CIL relief for the provision of land for the school and for the developments of the Spine Road which they argue will form part of the CBLR. It is SRBC’s position that the scheme will not be subject CIL relief and that it is entirely a choice for them (as Charging Authority) as to whether they should make a legal agreement with the Appellants under Regulation 73 of the regulation or not.
- The Appellants have stated that there is not a viability challenge with the delivery of the site (including full policy contribution) with or without CIL relief. If, for example, should SRBC impose on the Appellants the requirements to fund contributions towards the CBLR (incl. bridge enhancements), a scheme with a Gross Development Value I estimate at circa. £300,000,000, would be more than capable of viably funding all infrastructure needs.