



Local Development Framework

Central Lancashire Core Strategy

# Statement of Representations – Preferred Core Strategy Regulation 30(1)(d) Report

December 2010

This page is left deliberately blank

# STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIONS – PREFERRED CORE STRATEGY

## Introduction

This document contains details of the representations received following the consultation of the Preferred Core Strategy. The purpose of this document is to fulfil Regulation 27 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendments) Regulations 2008. This document sets out the following:

- Which bodies and persons were invited to make representations under regulation 25;
- How those bodies and persons were invited to make such representations;
- A summary of the main issues raised by those representations; and
- How those main issues have been addressed in the subsequent Core Strategy – the Publication version.

The Preferred Core Strategy was published for a consultation period of thirteen weeks on 30 September – 19 December 2008. Letters giving notice of this consultation on the Core Strategy were sent to all contacts on the Central Lancashire joint consultation database, including both statutory and non-statutory consultees. In addition, the Preferred Core Strategy, Preferred Core Strategy comments form, the Sustainability Appraisal and a summary version of the Preferred Core Strategy were made available on the Central Lancashire website, [www.centrallancashire.com](http://www.centrallancashire.com). Paper copies of the documents were also made available for inspection at the Preston, South Ribble and Chorley Council offices and at local libraries throughout the three areas.

In total 604 representations were made to the Preferred Core Strategy from 126 representors. The representations received varied widely in terms of the level of detail, the breadth of issues they covered and their viewpoint of the Strategy.

A number of common themes emerged from the body of representations, including:

- **Ingol Golf Course and the green corridor stretching from Lightfoot Lane to Tulketh School.** These representations expressed concern that the recreational greenspace would be lost due to pressure for housing development and therefore all the respondents who referred to this issue requested that the area be designated as an 'Area of Separation' in the Core Strategy.
- **Recreational aviation.** It was suggested that there is currently a major shortfall in the provision of airfields/airstrips for recreational light aircraft in Central Lancashire. It was suggested by the respondents that this issue has been neglected in the Health and Wellbeing chapter of the Publication Core Strategy.
- **Growth Point.** The main concern by respondents with regard to the Growth Point was the need for the Strategy to be flexible enough to accommodate changes particularly in terms of housing provision numbers resulting from a final decision on the designation of the Growth Point, which in 2008 was still pending.
- **Evidence base.** The evidence base of the Core Strategy was questioned in a number of representations, with concern that the housing policies in the Core Strategy had been devised without a completed Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment or Strategic Housing Market Assessment.
- **Hierarchy of towns and cities in the North West.** The primary concern of some neighbouring authorities was the status of Preston within the hierarchy of towns and cities in the North West. The authorities were concerned over the scale of

growth outlined for Preston, particularly that envisaged in the Tithebarn Regeneration Area.

### **Bodies and persons invited to make representations under Regulation 25**

To help ensure the inclusion of local residents, community groups and stakeholders, those listed in the Central Lancashire joint database were sent letters and directly invited to take part in the consultation of the Core Strategy. Representations could be made either on the website via an online form, e-mailed directly to the Central Lancashire authorities (via the dedicated Central Lancashire e-mail address – [envldf@lancashire.gov.uk](mailto:envldf@lancashire.gov.uk)) or written representations returned to the Freepost address. The statutory and non-statutory consultees that were invited to take part in the consultation are detailed in appendices 1 to 3.

In addition to the direct invitations the Central Lancashire authorities sought to ensure that the wider public were aware of and able to comment on the Core Strategy through various consultation events and media engagement activities. Advertisements were placed on local radio, in local newspapers (Chorley Citizen, Chorley Guardian, Lancashire Evening Post, and Preston Citizen) and on posters displayed in venues such as local libraries and Parish Council notice boards.

### **Summary of the main issues raised by representations**

This section of the report outlines the main issues raised during the consultation period of the Preferred Core Strategy and how the matters are now addressed in the Publication Core Strategy. A full set of responses to the Preferred Options representations is set out in Appendix 4 (*Summaries of formal representations to the Preferred Core Strategy – Including Responses*) Central Lancashire's responses are detailed *in italics*.

### **General comments**

- Design: The issue of building design was raised, specifically the question of whether it had been taken into consideration within the Core Strategy, the priorities placed on design issues and the extent to which the policy would achieve local distinctiveness in terms of design styles.  
*Design is now considered as a cross cutting theme throughout the Publication Core Strategy policies, therefore enabling the policies throughout to be strengthened and more emphasis to be placed on good design.*
- Cross-boundary issues: Respondents requested greater detail regarding cross boundary issues to enable assessment of how the Central Lancashire Core Strategy complements neighbouring authorities' Core Strategies.  
*Cross-boundary issues are detailed in what is now Chapter 3 of the Publication Core Strategy (Spatial Portrait – the character of local places and the roles they play).*
- Supplementary Planning Documents: It was suggested that SPDs should be completed as soon as possible to allow all Core Strategy policies to be appropriately implemented.  
*The authorities will aim to complete these documents as soon as possible during 2011.*
- Thematic approach: Respondents considered the thematic approach to be rather generic and suggested the Core Strategy should be revised to be more spatial.  
*Cross cutting themes have been introduced across chapters 5-12 for the Publication Core Strategy.*

- Sustainability Appraisal: There were concerns that it was not clear in the document that sustainability considerations had informed the content of the Core Strategy since the start of its preparation.  
*The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) has been fully integrated into the plan making process of the Core Strategy and has helped inform the choice of policies. At the Issues and Options stage each option was tested against the SA Framework. The results of the Issues and Options testing and recommendations made in the SA informed the choice of Preferred Options. A number of small changes made in the Publication stage have been assessed in the SA to ensure no negative effects would arise from implementing these policies. All policy chapters of the Publication Core Strategy include an SA summary textbox.*
- Soundness: The soundness of the Core Strategy was an issue cited by respondents as a concern. Respondents suggested that the Core Strategy did not satisfy the soundness test as set out in PPS12. They were also concerned that the policies were not justified against a robust evidence base and that the flexibility and deliverability of the document should be improved.  
*The Publication Core Strategy has thoroughly taken account of an extensive evidence base as well as the issues of flexibility and deliverability.*
- Ease of reading: Comments were made regarding the ease and understanding of reading the document, with concerns that the document was complicated and written for professionals.  
*The Publication Core Strategy has been completely redrafted for clarity and ease of reading.*
- Many representations received were site specific and therefore too detailed to be covered within the Core Strategy. However, these site specific issues will be addressed through the Site Allocations work.

### **Core Strategy Introduction**

- Evidence base: There was concern that the evidence base which had informed the Preferred Core Strategy was not robust enough to fully justify policy decisions, especially with regard to the absence of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).  
*The Preferred Options content has been reviewed and amended in light of representations and new information, including up to date SHLAA data. The policies in the Publication version of the Core Strategy are supported by evidence.*

### **Context**

- Environmental Objectives: The issue was raised that environmental objectives are a crucial part of the Core Strategy policy context and represent a key element in achieving sustainable development; however, it was considered that the text in this section was heavily biased towards economic and social aspects.  
*Chapter 2 of the Publication Core Strategy now includes more balanced references to environmental documents and issues.*

### **A Spatial Portrait**

- Canal network: It was suggested that the significance of the canal network should be acknowledged and this should be visually displayed.  
*The revised Spatial Portrait does now refer to inland waterways and they are now shown on the Key Diagram.*
- A6 bypass (Broughton)/M6 Junction (Brock) are not given prominence:

*The possibility of these suggested road and motorway schemes are detailed in Chapter 7 of the Publication Core Strategy.*

- Culture/heritage/historic importance: It was suggested that whilst the Core Strategy includes quite an extensive spatial portrait of the area it fails to give much information on the culture and heritage of the area and its historic inheritance.

*The Publication Core Strategy Spatial Portrait now includes a section covering 'Heritage and Local Distinctiveness' and Chapter 9 (Delivering Economic Prosperity) also addresses 'Leisure/Cultural Entertainment'.*

- Travel to work diagram: It was considered that the diagram was inconsistent with its approach in showing the relevant travel to work information and therefore misleading.

*A revised version of the Travel to Work diagram is included in the Publication Core Strategy.*

- Role of Chorley and Leyland: It had been suggested that the roles of Chorley and Leyland in the Core Strategy were considered complementary to that of Preston, rather than being considered in their own right.

*The Spatial Portrait has now been reworded and focuses on the character of local places and the roles they play.*

### **Spatial Vision and Strategic Objectives**

- Emphasis on the role of Preston: Several respondents suggested that the Vision places too much emphasis on the role of Preston after Manchester and Liverpool. *The Vision has been amended and now states: 'Preston will have become a transformed city, recognised as an alternative destination to Manchester and Liverpool for high quality retail, cultural, entertainment, business and higher education.'*

- Strategic Objectives: The question of how specific the Strategic Objectives are to Central Lancashire was raised as it was thought that the themes of the Core Strategy could apply anywhere and therefore need to be more locally distinctive. *The Strategic Objectives have been reworded and are now more locally distinctive.*

- Vision focus: Comments were made with regard to the focus of the Vision and that its overarching approach was not sufficiently environmentally focussed. *The Vision has been reworded and now includes reference to the importance of climate change mitigation and adaptation.*

### **Growth Point Update**

- Reference to Growth Point status: Several respondents considered that the Core Strategy did not take full account of the Growth Point, and that it was not sufficiently embedded throughout the document. Concerns were raised over the level of detail with which the Core Strategy addresses the Growth Point agenda. It was suggested that the expected levels of development, the types and distribution should all be addressed in the Core Strategy.

*The Publication Core Strategy takes full account of the Growth Point and also the economic recession. However, it has recently been announced that Growth Point funding will cease after March 2011.*

- Achieving housing growth targets in the current economic climate: *The Spatial Portrait (Managing and Locating Growth) now addresses the issue of the Growth Point with regard to housing. Chapter 5 of the Publication Core Strategy explains that the Growth Point uplift in housing delivery remains an aspiration of the authorities but may not be achievable. The trajectory of future house building is*

*derived from the SHLAA and is presented in Chapter 8 (Homes for All) of the Publication Core Strategy. The Central Lancashire authorities remain committed to removing obstacles to recovery and delivering accelerated rates of housing development across the Growth Point area.*

### **Locating Growth and Investment**

- Strategic Sites: Respondents were concerned with the identification of Whittingham as a Strategic Site. Concerns were with regard to the sustainability of the location and the impact on the existing villages. However, some respondents suggested that in principle the redevelopment of the site is a positive proposal but not as a Strategic Site.  
*Whittingham/Goosnargh is no longer considered to be of strategic significance as it is not central to the delivery of the Core Strategy.*
- Suburban protection: Comments were made with regard to the lack of a policy in the Core Strategy on suburban protection and garden developments.  
*National Planning Policy Statement 3 (Housing) has been amended and private residential gardens have now been excluded from the definition of previously developed land. The national indicative minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare has also now been deleted from PPS3 and the Publication Core Strategy has taken account of these changes.*
- Brownfield biodiversity: Respondents suggested it needs to be recognised that some brownfield land has value for biodiversity and where development takes places steps must be taken to mitigate impacts on biodiversity.  
*The Publication Core Strategy acknowledges that not all brownfield land is capable of being developed, and that proposals will be considered against the whole plan including the policies covering biodiversity.*
- Sustainable urban extension: Several respondents suggested that the potential of sustainable urban extensions should be recognised in the Core Strategy.  
*Publication Core Strategy Policy 1 clearly sets out where development and other forms of investment will be encouraged to help meet housing and employment needs. In addition, where they are considered appropriate, urban extensions have been identified as Strategic Sites or Locations in the policy and the justification for these is further considered in the Strategic Sites and Locations Background Topic Paper.*

### **Climate Change:**

- Wind sensitivity map: Several respondents made comments with regard to the map on page 48 of the Preferred Core Strategy, stating that there was no explanation of the significance of the map or reference in the text to the inclusion of the map.  
*The wind sensitivity map has now been deleted.*
- Future proof buildings: Respondents considered the need to future proof new buildings to take account of more extreme weather conditions as a result of climate change.  
*Future Proofing is fully considered in the relevant design and sustainable resources policies in the Publication Core Strategy and guidance will be set in the forthcoming Design Supplementary Planning Document.*
- Decentralised/renewable energy sources: Several respondents considered that the Core Strategy should set out a target percentage of the energy to be used in new development to come from decentralised and renewable/low-carbon energy sources where viable.

*Policy 27 of the Publication Core Strategy now includes a target percentage for a reduction in carbon emissions.*

- Too generic, ambiguous and contradictory: There was concern that the Core Strategy used generic phrases which seek to encourage use of energy efficiency, renewable energy and the minimisation and management of waste and pollution. Respondents suggested that greater detail and commitment to the policies was necessary to ensure that aspirations are achieved.

*The relevant climate change policies appropriately refer to detailed measures. In addition the commitment to tackling climate change is now reinforced throughout the Core Strategy as a Cross Cutting Theme.*

## **Housing**

- Evidence base: Several respondents commented on the lack of a robust evidence base to support the policies, especially in regard to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The concern was generally with regard to the affordable housing target and the viability of such target without being backed by the appropriate evidence. In addition, respondents suggested that as the SHLAA is crucial to the evidence base strategic decisions should not be made until the availability of an up to date and robust evidence base.

*The SHMA has been completed and acts as an evidence base particularly in terms of the need for affordable housing. Further housing viability work has also been undertaken which has resulted in site thresholds for affordable housing and percentage provision to be provided. Ongoing work on and updating the SHLAA has fed into and informed the Core Strategy preparation.*

- Affordable housing: It was suggested that the affordable housing targets were inconsistent with the North West Regional Housing Market Area Assessments study.

*The Affordable Housing Policy (Policy 7) has now been amended and is consistent with national policy as well as being soundly based on appropriate locally derived viability evidence. There will be an affordable housing Supplementary Planning Document to give further detail.*

- Delivery: There was concern that the Core Strategy did not provide a clear strategic policy for the identification of a five year supply for deliverable sites. There was also concern regarding the monitoring of the housing supply, the reference that this will occur on a three month rolling basis.

*The deliverability of potential housing sites is reviewed in the latest Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment; in addition the policy has been amended to refer to a continuous five year supply. The Publication Core Strategy states that housing construction will be monitored annually but local authority targets will be reviewed on the basis of a rolling three year performance as this will more appropriately take account of real trends.*

- Levels of development: Respondents considered there to be a need for more information on the amount of housing proposed in Central Lancashire along with an indication of the strategic direction for housing provision.

*The likely distribution of housing development is detailed in chapter 5 and a housing trajectory is included in what is now chapter 8 with revised housing requirement figures.*

- Developer contributions: Many respondents commented on the appropriateness of a general requirement for developers of market housing to contribute to the improvement of existing housing.

*In Publication Core Strategy Policy 6 (Housing Quality) the reference to developers of market housing contributing to the improvements of existing housing has been removed.*

- Preferred Core Strategy Policy PCS8(d) 'Encouraging all new housing to be built to high standards including in terms of internal space provision, sustainable construction and external appearance': Several respondents commented on this clause of the policy stating that it is not the decision of the Central Lancashire authorities to determine the size and space standards of market homes, only the size and mix of the affordable elements.

*This clause of the policy has been deleted in the Publication Core Strategy.*

## **Economic Growth and Employment**

- Several respondents deemed Core Strategy policy PCS11(f) to be overly restrictive, inappropriate, lacking clarity and certainty as well as rigid in its approach towards the release of sites identified within the Employment Land Review and unsound in its evidence base.

*What is now Policy 10 (Employment Premises and Sites) has been reviewed and revised to address the comments made by respondents. The policy has been reworded for clarification; however there has been no amendment to the sentiment of the policy.*

- BAE Systems, Samlesbury: It was requested that a general acknowledgment of the fact that the wider Samlesbury employment site lies significantly within Ribble Valley, and a clearer definition about the particular area within the BAE site that this policy exactly refers to and more detail, if possible, on what might be developed there.

*The Publication Core Strategy acknowledges that the site is located partly within Ribble Valley Borough Council, and that adjacent area in Pennine Lancashire will benefit from its development. The extent of the site within Central Lancashire is now shown in a proposed extract of the Proposals Map in Appendix B of the Core Strategy.*

- Live/work units: It was suggested that the policy should focus more strongly on opportunities for live/work units within the rural areas as this type of development within rural areas can ensure a reduction in car travel and support the local economy.

*The encouragement of live/work units is detailed in Policy 9 (Economic Growth and Employment) in addition to Policy 13 (Rural Economy), which states 'allowing limited extension and replacement of existing buildings, with a preference for commercial, tourism and live/work units.'*

## **Skills and Economic Inclusion**

- Developer contributions: There was concern over the requirement for developer contributions as no indication was given of the threshold at which this would be introduced and whether it related to all development or non residential development.

*Core Strategy Policy 15 (Skills and Economic Inclusion) no longer seeks developer contributions for training.*

- Follow on units, live/work units: Respondents welcomed the encouragement of graduate business start ups, contributing to the expansion of opportunities for such people. Hence the need for good quality incubation and 'follow on' premises, in addition to 'live/work' space.

*The encouragement of live/work units is detailed in Policy 9 (Economic Growth and Employment).*

### **Sustaining the Rural Economy:**

- Inland waterways: Suggestion that the leisure, recreation and tourism resources of inland waterways should be noted in the Core Strategy.  
*The tourism benefits of Inland Waterways have now been included in the Core Strategy.*
- Design considerations: It was suggested that special care is needed when adapting traditional farm buildings for new uses, any works of conversion or adaptation to be undertaken in a manner sensitive to and respectful of the historic and architectural interest of the building and its setting.  
*Design considerations are incorporated into Policy 13 (Rural Economy).*
- Integrated policies: It was suggested that an integrated set of policies should be included in the Sustaining the Rural Economy chapter. Respondents considered that the impact of factors such as decline in local employment, decline in local services, increasing traffic and changing demographic need to be fully recognised in the Core Strategy.  
*Policy 13 (Rural Economy) seeks to encourage a sustainable rural economy in a variety of ways. The policy wording has also been revised to achieve the economic and social advantages for rural areas whilst also seeking benefits for the landscape and natural environment wherever possible.*

### **Retail and Tourism:**

- Urban and rural tourism: It was noted by respondents that urban and rural tourism matters were addressed in separate chapters and therefore in the Retail and Tourism chapter tourism was perceived as a purely urban activity. The inclusion of all forms of tourism including heritage, geo-tourism and landscape based tourism was recommended.  
*Urban and rural tourism are now both included in one chapter, Chapter 9: Delivering Economic Prosperity. Policy 12 deals with Heritage based tourism and Policy 13 deals with rural based tourist activities.*
- Tithebarn: Many respondents made comments with regard to the proposed Tithebarn scheme and the high emphasis placed on the role of Preston. There was concern that the Core Strategy did not consider the impacts on neighbouring town centres of extending Preston's Primary Retail Core to facilitate the Tithebarn.  
*Cross-boundary issues with regard to the scale of retail growth envisaged for Preston City Centre have been taken into account in the Publication Core Strategy. The wording has also been amended so no longer is the scheme referred to solely as the Tithebarn scheme for which planning permission was sought but rather the Tithebarn Regeneration Area generally.*
- Hierarchy of towns: Further clarification on the hierarchy of centres in Preston, South Ribble and Chorley was deemed to be needed in the Core Strategy.  
*Core Strategy Policy 11 now clarifies the retail hierarchy.*
- Out-of-centre retail parks: It was suggested that development should not be prohibited at out-of-centre retail parks such as the Capitol Centre and Deepdale and that the Core Strategy policy was worded in rather a negative way.  
*The wording of the policy has been changed to "resisting further expansion of out-of-centre retail parks."*

### **Health and Wellbeing:**

- Recreational aviation: A number of respondents suggested that there is currently a major shortfall in the provision of airfield/airstrips for recreational light aircraft in

Central Lancashire. The respondents stated that the Core Strategy had neglected to address this issue within the Health and Wellbeing chapter and therefore wished to see recognition of the need for recreational aviation facilities in the document.

*The matter of the suggested lack of provision of airfields/airstrips for recreation flying in Central Lancashire is not considered a strategic matter in its own right but Policy 13 (Rural Economy) now does include recreational uses as being capable of positively contributing to the rural economy.*

- Walking and cycling: Several respondents proposed that the Core Strategy lacked reference and emphasis on the importance of walking and cycling.

*Chapter 7 (Catering for Sustainable Travel) now gives more prominence to walking and cycling as does the inclusion of the cross-cutting theme, 'Promoting Health and Wellbeing' at the beginning of each chapter 5 - 12.*

- Community safety strategy: Respondents considered there to be little mention in the Core Strategy of the community safety strategies, and suggested there should be reference to Architectural Liaison Officers, Park Mark accreditation and Secured by Design.

*The Publication Core Strategy now refers to the role of the Architectural Liaison Officer. References to Park Mark accreditation are considered too detailed a point for the Core Strategy. Policy 26 (Crime and Community Safety) refers to the inclusion of Secured by Design principles in new developments.*

#### **Biodiversity and Natural and Built Environment:**

- Scheduled monuments and registered parks and gardens: In order to cover a full range of heritage assets it was suggested that Scheduled Monuments and Registered Parks and Garden be included in the Core Strategy.

*The supporting text to Policy 16 (Heritage Assets) details the protection and conservation of heritage assets including Scheduled Monuments and Registered Parks and Gardens.*

- Areas of separation/green wedges/Ingol Golf Course: Many representations received were with regard to Ingol Golf course, the green corridor between Lightfoot Lane/Tom Benson Way, and the preservation and protection of the land from development. It was suggested that this land be designated as an Area of Separation.

*Policy 19 (Areas of Separation and Major Open Space) has been changed to include the following text:*

*"Areas of Major Open Space will be designated within the Preston urban boundary that prevents neighbourhoods merging, in particular between:*

*(a) Ingol/Tanterton and Greyfriars/Cadley;*

*(b) Sharoe Green and Fulwood."*

- Geodiversity/geological heritage sites/biological heritage sites: Inclusion of more references to geodiversity, geological heritage sites, and biological heritage sites was raised through representations.

*Appropriate references to suggested specific wording have been included in the Publication Core Strategy.*

- Green Infrastructure: It was considered that there was too narrow a focus on Green Infrastructure, the functions such features provide and their delivery.

*The benefits of Green Infrastructure are fully set out in the Publication Core Strategy in Policy 18 (Green Infrastructure).*

- Indicators: It was suggested that the Green Infrastructure indicators should be revised and made more comprehensive, comments were made especially with regard to "number of inappropriate developments permitted contrary to policy."

*A focussed set of indicators and targets are now set in the separate Performance Monitoring Framework to accompany the Publication Core Strategy.*

## **Travel**

- Walking: Concern was raised that walking as a mode of travel was not fully considered in the Core Strategy.  
*Wording amendments and the re-order of paragraphs have been made to the Travel chapter and policy to underline the importance of walking and cycling.*
- Buckshaw railway station: It was suggested that the opening date of the Buckshaw Village railway station, as detailed in the Core Strategy, be revised due to the uncertainty of the date of opening.  
*Policy 3 (Travel) has no mention of dates with regard to the opening of a new railway station and park and ride at Buckshaw Village but it is referred to in Chapter 5 (Spatial Strategy – Managing and Locating Growth) as being 'autumn 2011.'*

## **Delivering Infrastructure**

- Funding: It was suggested that as the Core Strategy is moving towards a final policy document it should be made clear how the Central Lancashire authorities intent to proceed, either by the introduction of a Community Infrastructure Levy or by a standardising charging mechanism supported by a clear and evidenced Supplementary Planning Document.  
*A separate Infrastructure Delivery Schedule itemises the essential strategic requirements as the first part of the full Infrastructure Delivery Plan that will be worked up alongside the preparation of the Site Allocations DPDs and the development of a levy/tariff Standard Charging Schedule just as soon as the government's intentions on this matter are clarified.*

## **Performance Monitoring**

- Funding and implementation: The Preferred Core Strategy was considered to be clear in its detailing of what needs to be done, however it was considered less clear how the recommendations made in the document are to be funded and implemented.  
*A separate Infrastructure Delivery Schedule itemises the essential strategic requirements for infrastructure including likely funding sources which are also referred to throughout the Publication Core Strategy.*

## APPENDIX 1: Statutory Consultees

First Name	Surname	Planning and Local Authority Liason Job Title	The Coal Authority Organisation
Mr Stephen	Hedley		The Countryside Agency
Michael	Davenport	Director of Planning, Transport & Housing	TVV
Carol	Furnison		The Countryside Agency
Ms Sam	Turner	Roadworks Planning Manager	British Telecom
Mr Ian	Southworth	Planning Liason Officer	British Telecom plc
Andy	Pepper	Area Planner, North West	The Environment Agency - Central Area
			British Waterways
Mr David	Hardman		The Planning Inspectorate
Mr Alan	Smith	Senior Estates & Wayleaves Officer	United Utilities - Asset Protection
Mr Charles	Belcher	Chief Executive	United Utilities Electricity Estates & Wayleaves
Mr David	King		United Utilities
Mr Stephen	Brammer	Business Manager	Virgin Trains
Jane	Slyche		Virgin Trains Power Powergen
Mr Peter	Green		Virgin Trains Business Manager - Preston/Liverpool
Paul	Green		Department for Transport
Phil	Smith	Local Planning Team	Virgin West Coast Virgin Trains
Jonathan	Pennick	Local Planning Team	Virgin West Coast Virgin Trains
Mr Steve	Fyfe	Head of Local Planning Team	English Heritage North West Region
Ms Lindsay	Alder		GoAone Ltd
Ms Sandra	Fleming		English Nature (North West)
Mr David	Wild	Land Use Planning Manager	Government Office North West
Mr Paul	Burdett		Government Office North West
Mr Bob	Baldwin		Government Office North West
Mr C	Hutchinson		Highways Agency
Ms Debbie	Thompson	District Partnership Officer	Highways Agency
Mr Phil	Megson	Principal Planning Officer	Highways Agency
Ged	Fitzgerald	Chief Executive	Highways Agency
		Highways Department	HM Inspector of Health & Safety (Explosives)
Ms Doreen	Wilde	Team Leader	Lancashire County Council
Andrew	Mullaney		Lancashire County Council
David	Nicholson		Lancashire County Council
Gill	Holt		Lancashire County Council Corporate Policy Unit
W D	Noblett	Sec & Dir of Operations	Lancashire County Council Estates Group
			Lancashire County Council Learning Difficulties
Mr Edmund	Southworth		Lancashire County Council Medical Committee
Ray	Worthington	Grp Director (LTP)	Lancashire County Council Social Services
Carmel	Penning		Lancashire County Museum Service
			LCC Environment Directorate
			LCC Youth & Community Service in South Ribble
		Land & Development Manager	National Grid Transco
Ms Ruth	Prinold	Planning and Advocacy, Natural England	National Grid, Land and Development (B1)
		Government Team	Natural England
		Planning Liason Officer	Natural England
		Planning Liason Officer	Natural England (Lancashire Area)
Ms Nicola	Holmes	Town Planner	Natural England (North West Region)
			Network Rail
			North West Regional Health Authority
A	Smith		Northern Rail Ltd
Mr Andrew	Bower		Norweb Electric - Estates & Wayleaves Department
Joe	Flanagan		nPower Renewables
		Manager	NWRA
		Property Department	O2 UK
Mr Tim	Clark	Planning Engineer	T Mobile (UK) Ltd
			Telewest Broadband - Planning Department

## APPENDIX 2: Neighbouring Local Authorities, Councillors, Parish Councils

First Name	Surname	Organisation	First Name	Surname	Organisation
County Councillor Y	Patel		Mrs Susan	Graham	Burnley Borough Council
County Councillor Mrs M E	Livesey		Mrs C A	Cross	Charnock Richard Parish Council
Councillor Ian	Whyte Hall JP		Councillor Mrs Nora Theresa	Ball	Chorley Council
County Councillor Norman	Abram		Councillor Terry	Brown	Chorley Council
County Councillor J	Mein		Councillor David	Dickinson	Chorley Council
County Councillor G	Wilkins		Councillor Julia	Berry	Chorley Council
Councillor T	Young		Councillor Magda Margaret	Cullens	Chorley Council
Councillor JR	Leeming		Councillor Alan	Cullens	Chorley Council
Councillor KW	Palmer		Councillor Henry William	Caunce	Chorley Council
Mr Ben	Wallace MP	Member of Parliament for Lancaster & Wyre	Councillor Pat	Case CBE	Chorley Council
Councillor J	Owen		Councillor Eric	Bell	Chorley Council
Councillor J	Kelly		Councillor Adrian	Lowe	Chorley Council
Councillor JA	England		Councillor Laura	Lennox	Chorley Council
County Councillor K	Ellard		Councillor Patricia	Haughton	Chorley Council
County Councillor D	Yates		Councillor Doreen	Dickinson	Chorley Council
Lindsay	Hoyle MP		Councillor Judith Ann	Boothman	Chorley Council
County Councillor D C	Lloyd		Councillor Kenneth William	Ball	Chorley Council
Ms Susan	Harmon	Adlington Parish Council	Councillor Michael John	Devaney	Chorley Council
Mrs Clare	Dugdill	Adlington Town Council	Councillor June	Molyneaux	Chorley Council
Ms M	Price	Anderton Parish Council	Councillor John P	Walker	Chorley Council
Mr R	Smith	Anglezarke Parish Council	Councillor Geoffrey	Russell	Chorley Council
		Area Education Office	Councillor Mark	Perks	Chorley Council
Mrs D	Platt	Astley Village Parish Council	Councillor Michael J	Muncaster	Chorley Council
Mr H	Roberts	Balderstone Parish Council	Councillor Kevin	Joyce	Chorley Council
Mr J R	Coulson	Barton Parish Council	Councillor Dennis	Edgerley	Chorley Council
Mrs D	Leff	Bispham Parish Council	Councillor Stella M	Walsh	Chorley Council
Mr Chris	Heyward	Blackburn with Darwin Borough Council	Councillor Rosemary	Russell	Chorley Council
Mr Tim	Brown	Blackpool Council	Councillor Edward M	Smith	Chorley Council
		Blackpool, Wyre & Fylde Community Health Service	Councillor Christopher	France	Chorley Council
Mrs C	Pearson	Blackrod Town Council	Councillor Joyce	Snape	Chorley Council
Simon	Godley	Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council	Councillor Gregory I	Morgan	Chorley Council
Mrs A	Partington	Bretherton Parish Council	Councillor Peter	Malpas	Chorley Council
Mr A M	Harkness	Brindle Parish Council	Councillor Keith	Iddon	Chorley Council
Mrs C	Worswick	Broughton Parish Council	Councillor Anthony	Gee	Chorley Council

First Name	Surname	Organisation	First Name	Surname	Organisation
Councillor Alistair	Bradley	Chorley Council	Mr John	Simpkin	English Partnerships
Councillor Peter	Goldsworthy	Chorley Council	Mr Steve	Robson	English Partnerships
Councillor Marie E	Gray	Chorley Council	Mr N	Cumberlidge	Environment & Rural Group
Councillor Harold	Heaton	Chorley Council			Equality and Human Rights Commission
Councillor Ralph	Snape MBE	Chorley Council	Dianne	Royce	Euxton Hall Hospital
Councillor Catherine	Hoyle	Chorley Council	Mrs D	Platt	Euxton Parish Council
Councillor Marion	Lowe	Chorley Council	Mrs Sue	Whittam	Farington Parish Council
Councillor Simon	Moulton	Chorley Council			Forestry Commission
Councillor Hasina	Khan	Chorley Council	Mr B K	Jones	Forestry Commission - North West England Conservancy
Councillor Debra	Platt	Chorley Council	Mr Nick	Wiley	Frank Whittle Partnership
Councillor Roy	Lees	Chorley Council	Mr K	Armistead	Freckleton Parish Council
Councillor Peter	Wilson	Chorley Council			Fulwood Police Station
G N	Rothwell	Chorley Fire Station	Mr Tony	Donnelly	Fylde Borough Council
		Civil Aviation Authority	Mrs J	Ward	Goosnargh Parish Council
Mrs E	Whitfield	Clayton-le-Woods Parish Council	Mr Peter	Croft	Grimsargh Parish Council
Ms Seline	Mason	Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment	Mr JN	Jones	Haighton Parish Council
Mrs S	Edwards	Coppull Parish Council			Health and Safety Executive - Hazardous Installations Division
Clr Graham	Davies	County Councillor Bamber Bridge and Walton-le-Dale	Mr Alan	Platt	Heapey Parish Council
Clr Howard	Gore	County Councillor Leyland Central	Mrs E	Woodrow	Heath Charnock Parish Council
Clr Mrs Anne	Brown	County Councillor Leyland South West	Mr Ian T	Cropper	Hesketh-with-Becconsall Parish Council
Clr Anthony	Pimblett	County Councillor Penwortham North	Mr A	Whittaker	Heskin Parish Council
Clr Thomas	Brown	County Councillor Rural East	Mrs D	Leff	Hilldale Parish Council
Clr Keith	Young	County Councillor Rural West	Mr Garath	Edwards	HM Prison
Clr Fred	Heyworth	County Councillor South Ribble Rural West	Mr A	Harkness	Hoghton Parish Council
Mr F R	Wand	County Librarian	Mrs L	Challender	Horwich Town Council
Mr Alan	Platt	Croston Parish Council	D	Borrow MP	House of Commons
Miss A	Woodhouse	Cuerden Parish Council	Mr N	Evans MP	House of Commons
Mr D	Sagar	Cumbria & Lancashire Strategic Health Authority	M	Hendrick MP	House of Commons
		Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs	Bill	Whittle	Hutton Parish Council
		Department of Employment	Brendan	Lyons	Hyndburn Borough Council
Adam	Scott	Director of Housing, Regeneration and Neighbourhoods	Peter E	Simmonds	Inland Waterways Association
Mr Colin	Clitheroe	Eccleston Parish Council	Councillor Carl	Crompton	Labour
Mr Alan	Platt	Eccleston Parish Council	Councillor T	Cartwright	Labour Independent
Ms Judith	Nelson	English Heritage - North West Region	Mr R C	Davey	Lancashire Association of Parish & Town Councils

First Name	Surname	Organisation	First Name	Surname	Organisation
		Lancashire Constabulary	Councillor Neil	Cartwright	Preston City Council
Stg. Steven	Hobin	Lancashire Constabulary	Councillor Albert	Richardson	Preston City Council
Steve	Stebbings	Lancashire Constabulary Southern Division	Councillor James	Hull	Preston City Council
		Lancashire Council Archaeological Services	Councillor Tom	Davies	Preston City Council
		Lancashire Council Museum Service	Councillor Ms Kate	Calker	Preston City Council
M	Costigan	Lancashire County Council, Planning & Reorganisation	Councillor Taalib	Shamsuddin	Preston City Council
Chris	Anslow	Lancashire County Council, Environment Directorate	Councillor Eric	Fazackerley	Preston City Council
Reg	Morley	Lancashire County Council, Highways & Environment	Councillor Jack	Davenport	Preston City Council
		Lancashire Family Health Services	Councillor Ken	Hudson MBE, JP	Preston City Council
John	Phethean	Lancashire Fire & Rescue Service	Councillor Bhikhu	Patel	Preston City Council
		Lancashire Fire & Rescue Service Headquarters	Councillor Mrs Margaret	McManus	Preston City Council
Peter	Holland	Lancashire Fire & Rescue Service HQ	Councillor Javed	Iqbal JP	Preston City Council
Ms S	Fiddler	Lancashire Probation Service	Councillor Brian	Rollo	Preston City Council
Mr Ian	Cox	Lancashire Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust	Councillor Ron	Atkins	Preston City Council
		Lancaster City Council	Councillor Mrs Linda	Crompton	Preston City Council
Mrs I	O'Donnell	Lanthorn Parish Council	Councillor Mrs Pat	Woods	Preston City Council
Mr W	McEnnerney-Whittle	Lea and Cottam Parish Council	Councillor Terry	Thompson	Preston City Council
D M	Hewitson	Little Hoole Parish Council	Councillor Bill	Shannon	Preston City Council
F	Cupstey	Livesey Parish Council	Councillor Mrs Joyce	Cartwright	Preston City Council
Mr B	Whittle	Longton Parish Council	Councillor B	Cartwright	Preston City Council
Mrs G	Woods	Mawdesley Parish Council	Councillor Jill	Truby	Preston City Council
Mr C	McDonald	Mellor Parish Council	Councillor Alan	Hackett	Preston City Council
Richard	Gelder	Much Hoole Parish Council	Councillor Michael	Onyon	Preston City Council
Sallie	Bridgen	National Housing Federation	Councillor Nerys	Eaves	Preston City Council
		National Offender Management Services (NOMS)	Councillor John	Browne	Preston City Council
Mrs Glenys	Syddall	North Turton Parish Council	Councillor Bill	Tyson	Preston City Council
Department of Trade & Industry		North West Regional Office	Councillor Keith	Sedgewick	Preston City Council
		Pendle Borough Council	Councillor Frank	De Molfetta	Preston City Council
Mr S	Caswell	Penwortham Parish Council	Councillor Ms J	Buttle	Preston City Council
Mr M J	Cronin	Penwortham Town Council	Councillor Rob	Osinski	Preston City Council
Nick	Clarke	Planning & Regeneration Dept, Wigan Council	Councillor Mrs Veronica	Afrin	Preston City Council
Ian	Glaister	Planning & Reorganisation Manager	Councillor D	Gallagher	Preston City Council
		Preston Acute Hospital NHS Trust	Councillor John	Collins	Preston City Council
Councillor Nick	Pomfret	Preston City Council	Councillor Peter	Pringle	Preston City Council

First Name	Surname	Organisation	First Name	Surname	Organisation
Councillor David	Hammond	Preston City Council	Councillor Kathleen	Beattie	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Geoff	Driver	Preston City Council	Councillor Graham	O'Hare	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Stephen	Thompson	Preston City Council	Councillor James	Breakell	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Mrs Christine	Thomas	Preston City Council	Councillor Fred	Heyworth	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Stuart	Greenhalgh	Preston City Council	Councillor David	Watts	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Mrs Jennifer	Greenhalgh	Preston City Council	Councillor Matthew	Tomlinson	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Harold	Parker	Preston City Council	Councillor Paul	Foster	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor John	Swindells	Preston City Council	Councillor David	Suthers	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Matthew	Brown	Preston City Council	Councillor Peter	Stettner	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Robert	Boswell	Preston City Council	Councillor Thomas	Sharratt	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Michael	Lavalette	Preston City Council	Councillor Michael	McNulty	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Mark	Jewell	Preston City Council	Councillor Colin	Coulton	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor M	Rawlinson	Preston City Council	Councillor Joseph Clifford	Hughes	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor C	Abram	Preston City Council	Councillor Mike	Otter	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor P	Brown	Preston City Council	Councillor Jon	Hesketh	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor K	Cartwright	Preston City Council	Councillor Thomas	Hanson	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor S	Desai	Preston City Council	Councillor Harold	Hancock	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor P	Rankin	Preston City Council	Councillor Irvine	Edwards	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Antony	Gornall	Preston City Council	Councillor Michael	Green	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor T	Hart	Preston City Council	Councillor Mrs Dorothy	Gardner	South Ribble Borough Council
Mr Derek	Whyte	Preston City Council Regeneration	Councillor John	Rainsbury	South Ribble Borough Council
		Preston Parish Church	Councillor John	Demack	South Ribble Borough Council
Mr David	Walmsley	Preston Primary Care Trust	Councillor James	Marsh	South Ribble Borough Council
John	Miller	Public Health Directorate	Councillor Mrs Madge	Suthers	South Ribble Borough Council
Stewart	Bailey	Ribble Valley Borough Council	Councillor Peter	Mullineaux	South Ribble Borough Council
Mrs Olive	Fisher	Rivington Parish Council	Councillor Mike	France	South Ribble Borough Council
Chief Planning Officer		Rossendale Borough Council	Councillor Renee	Blow	South Ribble Borough Council
Mr J	Forshaw	Rufford Parish Council	Councillor Linda	Woollard	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Jennifer	Hothersall	South Ribble Borough Council	Councillor Barrie	Yates	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Melvyn	Gardner	South Ribble Borough Council	Councillor Ray	Woodburn	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Alan	Ogilvie	South Ribble Borough Council	Councillor Linda	Williams	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Colin	Clark	South Ribble Borough Council	Councillor Graham	Walton	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Joseph	Kelly	South Ribble Borough Council	Councillor Alan	Best	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor James	Hothersall	South Ribble Borough Council	Councillor Julie	Buttery	South Ribble Borough Council

First Name	Surname	Organisation
Councillor Michael	Titherington	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor David	Duxbury	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Andrea Ann	Ball	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Frank	Duxbury	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Paul	Clegg	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor James	Owen	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Kenneth	Palmer	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Donald	Parkinson	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Mary	Robinson	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Carol Ann	Chisholm	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Stephen	Robinson	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Phil	Smith	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Mrs Margaret	Smith	South Ribble Borough Council
Councillor Mary	Green	South Ribble Borough Council
Mr R	Sears	Tarleton Parish Council
Mr A	Hubbard	The National Trust - (E Midlands & NW), The Planning Inspectorate
Ms Pam	Dobby	The Royal Town Planning Institute
Mrs Geraldine	Foster	Tockholes Parish Council
Dorothy	Todd	Ulnes Walton Parish Council
Mrs A	Partington	Ulnes Walton Parish Council
Ian	Gill	West Lancashire District Council
Mr Stephen	Byron	West Lancashire District Council
Mr E	Patterson	Wheelton Parish Council
Mr John K	Curtis	Whittingham Parish Council
Mrs A	Turner	Whittle-le-Woods Parish Council
Mr B	Golding	Withnell Parish Council
Mrs J	Buttle	Woodplumpton Parish Council
Mr Richard	Pearse	Wyre Borough Council

### APPENDIX 3: Non-Statutory Consultees

First Name	Surname	First Name	Surname	First Name	Surname	First Name	Surname
Robert	Alexander	Mr Charles R	Brittain	Andrea	Dalton	Vincent	Gallagher
Mr P	Allis	Mr George	Brooks	Audrey	Dawson	Mr Jim	Gallgher
Carlo	Amaini	Judith	Brooks	Geoff	Dawson	Stephen	Gee
Helen	Andrew	Jane & Christopher	Brunning	Mrs M	Dersley	John	Gibson
Mrs	Arkwright	County Councillor Thomas	Burns	Mr R	Dewhurst	Mr	Gick
Mrs C	Arkwright	George	Cameron	Mrs P	Dickenson	Mr G	Gilbert
Mrs K	Ashton	Mr M	Campbell	G N	Dickinson	John	Glithero
Mr J G	Ashworth	Mr & Mrs	Canning	Arthur	Ditchfield	David	Gooch
Mrs J	Aston	Mr B	Carroll	Ms P	Dodd	Mr & Mrs M	Gould
Edwin S	Baird	Mr D	Champness	Mrs J	Dowling	Mr Michael Edward	Gould
W	Baldwin	Mr John	Champness	Mrs D	Downing	Mr ME	Gould
Mr William T	Bamber	Mr David	Chapman MA (Oxon) ARICS	Mr Richard	Dugdale	Mr D	Goulding
Mr R	Bannister	Mrs	Chester	Dorothy Lucy	Dunbar	Mr P G	Gower
Andrea	Barnard	Collette	Clark	Graham	Eastham	Geoff	Gradwell
Mrs W	Barnard	Ernest Robert	Clement	Mr R	Edmonson	Mr Colin	Green
Mr John	Barnes	Mrs Janet	Clough	Rob	Edney	Rosie	Green
Mr E A	Batterby	JB	Clunaw	Mr & Mrs	Entwistle	Mr A	Greenhalgh
Mr Andrew	Baxendale	S	Coar	Mr Peter	Ericson	Paul	Greenwood
Tim	Beals	Mr Martin R	Cogley	Mr and Mrs R	Everest	Mrs J R	Haliday
Dave	Beavan	Mr	Cookson	A	Farnworth	Mr G M	Hall
Guy	Bebbington	Richard	Cooper	Mr Andy	Farrell	Mr	Halliwell Landau
Councillor Eric	Bell	Mr Richard	Cordwell	Daphne	Fell	Howard D	Hammond
Sue	Berry	Ms Judith	Cosgrove	Mr J	Fenton	Michael	Haralambos
Mrs C	Billouin	Andy	Coverdale	Margaret	Fielden	P	Harley
Mr D J	Bleasdale	Mr & Mrs	Cox	John	Finlay	Julie	Harrison
Mr and Mrs	Booth	Darren J	Cranshaw	Anne	Foley	Clive	Henderson
D K	Boyes	Mrs H	Croft	Mr Harry	Forrest	Mr Brian	Hibbert
Mr David	Braithwaite	Mrs B	Crook	Derek	Forrest	Margaret	Higginson
John	Bremers	Mr Andrew	Cross	Councillor Edward	Forshaw	J L	Hill
W	Bretherton	Mr ST	Cubberley	Mr G	Forshaw	Val	Hilton
Mrs J M	Brimley	S J	Cubbins	Mr and Mrs D	Fothergill	Rev Deacon	Hogan
Matt	Britcliffe	Mrs S F	Cullen	William	Freestone	Robert	Holden

First Name	Surname	First Name	Surname	First Name	Surname	First Name	Surname
Mr D B	Hoole	Josephine	Landon	Mr James	Morris	Ivy & Jim	Robinson
Mr Robert V	Hopper RIBA	Roger	Lathom	Mr Peter	Moss	Jim	Robinson
Major	Hosting	Mrs J K	Lawrenson	Mr & Mrs	Myson	Mrs K	Rodgers
G	Hough	Janet	Lawson	Mr C	Narrainin	Mr B	Rogers
M W & G	Hough	Catherine	Lee	Vaseem	Nawaz	Dave	Roocroft
Lynne	Howard	Mr and Mrs	Lees	Mrs Olive	Neal	Dorothy	Rowe
Mrs S	Howarth	Mr R	Limbachia	Max	Neill	Bill	Rowland
Miss Marion	Hubbertsley	Robin	Logie	Robert	Newsham	Elizabeth	Scaribrick
Miss Nicky	Hulme	Mrs Hilary L	Lowe	Mr Derek	Ormerod	Marion	Seed
J E	Hunt	Ms Francis	Maguire	Sheila	Owen	Mr H K	Sharples
Mr J	Hunt	Mr J	Major	Mr C	Owen MBC PHF	Lincoln	Shields
Mr Ian	Hunter	Clive and Maree	Mansfield	Mr & Mrs R.	Parker	Mrs J	Shorrock
Parish Councillor S	Hunter	A	Marsden	K	Parmee	Katherine	Shuttleworth
Bill	Hurst	David	Martin	County Councillor Vali	Patel	Mr P E	Shuttleworth
Mark and Juliet	Ibbotson	Mrs H A	Matthews	Mr	Pearson	Caleb	Simpson
Mr and Mrs	Jackson	B M	Mawdesley	Councillor Martin	Perks	Ms Susan	Slamon
David	Jackson	Joanne	Mawdsley	J W	Phillipson	Sue	Slater
Mr P M	Jardine	Mr M	McDonald	J W	Phillipson	Sheila	Smith
Danka	Jaszek	Jason	McGuinness	JA	Pickup	Greg	Smith
Adrian	Jeffer	Judy	McInerney	R	Ponting	Mr R	Smith
Barbara	Johnson	Alan	McLeod	Sue	Potter	Ms Ruth	Smith
David	Jolly	Renee	McNair	Ms Margaret	Potts	Mr Mark	Smithies
Dr Janet	Jones	Mr A	Meakin	Chris	Powell	Alan	Snake
Mr & Mrs	Jones	M	Menheniott	Mr H	Probert	Mr Eric	Snake
W	Jopson	George	Mercer	Mr Trevor	Proctor	Mr Robert	Spreadbury
Mrs L	Jump	Richard	Merrick	Terry	Quinn	F	Stallard
Prashed	Karri	Debbie	Miller	Mr F C	Reeves	Jeannie	Stirling
Brian	Kenwright	Miss	Mobbs	Mr John	Richardson	Mr John	Stoker
Mr Geoff	Kenyon	Mr J	Monk	Mrs Joyce	Richardson	Les	Stone
Chris	Kushner	Mr & Mrs Carl and Victoria	Moran	Peter	Riding	John and Margaret	Strong
Mr Steve	Laidlow	Carl	Morgan	Mike	Riding	John Anthony	Strong
Jennifer	Lampet	Jacqueline	Morris	Mr Tim	Roberts	Mr Marcus	Sumner

First Name	Surname	First Name	Surname
Nick	Sumner	Mr D F	Williams
Lesley	Sutcliffe	Angela	Williams
Thomas Leonard	Sutton	Mr L H	Williams
Bill	Sutton	Sarah	Wilson
Mr J B	Sutton	Mrs S M	Wilson
Mr MA	Swindlehurst	Dr R A	Wilson
Mr T R	Tasker	Michael	Winrow
Maria	Tate	John	Womack
Alan	Taylor	Stephen C	Wood
Michael	Taylor-Waring CFA	Barbara	Wood
Mr	Thompson	Mr David	Woods
Mr M	Thompson	Mr and Mrs J H	Woollard
Adrian	Tolan	Joy	Worthington
Arnold J	Tracey	Mr & Mrs A L	Wynne
James	Trebilcock	Councillor Don	Yates
Teresa	Turnbull	Robert	Yates
Peter	Turner	Ms B	Yates
Aidan	Turner-Bishop	Mr Paul	Yates
G.T.	Tyrer		
Mr & Mrs	Van-Holsbeke		
Mr PT	Wakeling		
Mr Et	Walton		
Mr Graham	Wareing		
Mrs	Waterworth		
Mr D A	Webber		
County Councillor Michael	Welsh		
John	Westcott		
Edward	Westhead		
Mr	Weston		
F A	White		
Mr Frank	White		
Councillor Alan	Whittaker		

Organisation	Organisation	Organisation	Organisation
A & H Fine Foods Ltd	Adlington St Paul's Primary School	Anderton St Josephs RC Primary School	Astley Park Special School
A & M Entwistle	Adlington Welding Supplies Ltd	Andhra Association	Astralux UK Ltd
A & SA Cornwell	Adult and Community Services Directorate	Andhra Cultural Association	ATG Health & Safety Consultants
A Cross Builders and Joiners	Age Concern Forum	Anicent Monument Society	Atisreal
A Lang & Son	Age Concern School Link	Anise	Atisreal on behalf of Associated British Ports
A. Goss Planning	AGMA	Anne Wray Independent Financial Adviser	Atisreal on behalf of Associated British Ports
A1 Skips	Aid in Sickness Fund - Penwortham	Apex Business Centre	Atisreal UK
A6 School of Motoring	AI - Anon	Apple Electrics	Atkins Transport Planning
Aamir Design Ltd	Alan Davies (Stainless) Ltd	AQS Swimming Pools & Spas	Automobile Association
Aarondale Care Centre	Alan Gordon Engineering Co Ltd	Aqsa Mosque	Avenham Presentation Society
Abactus Housing Group Ltd	Alarms 4 You	Aquajet Machining Systems Ltd	Avenham Tenants Association
Abbey Mill Fireplaces	Albany Science College	Aqualenium	AVVF Design & Build
Abbey Village County Primary School	Alcohol & Drug Services	AR Investments	Ayrefield Construction Ltd
Abram Ashton	Alder King	Arc Car Wash and Valeting	B & CA Norris
Accent NW	Aldeux Panel Products	Architectural Design	B & D Print Services
Ace Décor	Alexandra Kindergarten	Argent Group Plc	B & Q Plc
Acebench Ltd	Alfred Hulme	Arlington Property Developments Ltd	B.N.F.L.
Achroma Co UK	All Hallows Catholic High School	Armistead Barnett	B.T.C.V.
Acland Bracewell & Co	All Saints C of E Church	Armitstead Barnett	BAE Systems
Acland Bracewell Surveyors Ltd	All Saints Church	Artech Design	BAE SYSTEMS Properties Ltd
Action for Blind People	All Seasons Leisure Centre	Arts Council - North West	Bailcast Ltd
Adactus Housing Group	Allott, Rawkins & Holden	ASC Timber Supplies Ltd	Bailprint Labels Limited
Adams & Co Accountants Ltd	Alumus @ NIS Invotec Ltd	Ascension House	Bamber Bridge
Adams Homes Association	Alverna Convent	Asda Stores Ltd	Bamber Bridge Community Centre
Adelphi Residential Home	Alyn Nicholls & Associates	Ashiana Housing Association	Bamber Bridge Community Forum
Adlington & District Community Centre	Amethyst Photography	Ashprint Web Offset Ltd	Bamber Bridge Football Club
Adlington Amateur Rugby League Club	Amnesty International - Leyland & Chorley Group	Asian Business Federation	Bamber Bridge Leisure Centre
Adlington Church Together	Anchor Housing Association	Asian Ladies Cultural Organisation	Bamber Bridge OAP's Association
Adlington Cricket Club	Anchor Staying Put	Askew Library Services Ltd	Bamber Bridge St Aidan's C of E Primary School
Adlington Nomads Football Club	Anchor Trust	Assembled Joinery Ltd	Bamber Langley Milner
Adlington Plastics Systems	And the Kitchen Sink	Assistant Principal	Barclay & Mathieson Ltd
Adlington Primary School	Anderton County Primary School	Astley Computer Services Limited	Barlow Trailers

Organisation	Organisation	Organisation	Organisation
Barnados (Property Services)	Blacklidge Bros	Brinscall & Withnell Athletic & Recreation Association	Cameron-Carrick Courses
Barnardo's - SR Families Project	Blackmoor Garage	Brinscall Building & Plumbing Merchants	Campaign for Real Ale Ltd
Barron Group Ltd	Blackpool International Airport	British Gas Trading Limited	Campbell's Commercial Vehicle Marketing Group
Barry House	Blakedale Ltd	British Red Cross Society	Cancer Help (Preston Ltd)
Barton Grange Hotel Ltd	Bleeper Services	Broad Street Christian Centre	Cardinal Newman College
Barton Willmore Partnership	BLHC Two Corner Limited	Broadfield 2000 Community Group	CARE Ltd
Barton Wilmore Planning Partnership	Bloc Limited	Broadway Malyan	Care Services Manager
Baxi Heating UK	BNP Paribas Real Estate	Broadway Maylan	Careerlink
BBC Radio Lancashire	Boatel Party Cruises (Chorley) Ltd	Brook House Hotel	Carers UK
BDP Design & Print	Bond Pearce	Brothers of Charity Services	Carey Baptist Church
Beardwood Design Ltd	Bonney Greenhalgh & Co Ltd	Brown & Lonsdale Accountants	Carr Faulkner Associates
Beaumont Partnership	Booths Supermarket	BRT Bearings Limitd	Carrington Career and Workwear Ltd
Beaumont Transport	Booths Supermarket	Bryant Homes NW Ltd	Carrington Design (North) Limited
Beck Developments	Boots Properties PLC	Brysdale House	Carter Jonas LLP
Beljon Sales	Boulevard Land Ltd	BT Group plc	Casa Homes
Bell Cornwell Chartered Town Planners	Bovis Homes	Building Bridges with Hope	Cass Associates
Bell Group (North West)	Boyd Wright Projects Limited	Business Link Lancashire	Cass Associates
Bell Ingham	Brabners Chaffe Street Solicitors	Business Link North and West Lancashire	Cassidy & Ashton Architects & Building Surveyors
Bellway Homes Ltd (Liverpool) - Planning & Development Division	Bramblewood Nursery	Business Publications Limited	Cassidy and Ashton Planning
Benegraph & Academic Signs Ltd	Bramley-Pate & Partners	Business Venture Group Ltd	Casuals Badminton Club
Bentley Nurseries	Breast Cancer Support & Self Help Group	Bygone Times Trading Ltd	Catholic Caring Services
Bertie's Bike Breakers	Breast Feeding Network	C J Smith Chartered Quantity Surveyors	Cats of Leyland Aid & Welfare Society (CLAWS)
Beta Associates	Bretherton Endowed CE Primary School	C P Davidson & Sons Ltd	Catterall & Wood Ltd
Bethehl Evangelical Church	Brian Dean Landscapes Ltd	C.B.I.	Cavendish Upholstery Ltd
BG's Theatrical and Fancy Dress Hire	Brian Horrocks Fabrications	c/o MAPS Team	CB Richard Ellis
Bhailok Fielding Solicitors	Brick Technology Ltd	c/o Mono Consultants Ltd	CBC Crime & Disorder Reduction Manager
Big Tree Planning Ltd	Bridgewater Meeting Room Trust	CA Planning	CC Gladding Architects
Bill Beaumont Textiles	Brindle Badminton Club	Cable & Wireless	CCFA
Birchall Blackburn with Berry & Son	Brindle Community Hall	CADNWA	CCI & Design Ltd
Birkacre Nurseries & Garden Centre	Brindle Gregson Lane County Primary School	Calsoftware	CDF Supplies
Bishop Rawstorne C of E Language College	Brindle St James CE Primary School	Calvary Christian Fellowship	Cedar Farm Galleries
Blackburn Evening Telegraph	Brindle St Joseph's RC Primary School	Cameron S Crook	Celebration Electrical Wholesalers

Organisation	Organisation	Organisation	Organisation
CENTRA	Chorley & District Chamber of Trade	Chorley Duke St County Infants School	Chorley St Joseph's RC Primary School
Central Lancashire Dial A Ride	Chorley & District Chamber of Trade	Chorley Electrical Traders Ltd	Chorley St Joseph's RC Primary School
Central Lancashire PCT	Chorley & District Children & Families Practice Team	Chorley Environmental Action Group	Chorley St Mary's RC Primary School
Central Lancashire PCT	Chorley & District Cricket League	Chorley Equestrian Centre	Chorley Tennis Club
Central Lancashire PCT	Chorley & District Natural History Society	Chorley FoE	Chorley The Parish of St Laurence CE Primary School
Central Lancashire Primary Care Trust	Chorley & District Sunday League	Chorley Football Club	Chorley Town Centre Initiative
Central Lancs Autistic Support for Parents	Chorley & S Ribble Crossroads	Chorley Gillibrand County Primary School	Chorley UPVC Ltd
Central Lancs Friends of The Earth	Chorley & S Ribble Making Space	Chorley Golf Club	Chorley Wildcats
Central Lancs Friends of the Earth	Chorley & South Ribble Business Club	Chorley Guardian	Chorley Youth and Community Worker
Central Lancs PCT	Chorley & South Ribble Business Club	Chorley Harriers	Chorley, South Ribble & Districts Citizens Advice
Central Lancs PCT	Chorley & South Ribble CVS	Chorley Highfield County Primary School	Chris Thomas Ltd
Central Methodist Church	Chorley & South Ribble Flying Club	Chorley Historical & Archaeological Society	Christ Church Vicarage
CGS Signs	Chorley 3-Star Junior Tennis Club	Chorley Ladies Football Club	Christ The King RC High School
Chamber of Commerce - East Lancashire	Chorley All Saints CE Primary School	Chorley Ladies Rounders	Church of The Latter Day Saints
Chapel Fold Bed & Breakfast	Chorley Amateur Boxing Club	Chorley Lift and Crane Services	Citizens Advice Bureau
Charchris Design	Chorley Amateur Swimming Club	Chorley Marlins Associated Swimming Club	Citizens Advice Bureau
Charity Farm Caravan & Camping Park	Chorley and South Ribble Disability Forum	Chorley Masonic Hall	City Electrical Factors
Charnock Richard CE Primary School	Chorley Athletic Club	Chorley Mid-Week Cricket League	Clare & Co
Charnock Richard Cricket Club	Chorley Buccaneers American Football	Chorley Nissan	Clarendon St Mosque
Charnock Richard Football Club	Chorley Buckshaw County Primary School	Chorley Online.com	Classic Features Ltd
Charnock Richard Golf Club	Chorley Car Care Centre, Bungalow Filling Station	Chorley Orthodontic Suite	Clayton Brook Community Group
Charnock School of Motoring	Chorley Chamber of Trade	Chorley Panthers Amateur R L Club	Clayton Brook Community House
Chartered Institute of Marketing	Chorley Churches Together	Chorley Pensioners' Association	Clayton Brook County Primary School
Chataway 2000	Chorley Citizen	Chorley Raqueteers	Clayton Brook Village Hall
Chief Executive	Chorley Civic Society	Chorley RUFC	Clayton Community Football Club
Chief Executive	Chorley Cleaning Services	Chorley Sacred Heart RC Primary School	Clayton Green Branch Library
Chief Inspector	Chorley Coachcraft Ltd	Chorley Signs	Clayton Green Sports Centre
Chief Superintendent	Chorley Community Centre	Chorley Sporting Club	Clayton Hall Sand Co
CHM Chauffering Services	Chorley Council of Faiths	Chorley St George's CE Primary School	Clayton PTA
Chordale Wine Merchants	Chorley Cricket Club	Chorley St Gregory's RC Primary School	Clayton-le-Woods CE Primary School
Chorley & District Alliance Football League	Chorley Disability Sports Forum	Chorley St James' CE Primary School	Clayton-le-Woods Community Centre
Chorley & District Bowls League	Chorley District Youth & Community Office	Chorley St James Cricket Club	Clayton-le-Woods Parish Council

Organisation	Organisation	Organisation	Organisation
Clayton-le-Woods Primary School	Coppull Parish CE Primary School	Croston Evergreens Badminton Club	Deafway
Clearwater Consultancy Ltd	Coppull St John's CE Primary School	Croston Rural Action Group	Debt Free Direct
Cleopatra's Total Face and Body Care	Coppull St Oswald's RC Primary School	Croston Sports & Social Club	Deep Clean Services
Cliff Walsingham & Company	Coppull TV Servicing	Croston Subscription Bowling Club	Deepdale Asian Young Women's Group
Cockfight Barn	Coppull United Football Club	Crown Estate Commissioners	Defence Estates
Coffee Stop	Coppull Youth & Community Centre	Crown Stage and Theatre Services Ltd	Delma Developments
Colin Buchanan & Partners	Cornfield Properties Limited	Crumplezone Multimedia	Dennis Wilson Partnership
Colliers CRE	Corporate Director	Cruse Bereavement Care (Chorley & South Ribble)	Deputy Head of Regeneration
Commercial & Business Supplies	Corporate Director	Crusty's Sandwich Bar	Deputy Vice Chancellor
Commercial Development Projects Ltd	Corpus Christie RC High School	Crystal Conservatories	Design & Draw
Communications Maintenance Services	Cottam Community Association	CTC Rights Network	Design LSC
Community Council of Lancashire	Council for British Archaeology North West	Cuerden Valley Park trust	Dev Plan UK
Community Drug Team	Council for the Protection of Rural England	Cuerden Wildlife Explorers	Development Planning & Design Services
Community Gateway Association	Country Land & Business Association	Cunnane Associates	Devonshire & Solicitors
Community Leisure Services	Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	Cunnane Town Planning	Dialogue
Community Leisure Services Ltd	Countryside Properties (Northern) Ltd	Cunnane Town Planning	Dillon & Blake Hairdressing
Community Network/UCLAN	Countryside Rresidential (NW ) Ltd	D & G Builders & Joiners Ltd	Diocesan Pastoral Centre
Compound 1	Countrywise Countryside Services Ltd	D & S Turner	Diocese of Blackburn
Computer Projects Ltd	County Land & Business Association	D H Motors	Direct Display & Exhibitions Ltd
Confederation of Passenger Transport UK	County Palatine HA	D Hardman Solar Film Ltd	Direct Rail Services Ltd
Conismoor Ltd	Coupe Green Primary School	D Mayor & Son	Director Social Services
Conlon Construction Ltd	CPRE (Lancashire Branch)	Daisy Takeaway	District Team Manager
Connexions - Chorley Centre	CPRE, Chorley District Group	Dalziel Ltd	Divisional Commander - Southern Division
Connexions Lancashire	Croft Goode Partnership	Daniel Thwaites plc	DLP Consultants
Contact One Ltd	Croft Products (UK) Ltd	Darkinson Presbytery	Dodd Engineering (North West) Ltd
Co-Operative Group - Planning	Crosby Homes Lancashire Ltd	David J Killin & Co Ltd	Domino's Pizza
Coopers Taxis	Crossfield Saddlery	David L Walker Chartered Surveyors	Domino's Pizza
Cop Lane C of E Primary School	Crossley & Bradley Ltd	David McLean Homes	Donaldsons LLP
Coppull & District County Primary School	Croston Badminton Club	David Mclean Homes	Doodles Day Nursery
Coppull Junior Bowling Club	Croston Black Horse Bowling Club	David Walker Chartered Surveyors	Double Bridges Youth & Community Centre
Coppull Moor Lane Nurseries	Croston Corn Mills Ltd	Davis Design Consultants	DP Cold Planing Ltd
Coppull Parish CE Primary School	Croston Cricket Club	De Pol Associates Ltd	DPDS Consulting Group

Organisation	Organisation	Organisation	Organisation
Drivas Jonas	Education Business Partnership Link Ltd	Everest Loft Conversions	Forbes Solicitors
Drivers Jonas	Elite Homes Group Limited	Excelsior Commercial & Industrial Properties	Fordham Research Ltd
Drugline (Lancashire)	Elixir Beauty Salon	Expac Ltd	Forest of Bowland AONB
Drumbeat	Emery Planning Partnership	Eye Designs Ltd	Forshaw Engineering Ltd
Dryot Products Ltd	Emmanuel Church	F & P Wholesale	Fosgo Ltd
DTR Sheard Walsaw	Employment Service	F H Bleasdale (Timber) Ltd	Frank Harrington Associates
DTZ - Development Consultancy	Empress Timber	Factfocus Ltd	Frederick's Ice Cream Ltd
DTZ - Development Consultancy	En Qar Ltd	Fairport Containers Ltd	Freight Transport Association
Duxbury Builders Ltd	Engineering Support-Co UK	Fairport Properties Ltd	Frenchwood County Primary School
Duxbury Caravans Ltd	Enterprise Plc	Farington Moss St Pauls Church	Fresco Fresco
DVM Pigments & Additives Ltd	Environment Agency	Farington Primary School	Friends of Chorley & South Ribble NHS Trust
E & H Baxendale Ltd	Environmental Design Consultants	Farington St Paul's C of E Primary School	Friends of Healey Nab
E M D Microsystems Ltd	Environmental Resources Management	Farrell Heyworth Estate Accounts	Fuller Peiser
E Rylance & Sons Ltd	Environmental Services Chorley	Farringdon Lane Vicarage	Fulwood Free Methodist Church
E W Wrennall Contractors	Equal Opportunities Commission	Farringdon Park Community Centre	Fulwood High School
E.H.Booth & Co Ltd	Equaman Metal Products Ltd	Faxman (t/a G Rawlings)	Fulwood Methodist Church
Early Birds Private Nursery	Eric Wright Group Limited	Fayle Transport Ltd	Furious Wolf Design
East Cliff Residents Association	Esselle Sports Management	Federation of Builders	Fusion Online Limited
Eaves Brook Housing Association	Ethnic Minority Consultative Committee	Federation of Small Businesses	G & S Auto Electrical Services
Eaves Green Community Centre	Eurodiesel	Federation of Small Businesses	G H Lee
Eccleston Aviation Ltd	Euromedia	Feltons Service Station	Galloway's Society for the Blind
Eccleston Bowling Club	European Care (UK) Ltd	Fern Doors Ltd	Garden Grooming
Eccleston County Primary School	European Settled Estates plc	Fibreglow (UK) Ltd	Garner Planning Associates
Eccleston Cricket Club	Euxton Balshaw Lane County Primary School	Finishing Touch	Gasforce Ltd
Eccleston Ecumenical Partnership	Euxton CE Primary School	Fir Tree Nurseries	Gazeley Properties
Eccleston Electrical Services	Euxton Community Centre	Firecheck	Gebworth Construction Ltd
Eccleston Junior Football Club	Euxton Cricket Club	Firecraft Fireplaces	General Aviation Awareness Council
Eccleston St Mary's CE Primary School	Euxton Primrose Hill County Primary School	Firsbrook Limited	George Eastham Insurance Services
Eccleston Youth & Community Centre	Euxton St Mary's RC Primary School	Fishwick Buses	George Wimpey Manchester
Eckersley & Co	Euxton Tile Supplies Ltd	Fixit DIY & Manchester House	George Woodhead Designs
Economy Bag Company	Euxton Villa Football Club	Fletcher Smith Architects	Georgian Group
Edmund Kirby	Evans Halshaw	Flic Flac Gymnastics Club	Gerald Eves

Organisation	Organisation	Organisation	Organisation
Gillespies	H J Banks & Co	Heskins Ltd	Hutton Church Of England Grammer School
Gillibrand Hall	H J Banks & Company Limited	Higham & Co	Hutton Local History & Interest Society
Gillie Dolls	H Nightingale & Son	Higham & Co	Hybrid Power Ltd
GKA Planning	H Parkinson Haulage	Higher Walton Church of England Primary School	Hyder Consulting Ltd
GL Hearn Planning	Halifax plc	HighField Priory School	I & K Mackenzie
GL Hearn Planning	Hallam Land Mangement Ltd	Hilton Design Associates	I Cars
Gleadhill House Stud Ltd	Halliwells LLP	HM Prison Service	Ian McCarthy Haulage
Golden Year's OAP Association	Hammond Suddards Solicitors	Hoghton Bowling Club	ICI Chemicals & Polymers Ltd
Goldseal Windows & Tradeline	Hanfi Sunni Muslim Circle	Hoghton Recreation Club	ICT Services
Good Companions Over 55's Club	Hardwicks Solicitors	Hollins Strategic Land	Ideal Car Supermarket
Goodyear & Williams	Harlor Homes	Holy Cross Catholic High School	IGC Independent Gas Co
Gough Planning Services	Harris & Lamb Limited	Holy Trinity C of E Church	Impact Socket Supplies Ltd
Grange Community Association	Harrison & Taylor	Home Builders Federation	Impact UK Design & Print
Great Places Housing Group	Harrison Packaging	Home Start	Impressed Dry Cleaners
Green Wedge	Harrison Road Garage	Home Start Preston	Impression Design
Greenlands Estate Community	Harrison Salmon Associates	Homeland Estates Ltd	Ince Williamson
Greenlight Driving School Ltd	Harrow Estates	Homes Pets and Gardens	Indigo Planning
Greenside Landscapes	Harvest Housing Association	Hoole St Michael C of E Primary School	Indigo Planning
Gregson Lane Junior Football Club	Harvest Housing Group	Houghton House Aggregates Ltd	Indigo Planning
Grimley JR Eve	Harwoods Carpets	Housing & Care Services	Indigo Planning Limited
Grimshaw Plastering	Haslam Printers Ltd	Housing Corporation	Ingol Methodist Church
Grosvenor Estate Holdings Ltd	HBS Group	Housing Corporation	Inta Cornici
Guardian Properties	Headstart Pre-School Centre Ltd	Housing Corporation	Integrate
Guildhall Tenants Association	Headway	How Planning LLP	Inventures
Gujarat Hindu Society	Heapey & Wheelton Village Hall	How Planning LLP	ISIS
Gujarat Society	Help the Homeless	How Planning LLP	Ivy House Guest House
GVA Grimley	Heritage Covers Ltd (Plumbs)	How Planning LLP	J B Publicity
GVA Grimley	Heskin Fabrication Ltd	Howdens Joinery Co	J Dillon Decorating
H & A Prestige Packing Co Ltd	Heskin FC	HRT Commercials (Chorley) Ltd	J Rainford & Sons Ltd
H & E Abbot Glass Ltd	Heskin Hall Antiques	HSS Hire Shops	J S Design Associates
H & R Esp Ltd	Heskin Pemberton's CE Primary School	Hulme Upright Weedon	J T Holding & Son
H E Randall & Son	Heskin Village Hall	Hunter Car Delivery Service	J Trevor & Webster

Organisation	Organisation	Organisation	Organisation
J White Plastering & Tiling	JPM Resources (UK) Ltd	Knight Frank LLP	Lancashire Global Education Centre
Jacquard Weaving Co Ltd	JWPC	Kriss Kross	Lancashire Head Injury Association
James E Hatch & Son LLP	JWPC Limited	KSK Contractors	Lancashire Job Centre Plus
James Hall & Co (Properties) Ltd	JYM Partnership	L & L Cruisers	Lancashire Locations
James Herbert Building Contractors& Developers Ltd	K A Nichols (Electrical)	L Carter & Son	Lancashire Playing Fields Association
Janet Dixon Town Planners Ltd	K Supplies Ltd	La Leche League	Lancashire Rural Futures
JDH Property Development	Kaemingk UK	Ladies Circle	Lancashire Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust
Jeff Brailsford Rimmer & Co	Katherine Hancock Photography	Ladies Group - Hutton	Lancashire Teaching Hospitals Trust
Jewson Ltd	Kaylon Group Ltd	Laing O'Rourke Ltd	Lancashire Teenage Pregnancy Partnership
Jewsons Ltd	Keith Dickinson Associates	Lambda Calibration Ltd	Lancashire Volleyball Association
Jigsaw Group	Ken Miller (Wheelton) Ltd	Lambert Smith Hampton	Lancashire West Partnership
JKS Heating & Plumbing Supplies Ltd	Ken Moore Construction Services	Lancashire & Blackpool Tourist Board	Lancashire Wolverines
JMP Consulting	Ken Taylor Auto Electrical Services	Lancashire Ambulance Headquarters	Lancashire Youth & Community Service
JMS Transport	Kenmor Construction Products Ltd	Lancashire Ambulance Service	Lancaster Canal Trust
Job Centre Plus	Kenyons Builders Ltd	Lancashire Association of Parish and Town Councils	Landmark Associates
Job Centre Plus	Kepak UK c/o Barton Willmore Planning Partnership	Lancashire Care NHS Trust	Landmark Information Group Ltd
Jobcentre Plus	Kerry James Planning	Lancashire College	Langtree Homes
Jobcentre Plus	Kestrel Windows Ltd	Lancashire College	LARA
John B Lavin & Co	Kevills Solicitors	Lancashire College	Lathams of Broughton Ltd
John Fishwick & Sons	Key	Lancashire County Council	Lathom Kirkham & Bennett
John Goulding & Co	King Sturge LLP	Lancashire County Property Group	Lawn Tennis Association
John H Mayor & Sons Ltd	King Sturge LLP	Lancashire Disability Information Federation	Lawson Margerison Partnership
John Rose Associates	Kingfisher Estates Ltd	Lancashire Double Glazing	Lazy Day Luncheon Club
Joiner & Builder	Kingfold Over 60's Club	Lancashire Education Business Partnership	LCC District Partnership Office
Joiner & Building Contractor	Kingprint Limited	Lancashire Environment Fund Ltd (LWS)	LCC Social Services
Joint Chief Executive	Kings Church YV	Lancashire Evening Post	Lea Hough & Co.
Jon Sanderson Design	Kingsfold Library	Lancashire Family & Partners Support Group	Leisureplex Ltd
Jones Chartered Building Surveyors	Kingsfold Methodist Church	Lancashire Fayre	Leith Planning
Jones Day	Kirkby Centre	Lancashire Federation of Women's Institutes	Lever House Primary School
Jones Lang Lasalle	Kirkdale Construction Services Ltd	Lancashire Fire & Rescue Service	Level
Jones Retirement Homes, Lifetrend Developmens Limited	KMPG	Lancashire Fire & Rescue Service	Leyland Baptist Church
Jorgus Carpets	Knight Frank	Lancashire Fisheries Consultative Association	Leyland Conservatories

Organisation	Organisation	Organisation	Organisation
Leyland Filtration Ltd	Lostock Hall Community High School	Matrac Design & Build Ltd	MJK Design & Build Ltd
Leyland Historical Society	Lostock Hall Community Primary School	Matthews & Goodman	MLC Travel Ltd
Leyland Lane & Midge Hall Methodist Churches	Lostock Hall Leisure Centre	Mawdesley CE Primary School	Mobile Operators Association C/o Mono Consultants
Leyland Leisure Centre	Lostock Hall Library	Mawdesley Cricket Club	Modus Properties
Leyland Leisure Sales Trailer Centre	Loughlin Homes Ltd	Mawdesley RC Primary School	Money Matters
Leyland Methodist Church	Lovell Jones	Mawdesley Tennis Club	Mono Consultants Ltd
Leyland Methodist Infant School	Lower Healy Business Park	Mawtec Systems Ltd	Monserrat Association
Leyland Pentecostal Fellowship	Lynbrook Office Supplies Ltd	Mayfield School	Mood Swings Network
Leyland Playscheme Association	M J Fellows Building Contractor	MC & MA Stewart (Haulage) Ltd	Moor Lane Resource Centre
Leyland Project	M J McVerry	McCarthy and Stone (Development Ltd)	Moor Nook Community Centre
Leyland Senior Citizens Club	M V Graphics	McDyre & Co	Moor Nook Estate Management Board
Leyland St Andrew's	M.M. Designs	McInerney Homes (North West)	Moor Nook T & R A
Leyland St Andrew's C of E Infant School	Macdonald and Co	MCK Partnership	Moorbrook School
Leyland St Mary's RC Church	Malcolm Oats Associates Ltd	McKrisps Caterers	Moore & Smalley Chartered Accountants
Leyland Tenants Group (NPHA)	Malt Consultants	McClean Estates	Morgan Brothers (Chorley) Ltd
Leyland Trucks Ltd	Malthouse Farm	Medina Mosque	Morris Homes (North) Limited
Leyland United Reformed Church	Managing Director	MENCAP	Morris Homes Ltd
Leyland Youth & Community Centre	Managing for Quality Ltd	Menzel (UK) Ltd	Morris Quality Bakers
Leyland Youth Action Group	Manchester Evening News	Merrymaids South Lancashire	Mosaic Town Planning
Lidl UK GmbH	Manor Products Ltd	Merryweather House	Moss Side Community Centre
Lighthouse Group	Marine Propulsion Services Ltd	MGA Marketing	Moss Side Over 60's Club
Lions Club	Mark Parr Promotions	MGH Group	Motorun Service Centre Ltd
Liquid Plastics Ltd	Market Traders - Indoor	Michael Jackson Associates Ltd	MR Pharmacy
Little Hoole Primary School	Market Traders - Outdoor	Mick Ogden Diesel	Multiple Sclerosis Society
Lloyds Bank/TSB Plc	Marks & Spencer	Middleforth C of E Primary School	Muslim Welfare Society
Logma Systems Design Ltd	Marland Bros Ltd	Mike Barron Driver Training	Myerscough College
Longton Community Church	Marley Court Nursing Home	Mike Bretherton School of Motoring	N B Colour Print Ltd
Longton Community Church	Marsdens Solicitors	Mike England Timber Co Ltd	N R Marsden & Son
Longton Library	Marshall Demolition Ltd	Miller Homes	NAI Fuller Peiser
Longton Methodist Church	Martinfield Primary School	Millers Citax Taxis Ltd	Nat West
Longton Primary School	Masjeede Quba Mosque	Millfield Care Home	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
Lostock Hall Carnival	Mason Gillibrand Architects	MJH Data Systems Ltd	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners

Organisation	Organisation	Organisation	Organisation
National Childbirth Trust	North West Lancashire Health	P Messenger Concrete Products	Penwortham Education Environment Centre
National Farmers Union	North West Propshaft & Brakes Ltd	P Wilson & Company	Penwortham Girls High School
National Grid	North West Regional Development Agency	P.D.A.A.	Penwortham Leisure Centre
National Grid	North West Specialist Building Supplies Ltd	PAICE	Penwortham Library
National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE)	North West Waterways	Painter & Decorator	Penwortham Luncheon Club
National Offender Management Service (NOMS)	Northbrook Primary School	Painter & Decorator	Penwortham Methodist Church
National Playing Fields Association	NorthCountry Homes Group Limited	Painter & Decorator	Penwortham Over 60's Club
National Probation Service Area HQ	Northern & Western Lancashire Chamber of Commerce	Pakistan Welfare Association	Penwortham Primary School
National Women's Register	Northern Prospects	Pan Lancashire Partnership	Penwortham Townswomens Guild
Naylor & Walkden Ltd	Northern Studios	Parish Councillor	Penwortham West Holme Allotment Association
Neighbourhood Renewal Manager	Northern Trust Company Limited	Park Hall Hotel	Penwortham Youth & Community Centre
Neighbourhood Watch	Northern Trust Company Limited	Parkett Borse Ltd	Permavision Ltd
Neuro Rehabilitation Unit	NTJ Design	Parkin Plant Services Ltd	Persimmon Homes (Lancashire)
New Century Park	NTL Plant Protection	Parkinsons Disease Society	Persimmon Homes (Lancashire)
New Longton All Saints C of E Primary School	Oakes & Co	Parkinson's Disease Society	Peter Craig
New Longton Methodist Church	Oasis Travel	Parklands High School	Peter E Gilkes & Co
New Progress Housing Association	Older Peoples Forum	Parkville Hotel & Truffles Restaurant	Peter Mason Associates Ltd
Newbury Print Ltd	Older Peoples Partnership Board	Parr Hall Farm	Petrie Technologies Ltd
Newfield Jones Homes	Open Spaces Society	Partek Design Services Ltd	PFP Developments
Newlands	Optima Personnel Services	Partnerships Executive Job Centre Plus	Phil Walsh Architectural Services
Next Generation Clubs Ltd	O'Riordan & Co	Paul Butler Associates	Phoenix Radiators
Nguzo Saba Centre	Ormskirk Advertiser	Paul Butler Associates	Physical Disability Partnership Board
Nicholsons	Our Lady & St Bernard RC Church	PBS Disposables Ltd	Physical Disability Partnership Board
NIS Group	Our Lady & St Gerards R C Church	PCE Designs	Pilkington Oils
NJL Consulting	Our Lady & St Gerards R C Primary School	Peace Funerals	Pincroft Dyeing & Printing Co Ltd
NJL Consulting Ltd	Our Lady & St Patricks Church	Peacock & Smith	Pinewood Veterinary Practice
North & Western Lancashire Chamber of Commerce	Our Lady's RC High School	PECON	Pipers Day Nursery
North & Western Lancashire Learning Partnership	OVE ARUP & Partners	PECON	Places for People
North British Housing Association	Over 55's Club	Peel Holdings Limited	Planning & Landscape Associates Ltd
North British Housing Association	Over 55's Luncheon Club	Penwortham Community Action Group	Planning and Design
North British Landscapes	P & M Bennett	Penwortham Community Centre Over 60's Club	Planning Problems Solved
North West Housing Forum	P & S Baker (Plant Hire)	Penwortham Community Club	Plasma Profiling

Organisation	Organisation	Organisation	Organisation
Playmates	Preston & Western Lancashire Racial Equality Council	Primrose Brides	Readyplant Ltd
Pleasington Parish Council	Preston and South Ribble Congregations of Jehovah's Witnesses	Primrose Holdings	Recognition Express-Bolton
Plot of Gold Ltd	Preston Asian Business Association	Principal	Rector of Preston
Plungington Community Centre	Preston Association of Community Organisations	Pringle Homes	Red Rose Radio
Polestar Creative Ltd	Preston Bus Ltd	Priory Technology College	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited
Polgram Shelters	Preston City Council	Probus Club	Reeds Rains
Policy, Communications & Performance Division	Preston City Council	Professional Employee Relations Consultancy	Reeds Rains Ltd
Policy, Communications & Performance Division	Preston City Council	Progress Housing Group	Reeves Coach Services
Policy, Communications & Performance Division	Preston City Council	Progress Housing Group Ltd	REFA
Pontins Ltd	Preston City Council	Progress Housing Group Ltd	Regenda Group
Porta Lancastrian	Preston City Mission	Prolec Automaton Services	Regent Hosiery Factors
Porter Lancastrian Limited	Preston College	Prontaprint	RIBA North West
Positive Solutions Ltd	Preston Community Network	Public Health Intelligence Manager	Ribble Catchment Conservation Trust
Post Office Counters Ltd	Preston Community Network	Puddletown Pirates (USL Trading Ltd)	Ribbleton Rectory
Post Office Property Holdings	Preston Community Network	Pukar Disability Resource Centre	Richard Davies Management Services Ltd
Povey	Preston Community Network	Quinn & Co	Richard Stirrup Associates Ltd
Premier Plumbing & Electricals Ltd	Preston Community Services	Quwwat-UI-Islam Mosque	Rigby & Partners
Prescap	Preston Community Transport	R Frankland & Son	Rivington Park Independent School
Pre-School Playgroups Association	Preston Conservative Mens Club	R P Smith & Co	Rivington Primary School
Presenting Solutions Ltd	Preston Counseling Services	Rallytech Composite Engineering	Rivington Village Club
Presentpace Ltd	Preston CVS	Ramblers Association	RJY Vulcanising Services Ltd
Preston & District Blind Bowling Club	Preston Disability Action Group	Rapleys	Road Accident Prevention Federation
Preston & District Chamber of Trade	Preston DISC	Rapleys	Road Haulage Association
Preston & District Ex Service Council	Preston Faith Forum	Rapleys	Robert Pinkus & Co
Preston & District Scope	Preston Faith Forum	Ravenscroft Group	Robert Sherry & Associates Ltd
Preston & District Trades Council	Preston Golf Club	Raw Witts Transport	Roberts & Co
Preston & District Wildfowlers	Preston History Society	Rawcliffe's of Chorley	Roger E Haydock B.Arch RIBA
Preston & Lancashire Survivors Group	Preston Life Centre	Raza Mosque	Roger Tym & Partners
Preston & North Lancashire Blind Welfare	Preston MENCAP	Raza Mosque	Roman Catholic Diocese of Liverpool
Preston & South Ribble Access Group	Preston Standing Conference of Womens Organisations	RB Contacts Ltd	Roman Catholic St Mary's Church
Preston & South Ribble Partnership	Preston YMCA	RE Developmens Ltd	Room 18
Preston & SR Youth Justice Centre	Prime Resorts Ltd	Ready Mixed Concrete (NW) Ltd	Rosy Apple Childcare Ltd

Organisation	Organisation	Organisation	Organisation
Round Table	Samaritans	South Ribble Partnership Office	St Ignatius
Rowland Homes Ltd	Samlesbury & Cuerdale Parish Council	South Ribble Pensioners' Association	St James Mothers Union
Royal Airforce Association	Samlesbury C of E School	Southlands High School	St James Vicarage
Royal Bank of Scotland	Samlesbury D of E Group	Specialised Training	St John Baptist
Royal British Legion	Sanity	Spiritual Assembly of the Baha'is of Preston (Lancs)	St Johns Ambulance (Leyland Division)
Royal British Legion (Women's Section)	Savills	Sport England (NW Region)	St Johns CE/Methodist Primary School
Royal Mail Property Holding Plc	Scout Council	Springboard Events Ltd	St John's Church
Royal Mail Property Holdings	SDI Ltd	Springfield Nursing Home	St John's Church - Youth Work
Royal Naval Association	Sense Northwest	SRBC	St Joseph's Catholic Church
Royal Society for Nature Conservation	Seven Stars Primary School	SRBC	St Joseph's Parish Centre
RPS	Seventh Day Adventist	SRPCC - Cat Welfare Trust	St Josephs R C Church
RPS	Shackerley (Holdings) Group Ltd	St Aidans Church	St Jude's
RPS Consultants on behalf of BT Group plc	Sharples Davies Limited	St Andrew & Blessed George Haydock	St Laurence's Parish Centre
RPS Planning	Shaw Hill Hotel Golf & Country Club	St Andrew's C of E Church	St Lawrence Parish Church
RPS Planning	Shell UK Limited	St Andrews Church	St Leonard C of E Church
RSCE Consulting Engineers	Sherbourn House	St Andrews Kids Club	St Leonard C of E Church
RSPB	Shopmobility	St Andrew's Parish Church	St Leonards C of E Church
Rufford Printing Co	SHP Valuers	St Annes After School Club	St Margarets Church
Runshaw Adult College	Signet Group	St Anthony's Presbytery	St Maria Goretti
Runshaw Business Centre	Silhouette Photography	St Bedes RC Primary School	St Mary & St Benedict RC Primary School St Mary Magdalen's Catholic Primary School
Runshaw Business Centre	Sita Lancashire Ltd	St Bernard's Catholic Men's Club	St Mary's
Runshaw College	SJS Hire Tools Ltd	St Catherine's Hospice Ltd	St Mary's & St John Southworths R C Church
Russell Homes (UK) Limited	SLEAP/Wade Hall Family Centre	St Catherines R C Church	St Marys C of E Church
Ruttle Plant Hire	SLR Linings Division of Rema Tip Top UK Ltd	St Chads Bowlers	St Mary's R C Church
Ruttle Plant Hire Ltd	Sly Glass	St Chad's Catholic Primary School	St Mary's RC Primary School
Rytetype Limited	Somerfields	St Clare's Church	St Mary's Youth Foundation
S & J Electrical Services	Soroptomist International	St Cuthberts Vicarage	St Mary's Youth Group Penwortham
S Ollerton Ltd	SOS	St Francis's Church	St Michaels C of E Church
Sacred Heart Social Centre	South Ribble Business Venture Ltd	St George's Church Hall	St Michael's C of E High School
Sage Cottage Properties t/a Shaw Hill Golf	South Ribble Key	St George's Shopping Centre	St Michael's Mensfellowship c/o
Sahara Project	South Ribble Lions Club	St Gregory the Great	St Michaels Vicarage
Sal Abrasive Technologies	South Ribble Museum & Exhibition Centre	St Gregory's Club	

Organisation	Organisation	Organisation	Organisation
St Oswalds R C Church	Stills Decorators	Tesco Store	The Lawn Tennis Association
St Oswalds R C Primary School	Stomhouse Ltd	Tesco Stores Ltd	The Littlewoods Organisation
St Patrick's R C Primary School	Stoneleigh Planning Partnership	Tesco Stores Ltd	The Local Futures Group
St Paul's Amateur Players	Stonewise Ltd	Teslatest Systems	The Lodge Motel
St Paul's Vicarage	Storeys:ssp	Tetrad PLC	The Mawdsley Consultancy
St Peter's CE Primary School	Storeys:SSP Ltd	TG Hughes Plc	The Methodist Church - South Ribble Circuit
St Peter's Parish Club	Stringfellow Building Contractors Ltd	That's Mine	The Methodist Church (North Lancashire District)
St Saviour C of E Church	Students Union	The Beeches Nursing & Residential Home	The Mill Hotel
St Stephens Church	Studio 89	The Bretheren Christian Fellowship	The Museum of the Queen's Lancashire Regiment
St Stephens Vicarage	Sue Ryder Foundation	The British Horse Society	The North West Cardiac Centre
St Teresa's Catholic Primary School	Sunderland Peacock and associates ltd	The British Red Cross Society	The Northern Way Project Team
St Teresas R C Church	Sundown Bedrooms Ltd	The British Wind Energy Association	The Pines Hotel & Hawthorns Bar & Grill
St Theresa's Presbytery	Superintendent Minister of Methodist Church	The Brookhouse Group Ltd	The Planning and Development Network
St Walburge's Church	Sustrans	The Café @ Cedar Farm	The Planning Bureau Limited
St. Catherines RC Primary School	Swaminarayan Hindu Mission Temple	The Church House	The Planning Bureau Limited
Stagecoach in Lancashire	Sweeper Hire/B & T Tippers Ltd	The Coach House	The Planning Bureau Limited
Stagecoach Northwest	T Warbrick Heating & Plumbing	The Competitive Edge	The Pub Estate Company Limited
Stagecoach Ribble	Talon Nonsk Ltd	The Co-operative Group Ltd	The Quality Assurance Association
Stagecoach Theatre Arts School	Tapeswitch Ltd	The Council for British Archaeology	The Ramblers Association
Stan Fowler (Builders) Ltd	Tarmac Central Limited	The Diocese of Blackburn	The Religious Society of Friends (Quakers)
Stanley H Cross & Co, Solicitors	Taylor & Hardy (Chartered Town Planners)	The Diverse Cleaning Co Ltd	The Royal British Legion
Station House Boarding Kennels	Taylor Transformers	The Edgerton Trust	The Salvation Army - Preston
Steer Ethelson Rural Ltd	Taylor Wimpey UK Limited	The Emerson Group	The Showmen's Guild of Great Britain
Step N Style Hair Studio	Tecseal Ltd	The Emerson Group	The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings
Steve Candlin Properties	Teejay Leisure Ltd	The Georgian Group	The Society of St Pius 10th
Steve Mawson & Associates	Teenie n Tots	The Graham Bolton Planning Partnership Ltd	The Stripper
Steven Abbott Associates	Tender Nursing Care	The Grange Residential Home	The Sunlight Service Group Ltd
Steven Abbott Associates	Tenon	The Gypsy Council	The Theatres Trust
Steven Abbott Associates	Tenon	The Hamilton Gee Partnership	The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester & North Merseyside
Steven Abbott Associates	Terrence O'Rourke Ltd	The Houghton Players	The Woodland Trust
Stewart Longton Caravans Ltd	Terry McMullan Paving Ltd	The Ileostomy & Internal Pouch Support Group	Thermadyne Industries Ltd
Stewart Ross Associates	TES Ltd	The JTS Partnership	Thermagas plc

Organisation	Organisation	Organisation	Organisation
Thomas Cole Solutions	United Reformed Church	Walton-le-Dale. St Leonard's C of E Primary School	Withnell United Football Club
Thomas Mawdsley	United Reformed Church	Warner Estate Holdings Plc	Wm Lawrence & Sons Ltd
Thurnhills	University of Central Lancashire	Warwick Homes (N.W.) Ltd	WM Morrison Supermarkets c/o Peacock & Smith
Tigerfish Public Relations	University of Central Lancashire	WE Couplings Ltd	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc
Topflite (North West) Ltd	Urban Vision	Welcome Break Limited	Womens Institute
Total Damp Proofing	USL Trading Ltd	Weldbank Plastic Co Ltd	Womens Institute
Tower View Farm	Verde Sports Limited	Welding & Site Services Ltd	Womens Institute
Town & Village	Vibez Music & Discos	Wellfield Business & Enterprise College	Womens Institute
Town and Country Planning	Vic Crompton Ltd t/a 007 Chimney Lining Services	Westbank Dental Practice	Wood Associates
Town Planning & Legislation Unit	Victim Support Lancashire	Westcliffe Homes Ltd	Wood Frampton
Town Planning Consultants	Victoria Bowling Club	Westwood Road County Primary School	Woodfit Ltd
Townwomen's Guild	Victorian Society	White Coppice Cricket Club	Woodford Group
Trades Council	Viga Athletic Clothing Co Ltd	White Young Green - Planning	Woodford Land
Trans Pennine Express	Vincent & Goring	Whittaker Training Associates	Woodlea Junior School
Transco Plc - Planning Department	Visiting Chiropodist	Whittingham and Goosnargh Sports & Social Club	Worden Arts & Craft Centre
Transport 2000	Visual Concepts UK Ltd	Whittle & Clayton-le-Woods Cricket Club	Worden Sports College
Trevor Roberts Associates Ltd	VME Electrical Ltd	Whittle Jones	Wrekamendid Services Ltd
Tribal Plc - incorporating Malcome Judd & Partners	W K Byers & Son	Whittle-le-Woods CE Primary School	WST Engineering Ltd
Tribal Plc - Incorporating Malcome Judd & Partners	W Marsden and Sons	Wholesale Butchers	X K Print Ltd
Trinity & St Michaels Methodist primary School	WAC BM & JA Carr	Widows Welcome Club	Yarrow Bridge Garage
Trishna Takeaway	Wade Hall Action Group	Wigan and District Angling Association	Yorkshire Bank plc
True Bearing Ltd	Wainhomes	Wilcock's Farm Caravan Site	Young Disabled Unit
True Bearing Ltd	Wainhomes (North West) Ltd	Wildfowl Trust	Youth Council
Trustees of TH Kevill	Walker & Tickle	Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester & N Merseyside	Youth Council
Tulketh Community Sports College	Walltex	Willam Sutton Housing Association	
Turley Associates	Wallwork & Co	Williams School of Motoring	
Turley Associates	Walmer Bridge Methodist Church	Willows Child Development Centre	
Twins Club	Walmsley Associates Ltd	Withnell Cricket Club	
UCLAN	Walton and Co	Withnell Fold Conservation Society	
UK Federation of Business and Professional Women	Walton le Dale Recreation Society	Withnell Fold County Primary School	
Unit Two Systems	Walton-le-Dale Community Primary School	Withnell Fold Sports & Social Club	
United Reformed Church	Walton-le-Dale Youth & Community Centre	Withnell St Joseph's RC Primary School	

This page is deliberately left blank

**Summaries of formal representations to the Preferred Core Strategy – Including Responses**

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
1	National Offender Management Services	PPS12/Para4: Encourages early govt involvement with Infrastructure provision. Circular 3/98.Para7: need to replace outdated prison facilities and requirement of Local Authorities to liaise with Prison Service with regards to future need. Circular 3/98 Para2: Need for new prison developments to be addressed through the planning system	Inclusion of detailed criteria based prison development policy within DPD.	Agent has detailed criteria based prison development policy for inclusion in DPD if necessary.		No change. No clear need for such a policy in Central Lancashire.
2	Individual	Unclear as to how to use this section Themes: (1) Creating strong safe prosperous communities through local spatial planning - all sections (2) locating growth & investment - all sections (3) Health & Wellbeing. In general support themes but would wish to see more links and joined up thinking in economic development and developing the character of the area with close links to creation of a health economy delivery plan. Given some areas key targets for improvement in health and well being linking development to outcomes both in physical build as well as cultural and infrastructure would be helpful. In principle this brings together key 2nd tier authorities as stakeholder and I wonder why LCC isn't featured in the Central Lancashire partnerships and only as a stakeholder. Given their key role in economic development and strategic activity across thematic issues.	Greater contribution from 3rd sector organisations, outcomes and impact statements to measure proposed development case studies or scenarios in different economic fields e.g industry technology, health care and telematics, retail and economic development	Agricultural transmission and migration as specific climate change options within zones of activity. Transport and economic development zoning to create better division in environments with clearer health/employment/education impact statement to provide an improved case for consideration of development control within.	As detailed previously	The Core Strategy has been re-ordered and Cross-Cutting Themes references added to improve the cohesiveness of the document.
3	Individual	We are regular users of the green corridor between Lightfoot Lane and Tom Benson Way via Ingol Golf course to Tulketh School and consider it essential for exercise, safe dog walking, wildlife refuge and to provide the lungs for this part of the city.	It must be preserved and protected against further developments at all costs.			What is now Policy 19 - Areas of Separation and Major Open Space - has now been changed to include the following text: "Areas of Major Open Space will be designated within the Preston urban boundary that prevent neighbourhoods merging, in particular between: (a) Ingol/Tanterton and Greysfriars/Cadley; (b) Sharoe Green and Fulwood"
4	Individual	The strategy should protect the local identity of places by designating 'areas of separation' or green wedges and this should apply in the suburban areas as well as the countryside.	In Ingol and Tanterton, the area stretching from Lightfoot Lane/Tom Benson Way via Ingol Golf course through the grounds of Tulketh School to Tag Lane must be preserved and protected from further development at all costs. It is a high quality green space which helps separate and define Ingol and Tanterton and is a key landscape, amenity and environmental asset. Please designate as an area of separation.			What is now Policy 19 - Areas of Separation and Major Open Space - has now been changed to include the following text: "Areas of Major Open Space will be designated within the Preston urban boundary that prevent neighbourhoods merging, in particular between: (a) Ingol/Tanterton and Greysfriars/Cadley; (b) Sharoe Green and Fulwood"
5	Individual	Particular concerns regarding proposed development on Ingol Golf course. The area was historically designated as green open space and I cannot understand what has changed. The golf course is used not only as a golf course but as an amenity space, there is extensive flora and fauna and marl pits hosting rare reptiles. Orchids have established and large populations of mammals including several species of deer. Established rights of way also exist.	Ensure this area is designated as an area of separation between the various suburban areas.			What is now Policy 19 - Areas of Separation and Major Open Space - has now been changed to include the following text: "Areas of Major Open Space will be designated within the Preston urban boundary that prevent neighbourhoods merging, in particular between: (a) Ingol/Tanterton and Greysfriars/Cadley; (b) Sharoe Green and Fulwood"
6	Individual	I support the strategy to protect the local identity of places by designating areas of separation or green wedges. I feel that this should apply to areas within the city of Preston and not just the villages in the countryside. I feel that the green corridor between Ingol/Tanterton and Fulwood that stretches from Lightfoot Lane/Tom Benson Way via the Golf Course to Walker Lane/Boys Lane must be preserved and protected from further development as it is an area of important green space, amenity and environmental asset. Further housing and the increase in traffic will have considerable impact on the quality of life for residents. I support the plan for development of a park and ride facility at Cottam & Broughton	The traffic congestion at Wychnor needs to be addressed before housing is considered. The green corridor should be designated as an area of separation			What is now Policy 19 - Areas of Separation and Major Open Space - has now been changed to include the following text: "Areas of Major Open Space will be designated within the Preston urban boundary that prevent neighbourhoods merging, in particular between: (a) Ingol/Tanterton and Greysfriars/Cadley; (b) Sharoe Green and Fulwood"  Noted. What is now Policy 3 (d) addresses improving public transport by providing new park and ride sites.
7	Higham & Co.	Support the theme of concentrating new development on brownfield sites but residential development on greenfield sites may be needed to release brownfield for employment generating development. Large scale development in rural area should be avoided.				No change. The Core Strategy continues to recognise that some greenfield development is likely to be necessary to meet development requirements.
8	Individual	Congestion and lack of use of the railway systems existing infrastructure	1. Relocation of Preston Bus Stations as Tithebarn offers no real benefits and is further away from the train station. Aim for one similar to Chorley. Relocate Bus station to Corporation Street/Ringway with a walkway linking train and bus stations, relocate low value retail from this area 2. Install a visionary iconic transport scheme (tram/trolley bus) to promote social, economic and growth benefits. This should use environmentally friendly fuels and be off road to avoid congested routes. A self propelled system would require minimal infrastructure or investment. 3. Use the non operational Deepdale railway line which needs little infrastructure change and would provide for many areas (see response for details) 4. South Ribble Access - Again reuse old railway			No specific change. The Core Strategy appropriately promotes the use of railways and interchanging with bus transport, including the use of dedicated routes for a bus based rapid transit system, as now specifically referred to in what is now Policy 3 - Travel.

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
			routes to reach M65 terminus and possibly Clayton Le Woods to serve several areas (see details) People from Manchester/Liverpool will be attracted to the park and ride option and careful planning will minimise the environmental impact on the area. 5. Same idea for Docks/Ashton/Cottam/Fulwood but will require more investment			
9	Individual	I cannot read the green print	What are the big red blobs at Cottam and other places - strategic sites?	Transport and cycle ways	Transport	The Core Strategy is now more easily readable.
10	Cllr Shannon	1. Particularly support the vision of a high quality green environment and protection of green space but this should apply in urban as well as suburban areas and countryside. 2. Locating growth - Investment and growth should be sustainable and respect area character 3 Biodiversity - Designate areas of separation e.g Ingol golf club area (see detailed notes) and developers who have suggested such sites should be told as soon as possible that such development is inappropriate 4 Chapter 3 - Only area of development in Ingol is the Brickworks site. There are no other possible sites. 5. PCS1/8 - Protecting the green wedges between communities is imperative, including that between Ingol and Cadley/Greyfriars.	continuation: 6. PCS16 -Para 13.16 mentions bowling and tennis clubs but not golf clubs as an amenity and health benefit. Owners to maintain and improve facilities in the knowledge that planning permission won't be given for development. Failure should result in compulsory purchase as a country park and the 'surplus to requirements' clause should be made more robust to stop facilities being deliberately run down. 7. PCS17/18 - Agree that Voluntary Community and Faith sector (VCF) should contribute to provision of community services. Moreover, those services which VCF can most appropriately provide should be identified, so that VCF's are given priority and commissioning. 8. PCS22 - The most important landscapes are not necessarily the rural ones and the highest value assets are those close to home. Mitigation or compensation is not an alternative to the loss of green infrastructure. 9. PCS28 - Support park and rides and railway station at Cottam 10. PCS29 - more consultation regarding community needs on larger site applications and Local Authority decision on Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 spends. Monies to be spent in local area and not on LCC large scale projects.	Very strong support for the process but fears the new LDF gives more weight to developers needs and wants than those of the communities.	PCS14 - mention of the development of the Brickworks site at Cottam (should read Ingol Ward). Development desperately wanted (supermarket/retail/leisure and housing)	What is now Policy 19: Areas of Separation and Major Open Space, has now been changed to include the following text: "Areas of Major Open Space will be designated within the Preston urban boundary that prevent neighbourhoods merging, in particular between: (a) Ingol/Tanterton and Greyfriars/Cadley; (b) Sharoe Green and Fulwood"  What is now Policy 4(c) details the target proportion of new housing to be built on previously developed/brownfield land at at least 70%.  There is a proposal to establish a District Centre in Cottam at the Brickworks site, now recognised in what is Policy 11.  What is now paragraph 11.13 includes the following text - Regular physical exercise contributes to good levels of health and wellbeing. Aside from its benefits to the individual, increased participation in sport and physical activity can also have wider benefits in tackling social exclusion and reducing anti-social behaviour...Open spaces often have multiple uses: those designated for outdoor recreation, such as golf courses, public parks and allotments also form part of the wider Green Infrastructure network.  PCS16 – No change. This is relevant to what is now Policy 24 (Sport and Recreation)  PCS28 – Support noted. (Now Policy 3: Travel)  The issues of Green Infrastructure is addressed in what is now Policy 18, with particular reference to Policy 18 (d) : "Secure mitigation and/or compensatory measures where development would lead to the loss of, or damage to, part of the Green Infrastructure network."  PCS29: What is now Policy 2 - Infrastructure - has been changed to allow both a levy/tariff and Section 106 approach that will need to involve more consultation on community needs before it can be implemented.
11	British Waterways	1. Core Strategy does not recognise the significance of inland waterways in Central Lancashire and the canal network should be recognised in the Spatial Portrait chapter and on the key diagram. 2. Sustaining rural economy - Inland waterway network is an attraction in its own right and provides leisure, environmental, health and economic benefits. Support facilities are needed to fully realise these benefits. 3. Biodiversity/Natural Environment - supports the aims of PCS22 on investment and improvement. But is unclear how paragraph 14.18 relates to the canal network. 4. Disappointed that towpaths as pedestrian/cycle routes not recognised in PCS28	1.PCS13 to allow for provision of supporting facilities to the canal network - mooring, marinas, service and refreshment facilities etc to support the economy and social side of the waterways 2. PCS22 Para14.18 to clarify that investment will be directed towards improvement of towpaths and water quality. Expand to seek developer contributions for sites in the vicinity which place an additional burden on the waterways		PCS28 to make specific reference to canal towpaths	The revised spatial portrait does refer to Inland Waterways (including main rivers, canals and reservoirs) and they are now shown on the Key Diagram.  What is now paragraph 9.42 has been changed to refer to tourism benefits of Inland Waterways.  More detailed work on developer contributions is likely to identify a requirement for such improvements for cycle use, possibly including water quality.  What is now paragraph 7.8 refers to the use of canal towpaths for cycling purposes.  The list of agencies in what was PCS29 (now Policy 2: Infrastructure) has now been removed from the text.

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
12	BAE Systems	1. Growth & Investment - Support the focus on the BAE Samlesbury and Buckshaw Village sites as strategic locations for future development. 2. Housing - Supports PCS9 as a balanced policy, agrees with percentage suggestions and the flexibility to take into account market conditions at the time. 3. Economic Growth - supports PCS11 identifying BAE Buckshaw and Samlesbury as significant major employment sites	Would like changes to PCS11 accompanying text as follows: a) Para:9.22 - refer to Buckshaw as a mixed use development b) Para: 9.23 - Due to delays and uncertainty, reference to definite opening date of the railway station at Buckshaw should be removed. c) Para 9.31 - amend to give greater flexibility on range of employment activities permitted at Samlesbury			What is now paragraph 5.33 states - Buckshaw Village is a mixed-use, brownfield development site that spans the boundary between South Ribble and Chorley to the North of Euxton.  What is now paragraph 5.35 has been revised to say - The land at Buckshaw Village is highly accessible, being in close proximity to the M6 and M61. The area has a regular bus service, cycle and footpath routes, and a proposed railway station and park and ride on the Preston-Manchester line, planned to open in 2011.  What is now paragraph 5.29 refers to the employment uses proposed at Samlesbury.
13	Individual	Although more well established recreational activities are mentioned, no mention of recreational flying in the Core Strategy - although mentioned in the consultation phase. The strategy should look to promote new activities and despite concerns, the sites provide no disruption and contribute towards a sustainable rural economy, preserve a rural landscape and maintain habitat opportunities.			No mention of recreational flying in the Core Strategy although mentioned in the consultation phase.	Due to its strategic role, it is not appropriate for the Core Strategy to refer specifically to recreational flying and aviation sports. However, to encourage identification of suitable sites, Policy 13 (b) has been amended to refer to recreational uses.
14	Aircraft Pilots and Owners Association	PPG13 notes that Local planning authorities should consider the role of small airports and airfields for business, recreational and emergency service needs.	As objections		No mention of recreational flying areas in the document.	Due to its strategic role, it is not appropriate for the Core Strategy to refer specifically to recreational flying and aviation sports. However, to encourage identification of suitable sites, Policy 13 (b) has been amended to refer to recreational uses.
15	Commission for Architecture & Built Environment	CABE have not responded formally because of resource issues but have issued a list of design considerations to be taken into account when producing the next stage of the strategy. Please refer file for details.				The Core Strategy now refers to design as a cross cutting issue and specific policies have been strengthened to give more emphasis to good design.
16	Campbells Ltd	N.B: The objections and support contained are all noted in the context of a site at Cuerden Way considered for development. Evidence base: concern raised re: lack of evidence and reliance on broader strategies which may not refer to all 3 Authorities e.g. Open Space strategies of Preston and South Ribble but none available for Chorley. Soundness questioned and plan may fail to be justified as in PPS12. Commend the inclusion of evidence however in the document. Joint Approach: Generalised approach to the 3 areas is inappropriate given their individual characteristics although strong links would ensure consistency and shared resources. Area profile: Euxton and Clayton Brook outlined in Para 3.54 as 'suburban with a range of modern housing' yet Buckshaw is major employment. Locating growth: Need for new housing and employment but must be sustainable to protect environmental and social area needs and to minimise climate change. Land Supply: Although conditions are likely to vary population increases will affect future growth and the increased demand for tourism and leisure facilities in particular for the ageing population. Concern is raised that the preferred options consultation commenced before the SHLAA was complete in relation to the greenbelt boundary and potential changes. For this reason guarantees cannot be given and must be noted. For the same reason reference to the provision and protection of safeguarded sites must be made. Sustaining rural economy: strongly support this and PSC13(c&d) and consider to be robust but would ask that the words 'such as Cuerden Valley Park be added (para 11.1). Retail and tourism: questions why urban tourism is dealt with here yet rural tourism is within the rural economy section. Health & wellbeing: Fully supports	Change area profile re Buckshaw employment areas. Provision of bowling green (see development brief) to provide recreational and health based sports activities (ref para 13.12) Make reference to protection and provision of safeguarded sites Reconsider the spatial options 1 thru 3 in light of Growth Point expressions and build in flexibility to option 1 to secure accommodation and development in rural areas.			The Open Space strategies of the three Districts have been considered as part of the Open Space, Sport and Recreation Review work. The SHLAA (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment has been reviewed. The Site Allocations Development Plan Documents (DPD) will show the likely development implications for Safeguarded Land.  Specific references to the provision of a bowling green are too detailed for Core Strategy. Site specific comments will be dealt with at the Site Allocations DPD process.  The general reference to Country Parks in what is now paragraph 9.36 is considered appropriate, although Policy 18 refers to specific parks.  Urban and rural tourism are now included in one chapter (9 - Delivering Economic Prosperity).
17	Individual	The Core strategy vision for Ingol and Tanterton could be compromised if our urban green areas are encroached upon by developers. Building of any description will rob the city of quality green amenity space, green spaces are sanctities for wildlife diversity and the golf course provides a recreational facility not only for locals but residents of the city and county. Area behind Tulketh High school should be designated as an area of separation	Retain, and stop development on the green spaces.			What is now Policy 19: Areas of Separation and Major Open Space, has now been changed to include the following text: "Areas of Major Open Space will be designated within the Preston urban boundary that prevent neighbourhoods merging, in particular between: (a) Ingol/Tanterton and Greyfriars/Cadley; (b) Sharoe Green and Fulwood."
18	Individual	Lack of reference to recreational flying within the core strategy.	The availability of a farm/grass airstrip in the area would provide benefits for the involvement of schools, youth organisations and local residents. It is proven that similar sites do not have noise issues and do not affect farm animals and PPG17 encompasses guidelines to promote recreational flying.			Due to its strategic role, it is not appropriate for the Core Strategy to refer specifically to recreational flying and aviation sports. However, to encourage identification of suitable sites, Policy 13 (b) has been amended to refer to recreational uses.
19	Lea & Cottam Parish Council	The Parish Council are supportive of the generic document as a whole however they would expect the implementation and detail of any specific policy to take into account the needs and wishes of the communities which may be affected.				The more detailed work on Site Allocations will be thoroughly consulted on with local communities.
20	James Herbert & Sons	Page No 66-71, paragraph affordable housing – support.				Noted.
21	Individual	Need to preserve the areas of separation or green wedges in the Ingol and Tanterton area which provide a haven for wildlife and a corridor for movement - roe deer and foxes are occasionally seen and the area provides a place for outdoor recreation and room to breathe.	Maintain the area as an area of separation.			What is now Policy 19: Areas of Separation and Major Open Space, has now been changed to include the following text: "Areas of Major Open Space will be

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
						designated within the Preston urban boundary that prevent neighbourhoods merging, in particular between: (a) Ingol/Tanterton and Greyfriars/Cadley; (b) Sharoe Green and Fulwood."
22	RSPB	Chapter 14, biodiversity, page 127, paragraph 14.27: I think another bullet point is needed.	Bullet point - 'look to designate as SSSIs important qualifying nature conservation sites e.g. West Pennine Moors so that their protection can be strengthened		Protect deep peat sites from potentially damaging wind farm developments.	The Core Strategy cannot promote SSSI designation nor specifically preclude wind farm developments from deep peat sites but what is now Policy 20 specifically refers to the West Pennine Moors.
23	Northern Trust	Concerns that Preston will be the focus of the strategy with Chorley and Leyland being last in the queue, and that there is not enough flexibility to manoeuvre if a larger unexpected development came along. Does the policy allow for change if performance monitoring shows that it is not working in some area. What will happen if one of the 3 councils decides it does not wish to go ahead with the Growth Point? Would the Core Strategy be jeopardised? The core strategy is not detailed enough from a property point of view although is well written from a planning professionals perspective. The brownfield target cannot be met in the early years of the strategy and especially in the economic downturn. There is no definition of whether the 70% has to be achieved at all times or as an average and if so what is the time scale used to calculate the average. To kick start the economy and achieve market and affordable housing provision, green field sites need to be given in the short term and with the view that over the term of the CS the brownfield sites will bring that level back to 70%. This is essential in rural areas where brownfield is at a premium.	The Core Strategy needs to be written to allow flexibility in response to market changes because it is the private sector that are critical to successful delivery of the vision, and explicit in its appreciation of the private sector.			The focus of the Core Strategy is on all three of the Central Lancashire Districts - Chorley, South Ribble and Preston. All three authorities have signed up to the Growth Point and the Core Strategy takes full account of this initiative and the need to be flexible in terms of implementation.  What is now paragraph 8.15 states: The former RSS set a target of at least 70% of new housing being provided on previously developed (brownfield) land. National planning policy has now reclassified residential gardens as greenfield land. However even after taking account of this change in respect of housing development of such land both in terms of past performance and likely future trends, the 70% target is still achievable. In the event that an upturn in the house building market takes longer than expected, authorities will need to be flexible in their approach to meet the housing delivery requirements but there will be no compromise on overall design standards. Regular monitoring will be undertaken and analysis of data to understand trends and predict future outcomes.  PCS11(f) has been revised and is now Policy 10 (Employment Premises and Sites)
24	Central Lancashire Flyers	Concerned that points made in original response have been overlooked. Numerous references to recreational activities in the strategy but all have good public and private provision. No reference is made to recreational flying despite govt and Dept Transport recognition of the activity and PPG13 identifying the need to enhance aviation infrastructure. Expertise and supporting data is available to substantiate the fact that light aviation will not have any detrimental effects on neighbouring areas. The nature and use of these sites contributes towards sustainable rural economy, preserves a rural landscape and maintains habitat opportunities.	The strategy should be looking at gaps in recreational provision e.g. recreational flying with particular reference to Central Lancs lack of provision compared to Sefton, Lancaster and Wyre.			Due to its strategic role, it is not appropriate for the Core Strategy to refer specifically to recreational flying and aviation sports. However, to encourage identification of suitable sites, Policy 13 (b) has been amended to refer to recreational uses.
25	Individual	Having read the Core Strategy I note that there is no mention of recreational flying facilities for the area. Flying sites have little or no impact on the landscape of the countryside, provide safe habitats for the wildlife and opportunities for schools and youth groups in an area renowned for its aircraft industry.	Please consider a provision for potential flying facilities in Central Lancashire.			Due to its strategic role, it is not appropriate for the Core Strategy to refer specifically to recreational flying and aviation sports. However, to encourage identification of suitable sites, Policy 13 (b) has been amended to refer to recreational uses.
26	Lancashire & Blackpool Tourist Board	LBTB supports the Preferred Core Strategy which recognises the contribution that the visitor economy makes to both rural and urban economies within Central Lancashire. LBTB also encourages sensitive, timely and sustainable development that support economic growth and create a high quality environment for those in the area. Main areas of support: 1. Anticipated growth in business tourism in Preston, reflecting inward investment and good rail/road accessibility 2. Promote sustainable rural tourism whilst protecting and enhancing the natural assets of the area 3. Support retail and leisure development as part of the tourism ideal. Business networks in urban areas should be encouraged to identify specific development and business support needs for support in alignment with identified priorities and aspirations. Also support the cultural offer with a view to the Preston Guild 2012 and its inward investment opportunities		Monitoring and evaluation plans for delivery of the strategy highlight a number of performance indicators relating to the visitor economy and further work to define and align to existing measures used by key stakeholders would be welcomed.		Contact has been made with the Tourist Board and the appropriate performance indicators have been included in the Performance Monitoring Framework of the Core Strategy.
27	Walmer Bridge Village Committee	Very pleased to see that Option 1 of the Issues and options has been adopted. Subsequent surveys of the village have confirmed that this option is the better one especially related to the maintenance of village identity by preserving the Green Belt with 96% of residents wishing to keep the villages green boundaries.	There is a need for a direct bus service from Western Parishes to Leyland and Chorley.	The only land for development within the boundaries on SRBC's local plan is a wasteland area designated for 28 years as Mixed Use. A change of use has been proposed (housing, affordable housing and surgery) to afford 106 monies, and the owner/developer has been invited to consider this with a view to its place within the LDF		The Core Strategy cannot refer to specific bus services or individual small sites as they are not of strategic significance. The Site Allocations work will consider these sites, but what is now Policy 3 (Travel) continues to seek improvements to bus services.
28	Individual	No reference to recreational aviation in the region despite specific representations	Please ensure the proposal recognises the validity of			Due to its strategic role, it is not appropriate

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
		by local and national groups. Recreational sport is govt recognised and at a recent planning appeal the LA was criticised for not having made provision. Farm strip aviation offers minimal disruption despite ignorance to the contrary, act as wildlife sanctuaries and offer an alternative to poorer farmland. Aviation also adds more to the GDP because of the local jobs involved	recreational flying as a sport and make adequate provision in the plan.			for the Core Strategy to refer specifically to recreational flying and aviation sports. However, to encourage identification of suitable sites, Policy 13 (b) has been amended to refer to recreational uses.
29	Sainsbury's Supermarkets	Sainsbury's support the encouragement of retail, office and leisure development within Preston City Centre in order to retain its role as the sub regional centre of Lancashire.	In light of proposed changes to PPS6 (July 08) we advocate a further category be added to promote competition between retailers to allow genuine choice and support efficient competitive and innovative retail development and improve productivity.		As above	The Core Strategy has been amended to be in conformity with PPS4.
30	Trustees of the Worden Estate Land at Ulnes Walton	N.B: Representation made with regards to land at Ulnes Walton between HMP Wymott and Garth, and Moss Side Ind Est Test Track. Supports identification of Leyland as a key service centre as is the flexibility for some greenfield development on the main urban area fringes. Housing and employment policies supported in principal Land aforementioned represents a logical western boundary to extended Leyland, is close to the Preston/Ormskirk railway and lies between mixed use developments which should strengthen the case for further development. Joint working is very welcome in the case of this site and future development issues			No reference to GP status and does not take into account enhanced levels of housing provision to be accommodated (20% extra)	The Core Strategy takes full account of the Growth Point but also the economic recession. Relevant references (new paragraph numbers): 5.9: The Growth Point national initiative was conceived as a way of stimulating the housing industry and improving the availability of housing, by inviting local authorities to bid for public pump priming monies for investment in infrastructure. Across Central Lancashire and Blackpool the aim in the Growth Point bid submitted by the participating councils was to uplift the numbers of new dwellings built by 2017 by more than 30% above the provision levels in the former Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). The successful bid did not change the overall housing provision requirements, but was designed to bring a greater proportion of new housing forward for construction up to 2017. 8.6: The Growth Point aimed to uplift the rate of house building to a level of over 30% above RSS levels for the period to 2017. However, the recession and reduced Growth Point funding has made such an uplift unlikely. In any event there was no intention to exceed the RSS total requirement to 2021 or beyond.  The Core Strategy continues to refer to mixed use development proposed at the former Moss Side Test Track (now Policy 9: Economic Growth and Employment) but does not propose an extension of Leyland further westward as this is Green Belt land and there is no justification for releasing it for development.
31	Individual	Support the protection of local identity by designating areas of separation or green wedges but should be for suburban as well as rural areas e.g. between Ingol and Tanterton. Preservation of corridor from Lightfoot Lane to Tulketh school should be paramount as area offers green space, separates communities and is amenity and environmental asset				What is now Policy 19: Areas of Separation and Major Open Space, has now been changed to include the following text: "Areas of Major Open Space will be designated within the Preston urban boundary that prevent neighbourhoods merging, in particular between: (a) Ingol/Tanterton and Greyfriars/Cadley; (b) Sharoe Green and Fulwood."
32	Individual	Support the protection of local identity by designating areas of separation or green wedges but should be for suburban as well as rural areas e.g. between Ingol and Tanterton. Preservation of corridor from Lightfoot Lane to Tulketh school should be paramount as area offers green space, separates communities and is amenity and environmental asset	Stop the provision of large detached homes of which Ingol has a glut			What is now Policy 19: Areas of Separation and Major Open Space, has now been changed to include the following text: "Areas of Major Open Space will be designated within the Preston urban boundary that prevent neighbourhoods merging, in particular between: (a) Ingol/Tanterton and Greyfriars/Cadley; (b) Sharoe Green and Fulwood."  The size/type of housing market is now referred to in paragraphs 8.28 and 8.29.
33	Individual	Support the protection of local identity by designating areas of separation or green wedges but should be for suburban as well as rural areas e.g. between Ingol and Tanterton. Preservation of corridor from Lightfoot Lane to Tulketh school should be paramount as area offers green space, separates communities and is amenity and environmental asset				What is now Policy 19, Areas of Separation and Major Open Space, has now been changed to include the following text: "Areas of Major Open Space will be designated within the Preston urban boundary that prevent neighbourhoods merging, in particular between: (a) Ingol/Tanterton and Greyfriars/Cadley; (b) Sharoe Green and Fulwood."
34	GeoLancashire	Support moves to put geodiversity on a level footing with biodiversity but Chapter 14 titles should be 'Physical and natural environment' to keep it generic. Chapter 14.1 - protect and enhance but also promote enjoyment without causing damage	Chapter 11- efforts should be made to explore geotourism as a means of enhancing visitor/resident appreciation and of assisting rural diversification. Chapter 12 - Tourism conceived as an urban activity		Chapter 13-no mention of outdoor exercise although walking is a popular informal activity. Chapter 14 - 'Givens; should include Lancashire Local Geodiversity Action Plan	What is now Chapter 10 has been re-titled "Achieving Good Design" and the term "geodiversity" included in Policy 22 and the supporting text.

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
			but should draw upon the physical and natural environment. Chapter 14.5 - Understands the need to understand assets but gives no idea of how this will be addressed. Adoption needed of a policy to explicitly defend local sites. Chapter 14.8 - Second sentence change 'landform features' to geodiversity. As it stands the phrase means only geomorphology. Chapter 14.15 to read 'but many sites are important in their own rights as a geological and geomorphological asset' Chapter 14.16 remove the 1st sentence and 'therefore; in the 2nd. After Central Lancashire add 'all sites are set within landscapes and conservation does not end at site boundaries. Landscape, bio and geo diversity are all interlinked aspects of the total ecology of place'		Chapter 14.7 - Add after 'forms' - "While geodiversity is the variety of rocks and landforms together with the processes which form them" Suggest new paragraph between 14.17 and 14.18 to read 'Many of the Geological Heritage Site's are located within GI and some cover extensive areas. They are often functionally linked to biological assets and with them are recognised as specific places of importance set in a wider landscape. Suggest new paragraph after 14.31 to read 'Listed buildings, ancient monuments and sites are key features of the cultural landscape. GHSs are key features of the physical landscape and will be accorded comparable importance protection and promotion."	Geodiversity is defined in what is now paragraph 10.19. Heritage-based tourism is covered in what is now Policy 12 (Culture and Entertainment Facilities), Green Infrastructure in Policy 18 and Landscape Character Areas Policy 21.  What is now Policy 13 (Rural Economy) b addresses rural tourism.  Outdoor exercise, and specifically walking, is mentioned throughout the Cross-Cutting Theme of "Promoting Health and Wellbeing" as well as in the detailed Chapter 11 (Promoting Health and Wellbeing).  Geological Heritage Sites are now detailed in paragraph 10.21.  Paragraph 14.7: Suggested text has been included in what is now paragraph 10.20.  Biodiversity and geodiversity are addressed in paragraphs 10.20 to 10.24 and what is now Policy 22.  Geological Heritage Sites are detailed in paragraph 10.21 - to change to reflect suggest changes.
35	Individual	Centralised policy makes no allowance for divergent attitudes. No reference to aviation regardless of airfields/ports in the area		True democracy would try to contact the populous. I knew nothing of the strategy until 9th Dec 08.		Due to its strategic role, it is not appropriate for the Core Strategy to refer specifically to sites for recreational flying and aviation sports. However Policy 13 (Rural Economy) has been amended to refer to recreation uses and storage.
36	Wyre Borough Council	Subject to a call-in period and following Cabinet consideration Wyre BC object to the PCS a) Vision places too much emphasis on the role of Preston after Manchester and Liverpool. Policy RDF1 of the RSS places regional centres of Manchester and Liverpool as 1st priority for growth and development followed by the inner areas surrounding these centres. 3rd priority should be towns within the 3 city regions including Blackpool, Burnley, Blackburn and Preston with no distinction made in the RSS. Preference of Preston in the policy is therefore not in conformity with the RSS. b) Chapter 12.Para 12:3.Under 'givens' page 94 states that the RSS identifies Preston as a centre for higher order retailing and services'. This is not the case - Policy W5 of the RSS establishes a hierarchy for retailing in the North West and Preston is not prioritised as stated in the givens. c) Following from this PCS14 is directly in conflict with policy W5 of the RSS	The document does not consider the impacts on surrounding centres of extending Preston's Primary Retail Core to facilitate the Tithebarn proposal. More information on the impacts should be embedded within the document. Any impact on the growth and development of Blackpool could have implications for the rest of the Fylde Coast, including the possible regeneration of Fleetwood.			The Vision has been amended to state: "Preston will have become a transformed city, recognised as an alternative destination to Manchester and Liverpool for high quality retail, cultural, entertainment, business and higher education."  What is now paragraph 3.10 states the Core Strategy takes account of cross-boundary issues with neighbouring districts outside Central Lancashire. The issues identified are... - The scale of retail growth envisaged for Preston City Centre.  Furthermore paragraph 3.13 says the scale of retail growth envisaged for Preston City Centre is covered in Chapter 5, and more particularly in Chapter 9. The Central Lancashire authorities consider that the scale of retail growth proposed is appropriate given the evidence of need and the regeneration requirements of Preston City Centre (particularly in the Tithebarn Regeneration Area).  What are now paragraph 9.20 and 9.21 have been appropriately reviewed to state: 9.20 Preston is the main retail and service centre in Central Lancashire, and is ranked first in the Lancashire sub-region for its non-food (comparison) shopping. It is the centre for commercial and administrative activity, with proposals for a Central Business District development close to the railway station. The City Centre requires further investment if it is to maintain and improve its overall performance. Major retail investment in Preston City Centre will benefit the whole of Lancashire by providing higher order comparison shopping within the sub-region, thereby reducing the need for longer trips to Manchester and Liverpool. 9.21: The Tithebarn Regeneration Area is on the eastern edge of the City Centre, and well located to enable regeneration and

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
						expansion. It is an appropriate location for large scale mixed use re-development. The comprehensive development of the Tithebarn Regeneration Area is an important component of the overall strategy for Preston, which seeks to ensure that Preston fulfils its economic potential as a successful city (and as a centre of knowledge based employment).
37	Individual	Strongly object to the use of the land at Ingol Golf Course as housing development as the area is parkland which divides existing areas and should be retained if not as a golf course, for the good of Preston.	Area to be retained as an area of separation.	Rename area 'Hemmings Park'		What is now Policy 19: Areas of Separation and Major Open Space, has now been changed to include the following text: "Areas of Major Open Space will be designated within the Preston urban boundary that prevent neighbourhoods merging, in particular between: (a) Ingol/Tanterton and Greyfriars/Cadley; (b) Sharoe Green and Fulwood."
38	Broughton Parish Council	Support for 1. 3.34/3.35 congestion on A6 at Broughton by pass required 2. PCS1 - growth on brownfield sites 3. PCS24 - Protect identity and local distinctiveness of Broughton 4. PCS28 (H) Improve the road network of Broughton		As with section 8 of this form Broughton should not be viewed as a service centre. The current shape and size of the village is appropriate. The CS is a reaffirmation of the need for a bypass for environmental quality and economic benefits to the wider area of Central Lancs and Lancashire as a whole		What is now paragraph 7.17 details a planned bypass at Broughton.
39	Lancashire Constabulary	No objection/support - see omissions			Little mention to reassure that plans have community safety strategy built in. On major developments Architectural Liaison Officer/crime reduction input should be included to reduce opportunity for crime and to form agency partnerships Also inclusion of comment that car parks would strive towards the Park Mark certificates and developments to achieve Secured By Design certification.	What is now paragraph 11.20 refers to the role of the Architectural Liaison Officer. References to Park Mark accreditation are considered too detailed a point for the Core Strategy.
40	North and Western Lancashire Chamber of Commerce	Policy to promote sustainable economic growth is supported. Business involvement must be pre-ceded by economic revival but consultation with businesses must be sought. Regeneration schemes traditionally fail to engage the business community and the private sector must fully participate and be asked to do so. Disagree with proposal to rule out development near motorway junctions. Congestion on roads is a major issue for businesses.	Preferred Core Strategy is clear about its objectives but unclear as to funding and implementation of those objectives.			The Core Strategy's Infrastructure Delivery Schedule refers to funding and implementation opportunities.  The Infrastructure Delivery Schedule itemises the essential strategic requirements as the first part of a full Infrastructure Delivery Plan that will be worked up alongside preparation of the Site Allocations Development Plan Documents and the development of a levy/tariff Standard Charging Schedule.  A full set of indicators and targets is provided in a separate Performance Monitoring Framework to accompany the Core Strategy at publication stage.  The wording has been amended and no longer refers to the specific Tithebarn proposal but rather the Tithebarn Regeneration Area. This is detailed in Policy 9 (Economic Growth and Employment) and paragraphs 9.20 and 9.21.
41	James Hart	Economic growth and employment: Aspects of regional and national policy require Local Authority to consider whether historically employment land could be used for alternative development. Concerns that PCS11/f lacks clarity and certainty in terms of the sites it will be applied to. Need clarification as to the sites ranked "other" in the Employment Land Review and if any site not identified otherwise will be classed as "other". Is the assumption that those not specifically identified have been excluded and PCS11 should be clarified so that the criteria will be applied to release 'other urban sites' to non B use class employment sites (including housing). Delivery of new housing: Objection to the approach of maintaining of a 5yr deliverable supply of land - PPS3 Para 53. PCS8 para: 8.20 advocates a minimum of 6 years but unsure as to supply as a whole or individual district and calculation method is in question i.e. 3 yr rolling programme with 20% tolerance. a) 20% less than 6 yrs indicates 4.8 years below the PPS3 minimum b) Para 60 PPS3 requires a continuous 5yr supply but on a rolling basis this may not necessarily be maintained.6 years would allow for lulls in tolerance  Would like to question tolerance of 20% and why it is required. a) CL is important for delivery of sustainable housing growth. b) RSS saw a significant increase in			See across	What is now Policy 10- Employment Premises and Sites - has been amended to read:  "All existing employment premises and sites or land and premises last used for employment use will be protected for employment use. There will be presumption that "Best Urban" and "Good Urban" sites will be retained for B use class employment use. Proposals on all employment sites/premises for re-use or redevelopment other than B use class employment uses will be assessed under the following criteria..."  Following the revocation of the RSS and housing delivery issues associated with the state of the economy the housing requirement figures have been reduced by

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
		<p>the strategic housing requirements for joint authorities but is not a maximum especially re: GP status and elements of PCS8 look backwards with a policy of housing restraint and c) the Secretary of State makes it clear that it is inappropriate to resist additional housing on over supply grounds.</p> <p>If land supply is based jointly then we object as planning applications should be based upon land supply of the relevant authority and clear assessment methodology needs to be set out and tested.</p> <p>Chapter 6 Locating growth P43-44 PCS1 The preferred option PCS1 provides an appropriate spatial focus and framework for growth and development over the plan period. In particular it is noted that the Preston urban area is listed as the primary focus for growth and investment.</p>				<p>20% but the tolerance margins have been retained in what is now Policy 4 (Housing Delivery). Paragraphs 8.9-8.13 explain the reasoning behind this approach.</p> <p>Growth and investment will be focused on brownfield sites and the Strategic Location of Preston Central, the key Service Centres of Chorley and Leyland and the other main urban areas in South Ribble. This is detailed in what is now Policy 1- Locating Growth.</p>
42	English Heritage	<p>Vision and strategic objectives supported but support for historic environment should flow through to the development and implementation of the document. PCS1 - support inclusion of para6.18 and need to protect local character but includes BAE Samlesbury as a strategic employment site. Whilst there are benefits there is also the potential to cause damage to Samlesbury Hall and its immediate area. S106 funding should be investigated to help prevent such damage. Para 9.19 refers to development of older commercial building and the reuse of some should be promoted. PCS13d supports farm use but note should be made that conversion should be undertaken in a sensitive manner. PCS19 - support for protection of cultural assets but should also include cultural tourism</p>	Amend PCS11 to cover promotion of older commercial building development		<p>The document fails to give information on the culture and heritage of the areas and its historic inheritance. Citation of Joint Lancashire Structure Plan SPG on Landscape and Heritage as part of the evidence base (PCS1) and ways to adopt and incorporate this guidance. Also citation recommended of Microgeneration in the Historic Environment publication for clarity of PCS2. PCS20 - Inclusion of ways to reuse schools of architectural interest. PCS22 Clarify/add the contribution of the historic environment to the green infrastructure. PCS27 refer to conservation area appraisals and management plans to secure high quality development.</p>	<p>The Spatial Portrait now includes a section regarding "Heritage and Local Distinctiveness". Chapter 9 - Delivering Economic Prosperity - also address "Leisure/Cultural Entertainment."</p> <p>No damage to Samlesbury Hall is envisaged from any of the Core Strategy's proposals.</p> <p>The supporting text to Policy 16 - Heritage Assets - details protecting and conserving heritage assets including Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Registered Parks and Gardens.</p> <p>Design considerations are incorporated into what is now Policy 13 (Rural Economy).</p> <p>Cultural tourism is encouraged by what is now Policy 12 (Culture and Entertainment Facilities), where the Core Strategy appropriately deals with strategic heritage and design matters.</p> <p>Paragraphs 10.4 to 10.6 address the issues of "protecting and conserving heritage assets", however, there is no specific mention with regard to redundant schools.</p> <p>What is now Policy 17 (Design of New Buildings) has been amended to the following: "The design of new buildings will be expected to take account of the character and appearance of the local area..." This Policy has been updated to include additional information on how the character and appearance of the local area is to be taken into consideration.</p>
43	Haighton Parish Council	<p>Chapter 6: Support the aim to focus growth on brownfield sites and key regeneration areas in Preston, Chorley and Leyland, and appropriate scale of growth and investment providing it is in keeping with character and setting. Object to identification of Goosnargh/Whittingham as a strategic site and believe redevelopment of Whittingham Hospital appropriate if in scale with existing infrastructure and village sites.</p> <p>Chapter 3: Support recognition that countryside plays in separating communities and advocate areas of separation particularly Goosnargh and Whittingham.</p> <p>Chapter 14: Support the value of green infrastructure and multi benefits e.g. room to breathe. For the first time in a planning document the need to protect green belt areas between communities has been recognised</p> <p>Chapter 7: Support recognition that areas of high scenic value be designated 'high' in terms of sensitivity to wind energy development.</p> <p>Chapter 6: Object that rural areas to the south of the Ribble have protected Green Belt status whilst those to the north do not.</p>	Propose remove the title 'strategic site' from PCS for Whittingham. Object to the use of 'city' in Central Lancashire City Region as this reminiscent of CL New Town Plan for a sprawling conurbation. Proposed development of Longridge to the west contrary to green infrastructure section as proposes expansion towards Grimsargh.	Instead of creating the Broughton bypass which will simply remove traffic congestion northwards, we propose a new M6 junction at Brock to cope with traffic from Garstang which would benefit not only Preston but Fylde/Wyre also.		<p>Goosnargh/Whittingham is no longer referred to as a Strategic Site.</p> <p>The "Central Lancashire City Region" term was coined by the Northern Way initiative and adopted by the Regional Spatial Strategy and is only referred to in the Core Strategy in this context.</p> <p>The Core Strategy only refers to the possibility of development at Longridge, where this might be located is a matter for the Site Allocations work.</p> <p>The Core Strategy does not propose any change to the strategic extent of the Green Belt as such an alteration is not considered necessary to manage the location of development.</p> <p>Paragraphs 7.18 and 7.19 refer to the Motorway Network.</p>
44	Redrow Homes Ltd	<p>Lack of supporting information to evidence whether the PCS is sound e.g. Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and Strategic Housing Market Assessment. PCS1, Page 43 - Overall strategy of concentrating housing development around Preston City and the key service centre of Leyland and Chorley is supported however clarity is needed in particular with relation to Preston urban and Leyland/Farlington. This will give more flexibility in light of the Growth Point bid and potential future housing requirements.</p> <p>PCS8 p64 - although need will vary the greatest problem with housing provision</p>	<p>PCS1 -Amend bullet point 2 of para (a) to read ' the northern fringe of the City focussing on a sustainable urban extension'</p> <p>PCS1-Amend first bullet point of para (b) to read 'Leyland/Farlington focussing on regeneration of Leyland town centre and brownfield sites as well as greenfield development on the south western fringe of</p>			<p>Policy 1 (a) second bullet point now reads: "The northern suburbs of Preston, focussing on Local Centres, with greenfield development within the Cottam Strategic Location."</p> <p>Following the revocation of the RSS and housing delivery issues associated with the</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
		will result from under provision against policy requirement. For that reason 20% under delivery will reduce completions in excess of 800 units across the 3 districts Targets for affordable housing to be evidenced by SHMAA and reflect economic viability of development land (para 29 PPS3) - neither of which have been met so far. As such PCS is unsound The PCS should not attempt to delegate policy decision to SPD's which should provide greater detail on DPD policies not introduce policies themselves.	the main urban areas.  PCS8 - Amend the trigger level in para (b) to refer to a 10% minus over 2 year performance period			state of the economy the housing requirement figures have been reduced by 20% but the tolerance margins have been retained in what is now Policy 4 (Housing Delivery). Paragraphs 8.9-8.13 explain the reasoning behind this approach.  The SHMA has been completed and acts as an evidence base particular in terms of the need for affordable housing - further housing viability work has also been undertaken whilst has resulted in site size thresholds for affordable housing and percentage provision to be provided. The Core Strategy no longer requires new housing to fund existing housing improvements.
45	Charnock Richard Parish Council	Councillors found it difficult to read and considered it a document written by planners for planners. Also questioned the cost of producing the document. Consider the protection/preservation of green belt land in rural parishes to be of the utmost importance.				Noted. The Core Strategy has been re-drafted and is now considered easier to read. The costs of production are minimised per authority as they are shared three ways.
46	Sport England North West	Vision and strategic objectives: support aspiration to create healthy communities through sport. Chapter 13 - sport and recreation. Support and reference to PPG17 welcomed. PCS16 - support in particular reference to developer contributions helping sports provision.	Economic Growth and Employment: PCS13 - support in general but mention could be made of sport's positive use of land as part of the rural economy reflecting advice in PPS7. Monitoring, indicators should reflect commitments in PCS16 to quality and quantity.			Rural recreation is now included in what is now Policy 13 (Rural Economy).  The Performance Monitoring Framework has been amended to cover matters that are feasible to monitor.
47	The Emerson Group	Locating growth - policy was formulated in advance of the adoption of the RSS and Growth Point announcements and as such will have to be checked for compliance. Climate Change - 1st part of policy reiterates national standards but technology must exist to achieve standards. Object to rest of policy as too strict and could prevent development. Planning requirements should not duplicate other legislation. PCS8: Housing - Concern over section b of policy. Contributions should not be additional to normal affordable housing policies (PCS9) and only be requested in lieu of some or all on site provision. Micromanagement of new housing inappropriate and will lead to higher house prices. Market housing should not be subject to space standards and there is nothing in PPS3 or RSS for this. Resource availability is to be given consideration PCS12: Skills and economic inclusion - Concern over requirement for developer contributions and no indication to threshold for introduction. Spend of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) should relate specifically to development proposed so as to comply with circular 5/2005	Needs to take account of final RSS and Growth Point bid. Locating growth - insert reference to sustainably located greenfield sites. Climate change - introduce into the policy 'where feasible and viable' into 3rd paragraph. Housing - Clarify b in PCS7 to indicate that this is an option to on site provision and delete reference to internal space provision from (d) in PCS8 Reconsider PCS29 in light of introduction of CIL.			The Core Strategy has appropriately taken account of the Growth Point, the RSS has now been revoked.  The Climate Change policies are in line with national and regional policies. Economic viability is referred to in what is now Policy 27 (Sustainable Resources and New Developments).  New Policy 7 on Affordable Housing is in line with national policies and also taken account of economic viability considerations.  What is now Policy 6 - Housing Quality - has been amended so now it does not seek developer contributions for improving existing housing.  Local planning authorities are encouraged by national policy to improve design and quality, internal space standards are part of this.  Paragraph 6.8 states: 'A separate Infrastructure Delivery Schedule itemises the essential strategic requirements as the first part of a full Infrastructure Delivery Plan that will be worked up alongside preparation of the Site Allocations Development Plan Documents and the development of a levy/tariff Standard Charging Schedule.' Further information is provided in Policy 2 (Infrastructure)  The intentions of what is now Policy 2 has taken account of the possible introduction of CIL.  What is now Policy 15 - Skills and Economic Inclusion - no longer seeks developer contributions for training.  What is now paragraph 5.27 state: The Infrastructure Delivery Schedule identifies the required essential strategic infrastructure - what it comprises and where it applies, when it will be needed as well as the likely providers and funding sources...Under each Site/Location below major additional infrastructure requirements are out, not all will require developer contributions (the Schedule makes this clear) and neither are minor public utility connection/diversion works referred to as

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
48	Highways Agency	<p>N.B. All comments made with regards to potential impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN).</p> <p>PCS1 - As potential development locations in the Preston Urban Area are accessible by a number of sustainable transport choices, support is given on the proviso that consultation is made on the impact of larger scale development and subsequent implications on the SRN - in particular on the fringes of Preston Urban Area which impact on the M6 bypassing Preston to the east. South Ribble Suburbs (Lostock Hall, Bamber Bridge and Walton le Dale) are located close to a number of junctions and development would have to be sustainable especially if larger trip generating sites.</p> <p>Leyland: Although PCS states development in Leyland will be town centre, its proximity to the M6 J28 will impact on SRN irrespective of town centre location. In the same way although supporting town centre development such as Chorley, large site allocations and town centre masterplans must be considered by the agency to eliminate impacts on the greater SRN.</p> <p>Urban and Rural Local Service Centres: Some locations referred to are close to the junction of the SRN so any development in these areas will have to ensure traffic implications are properly mitigated.</p> <p>New Growth Points - must be supported by a robust evidence base.</p> <p>PCS11 - Support for the development in Preston City Centre due to the accessibility of existing transport services. The Tithebarn Regeneration Area will also benefit by the relocation of Preston bus Station. Mixed use developments are supported as a way to reduce impact on SRN but a detailed and robust evidence base must be provided to support aspirations emerging and to reduce the need to travel by car. Agency supports Park &amp; Ride in principle but must be supported by detailed monitoring work.</p>	<p>Agency to be informed at all stages of development control process with regards to strategic sites and major town redevelopment so as to reduce impact on SRN. Development at Preston East and Millennium City Park Sites to be brought forward in a sustainable monitored manner so as to reduce already congested peak time areas.</p>			<p>these are a standard aspect of developing sites.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
49	Lancashire CPRE	<p>Introduction - good layman's description. Chapter 4 - diagrams look thorough but too complicated for easy reference. Key diagram - 3 city regions to be shown with contiguous boundaries as in the RSS. Sustainable Community Strategy Themes. Diagram(p34-5) - would benefit from simplification</p> <p>Green infrastructure diagram looks like a brownfield spatial diagram. A much fuller glossary (see RSS) would be of benefit and a consolidate bibliography with an online address directory. Welcome the presumption of no loss to green belt by 2026 and green ambitions of the vision and green city concept. Core Strategy should identify indicators and targets as concern over Govt and regional plans which emphasise economic growth.</p> <p>All targets for completion of SPD's to be set at no more than 3 years from now as without approval some preferred options will not be achieved by 2026.</p> <p>Chapter 6 - Support focus of investment on Brownfield sites but as no further preferred option on 'suburban protection' assume this means development limitations on back gardens. Suggest urgent production of SPD 'Character and setting of places' to avoid gardens being the "easy option" when economy upturns.</p> <p>Chapter 8 - policies to achieve affordable housing in rural areas welcomed however developer contributions will be difficult to achieve until economic upturn. Large site planning permissions to be approved first to help this affordability.</p> <p>Chapter 10 – support.</p> <p>Chapter 11 Agree but rural broadband provision critical to achieve this target. Para PCS13g to increase height of screening trees and density.</p> <p>Chapter 15 - park and ride areas not to be located in greenbelt or greenfield areas and efficacy to be demonstrated before new road infrastructure around Preston built. Clarify that new westerly bridging point of the Ribble will not be built.</p>	<p>Chapter 3 - Infrastructure improvements e.g Cottam should be covered in relevant theme chapters. Linking Whittingham strategic site (least sustainable of the 6 mentioned) to Broughton Bypass is not a reason for new road developments and infrastructure strengthening associated with Broughton traffic light improvements should be innovative enough to remove the need for a future bypass. Chapter 9 - analysis of economic drivers could be adjusted to make economic growth more sustainable.</p> <p>Chapter 14 - Peat bog protection should be in this chapter and not within table of Chapter 17. Clarify how areas of separation have been arrived at on the key diagram and the loss of any greenfield land should be compensated by an equivalent area of greenfield allocated as an area of separation.</p> <p>Chapter 15 - loss of linear green infrastructure following reuse of old railway lines would need to be replaced.</p>		<p>Planned health, well being and sense of place benefits of Green Infrastructure have been missed in many of the preferred options that propose built environment in this strategy. Core Strategy refers to greenfield use - clarify assumption that this is for sites with existing planning permission or already identified for development. If not the integrated site allocations map should be released early to enable public debate. Regional Spatial Strategy detailed policy requirements not reflected in Core Strategy.</p> <p>Chapter 3 - student population figures should be included, and para 3.7 refers to 3 bridging points into Preston from the south where there are actually 4 plus the M6</p> <p>Strategic sites - 6 sites on key diagram not all included on list on PCS11 and site definitions need rationalising.</p> <p>Chapter 7 - Detail as to the reuse of embodied energy in existing buildings</p> <p>Chapter 12- no mention of engaging tourists to use regional parks and focuses on town tourism more than rural areas.</p> <p>Chapter 16 - Indicators very impressive but need clarity on targets ahead of the final document. And local voluntary bodies should help deliver the targets to achieve better community buy in.</p>	<p>Policy 18, part (a) and paragraph 10.10 recognise the benefits of green infrastructure in all areas of "economic, social and environmental".</p> <p>Site specific detail of where new development and investment will be located will largely be set out in the subsequent Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p>The authorities will aim to complete SPD's as soon as possible.</p> <p>The number of students at the University of Central Lancashire is detailed in what is now paragraph 9.49: Skills and Economic Inclusion.</p> <p>Reference to road bridging points has now been removed.</p> <p>Noted - Sustainable Communities Strategy Themes diagram has been amended.</p> <p>What is now Chapter 5 (Spatial Portrait - Managing and Locating Growth) addresses the issue of the Growth Point in regard to housing.</p> <p>Garden development: Paragraph 8.15 state: 'National planning policy has now reclassified residential gardens as greenfield land.'</p> <p>The former Whittingham Hospital is no longer considered as a strategic location as it is not central to the delivery of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>What is now Chapter 12 (Tackling Climate Change) addresses climate change with regard to the built environment. Paragraph 12.11 (Existing Buildings) states: "Although the conversion or re-use of buildings may not require planning permission, it is important that the principles of good design and sustainable development are considered in order to reduce carbon dioxide emissions and enable them to cope more effectively with the impacts of climate change."</p> <p>Rural tourism is supported in what is now chapter 9: Delivering Economic Prosperity, Policy 13 (Rural Economy) b.</p> <p>The issue of peat bog protection is too</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
						<p>specific for a Core Strategy.</p> <p>In what is now chapter 10: Achieving Good Design, Policy 19 details Areas of Separation and Major Open Space.</p> <p>Policy 18 (c) reflects the loss of greenfield and linear green infrastructure.</p> <p>The Key Diagram will be amended to avoid suggestion of a new westerly bridging point of the Ribble.</p> <p>What is now Chapter 6 - Delivering Infrastructure and Policy 2 - Infrastructure details developer contributions.</p> <p>A full set of indicators and targets are set out in a separate Performance Monitoring Framework to accompany the publication version.</p> <p>Figure 4 (The North West in Context) now shows the three city regions with contiguous boundaries as in the RSS. Figure 8 (The Influence of Sustainable Community Strategies on the Core Strategy) is much more coherent and simplistic.</p> <p>The glossary has been added to.</p>
50	Government Office North West	<p>Recommend that review document and remove some of the background detail to enhance the message of the strategy. Some thematic sections contain info which should be kept as background evidence. State simply what evidence the Core Strategy is based upon, where it can be found and how it led to proposals within the Core Strategy. PCS1 to PCS9 read more like detailed policy approaches rather than preferred options and some contain inappropriate levels of detail e.g PCS13. Titles of the Preferred Options (inc in tables pages 149 to 155) should be included in document body above the text of each preferred option.</p> <p>a) Unclear as to the specific issues to be addressed. Strategic objectives appear to be general Sustainability Appraisal objectives rather than specifics arising from vision, and themes could apply anywhere</p> <p>b) Concerns regarding presentation of PCS1 (e mail JJ/SF 1.7.08). Para 6.22 offers reasons why others 'not favoured' but unclear as to why and no trace of source to Sustainability Appraisal despite links in I&amp;O2 paper.</p> <p>Appendix 1: Section on 'not favoured options 1 and 2' sets out predicted effects which are the same as those for 'preferred spatial option' Please confirm if correct. Chapter 6 does not correspond information with Appendix 1 and sub headings 6.1.6 &amp; 6.1.14 described as 'plan objectives' - should they be themes instead.</p> <p>Growth Point: Not embedded sufficiently in Core Strategy beyond the Growth Point chapter. Although early stage, Core Strategy should be transparent and reflect current expectations and outcomes. Scope to say more about robustness of preferred option and ability to deliver Growth Point.</p>	<p>A) The key issues could be brought out early on in the document and used to inform the vision and objectives which should be more location specific.</p> <p>B) Para 1.36 refers to Sustainability Appraisal but rest of document needs clarification as to how sustainability has informed the DPD content as your justification gave the Sustainability Appraisal as an important source for option choice.</p> <p>C) Thematic approach too generic - suggest more spatial/locational at next stage - applying all themes to areas rather than the other way round. Alternatively draw out some of the implications in an integrated way for key centres.</p> <p>D) PCS14: Clarify relationship Preston Leyland and Chorley have in hierarchical terms e.g. function.</p>	<p>Re: LDF soundness guidance - clarity needed as to how and why chosen approach opted for and audit trail to clearly show reasoning behind hybrid choice.</p> <p>Chapter 7 paragraph 7.11 - consider scope to develop the issue of adaptation to effects of climate change</p> <p>PCS8 - In givens, RSS housing requirements shown to 2021 but would expect to see figures to end of Core Strategy - 2026 with indication of the strategic direction for location of new housing.</p> <p>PCS9 - When formulating affordable housing policy, bear in mind provisions of PPS3 paragraph 29 (see rep for detailed response)</p>	<p>Chapter 7: If map (p48) to be retained suggest text to explain reasons for inclusion e.g. proposed policy approach to wind energy development in landscapes sensitive to development</p> <p>PCS2 - although PCS2 paragraph b sets out to reduce carbon emissions the Core Strategy should set out a target percentage in line with PPS1 Para 26</p> <p>PCS15: More detail needed on the nature of health issues in the area and benefits of walking/cycling in relation to these health issues</p> <p>Chapter 16: Confirmation of detail as to what infra to be provided and who will be responsible - PPS12 paragraph 4.8.</p>	<p>The Strategic Objectives have been reworded and are now more locally distinctive.</p> <p>Paragraphs 1.15 to 1.19 give further clarification as to why some strategic sites/locations were chosen and other not. There is also a background topic paper on the matter.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) has been fully integrated into the plan making process of the Core Strategy and has helped inform the choice of policies. At the Issues and Options stage each option was tested against the SA Framework. The results of the Issues and Options testing and the recommendations made in the SA informed the choice of Preferred Options. A number of small changes made in this Publication stage have been assessed in the SA to ensure no negative effects would arise from implementing these policies. All chapters, five to twelve, have reference to the SA within a text box.</p> <p>Cross cutting themes have been introduced across the Publication Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Growth Point is now embedded throughout the document.</p> <p>The Vision and Policy 17 (Design of New Buildings) discuss the position of climate change adaptation</p> <p>Policy 27 (Sustainable Resources and New Developments) now included a target percentage for a reduction in carbon emissions.</p> <p>The likely distribution of housing development is detailed in what is now paragraph 5.20. A housing trajectory is included in what is now Chapter 8 (Homes for All) – Figure 11.</p> <p>The policies in the Publication Core Strategy fully reflect the roles and future potential of Preston City Centre and Leyland and Chorley Town Centres.</p> <p>Policy 11(Retail and Town Centre Uses and Business Based Tourism) now clarifies the retail hierarchy.</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
						<p>What are now paragraphs 11.3 and 11.4 detail public health issues common to all three Districts.</p> <p>There is a separate document, the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule, accompanying the Core Strategy publication version.</p> <p>The Core Strategy, publication version, has been revised and much of the background detail will now be included within background topic papers.</p>
51	Blackpool Council	<p>Vision to establish Preston as an alternative to Manchester and Liverpool raises the city above the level of that established by the RSS. RSS places Manchester and Liverpool as 1st priority for growth followed by inner areas surrounding the regional centres. The 3rd priority is towns/cities in the 3 city regions, which includes Preston, but also Blackpool, Burnley and Blackburn.</p> <p>PCS (givens p94) states that RSS identifies Preston as a centre for higher order retailing and services yet Policy W5 of RSS establishes a hierarchy in the NW and CLCR2 makes no reference to Higher Order retailing</p> <p>PCS14 commits to development of Tithebarn scheme but this is considered to be of excessive scale and contrary to the provisions of the national planning policy and newly adopted RSS. It is also thought to have an unacceptable adverse impact on the viability and vitality of other centres and to lack robust supporting assessment. In pursuing a vision for Preston that is contrary to RSS, the PCS is considered to be unsound and as such an inappropriate basis for a Submission Core Strategy.</p> <p>This stance sets out the combined officer view of the 3 Fylde Coast Authorities</p>				<p>Cross boundary issues have been taken into account in paragraph 3.10, stating "The Core Strategy takes account of cross-boundary issues with neighbouring districts outside of Central Lancashire. The issues identified are...</p> <p>- The scale of retail growth envisaged for Preston City Centre;"</p> <p>Paragraph 3.13 also details the scale of retail growth envisaged is to be appropriate given the evidence of need and regeneration requirements of Preston City Centre.</p> <p>Paragraphs 9.20 and 9.21 detail appropriate development and investment in Preston City Centre.</p> <p>The wording of the Publication vision has been amended, detailing Preston as AN alternative to Manchester and Liverpool - not THE alternative as previously stated.</p>
52	Preston Moor Park Congregation of Jehova's Witnesses	<p>Spatial Vision: Support statement and reference to PPS12 but suggest community facilities be detailed rather than alluded to.</p> <p>Strategic Objectives: Support the 3 headings and related objectives. 'Social' - second objective should emphasise the need for facilities in deprived areas but not to the exclusion of other areas. Include 'for everyone' in latter part of statement</p> <p>Community Activities: Highly commended. Strongly recommend place of worship be specifically included in paragraph 13.22 (see PPS1 Para 16)</p>				<p>Publication Core Strategy Policies 12, 24 and 25 cover various community facilities and activities.</p> <p>What is now Strategic Objective 18 now reads: To improve the health and wellbeing of all Central Lancashire's residents and reduce the health inequalities that affect the more deprived urban areas, particularly Inner East Preston.</p> <p>Paragraph 11.15 currently discusses "churches and other religious organisations."</p>
53	Chorley Branch of the Ramblers Association	<p>PCS8: New housing should not be built in Central Lancashire to provide capacity for overflow populations e.g. Manchester</p> <p>PCS11: Central Lancashire to restrict growth to meet the need of Central Lancashire, provide jobs for residents (inc higher level for graduate attraction) and new and green industry should draw on labour from within not without Central Lancashire.</p> <p>PCS16: Insufficient emphasis given to walking and cycling.</p> <p>PCS22: Support this but are disappointed that indicators do not specifically include reference to public footpaths separate from motorised routes</p> <p>Perhaps the detail covers what appear to us to be some gaps in the strategy. It is not easy to read. Seems to have been put together for people who already have a good level of knowledge of development strategies to follow.</p> <p>Disappointed with the paucity of the number of comments by those who are being consulted.</p> <p>How have you consulted with local people and what measures have you taken to ensure that the views of local people on the wide range of issues covered in the CS have been considered?</p>		We do not have access to the detail of the performance measures covered by the indicators.	<p>PCS16: Insufficient emphasis given to walking and cycling. Promotion of walking and cycling through health advice, taster guided walks, cycle routes and development of linear routes from urban centres with public transport for the return journey</p> <p>PCS25: Promotional information re parks and walking/cycling routes and inclusion to encourage one of the Central Lancashire towns to pursue 'Walkers are welcome' status which in turn increases trade.</p> <p>PCS28: Walking to be included as a mode of travel</p>	<p>A full set of indicators are set out in the Performance Monitoring Framework to accompany the publication Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Core Strategy Issues and Options Paper 1 was published in Dec 06 and had an engagement stage that concluded in March 07. Following on from the principles set out in the authorities Statements of Community Involvement, the consultation was undertaken using various methods including: a dedicated website, leaflets delivered to majority of households and also made available in authorities' libraries and Council offices. Presentations by officers at community groups, public "drop-in" forums and articles placed in Lancashire Evening Post and other local community newspapers.</p> <p>The Core Strategy Issues and Options Paper 2 consultation period was from 2nd Nov 07 to 31st Jan 08. Again, advertisements were placed in each authority's local newspapers and letters sent to individuals and organisations on the authorities' shared consultation database.</p> <p>The consultation for the Preferred Option Core Strategy (30th Sept 08 - 19th Dec 08) included: a series of organised events and</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
						<p>other meetings attended, paper engagement, electronic engagement and media publicity.</p> <p>New housing will be built to support the population of Central Lancashire and its housing market.</p> <p>Graduate attraction and retention is supported by encouraging positive links with the University of Central Lancashire and a variety of economic uses as part of sustainable economic growth. Detailed in Policies 9, 10 and 14.</p> <p>In what is now chapter 7 - Catering for Sustainable Travel - walking and cycling are addressed.</p> <p>A full set of indicators and targets is provided in a separate Performance Monitoring Framework to accompany the Core Strategy at Publication stage.</p> <p>Wording amendments and the re-order of paragraphs have been made to Chapter 7 and Policy 3 (Travel) to illustrate the importance of walking and cycling in the hierarchy.</p>
54	Agent on behalf of individual	Chapter 6 Locating Growth, P41, Paragraph 6.14 PCS1: The Core Strategy document acknowledges that Longridge serves areas to the north and east of Preston and could be developed westwards to serve Central Lancashire. Longridge is categorised as a key service centre. As a key service centre it also serves the areas within the Borough of Ribble Valley. The town centre of Longridge is close to the borough boundary and continued expansion eastwards will increase the artificial skew of new development in an eastwards direction. We welcome the statement that Longridge could be developed westwards into Central Lancashire.			Para 6.14 acknowledges the need to take account of cross boundary issues with neighbouring districts (Longridge) but should be noted that expansion will involve greenfield development due to a lack of brownfield sites on both sides of the Borough boundary. Commitment to be shown that greenfield development westwards at Longridge will be acceptable.	No change. This will be assessed through the Site Allocations DPD process.
55	Homes and Communities Agency	Terminology in terms of brownfield and previously developed land should be consistent and if a distinction intended then explained in the glossary. Chapter 6: PCS1 - Supports growth and investment on brownfield sites and key regeneration areas, and release of some greenfield on urban fringe areas where contributes to sustainable growth as part of Growth Point initiative. Principle of encouraging growth of key service centres to maintain community quality also supported. SEE DETAILED SITE SPECIFIC REPRESENTATION re inclusion of sites at Eastway and Kingsfold. Chapter 7 - supports PCS2/3/4/5 Chapter 8: Supports the strategic objective core but would like to see the need for high quality sustainable new homes expressed with the need to improve existing stock. Supports PCS7 and PCS8 and its 6yr land supply on a 3 year rolling programme. Also full support for PCS9/10. Chapter 9 - supports. Central Lancashire is strategically located and this underpins the success of high growth of jobs however there is an important balance to be struck given proximity to East Lancashire where regeneration is essential to maintaining communities. Support for PCS11 and the inclusion of the Cuerden Regional Investment Site. Chapter 10: Support -as in addressing the problem of affordability employment where maximum income potential is needed to allow access to the housing market. Chapter 12: support the need for vibrant towns to support the communities they serve and contribute towards reducing travel need. Also supports PCS14 in particular the inclusion of support for a district centre at Cottam.	Support PCS12 and 13 in principle but justification and detail on size of contribution and development type should be amplified. Where contributions are sought towards new health facilities there should be reference to the source of amplified guidance e.g SPD, Tariff etc to support Chapter 13: Supports in principle but good design is important for crime reduction yet contributes to social exclusion. Please refer to the Urban Design Compendium PCS27 is unclear - should 'rewarded' be transposed with 'required'. Chapter 15 - support PCS28 however at (b)(ii) the intention of 'providing high occupancy road lanes into Preston whilst the need to manage traffic and incentivisation of shared trips is supported, the implementation and policing of HVO lanes needs to take into account the best and most economic use of available road space (sic. Unsure of exact meaning)		Chapter 2: Core Strategy to reflect upon changes to the Planning Bill and establishment of HCA (see rep for details). In moving forward clarify how the Core Strategy/joint authorities mean to proceed - either by Community Infrastructure Levy or standardised charging mechanism supported by a clear and evidenced SPD	Support noted.  Terminology will now only relate to "brownfield land" and all references to "previously developed land" have been excluded.  Strategic sites are detailed in Policy 1 - Locating Growth.  The chapter devoted to design (Chapter 10) refers to the Building in Context concept to promote best practice.  In the first line of what is now Policy 17 (Design of New Buildings) Wording has been amended from "rewarded" to "expected".  What is now paragraph 6.8 states: "A separate Infrastructure Delivery Schedule itemises the essential strategic requirements as the first part of the full Infrastructure Delivery Plan that will be worked up alongside preparation of the Site Allocations Development Plan Documents and the development of a levy/tariff Standard Charging Schedule." What is now Policy 3 (Travel) has been recast to be clear.
56	Trustees of T H Kevill	Broadly support the Core Strategy but do not wish to comment on individual sections. Representation made with regards to suitability of site at Clayton Gate Drive, Lostock Hall				Suitability of sites for development will be examined through the Site Allocations DPD process.
57	Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Manchester and North Merseyside	Chapter 14: Parks: Ribble Coast and Wetlands regional park is not to our knowledge recognised by Natural England as a potential National Park. Biodiversity: Policy in general welcomed but does not make it clear how reference to 'local wildlife sites' in policy EM1 RSS to be translated into LDF policy as there is no joint structure plan at sub regional level. Chapter 14 p120 Biological Heritage Sites are not just locally important but nationally/internationally. 'Local' now used to mean 'locally designated' and not of 'local value' Chapter 7: Map p48 does not provide a full picture and risk that it may be used to infer suitability. Also only considers landscape conservation (see rep for detailed omissions). Chapter 7 P57: Policy wording is ambiguous and contradictory.(see detailed explanatory notes). Chapter 7 p56: Text of PCS3b omits non statutory	Chapter 14: Parks: Delete 'is recognised as a National Park' sentence 1 Para 14.26. Biodiversity: If reference to Biological Heritage sites paragraph 14.9 constitutes sufficient underpinning for the BHS system as the preferred mechanism to deliver PCS21 we support. If not please refer specifically in PCS21 text. Chapter 14 p120: Delete 'regionally' and replace with 'sub regionally', delete important and replace with 'designated'. Chapter 7: Map p48 - other constraints to be added and recognition to be added that water management and flood risk measures to start in the uplands. Past		Chapter 14 p120: UK Govt's guidance of Local Site systems has been omitted from list of givens ( <a href="http://www.defra.gov.uk/wildlife-countryside/ewd/local-sites/localsites.pdf">www.defra.gov.uk/wildlife-countryside/ewd/local-sites/localsites.pdf</a> )  Missing information: Restoration and maintenance of a functional Biological Record Centre for administrative Lancashire, Establishment of a sustained Local Sites monitoring programme for Lancashire, compliant with Defra guidance Establishment of continuity resource for Lancashire-related	The authorities recognise the Ribble Coast and Wetlands Regional Park is not a potential national park and have amended the text accordingly.  Paragraph 10.21: No change to "regional". "Designated" has replaced "important"  Wording has been amended in what is now paragraph 10.21 with regard to Biological Heritage sites and the introduction of Geological Heritage sites.

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
		sites as identified in NI197 compromising local authority ability to monitor local outputs and contribute to NI197 monitoring.	measures increase the impacts of storm events. Chapter 7 P57: Policy must decide if short/medium term benefits to agriculture productivity outweigh the harm to potential future agriculture production. Although short term food production benefits in the current climate may be perceived to outweigh long term outcomes food production loss in the future should be considered. Consider 'take account of the potential of soils to sustain current and future food production and their roles in flood management (inland and coastal) and carbon storage and capture when considering agricultural and other forms of development' Chapter 7 p56: Reword to include reference to Biological and Geological heritage sites.		input into the UK Biodiversity Action Recording System (BARS).	Agricultural food production issues are too detailed for a Core Strategy.  The Core Strategy is informed by evidence on the complete water cycle  Biological Heritage Sites are now referenced in paragraph 10.21.  "Givens" are not included in the Publication Core Strategy.
58	Bovis Homes Ltd	Broad support for the document however objections made for the following: PCS7/PCS9e/PCS12b/PCS16a/PCS20b/PCS29 All above relate to provision of financial contributions. Preferred Core Strategy does not take into account economic circumstances and scheme viability when requiring developer contributions and the way infrastructure projects are identified by Local Authorities.	Policies should include reference to the fact that contributions only required when tests of policy as per circular 05/2005 are met.			What is now Policy 2 – Infrastructure – sets out the authorities' position on developer contributions, including economic viability.
59	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Comments made specifically with relation to interest in land at Hoyles Lane, Preston. Strong support for greenfield release requirement however PCS1 remains too vague and needs rewriting to identify broad locations for contribution to ensure soundness as per PPS12. PCS8 Para 8.20: strongly supported but paragraph 2.80 raises doubts as to whether there is a 5yr supply in Preston (appeal decision). In the current economic climate many sites proposed are no longer viable and unlikely to come forward in 5 yrs. Reliance on previously developed sites is flawed and should be reconsidered as greenfield development will need presumably to be brought forward earlier than expected. Constraints in availability in Preston would logically aim for an urban extension to the North where substantial infrastructure exists. Objections to the appropriateness of housing land strategy given the available evidence base. Growth Point development programme should form part of this evidence and be made available as should the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment for scrutiny by third parties. Lack of evidence clearly makes policies unsound.	PCS1a unclear as to whether greenfield development in north Preston relates exclusively to committed land at Cottam or additional land elsewhere. Core Strategy lacking flexibility to respond to current market situations. And not considered to be consistent with national policy (PPS3 para33 annexe C).			The wording of what is now Policy 1 (Locating Growth) has been changed: "(a) The Preston/South Ribble Urban Area comprising... - The northern suburbs of Preston, focussing on local centres, with greenfield development within the Cottam Strategic Location."  Land at Higher Bartle (off Hoyles Lane) is less sustainable than that at Cottam and is unlikely to be required for residential development. The Strategic Sites and locations background Topic Paper covers this in more detail.  Availability of land for housing is dealt with through the SHLAA process.  What are now Chapter 5 (Spatial Strategy- Managing and Locating Growth) and Policy 1 (Locating Growth) have been revised. Implementation of this policy will be pursued through the Site Allocations DPDs.  Ongoing work on the SHLAA has fed into and informed the Core Strategy preparation. The latest SHLAA report is available for viewing alongside the Publication Core Strategy.  The Publication Core Strategy has thoroughly incorporated the evidence base, flexibility and deliverability into the document.
60	Environment Agency	Although understand why thematic approach has been pursued. Chapters 7 and 14 will influence the way other themes progressed. Pleased to see emphasis on sustainability in Preferred Core Strategy but have some concerns on Chapter 7 Feel that evidence should be provided by developers to show site suitability with regards to contaminated land.	Para 7.14 - 7.20 - support but please refer to water resource efficiency in one of the preferred options (maybe PCS2) PCS4: PPS25 states inappropriate development to be avoided in flood risk areas. Point c should reflect this. PCS4 (f) refers to Sustainable Drainage Systems but does not show how to be achieved. Recommend SuDS unless inappropriate but feel United Utilities should be consulted further. Support options set out in Chapter 14 but reference to green infrastructure should be cross referenced with Chapter 7			The Publication Core Strategy has introduced Cross-Cutting Themes which include "Tackling Climate Change" and "Achieving Good Design".  What is now Policy 29 – Water Management – and justification text concerns water management, as does Policy 17 (k) – Design of New Buildings.  No change has been made to what is now Policy 29 (d). No change has been made to what is now Policy 29 (g) regarding Sustainable Drainage Systems, however detail is provided in the supporting text (paragraph 12.18).  Introduction of Cross-Cutting Themes which include "Tackling Climate Change" and "Achieving Good Design."
61	Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council	Growth Point: Although it is acknowledged that Growth Point bid was driven by timetables which fit poorly with Development Plan Document process, the Preferred Core Strategy is inadequate in its level of details re the Growth Point agenda. Creation of a Core Strategy which is flexible enough to accommodate Growth Point when and if it emerges is inappropriate since development under	At the very least Core Strategy should have a 'what if' scenario explaining different levels for Growth Point inclusion/omission Preferred Core Strategy appears light in reference to cross boundary issues and does not explain how it	Would welcome the chance to discuss strategic infrastructure issues that may go beyond the Central Lancashire area in particular the developer contribution levy.		The Core Strategy takes full account of the Growth Point but also the economic recession. This is detailed in following paragraphs 2.12, 5.9-5.13, 8.5-8.6.

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
		Growth Point is a different strategy and would need to be subject to proper scrutiny. PCS refers to partial RSS review and possible scrutiny proposals however objection is made in that it represents tacit approval for increased development under Growth Point without sufficient LDF process scrutiny. Centre Hierarchy: Considered that the establishment of Preston as an alternative to Manchester and Liverpool raises the city above the level of that established by the RSS. PCS14 (gives p94) gives explicit support for the proposed Tithebarn retail scheme. The proposed Tithebarn development is considered to be of an excessive scale and contrary to the provisions of newly adopted RSS. It would also have an unacceptable adverse impact on the viability and vitality of Blackburn Town Centre.	might or might not fit into activity and strategy elsewhere.			The Vision has now been amended, detailing Preston as "an alternative to destination to Manchester and Liverpool..." Paragraph 3.10 states: "The Core Strategy takes account of cross-boundary issues with neighbouring districts outside of Central Lancashire. The issues identified are: - The scale of retail growth envisaged for Preston City Centre..." The wording regarding the Tithebarn has now been amended and no longer refers to the specific Tithebarn proposal - paragraphs 9.20 and 9.21.
62	Harrow Estates	Page71: Policy shows affordable housing of 20/30% on market housing schemes with 30% minimum in rural areas but is inconsistent with the North West Regional Housing Market Assessment which results in a need of less than 10% affordable housing in the area. Developers should not be required to contribute to environmental improvements in existing housing unless demonstrated that works are reasonably related in accordance circular 05/2005. Chapter 6 p43-45: support as consistent with national policy. Climate change p56: Clarify whether renewable/low carbon energy sources to be provided on or off site. On site provision would place unduly onerous requirements on developers in particular in small schemes	Para A PCS8: Add the words 'at least' after 'providing' in sentence 1 and refer to Para 54 of PPS3 Reduce affordable housing requirement to 10% Climate Change: policy wording to include element of flexibility in case of lack of feasibility of viability		Section 8 Housing: PPS3 para 54 discusses need for 5yr land supply but policy and supporting text do not make reference to the need for this supply The evidence base should include a SHMAA and an assessment of economic viability (PPS3 para 29) Policy makes no reference to up to date SHMAA to inform affordable housing requirements or viability assessment.	What is now Policy 27 (Sustainable Resources and New Developments) sets out the authorities' position on sustainable resources and new development.  What was PCS7b has now been removed from the Core Strategy. The evidence base now related to a housing viability study and SHMA, specifically paragraph 8.34 and 8.35.  What is now Policy 7 (Affordable Housing) has been amended and is now consistent with national policy. There will be an affordable housing SPD to give further detail. The evidence base now relates to a housing viability study and SHMA, specifically paragraph 8.26 and 8.27.  What is now Policy 4 (Housing Delivery) (c) states: "supports a continuous forward looking 5 year supply in each authority from the start of each annual monitoring period..."
63	Christopher Pugh Property Consultants Ltd	N.B. Comments made refer specifically to site at Coppull Enterprise Centre. PCS8: It is important that the Core Strategy is flexible enough to allow sufficient land to deliver increased housing when/if Growth Point achieved. PCS1: Support is given to the inclusion and development of Local Service Centres including Coppull. Recognition of the need to provide housing development within such locations is commended and it is important that it is recognised in the final Core Strategy document. PCS11: No objection to points (b) to (e) but criterion (f) should be less rigid towards the release and protection of sites identified within the Employment Land Review if housing targets are to be achieved.				Site specific suitability will be dealt with through the Site Allocations process.  The Core Strategy takes full account of the Growth Point but also the economic recession, especially paragraphs 5.9 to 5.13.  What is now Policy 10 (Employment Premises and Sites) has been reworded for clarification, however, there has been no amendment to the sentiment of what was criterion (f) in PCS11. The protection of employment sites is a key priority where they are appropriate and a need.
64	Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	N.B. Comments made specifically with regards to land at Bee Lane, Penwortham Chapter 6: Fully support the aims of the Preferred Option in relation to the growth and investment in Central Lancashire. Preferred option makes specific reference to the fact that Penwortham could support some greenfield development. Located to the south of Preston the area represents a realistic opportunity for a sustainable urban extension to support the key aim of PCS1. Delivery of the proposed site will have far reaching impact with benefits beyond the local level and without would be no feasible alternatives for an east-west link or circular ring road to be delivered, which in turn help to accelerate the focus of growth around the core of the Preston urban area. Chapter 7: Welcome the approach as reflects national and regional planning guidance. Chapter 8: Welcome the approach to provide a 6 yr supply of land, bring forward mixed use sites and the potential to allow flexibility in case objectives not achievable. Chapter 9: Whilst we support the approach of PCS11 in relation to balanced communities, it is not necessary to specifically identify the Penwortham sites alongside established employment sites. Chapter 14: PCS24 refers to designation of 'areas of separation' and we recommend clarification of the specific areas proposed in particular those between Bamber Bridge, Penwortham and Lostock Hall. Whilst we support the need for countryside protection where appropriate the opportunity to provide for a genuine sustainable extension in proximity to Preston City Centre should not be compromised. Chapter 15: Large commuting pattern from South Ribble to Preston has placed tremendous pressure on the road infrastructure in particular Penwortham. We support PCS28 (h) iii which refers to the A582 and link to the A59 of which the Bee Lane area forms a part and which will offer a major way of enhancing public and private transport networks.			The preferred option (PCS9) makes no reference to the SHMA required by PPS3 and we recommend that specific reference is made with regards to the relationship between future delivery of affordable housing.	Site specific comments will be dealt with through the Site Allocations Development Plan Document process.  What is now Policy 1 (Locating Growth) includes a reference to "some greenfield development" at Penwortham but the Core Strategy does not propose a Strategic Site or location at Bee Lane (Pickering's Farm) Kingsfold as there are a range of sites in the vicinity that could help meet housing and employment needs. It is considered these issues are best resolved through the Site Allocations Development Plan process. The Strategic Sites and Locations Background Topic Paper covers the matter in more detail.  What is now chapter 8 (Homes for all) and Policy 4 (Housing density) clause (c) is in conformity with national policy and seeks "a continuous forward looking 5 year supply..." The evidence base now relates to a housing viability study and SHMA, specifically paragraphs 8.26 and 8.27.  No Penwortham sites are included within what are now: Policy 9 (Economic growth and employment) and Policy 10 (Employment premises and sites).  What is now Policy 19 (Areas of Separation

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
						and Major Open Space) has been reworded for clarification.
65	Mawdelsley Parish Council	<p>Decline in local business growth has led people to seek employment outside the local community which in turn increases transport and infrastructure needs, encourages migration to where employment is more readily available and as this is often the choice of younger members dictates the local age profile. This affects the level of services provided e.g dentists, doctors etc.</p> <p>Out of town shopping centres have thrown strain on road and transport links and the rural environment means that competition amongst home buyers has forced the price of available stock to such a height that locals are prohibited to buy on affordability grounds. Affordable housing is essential but to avoid local opposition must include consultation from the onset with parish representatives.</p>	The impact of the items noted has not been fully recognised by the Core Strategy.		The inclusion of an integrated set of policies which would address the need for improved transportation links, business support and affordable housing so as to sustain the rural economy and associated communities.	<p>What is now Policy 13 (Rural Economy) seeks to encourage a sustainable rural economy.</p> <p>What is now Policy 11 (Retail and town centre uses and business based tourism) details "retail and town centre uses will be delivered in the following ways :...( f) resisting further expansion of out-of-centre retail parks..."</p> <p>The Core Strategy policies will be used together to determine planning applications - paragraph 1.5.</p> <p>The Core Strategy has an integrated set of policies covering, amongst other matters transport links, business support and affordable housing.</p>
66	Bellway Homes Ltd	<p>PCS8: support wording but ask for more bullet points to make it easy to read.</p> <p>PCS9: Volume of supporting text excessive and should be edited. Locating growth and investment: Support the agenda embodied in the Preferred Core Strategy and seek to assist in its delivery. Preferred Spatial Option is stated as a hybrid and as such support elements within which had been option 3.</p> <p>Also support PCS1's identification of Leyland as a key centre as consider that it is able to deliver sustainable growth. No justification has been put forward to support the release of some greenfield development on fringes of main urban areas and it can only be assumed that urban extensions are the most sustainable form of Greenfield development. This is not always the case. Chapter 7: PCS2 states that all new dwellings will be required to meet level 3 of the sustainable homes code goes well beyond national guidance and inconsistent with national policy and RSS. Govt will roll out code and Core Strategy must not go beyond that timetable. SHLAA is an important piece of evidence and should be realistic of market conditions and site deliverability. PCS7: Clarification as to level of contribution towards the improvement of existing and empty dwellings and recommend that the chapter leads with PCS8 as it will be the role of new homes to deliver the growth agenda.</p> <p>Also object to item (b) of PCS7 as this is beyond the reasonable scope of a S106 agreement. Please delete. It is important that the Core Strategy supports the delivery of new homes and the development industry at this difficult time with the economic viability of the schemes looked upon favourably in the short term. PCS8: Please amend criteria (a) from deliverable land to 'available' deliverable land and although support the 6 yr supply, policy should refer to beyond that period e.g. 7-12 years and seek to identify strategic land.</p>	<p>Consider that existing strategic sites (along with proposed new ones) are specifically referred to in text of PCS1 a in the case of the Preston Urban Area and key service and local centres. It currently remains unclear within the policy and this is unsatisfactory.</p> <p>Recommend that sentence 'some greenfield development required on fringes of main urban area' be amended to include 'and other locations subject at all times to sustainable development being satisfactorily demonstrated'. Recommend plan making authorities consider new policy to support the delivery of new homes in the early part of the period e.g. 1st 5 yrs or add a statement onto PCS8</p>		No reference as to whether PCS1 will apply a sequential approach to site selection. This should be clearly stated in the policy and the focus should be on the delivery of growth as CL priority in accordance with RSS and RES. SHLAA should be referenced in Chapter 8. PCS9: Criteria c) should include a rural exceptions policy to enable locally afforded homes.	<p>The Core Strategy takes full account of the Growth Point but also the economic recession. This is particularly detailed in paragraphs 5.9 to 5.13.</p> <p>Strategic sites are identified in Policy 1 (Locating growth). The former Whittingham Hospital site is no longer considered to be a Strategic Site. What is now paragraph 9.18 states: "Former Whittingham Hospital has now been excluded from [what is now] Policy 9 as it is only proposed to have a small proportion of non-residential development."</p> <p>Site specific matters will be dealt with through the Site Allocation Development Plan Document Process.</p> <p>What is now Policy 27 (Sustainable Resources and New Developments) is consistent with national policy.</p> <p>The evidence base now relates to a housing viability study and SHMAA, specifically paragraphs 8.26 and 8.27.</p> <p>The reference to developer contributions for improvements to existing housing stock has now been removed.</p> <p>What was PCS8(c) has now been removed from the policy.</p> <p>PCS8(a) - no inclusion of the word "available".</p> <p>The wording of what is now Policy 4 (c) has been changed to "providing a continuous forward looking 5 year supply in each authority..."</p> <p>The Core Strategy has been streamlined for the publication version.</p>
67	Council for British Archaeology North West Regional Group	<p>Welcome vision sentence (p4) re retention of village identities and historic and built heritage. Also value below ground archaeology, natural environment and historic buildings being treated together and that their social benefits are appreciated and Para 14.36 should serve as a model for others.</p> <p>PCS26 disappointing - although (b) refers to heritage asset enhancement, the rest of the option simply seeks to avoid damage and the options on the whole are vague. The document appreciates the historic environment and understands its value but has yet to exploit it in a sustainable way</p>				<p>What is now Policy 16 (Heritage Assets) has been slightly updated in line with PPS5.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
68	Agent on behalf of landowner	N.B. Comments made specifically re site suggestion for Cypress Close, Clayton Le Woods. Broad support but do not wish to comment on specific sections				Site specific details will be dealt with through the Site Allocations process.
69	The Theatres Trust	<p>PCS19 Culture and Entertainment: Welcome this policy and any element which requires protection and promotion of cultural facilities for the future. Theatres/performing arts are required elements of a sustainable community and provide social, cultural environmental and economic benefits. They also play a major part towards the towns cultural infrastructure</p> <p>PCS29 Developer Contributions: We support the CS policy to show an overall approach to developer contributions with appropriate reference to strategic sites</p>				Noted. The relevant Policy is now 12 – Culture and Entertainment Facilities.

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
		and clear links set out in an accompanying SPD.				
70	Bee Lane Consortium (private landowners)	N.B. Comments made specifically with Bee Lane/Flag Lane/Lords Lane site suggestion in mind. Please refer DTZ representation for Taylor Wimpey PCS 64 - complete agreement with comments made. Note should be made that this site if brought forward will benefit from the provision of the Cross Borough Link Road.				Site specific details will be dealt with through the Site Allocations DPD process. Policy 3 (Travel) clause (h)(ii) refers to "completing a new road from Walton Park, through Bamber Bridge to Lostock Hall."
71	National Trust	Spatial Vision: Overarching vision is not sufficiently environmentally or climate change focussed and states only that heritage will be retained but not enhanced (PPG15/16). New development should reinforce local characteristics. Strategic Objectives & Climate change: fully addresses issues and unlike vision incorporates key considerations re: heritage value and landscape character, climate change issues and prudent use of natural resources Retail and Tourism: Object as only deals with tourism issues of major cities and not those heritage and land based tourisms. Biodiversity/Environment: Overall approach welcomed and supported however reference to green infrastructure is too narrow a focus. Approach should identify the wider benefits from green spaces (health, wildlife, space to breath etc)	Vision: amend second paragraph to read 'the city towns and villages will retain their individual identities with historic and built heritage being protected and enhanced, and valued local distinctiveness being reinforced in new development' Add new paragraph: 'a positive response will have been made to the threat of climate change by reducing emissions through lessening the need to travel, improving public transport and facilities for pedestrians and cyclists, reducing energy use, addressing flood risk issues and enabling species to adapt to those changes that are now unavoidable' Retail & Tourism: Policy should be added to enable tourism other than major city to be able to thrive thus adding to the well being of the area and improving image. It should also recognise that on site or adjacent facilities are a normal but important part of attractions and deemed essential. Paragraph: needs adding 'modest retail and refreshment facilities will be supported at site specific tourist attractions provided they do not adversely impact upon the special qualities of that location' Biodiversity: Add to the policy after the opening sentence 'a) promote the multifunctional potential of green spaces'	As previously stated		The Vision has been reworded and now includes reference to the importance of climate change mitigation and adaptation. Local characteristics are supported through what is now Policy 16 (Heritage Assets) (b).  What is now Policy 12 deals with Heritage based tourism and what is now Policy 13 deals with rural based tourist activities.  The benefits of green infrastructure are discussed within what are now paragraphs 10.10 and 10.11 and Policy 18 (a).
72	The Coal Authority	Chapter 14: Built Environment. As Central Lancashire has been subjected to coal mining, the legacy left behind must be considered when promoting development. Public safety and stability, gas emission, spontaneous combustion, water discharge etc may all be triggered by development activity and the provision of green infrastructure and rather than being a constraint it can be argued that mining legacy matters have been addressed and the site is therefore safe, stable and sustainable As Chorley has coal resources the coal board will seek extraction before sterilization by development which will remove land instability but must be noted as it affects development itself.	1) a relevant reference in Chapter 14 to PPG14 which is related to the need to raise awareness of potential safety hazards arising from mining legacy. This issue has not been referenced as part of the evidence base or 'givens' 2) Additional text in Chapter 14 which refers to 'Central Lancashire area has previously experienced mining activities which have left an environment legacy. This has the potential to lead to public safety hazards unless there is awareness and matters have been appropriately treated. The Central Lancashire Core Strategy seeks to ensure that land is thoroughly investigated for mining legacy problems which are then appropriately treated to ensure future development is safe and stable.			This is not a strategic matter and will be assessed through the Site Allocations DPD process.
73	University of Central Lancashire	Consider how the links between themes are articulated. Welcome the spatial vision and strategic objectives for addressing issues of recruitment and retention and quality of life issues. UCLAN appreciate recognition within the document of its various roles and support balancing the 2 spatial priorities with sense of community and quality of life. The most significant objective for retention is the provision of a wide range of job opportunities, business start ups and would welcome the inclusion of good quality 'start up ' premises and employment opportunities. It should be noted that as nearly half of students in the area are part time or mature, help in this area should be specified. Despite our support it is key however that a balanced portfolio of development plans apply over and beyond the Tithebarn and monitoring and review processes builds in a degree of foresight.				Noted.  Details of the Tithebarn Regeneration Areas are provided in paragraphs 9.20 and 9.21.  Cross-cutting themes have been introduced in the Publication version to illustrate the links between each chapter. The Core Strategy requires the need for a broad portfolio of sites for business uses.
74	Northwest Regional Development Agency	Instead of describing Preston as the alternative to Manchester, suggest vision is rewritten in a more positive way. Strategic objectives broadly supported. Growth Point: Chapter 5 needs updating to reflect housing no longer being considered as part of RSS partial review and to note Growth Point progress. Locating Growth: Support the focus on brownfield sites and key regeneration areas but question the inclusion of 'key service centre Longridge'. As agency currently reviewing strategic site list it reserves its position on the strategic site elements of PCS1 pending the outcome of the review. Climate Change: welcome changes. Housing: PCS7 - question appropriateness of requirement for developer to contribute to existing housing improvements or the encouragement of empty house conversion for other uses as lost dwellings would have to be replaced. PCS12 - This will help to deliver RES objectives and is therefore supported. PCS13: Various proposals welcomed but spatial coverage is unclear and makes no ref to growth and expansion of rural service centre business where larger scale extensions or new build may be required. Biodiversity PCS24: proposes designation of areas of separation but paragraph 14.25 suggests they will be only narrow gaps of open land. For this reason we see little merit in the additional none statutory designation. PCS25 Regional parks: Policy purpose is to provide a framework for detailed work by 4NW and not intended to impose general restrictions on development across these areas. Travel PCS28: Question whether realistic opening time for Buckshaw train station	PCS8: Although RSS L4 forms part of the development plan it would be helpful for the Core Strategy paper to set out in a table the minimum level of provision required by RSS and the higher level envisaged under Growth Point.			The Vision has been amended to the following: "Preston will have become a transformed city, recognised as an alternative to Manchester and Liverpool for high quality retail, cultural, entertainment, business and higher education."  The Core Strategy takes full account of the Growth Point but also the economic recession, particularly in paragraphs 5.9 to 5.13.  No change to what is now Policy 1 (Locating Growth) in respect of Longridge it acts as a Key Service Centre.  Policy 1 details the following as Strategic Sites: - BAE Systems Samlesbury (employment) - Lancashire Central, Cuerden (employment) - Buckshaw Village (mixed use).  In what is now Policy 6 (Housing Quality) the

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
		as Community Infrastructure Fund bid suggests there is still some uncertainty regarding scheme funding. Preferred option makes no mention of Preston Stations key role				<p>reference to developers of market housing contributing to the improvements of existing housing has been removed. The empty house conversion clause has been modified.</p> <p>In what is now Policy 4 (Housing Delivery)-housing targets have been added.</p> <p>In what is now Policy 13 (Rural Economy) there is no reference to in the policy to expansion of rural service centre businesses - too specific for merits of application. No change.</p> <p>What is now Policy 19 (Areas of Separation and Major Open Space) has been reworded to include Areas of Major Open Space, including Ingol/Tanterton and Greystones/Cadley, and Sharoe Green and Fulwood. Detailed boundaries for the Areas of Separation and Major Open Space will be set out in the Site Allocations DPD. The Policy reinforces Green Belt and Open Countryside designations.</p> <p>What is now Policy 20 (Countryside Management and Access) has been amended to refer to plans and proposals - no development is proposed in the park.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.11 refers to the opening of a new railway station and park and ride at Buckshaw Village in 2011.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Schedule identifies the required essential strategic infrastructure - what is comprises and where it applies, when it will be needed as well as the likely providers and funding sources. Paragraph 6.8 covers this.</p> <p>Distinctive landscapes being conserved and enhanced in now in Policy 21 – Landscape Character Areas.</p>
75	Trustees of T H Kevill	Broadly supportive. Wish to emphasise the suitability of Land at Eaves Green, Chorley for residential development.				Eaves Green suitability will be assessed as part of the site allocations DPD.
76	Natural England	<p>Welcome the specific mention of a high quality green environment, however also consider that specific mention should be made of climate change adaptation and reducing the area's contribution to climate change.</p> <p>Chapter 2: Welcome the clear and more detailed ref to RSS. Text in this section rather heavily accented to economic and social aspects and underplays considerable natural assets of the area. Very little is said about the Sustainable Communities Strategies of the 3 Local Authorities. Strongly support all environmental objectives on page 35.</p> <p>Chapter 5: Particularly interested in environmental conditions to be met by the Growth Points.</p> <p>Chapter 13: welcome production of SPD in relation to PCS16.</p> <p>Chapter 14: support the integrated approach and use of evidence base. p.121: correction needed paragraph 14.15 English Nature should be replaced by Natural England (its successor). P.127: Ribble Coast Regional Park is not recognised as a potential National Park by Natural England.</p> <p>PCS21 indicators should be more comprehensive.</p> <p>Chapter 16: support requirement for developer contributions and strongly consider that all forms of green infrastructure should be included in the requirements for dev contributions. Core Strategy needs to be assessed with ref to the Habitats Regulations and we think this is best done at each stage of preparation and as early as possible and would be pleased to assist.</p>	<p>Chapter 3: Descriptions in early part of chapter are comprehensive but spatial portraits need more mention of landscape, biodiversity, access and recreational opportunities.</p> <p>Chapter 4: specific mention should be made of the area's distinctive landscapes being conserved and enhanced. Social objectives: would like specific mention of improving access to all types of green space.</p> <p>Chapter 6: PCS1: welcome emphasis on brownfield land but should be recognised that some brownfield land has value for biodiversity.</p> <p>Chapter 7: aspects of sustainable construction and design in PCS4 may be better included in PCS2 as a summary of what should be provided. PCS3: does not go far enough to safeguard landscape and natural environment whilst taking advantage of renewable energy opportunities.</p> <p>Chapter 11: PCS13 should be more strongly worded to achieve economic and social advantages for rural area whilst protecting natural environment. Farm diversification/barn conversions may raise issues related to protected species and reference should be made to safeguarding measures.</p> <p>Chapter 13: Inclusion of the Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards would strengthen the preferred option and underpin the SPD. p.121: correction needed paragraph 14.15 English Nature should be replaced by Natural England (its successor). P.127: Ribble Coast Regional Park is not recognised as a potential National Park by Natural England. PCS21 indicators should be more comprehensive. PCS22: bullet point a) is too restrictive and could be reworded to 'contributes to economic, social or environmental well-being' PCS23,24,25: indicator of 'no. of</p>			<p>See Cross Cutting Themes at the beginning of Chapter 10. See also Policy 17 – Design of New Buildings.</p> <p>Chapter 2 now included more balanced references to environmental documents e.g. Lancashire Climate Change Strategy.</p> <p>Chapter 3 has been re-written and includes heritage, local distinctiveness and landscape context. Clearer references to the Sustainable Communities Strategies are now in the Vision and Chapter 4.</p> <p>References to safeguarding landscape in respect of renewable energy are not changed - but what is now Policy 28 (Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Schemes) should be viewed alongside other policies, especially Policy 21 (Landscape Character and Areas) and Policy 22 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity).</p> <p>What is now Policy 13 covers all aspects of the Rural Economy, including rural based tourism and has been reworded to achieve the economic and social advantages for rural areas whilst also seeking benefits for the landscape and natural environment wherever possible.</p> <p>What is now Policy 24 (c) (Sport and Recreation) states: "Developing a minimum local sport and recreation standards in a Supplementary Planning Document."</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
			inappropriate developments' needs to be reconsidered - how would it be defined and monitored? PCS26 bullet point a) - remove 'important'. PCS27 supported but needs to be cross-referred to earlier preferred options eg 2,4,8. Would welcome a reference to the 'duty' in relation to biodiversity introduced through the NERC Act 2006 section 40.			<p>Access to greenspace detail is not included in the Core Strategy; such standards will be incorporated into a SPD.</p> <p>The text has been amended to refer to Natural England.</p> <p>The Ribble Coast Regional Park is no longer referred to as a potential National Park.</p> <p>A full set of indicators and targets will be available as a separate Performance Monitoring Framework that accompanies the Publication Core Strategy.</p> <p>The word "important" has been deleted from what is now Policy 16 (a) (Heritage Assets)</p> <p>Although what is now Policy 2 (Infrastructure) does not directly refer to the requirements for Green Infrastructure, the sustainability appraisal does acknowledge "a broad range of infrastructure including transport, utilities and green infrastructure which cover all three aspects of social, economic and environmental sustainability."</p> <p>With regard to the bodies listed in the preferred option - these have been removed from Policy 2 (Infrastructure).</p> <p>A Habitat Regulations Assessment is now referenced in Chapter 1, paragraphs 1.27-1.29.</p> <p>Cross-Cutting Themes have now been included at the beginning of each chapter, covering both "Achieving Good Design" and "Tackling Climate Change."</p>
77	Individual	Agree that Core Strategy should protect identity of local places by designating 'areas of separation' or 'green wedges' and believe that it is vital that this policy applies in suburban areas like Ingol. Corridor from Lightfoot Lane, Tom Benson Way via golf course to Tag Lane must be protected from further development - high quality green area, helps define communities, key environmental asset with species such as hawks, herons and foxes. Also concerned over rainwater run off if developed.	That the corridor from Lightfoot Lane via golf course to Tag Lane is designated as an area of separation.			<p>What is now Policy 19 - Areas of Separation and Major Open Space - has now been changed to include the following text: "Areas of Major Open Space will be designated within the Preston urban boundary that prevent neighbourhoods merging, in particular between: (a) Ingol/Tanterton and Greyfriars/Cadley; (b) Sharoe Green and Fulwood"</p>
78	Persimmon Homes Ltd & Prime Resorts Ltd	<p>Evidence base supporting the document was not available, this should be provided improve accessibility to all information. On behalf of Persimmon Homes, in relation to Camelot Theme Park. Detailed report submitted. Concerned that Central Lancashire is formulating policy in the Core Strategy without the policies being 'justified' (as required by PPS12) against a robust evidence base. Disappointed that, at the least, a draft SHLAA was not published prior to the release of the Core Strategy Preferred Options. Object to the Preferred Options as believe they are premature, prejudicial and flawed given that the evidence base is not yet finalised.</p> <p>Para 6.13: should not be considering increased use of greenfield land in Chorley when brownfield opportunities exist. PCS1: unsound as in part b) refers to greenfield development in Chorley, with no evidence base to support this.</p> <p>The Core Strategy is unsound in that it does not provide a clear strategic policy for identifying a 5 yr supply for deliverable sites - should not be relying on sites with planning permission. P63 'Evidence': object to the reference that the SHLAA has assessed sites for housing as we have written confirmation from CLA that it has not been completed. PCS8: support the initiative to ensure at least a 6 year supply but as previously, have yet to see the evidence to demonstrate that this is possible. Object to the reference that monitoring of housing supply will only occur on a 3-year rolling basis - there is no precedence for this.</p> <p>Disappointed that Central Lancashire has decided to consult on Core Strategy Preferred Options prior to the release of its full evidence base. Reserve the right to question the Central Lancashire's procedure judicially. Core Strategy Preferred Options is misleading as it does not fully emphasise its compliance with policies within the North West Plan. Disappointed that the Central Lancashire has not set out spatially the likely level of housing delivered in each authority on previously developed land based on the evidence-base to date, to ensure compliance with the NWP's requirements.</p>	<p>Diagram of travel to work flows: inconsistent and distorting - request that only one arrow is shown between Greater Manchester City Region and the CLA with the appropriate flows shown.</p> <p>Givens on p.40 should break housing targets down to LA level, and should also include the target for brownfield development.</p> <p>PCS8b) suggest that the Central Lancashire errs on the side of caution and only allows a variation of +/- 10%. To avoid having the document being declared unsound, we request that the CLA re-consider its strategic proposals by setting out more clearly the requirements from the national policy in PPS3 and PPS12 and the NWP.</p> <p>It should also provide more detail on how it proposes to deliver the requirements (in PDL and greenfield terms) in accordance with the CS objectives as set out in paragraph.4.1 of PPS12, including designating key development sites in each authority area.</p>		<p>As part of chapter 8, a completed version of the housing provision table in Appendix 4 of the report should be included in the CS to ensure clarity; to demonstrate its compliance with legislative requirements; and be consistent with national policy.</p>	<p>Ongoing work on the SHLAA has fed into the Core Strategy preparation. The latest SHLAA report will be available for scrutiny when the Strategy is published.</p> <p>The Core Strategy takes full account of the Growth Point but also the economic recession. Relevant references are paragraphs: 5.9, 5.13 and 8.6</p> <p>What are now paragraphs 8.4, 8.7 and 8.12-8.13 detail housing delivery targets.</p> <p>The Publication Core Strategy does not propose development at Park Hall/Camelot as it is not considered sustainable or necessary to meet development needs. Detailed consideration of the development potential of this site is considered in the Strategic Sites and Locations Background Topic Paper.</p> <p>A revised version of the Travel to Work diagram will be included in the Publication Core Strategy.</p> <p>Policy 4 (Housing Delivery) details brownfield/previously developed land targets.</p> <p>The site specific detail of where new</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
						<p>development and investment will be located will largely be set out in subsequent Site Allocations Development Plan Documents. Likely distribution of housing development for service centres and strategic sites and locations are provided in paragraph 5.20.</p> <p>The reference to "windfall" sites has now been removed.</p> <p>What is now Policy 4 (Housing Delivery) (a) states: "Ensuring there is enough deliverable land suitable for house building capable of providing a continuous forward looking 5 year supply in each authority from the start of each annual monitoring period and in locations that are in line with the Spatial Strategy Policy..."</p> <p>What is now Policy 4 (Housing Delivery) (c) states: "Monitoring house construction annually but review local authority targets on the basis on a rolling 3 year performance..."</p> <p>Comment with regard to PCS8, allowing for a +/- 20% allowance of uncommitted sites. Not amended as this approach is consistent with PPS3.</p>
79	De Pol Associates	<p>PCS1: proposed classification of the settlements and strategic sites is considered unsound and we have concerns regarding the exclusion of certain settlements from any classification and the identification of certain sites/areas as strategic sites. We are happy to provide further evidence in support of our views. PCS9: part e) only allows for financial contributions instead of on-site affordable housing provision when the development location is unsuitable for affordable housing. There are other instances where affordable housing on a site may be difficult or undesirable and the criterion should therefore be more flexible. PCS11: part f is seen as unsound as evidence emerging from RSS and the joint authorities' study is that there is a surplus of employment land generally. Policy is overly restrictive. PCS2: Targets for % of energy to be sought from renewable sources in new developments are as per the adopted RSS figures which are a regional target. The Core Strategy targets should be aspirational rather than absolute, having regard to site specific factors and viability of renewable energy in changing market conditions.</p>	<p>Suggest that part f) of PCS11 is altered so that best and good urban sites are still subject to the criteria whilst lower order sites ought to be allowed to be considered for redevelopment for alternative uses without having to comply to onerous requirements.</p>			<p>What is now Policy 1 has had some changes, especially to strategic sites, but no changes made to the classification of settlements as these are considered appropriate.</p> <p>What is now Policy 7 (PCS9) has not changed as it is in line with national policy.</p> <p>What is now Policy 10 (Employment premises and sites) has been reworded for clarification, however, there has been no amendment to the sentiment of criteria (f). The protection of employment sites is a key priority where they are appropriate and a need.</p> <p>What is now Policy 27 – Sustainable Resources and New Developments – has higher renewable energy target than the former RSS as these are achievable given the local opportunities for energy capture but the policies also recognise economic viability considerations.</p>
80	Royal London Asset Management Company	<p>PCS1: Capitol Centre Retail and Leisure Park is an established commercial destination which complements and supports surrounding centres, is a brownfield opportunity, major employment site and is in a highly sustainable location. It is therefore suggested that the Core Strategy should include explicit policy recognition of the appropriateness of the Capitol Centre and its suitability as a location for future growth and investment.</p> <p>PCS14: 'the sale of traditional town centre goods will be restricted at out of town centre retail parks'. Is objected to as development should not be prohibited at the Capitol centre due to its sustainable location and given that it compliments rather than competes with existing centres. PCS11: focuses only B Class uses and does not take account of the benefits that retail development can provide. Draft PPS 4 states that economic development covers a wide range of development including 'retail, leisure and offices, both in town centres and elsewhere'</p>	<p>PCS14: the overriding vision of the document is positive and one of growth, therefore the restrictive policy of part e) should be reworded in a positive way.</p> <p>Recommended that PCS11 includes and acknowledges all 'wealth creating' use classes including retail, in delivering economic growth.</p>			<p>No change has been made to what is now Policy 1, but change has been made to what is now Policy 11 (Retail and Town Centre Uses and Business Based Tourism) restricting expansion of the Capitol Centre.</p> <p>In what is now Policy 11 (f) the wording has been changed to..."Resisting further expansion of out-of-centre retail parks, including the Deepdale Shopping Park, Capitol Centre and Riversway Retail Park", as this accords with national policy.</p> <p>In what is now Policy 10(Employment Premises and Sites) no change, but the policy purpose has been clarified - to protect employment land and set criteria for change of use to (amongst others) retailing.</p>
81	Tesco Stores Ltd	<p>Tesco welcomes strategic objectives as set out in paragraph 4.8 and in particular the 4th point under economic objectives which seeks to maintain and improve retail and related services. With regard to the social objectives as set out in paragraph 4.8 it is considered that access to retail facilities can help improve the quality of life in deprived areas and therefore reference to the improvement of retail should also be made under social objective 2.</p> <p>PCS1: convenience shopping is a day-to-day activity therefore retail development should be located close to where people live or work. Therefore reference to limited growth in Ecclestone, Longton etc should recognise the fact that some development would be acceptable to meet everyday needs of residents. Chapter 7: paragraph 7.11 and the proofing of new buildings to take account of more extreme weather locally, we would question whether the council might be best at</p>	<p>PCS2: ask that some consideration is given to where targets cannot be achieved for very genuine reasons, PCS3 recognises potential issues but PCS2 should also. In PCS14 it would be more appropriate to distinguish between district and local centres to avoid confusion.</p>			<p>Strategic objectives have been re-written and now include reference to retail - SO 11.</p> <p>Policy 1: Locating Growth has not been changed to refer to everyday needs of residents. Policy 11 (Retail and Town Centre Uses and Business Based Tourism) covers this matter and District and Local Centres.</p> <p>Future Proofing guidance will be in the Design SPD.</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
		providing guidance on this to ensure consistency. Chapter 12: contest paragraph 12.10 and the ref that Tesco has led to further decline in Leyland as the centre now has much more significant footfall than prior to the development of the food store and if planned effectively could be regenerated to attract further retailers on the back of Tesco anchoring the centre.				<p>What is now Policy 27 (Sustainable Resources and New Developments) refers to viability as does paragraph 12.7.</p> <p>What is now paragraph 9.23 has been reworded and removed the reference of the Tesco store leading to further decline within Leyland Town Centre.</p>
82	Kevill Glaisters Minors Trust Trustees	<p>Comments are in relation to Land at Pear Tree Lane, Euxton and its suitability as a sustainable urban extension. PCS23: the development of urban extensions can contribute positively to the conservation of existing urban areas and help deliver strategic objectives. PCS17: sustainable urban extensions will assist in expanding community activities advocated through PCS17. Such development helps ensure viability of facilities.</p> <p>PCS16: proposed play space and sporting opportunities form a key part of any sustainable urban extension and opportunities exist in Euxton. PCS8: PCS8 does not comply with PPS3 in that it only seeks to identify a rolling six year supply whereas a longer supply is required to deliver certainty for more strategic development sites.</p>	<p>PCS1 should clarify that greenfield development at the fringes of the main urban areas incorporates urban local service centres including Euxton which has good potential for sustainable mixed use regeneration. The key role urban extensions can play as identified in paragraph 6.15 should be expanded to set out their importance in terms of residential and employment land delivery.</p> <p>PCS28: support the objectives but should be more emphasis on urban extensions which can significantly reduce the need to travel by private vehicle. Should be an additional sub-section to the policy seeking to focus development in highly accessible locations, particularly adjacent to existing and proposed train stations.</p> <p>PCS24: clarify that an urban extension would be appropriate at the fringe of Euxton as it would also enable the maintenance of section between Chorley and Euxton.</p>			<p>Where they have been considered appropriate, urban extensions have been identified as Strategic Sites or Locations.</p> <p>Policy 1 (Locating Growth) d) details in which Urban Local Service Centres some growth and investment will be encouraged to help meet housing and employment needs.</p> <p>What is now Policy 4 (Housing Delivery) has been amended to refer to a continuous five year supply - more information is provided in the policy's supporting text. (Policy 4 c)</p> <p>What is now Policy 19 (Areas of Separation and Major Open Space) provides details of designated areas of separation and major open space. Site specific details will be dealt with through the Site Allocations process.</p> <p>There has been no change to what is now Policy 3 (Travel) in response to the representation as it is considered appropriately worded.</p>
83	Pincroft Dyeing and Printing Company and Land 4 Homes	<p>Comments on behalf of owners of land adjacent and to the south of Adlington. PCS23: the development of urban extensions can contribute positively to the conservation of existing urban areas whilst underpinning facilities and helping deliver strategic development. Such extensions can also ensure defendable boundaries for development in the long term. PCS17: sustainable urban extensions can help ensure existing community facilities are viable and deliver new facilities where required. PCS16 : proposed play spaces and sporting opportunities form a key part of any sustainable urban extension and opportunities exist in Adlington. PCS14: Adlington is an identified urban local service centre that has an under provision of retail floor space and the potential to address this exists as part of a comprehensive urban extension. PCS8 only seeks 6 year supply whereas a longer supply is needed to deliver certainty for strategic developers.</p>	<p>A healthy retail function can help underpin urban centres such as Adlington and the importance of incorporating new retail floor space should be expressed in PCS14 d). PCS8 should be amended to reflect guidance for a longer term supply as in PPS3. PCS1 should clarify that greenfield development at the fringes of urban areas incorporates urban local service centres including Adlington which has good potential for sustainable mixed use regeneration. The key role urban extension sites can play as identified in paragraph 6.15 should be expanded. Objectives of PCS28 supported but the opportunity for sustainable urban extensions well located in relation to existing public transport infrastructure should be greater emphasised with use of sub policy.</p>			<p>Where they have been considered appropriate, urban extensions have been identified as Strategic Sites or Locations.</p> <p>Policy 1 – Locating Growth – (d) details in which Urban Local Service Centres some growth and investment will be encouraged to help meet housing and employment needs.</p> <p>What is now Policy 4 (c) has been amended to refer to a continuous five year supply - more information is also provided in the supporting text.</p> <p>What is now Policy 11 (Retail and Town Centre Uses and Business Based Tourism) has not been changed in respect of district and Local Centres as this accords with national policy.</p>
84	British Land	<p>Comments on behalf of British Land (owners of Deepdale Retail Park). PCS1 does not identify Deepdale Shopping Park as a suitable location for growth. PCS14 restricts development at out of town centre retail parks. The wording of PCS14 is negative in that it is restrictive whilst on the whole the core strategy is positive. PCS11 only focuses on B Class uses and does not take account of the benefits that retail development can provide. PPG4/draft PPS4 recognises significant economic benefits that can be gained through retail development and there is also evidence in 'The Contribution of the Retail Sectors ' document produced by King Sturge on behalf of Accessible Retail.</p>	<p>PCS1: the Core Strategy should include explicit policy recognition of the appropriateness of the established retail and leisure destination of Deepdale Retail Park, and its suitability as a location for future growth and investment. PCS14 should not restrict development at Deepdale Shopping Park given its sustainable location and given that it is an existing established retail destination, which compliments rather than competes with existing centres. PCS14 should be re-worded in a positive manner. PCS11 should include and acknowledge all wealth creating use classes including retail, in delivering economic growth. PCS2: all developments should be considered on their individual merits rather than the set targets, and renewable energy should be provided only where practical and viable, taking into account current market conditions.</p>			<p>Policy 1 (Locating Growth) has not been changed to include reference to Deepdale Shopping Park as this is more appropriately dealt with in what is now Policy 11 (Retail and Town Centre Uses and Business Based Tourism) part (f) states: "Resisting further expansion of out-of-centre retail parks, including the Deepdale Shopping Park, Capitol Centre and Riversway Retail Park. This accords with national policies.</p> <p>What is now Policy 10 (Employment Premises and Sites) - no change made. However, the policy purpose has been clarified-to protect employment land and set the criteria for change of use to (amongst others) retailing.</p> <p>What is now Policy 27 (Sustainable Resources and New Developments) details a viability qualification, explained in paragraph 12.7.</p>
85	The Woodland Trust	<p>In para 7.10 we would like to see some reference to use of wood as a low carbon building material instead of fossil fuel based materials such as metal or plastics. PCS4 should make specific reference to the role which trees and woodland can play in improving water quality and alleviating flood risk. Support the wording of para 13.12 and 13.15 and would like to see a specific reference in these paragraphs to the multiple benefits which open spaces can provide for local people.</p>	<p>In PCS4, amend point g) to read: "seeking to maximise the potential of green infrastructure and in particular woodland to contribute to flood relief". In the section on low carbon energy generation (p.47&amp;49), add references to product substitution (eg use of wood rather than metal or plastic) and also to use of wood as a fuel.</p>		Add a new preferred option covering various aspects of adaptation to climate change.	<p>What is now Policy 22 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity) has not changed. There is no specific policy on trees; however trees are covered in Policies 18,19,20,22.</p> <p>Cross cutting themes, including tackling climate change, have now been introduced</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
		P.119: disappointing that there is no reference to the importance of protecting irreplaceable semi-natural habitats e.g. ancient woodland. P120: support the reconnecting of habitats - should cross ref this to climate change as networks can enable wildlife to adapt to climate change impacts. Support PCS22. Strongly support the ref in para 3 of spatial vision to the importance of creating/maintaining green space and countryside which is accessible, contributes to quality of life and enhances biodiversity.	PCS16 commits to using local access standards and we would like the Woodland Trust's Woodland Access Standard to be considered in the SPD. Would like to see an additional bullet point added to strategic objectives: - to give absolute protection to important semi-natural habitats such as ancient woodland and ancient/veteran trees. P.129, para 14.35 add a ref to no. of ancient/veteran trees in council area www.ancient-tree-hunt.org.uk. In the "Givens", include a ref to PPS9 and also EM1 in NW RSS. P.120 amend para 14.11 "...contributing to biodiversity, enabling species to adapt to the impact of climate change...". Amend preferred PCS21 a) by adding at the end "...and giving absolute protection to irreplaceable semi-natural habitats such as ancient woodland"			<p>across the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Ancient woodland and ancient/veteran trees have not been detailed in the strategic objectives. Trees are covered in policies 18,19,20,22.</p> <p>Paragraph 14.11 has now been removed.</p> <p>No change has been made to what is now Policy 29 (Water Management) – too specific for the Core Strategy.</p> <p>What is now paragraph 12.7 has been amended to refer to product substitution.</p> <p>What is now Policy 24 – Sport and Recreation – details that aspects of the access standards will be incorporated into the SPD.</p> <p>"Givens" will not be included in the Publication Core Strategy.</p>
86	4NW	<p>Core Strategy is in general conformity with the approved NW RSS to 2021. Objections are however raised in respect to the following preferred options: PCS3: no indication of how the Landscape Sensitivity Study will be used is provided. Reference is made to a Central Lancs renewables target but no figure is given. PCS8: provides a settlement pattern which is in conformity with RSS but provides little guidance on the expected actual levels of development at each location. Will need to be addressed in conjunction with emerging Growth Point. PCS11: several of the sites eg Botany/Great Knowley appear to be unsustainable locations. PCS14 does not reflect the settlement hierarchy in Central Lancs as set out in the RSS.</p> <p>Plans should ensure major developments have good access to public transport and good provision for pedestrians and cyclists. Although there is ref to some strategic sites in PCS28e), in general this is not reflected in PCS28. PCS28 e)h) identifies large schemes such as Coppull Rail Station and Penwortham Bypass, none of which are covered by the Regional Funding Allocation. The Core Strategy will therefore need to be backed up by an infrastructure plan.</p> <p>Chapter 4: Spatial Vision: the aspiration set out for Preston as the alternative centre to Manchester and Liverpool, is not in line with published RSS Policies RDF1, CLCR1 and CLCR2. Chapter 8: welcome ref to L4, however ref should also be made to the supporting text. PCS22 makes little reference to the delivery of green infrastructure. Reference could be made to future LDDs, as to how work is prioritised and delivered. PCS28b) the provision of high occupancy vehicle lanes on roads into Preston may not be the most appropriate solution.</p>	<p>PCS8: the core strategy should take a more pro-active approach that sets out how Central Lancs will contribute to the sub regional targets. PCS11 should refer to issues covered by DP4,5,6 of the RSS. Recommended that the wording in PCS14a) is amended to reflect policies CLCR1 and W5 to read '...so as to retain its role as the sub-regional centre in the Central Lancashire and a major commercial and service centre in Lancashire as a whole. PCS21: Policy EM1b) requires LAs to provide spatial information on biodiversity networks. Reference is made to the development of ecological networks but it is not clear how this is to be taken forward - this needs explaining. PCS24: the policy should be amended to clarify the status of 'areas of separation' and that they are not intended to provide the same level of protection as Green Belts. It may be worth considering whether a sub-regional review of Green Belt will be required after 2011. PCS1 c)d): given that many of the strategic sites are located away from urban areas and transport hubs, and some are greenfield, it is suggested that ref is made to the history of each site and how sustainability issues have been/should be addressed. Chapter 15: suggested that this chapter should recognise Preston's role as a regional gateway and make ref to RSS Appendix RT. References to the 'North West Regional Assembly' e.g. PCS11 will need to be amended to '4NW'.</p>			<p>Support noted.</p> <p>What is now paragraph 5.20 details the likely distribution of housing development in Central Lancashire to 2026.</p> <p>In what is now Policy 11 (Retail and Town Centre Uses and Business Based Tourism) the key elements of the hierarchy are identified as:      -City Centre: Preston      - Principal Town Centres: Leyland and Chorley      -District Centres: Bamber Bridge, Clayton Green, Longton, Penwortham and Tardy Gate, and those proposed at Buckshaw Village and Cottam."      This accords with the local evidence.</p> <p>The supporting text of what is now Policy 22 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity - has been amended to refer more to implementation</p> <p>What is now Policy 19 - Areas of Separation and Major Open Space – includes additional protection to Green Belt designation.</p> <p>A separate Infrastructure Delivery Schedule itemises the essential strategic requirements as the first part of a full Infrastructure Delivery Plan that will be worked up alongside preparation of the Site Allocations DPD and the development of a levy/tariff Standard Charging Schedule.</p> <p>The Landscape and Sensitivity Map has been excluded from the Publication Core Strategy as it could be misleading and what is now Policy 28 (Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Schemes) has been classified with reference to mitigation, adaptation and compensatory provisions.</p> <p>The Vision has been amended to the following: "Preston will have become a transformed city, recognised as an alternative destination to Manchester and Liverpool..."</p> <p>Paragraph 12.18 now references the national policy stance on Sustainable Drainage Systems and the Flood and Water Management Act 2010.</p> <p>What is now Chapter 5 (Spatial Strategy - Managing and Locating Growth) provides details of each strategic site and strategic location, detailing location, a brief site history and infrastructure requirements.</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
						<p>Paragraphs 8.4 to 8.13 explain housing provision requirements.</p> <p>What is now Policy 3 (Travel) makes numerous references to the location of regional road and public transport corridors in Central Lancashire.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure delivery is detailed in the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule as are renewable energy targets.</p>
87	Cllrs Truby and Cartwright	Generally support the aims, objectives and policies set out in the Core Strategy. However concerns with chapters 14 and 15. Chapter 14: College Ward is blessed with significant amounts of open space and includes a critical wildlife corridor. It is recognised that the brownfield land e.g. Sharoe Green Hospital site is needed to meet housing targets but the remaining open spaces should be protected very strongly. This should include measures to prevent houses with large gardens being regarded as brownfield and thus being redeveloped to a higher density. Chapter 15: there is insufficient recognition given to local traffic problems as typified by College ward. Traffic problems have a big impact on quality of life and we therefore strongly support the emphasis on Park & Ride and would wish to see the early creation of one in the vicinity of the M55/M6 junction. The existing infrastructure is inadequate for the current levels of activity and any further developments proposed should be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that there is either no detrimental impact, or that it is sufficiently mitigated.				<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Garden Development is covered in what is now Policy 5 (Housing Density) with reference to the qualities of the area.</p> <p>Travel is now covered in chapter 7 with a change of emphasis in the altering behaviour of favouring non-car solutions.</p>
88	Banks Development Ltd	Page 57: Core Strategy points out the need for addressing climate change but fails to include a policy that works towards the generation of renewable energy and the ability to meet national targets. By not including this, Central Lancs. appears unconcerned about meeting national target of 10% and is relying on the RSS as the sole driver. It's not prepared to set targets for itself. P.48: the diagram promotes a positive approach to steering the development of wind energy. However the plan also shows average wind speeds overlaying the sensitivity to wind energy development. Following this, there is no explanation of its significance and no explanation as to whether Central Lancashire is using average wind speed data as a material consideration towards the site finding process for wind farms. P.49: it must be recognised that embedded energy in new housing and micro-regeneration is not enough to meet renewable energy targets set locally, regionally or nationally and does not follow the emphasis placed by national policy on renewable energy.	Policy PCS3 could be extended to include renewable targets for Central Lancs. Although the first 2 options in table 7.34 have not been favoured, they could be combined to form a policy on climate change, wind farms and renewable energy targets. P.48 the appropriate number of turbines that would be acceptable for different sensitivities should be included. Also, a summary should be included either before or after the plan to explain its significance and why average wind speeds have been placed on top of the sensitivity to wind energy. P.49: two separate policies should be created to distinguish embedded energy targets and renewable energy targets.	Policy on climate change, wind farms and renewable energy targets.		<p>What is now Policy 27 (Sustainable Resources and New Developments) contains emissions reduction targets as does the Performance Monitoring Framework</p> <p>The Landscape and Sensitivity Map has been excluded from the Publication Core Strategy as it could be misleading and what is now Policy 28 (Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Schemes) has been classified with reference to mitigation, adaptation and compensatory provisions.</p> <p>What is now Policy 27 addresses sustainable resources and new developments and Policy 28 renewable and low carbon energy schemes in appropriate ways.</p>
89	Home Builders Federation	Serious reservations regarding policy PCS8 d) The council cannot determine the size of market homes, only the size and mix of the affordable element. Para 29 of PPS3 only allows Local Planning Authorities to stipulate the amount of affordable housing required and therefore as this part of the preferred option is contrary to national guidance and should be deleted. If developers are made to build bigger homes it will result in lower densities and often land vendors will refuse to sell land at the price the developer can afford based on the lower density. There would need to be an increase in land supply to accommodate the requirement for bigger homes. Lower density house building will generate less 'betterment' value to subsidise all the other regulatory and infrastructure demands required by planning authorities. If house builders are required to build bigger, then we must recognise that the market homes will be more expensive to recoup development costs.	Either remove this aspect of PCS8, or complement it with a considerable increase in land supply and a far more encouraging development control system which removes obstacles to housing delivery instead of placing additional regulatory requirements and infrastructure demand on house building activity.			PCS8 (d) has now been deleted.
90	Fylde Borough Council	Too much emphasis is placed on the role of Preston after Manchester and Liverpool. Preston appears to be seeking to raise the level of the City above that established by RSS. Policy RDF1 places the regional centres of Manchester and Liverpool as first priority, followed by the inner areas surrounding these centres. The 3rd priority should be the towns/cities in the 3 city regions which includes amongst others Blackpool, Blackburn, Burnley and Preston. RSS does not promote Preston as a higher order centre, as referred to under 'givens' on p.94 of the Core Strategy. The document does not include the impacts on surrounding centres of extending Preston's Primary Retail core to facilitate the Tithebarn proposal.	More information on the impacts of the growth of Preston's Primary Retail Core should be embedded within the document rather than just being in the SPD.			<p>Amendments have been made to the vision: "Preston will have become a transformed city, recognised as an alternative destination to Manchester and Liverpool for high quality retail, cultural, entertainment, business and higher education."</p> <p>Amendments have been made to cross boundary issues: "The Core Strategy takes account of cross-boundary issues with neighbouring districts outside of Central Lancashire. The issues identified are... - The scale of retail growth envisaged for Preston City Centre..."</p>
91	Regenerate Lancashire (Formerly Elevate Lancashire)	Concerned about the impact of growth in Central Lancashire on opportunities and aspirations for growth and renewal in Pennine Lancashire, in particular upon the adjacent housing market areas of Blackburn with Darwen, Hyndburn and the Ribble Valley. Although the Core Strategy gives some broad indication of the level of growth and its location, this is not sufficient to enable Elevate to fully assess the				<p>Amendments have been made to cross boundary issues and growth point references in the spatial portrait, as follows: - "The Core Strategy takes account of cross-boundary issues with neighbouring districts</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
		extent and nature of the impact on the Pennine Lancashire Housing Market. It is essential that Elevate and its local authority partners are formally consulted on the detail of the Growth Point bid at the earliest opportunity. Would be interested in the findings of any impact analysis that may have been carried out under L4 of the RSS as we have not been formally approached for our views.				<p>outside of Central Lancashire. The issues identified are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The implications of Growth Point status for Pennine (East) Lancashire."</li> </ul> <p>A study jointly commissioned by Central Lancashire and Pennine Lancashire authorities has shown that the relationship between the two housing markets and the effects of the recession on house building mean that the Growth Point will have little impact on the HMR Area and that the two areas can, in fact, complement each other.</p>
92	Fox Land & Property Ltd	<p>Comments partly in respect of land at Cuerden Farm, Wigan Road and Lancaster Lane, Clayton-le-Woods. Support the aspirations set out within the Vision in terms of what it covers so far. However, the vision does not clearly and forcibly assert that housing growth and economic development, which are now enshrined in the adopted planning policies within the NW RSS are the key drivers to the achievement of the vision.</p> <p>PCS1 is supported in particular part e) and this option should also recognise Clayton-le-Woods' potential key support role as an Urban Local Service Centre in relation to Leyland, Buckshaw and Chorley.</p> <p>PCS2: demands for all residential development to be assessed against the Code for Sustainable Homes, and to reach requirements for on-site contributions above RSS levels place unnecessary burdens on developers and are not required by regional/national policy Emissions reductions are covered by building regulations and are currently under consultation so results of this should be noted.</p> <p>Chapter 8: the phrase "too much residential development on greenfield sites" contained within paragraph 8.13 is negative and should be replaced with a positive statement. RSS PDL aspirations are targets and not absolute. PCS8: 6 year supply is supported. Part b) "the phasing of uncommitted sites will be adjusted as appropriate" is unclear.</p> <p>PCS11: it is of vital importance that Preston remains the driving economic turbine for the sub-region, but is strongly supported by settlements made sustainable by a balance of employment opportunities with commensurate amounts of housing provided in sustainable locations eg Clayton-le-Woods that will accommodate the workforce.</p> <p>PCS21: principle supported but the assets of each area should be properly assessed to ascertain the level of their quality to avoid errant application of designations.</p> <p>PCS27 g) should be acknowledged that building design and aesthetics may need to change to accommodate sustainable construction features.</p> <p>PCS29: there is a limit to the extent to which developer contributions can address existing or future deficiencies within community infrastructure.</p>	<p>Para's 3.25-3.29: the description should acknowledge the close proximity, and potential for increased functional interrelationship and connectivity with Clayton-le-Woods that lies directly east of Leyland. Para 3.54 should be modified to ensure the contributory role that communities in the Euxton-Clayton area can play in offering sustainable opportunities to strengthen and develop Central Lancashire. PCS9 f) the Core Strategy should direct LDF policy that affordable housing provision should not be called for in respect of use class C2 care accommodation. The term 'special needs' could be potentially misleading and should either be defined or supplemented by the inclusion of reference to use class C2 accommodation for people in need of personal care. PCS14: Clayton-le-Woods should be included. PCS28 e) an emphasis should be placed on the role of the public sector in securing govt funding - planning obligations should only be called upon to meet the reasonable travel needs attributed to the development.</p>			<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Site specific comments will be dealt with through the Site Allocations DPD process.</p> <p>The Vision takes full account of Central Lancashire's current issues, attributes and potential.</p> <p>What is now Policy 1 (Locating Growth) (d) states: "Some growth and investment will be encouraged at the following Urban Local Service Centres to help meet housing and employment needs...Clayton-le-Woods (Lancaster Lane)."</p> <p>What is now Policy 27 (Sustainable Resources and New Developments) details Code for Sustainable Homes levels to be met. No reduction in target - the target in Policy 27 (b) has been changed to 15% as this is considered attainable</p> <p>Paragraph 8.13 refers to restricting granting planning permissions on less appropriate greenfield sites in the context of lower housing requirement figures.</p> <p>(PCS8) What is now Policy 4 (d) is unchanged.</p> <p>What is now Policy 3 (d) is considered to be appropriately worded.</p> <p>What is now Policy 7 (e) is unchanged. C2 uses are not counted in housing figures. "Special needs" housing is defined in the glossary, along with "extra care accommodation."</p> <p>Clayton-Le-Woods is not mentioned in the list of District Centres in Policy 11 (Retail and Town Centre Uses and Business based Tourism) This role is covered by the Clayton Green District Centre.</p> <p>The Sustainable Resources design issue is addressed in what is now Policy 17 (Design of New Buildings) (k) which states: "promoting designs that will be adaptable to climate change, and adopt principles of sustainable construction..."</p> <p>A separate Infrastructure Delivery Schedule itemises the essential strategic requirements as the first part of the full Infrastructure Plan that will be worked up alongside preparation of the Site Allocations Development Plan Documents and the development of a levy/tariff Standard Charging Schedule.</p>
93	Hallam Land Management	<p>PCS1: the strategic approach of focussing development on urban areas should not be to the detriment of growth in rural communities. The 70% PDL target means that 30% of development can be located on greenfield sites and strategic decisions can be made on which sites this occurs on to compliment PDL development. Key strategic decisions regarding housing should not be made until the outcomes of the SHLAA are clear. Policy RDF4 in the RSS states that no substantial changes should be made to the Green belt before 2011 but minor</p>		<p>Grimsargh would be an ideal location for a Rural Service Centre and would contribute to the public transport corridor and further improve sustainable patterns of travel. Land to the south of Church House Farm, Grimsargh is wholly suitable for</p>		<p>Ongoing work on the SHLAA has fed into and informed the Core Strategy preparation. The latest SHLAA report will be available for scrutiny when the strategy is published.</p> <p>No change in respect of Grimsargh. It does not have a sufficient range of services to be</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
		changes may be made through the LDF. This should be undertaken to identify further potential sites in the most sustainable locations should there be a need to meet increased housing requirements. Policy PCS1 identifies development to be located in Preston and the northern suburbs focussing on the local centres. None of the northern suburbs of Preston are identified as local centres. Should development be constrained in these northern suburbs it would widen the gap of affordability in the Preston area.		residential development providing a sustainable location.		Rural Local Service Centre. Whittingham Hospital has now been deleted as a Strategic Site because it is not considered central to the achievement of the strategy.
94	Longridge, Goosnargh and Whittingham Action Group	The Longridge, Goosnargh and Whittingham Action Group support the broad objectives of the Core Strategy. Concerned however that where use of agricultural land is permitted to change it can have a great impact on the landscape. Concerned by agricultural land being sold in small parcels in order to maximise sale value - this inflates land values and leads to more intensive use e.g. caravan/equine. LGW Group supports the provision of good quality pitches for travelling families in properly designated areas; however it is essential that care is taken to site such provision sensitively for the benefit of the local community, the travelling families, and the environment. Support improvements to public access into the countryside - people do not feel they can access the countryside without sufficiently maintained and signposted footpaths.			The Preferred Core Strategy should include provision for dealing with the pressure on agricultural land which occurs when land is sold in small parcels and the subsequent pressures for intensive and sometimes inappropriate uses that ensue. The Preferred Core Strategy could promote better maintenance of rural footpaths and encourage increased usage of them by the public.	No change - it is not the function or purpose of the Core Strategy to influence the sub-division and sale of agricultural land.  In what is now Policy 20 (Countryside Management and Access) there is reference to supporting the continued development of plans and proposals for sustainable access.
95	Developers consortium for Hoyles Lane/ Lea Road/ Bartle Lane/ M55/ Dandyforth Lane/ Lightfoot Lane Areas	Comments on behalf of a number of landowners whose landholdings lie immediately to the north of Preston. Support the Preferred Core Strategy's objective of concentrating most housing developments in or around Preston, Leyland, Chorley and other Urban Local Centres. However, as regards Preston, and following success in the Growth Point Bid, we consider that concentration will need to focus on a sustainable urban extension located to the North of Preston (bordered by Hoyles Lane/ Lea Road/ Bartle Lane/ M55/ Sandyforth Lane/ Lightfoot Lane.	Needs to be a clearer identification in the Core Strategy of locations for development than the rather vague reference in the second bullet point of PCS1. The wording of the bullet point needs to be amended so as to make clear that greenfield development north of Hoyles Lane/ Lightfoot Lane as envisaged; otherwise it might be inferred that the reference to "some greenfield development" relates only to the residue of HCA land at Cottam.			Where they are considered appropriate and sustainable, urban extensions are identified as Strategic Sites or Locations in Policy 1(Locating Growth).  In Policy 1 the wording "some greenfield development" has been removed. The new text state: "Growth and investment will be concentrated in... - The northern suburbs of Preston, focussing on Local Centres, with greenfield development within the Cottam Preston Strategic Location."  Development of land to the north of Cottam at High Bartle would be less sustainable and not necessary to meet Preston's housing requirements. More detail on this matter is provided in the Strategic Sites and Locations Assessment Background Topic Paper.
96	United Utilities Property Solutions (UUPS)	PCS1: support brownfield development but this option does not fully allow the development of local communities in areas which are not considered to be Rural Service Centres, particularly in the areas to the north of Preston. PCS4 d) (Sewer Flooding): this is an operational issue - contact at United Utilities is David Hardman. PCS8: 6 year supply does not correspond with PPS3 which demands 15 years. PCS24 does not clearly identify the areas of separation as it merely lists the settlements affected.	Greater emphasis should be placed upon the needs of local communities outside of the main urban areas in terms of housing provision and utilities provision. The term 'fringes of main urban areas' is unclear and we seek further clarification of its definition. PCS1 f): settlements to the north of Preston eg Grimsargh should also be included to address imbalance. PCS9 b) UUPS feels that contributions for affordable housing in rural areas should also be considered against any mitigating factors to ensure rural sites do not become unviable. PCS11 e) should focus more strongly on opportunities for live/work units in rural areas as this type of development can reduce car travel and support the local economy. PCS17: LPA's should adopt a site-specific approach when assessing contributions. PCS24: diagrams could be used to clarify the areas of separation. It should also be recognised that limited infill development would not impact upon the separation of certain settlements.			What is now Policy 1 (Locating Growth) appropriately identifies Rural Local Service Centres. Grimsargh does not have a sufficient range of services to be so designated.  The new adopted SHLAA approach in effect covers a 6 year period. PPS3 aims to ensure that there is a continuous five year supply of deliverable sites available for housing. Local Planning Authorities should monitor the supply of deliverable sites on an annual basis, linked to the LDF Annual Monitoring Report review process but yearly revisions to the application of the policy are too susceptible to very short term fluctuations.  PCS9 (b) - what is now Policy 7 (Affordable Housing)- clause withdrawn, though reference in supporting text to viability.  PCS11 (e) remains in what is now Policy 9 Economic Growth and Employment and is appropriately worded as is the reference in Policy 13 (Rural Economy).  In what is now Policy 25 (Community Facilities), the policy remains unchanged but paragraph 11.18 includes reference to shortfalls in provision.  The Areas of Separation, as detailed in what is now Policy 19, are now indicated more clearly on the Key Diagram. Move information will be provided in the site allocations DPDs.
97	Costco Wholesale UK Ltd	On behalf of Costco Wholesale UK. As it is proposed. Preferred option PCS11 only permits sui generis uses on lower quality sites which are by their nature, smaller, less prominent, have reduced access and lie within residential areas	PCS11 is missing an opportunity to allow a range of jobs on employment land by proposing an inflexible approach to development on high grade employment sites. National policy (draft PPS4) promotes a more flexible, market responsive approach to employment allocations acknowledging that employment should not be defined by the use classes.	Suggest the following wording for part f) "Within the Employment Areas defined on the Proposals Map, planning permission will be granted for employment generating uses within classes B1, B2 or B8 and sui generis uses which would:		What was PCS 11 is now Policies 9 and 10. There is no change to the policy but the purpose has been clarified. To protect employment land - set criteria for change of use to (amongst other things) retailing and sui generis.

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
				<p>i) generate employment which is quantitatively and qualitatively comparable to uses within those Classes; and</p> <p>ii) not harm the continuation of existing uses within those classes"</p> <p>It is then considered that the policy could continue with criteria iv, v and vi as drafted.</p>		
98	Hollins Strategic Land	<p>PCS1: the strategy needs to move away from the simplistic 'green bad, brown good' approach and recognise that greenfield sites close to town or service centres and public transport corridors can be highly sustainable locations whilst brownfield sites may be in much less preferred locations. Adlington performs well as a sustainable location and this should be exploited in the allocation of new housing development. PCS9: The evidence base is not in place to justify the thresholds required as the references to evidence refer to interim statements and policies. PCS11: where employment land targets are exceeded, priority should be afforded to sustainable residential development on unused or underused employment sites. Suggestion of Grove Farm in Adlington for a housing development as suggest land not well located for employment. PCS28: there is no bold statement that the use of public transport will be encouraged. The benefits of bus and rail travel in a sustainable society are not identified in the policy. This is a major weakness and gives a message that public transport will always be second rate, even in 2026. PCS29: is based on an assumption that there is excess value in developments that can be diverted to pay for infrastructure and services - no reference to any evidence for this.</p>	<p>PCS8 should be brought into line with national policy and identify sites for 10 and 15 years ahead. PCS9 should be reworded for flexibility to reflect the outcome of housing needs over time. There is a strong possibility that LPA's will need to adjust their demands on house builders to ensure that sufficient land comes forward for development and that developers can make enough profit to justify their investment in what is clearly a business with significant risks.</p>			<p>What is now Policy 1 - Locating Growth – appropriately addresses growth and investment locations.</p> <p>What is now Policy 4 - Housing Delivery - has been amended to refer to a continuous five year supply with more information in the supporting text.</p> <p>In what is now Policy 7(Affordable Housing) there is reference in supporting text to viability, especially paragraphs 8.26 and 8.27.</p> <p>In what is now Policy 3 (Travel) has been reordered and there is detailed supporting text within the chapter detailing promoting walking, cycling and public transport.</p> <p>In what is now Policy 2 (Infrastructure) there is reference in the supporting text to viability (Paragraphs 6.5, 6.6, 8.26 and 8.27)</p>
99	Ribble Valley Borough Council	<p>Pleased to see the recognition of Longridge in the strategy and its role as a key service centre not only for Ribble Valley but as a centre that will support the community in the Central Lancashire area. Ribble Valley's involvement with the BAE site at Samlesbury needs to be acknowledged when this site is mentioned in the Core Strategy. The issue of how the Samlesbury site is to be dealt with in strategic terms has implications for Ribble Valley's treatment of employment land. Chapter 7: the map on page 48 shows that there are parts of Central Lancs adjacent to Ribble Valley which have relatively high wind speeds and therefore a potential wind energy source but the diagram also illustrates that these are in areas with moderately high or high sensitivity to this use. Ribble Valley has concerns about this issue as any renewable energy development close to the boundary would inevitably have impacts upon Ribble Valley and therefore the Council wishes full and transparent involvement in any such development close to its boundaries.</p>			<p>Ribble Valley planning officers request a general acknowledgement of the fact that the wider Samlesbury employment site lies significantly within Ribble Valley, and a clearer definition about the particular area within the BAE site that policy PCS11 exactly refers to and more detail, if possible on what might be developed there.</p>	<p>The Publication Core Strategy acknowledges at paragraph 5.28 that the site is located partly within Ribble Valley Borough Council, and that adjacent area in Pennine Lancashire (which includes Ribble Valley) will benefit from its development.</p> <p>Appendix B to the Core Strategy shows the extent of the BAE Systems Site within Central Lancashire and indicates the remainder is in Ribble Valley.</p> <p>The Wind Speeds/Landscape Sensitivity Maps have been deleted from the Publication Core Strategy as it was misleading.</p>
100	Agent on behalf of Landowner	<p>Relating to Land to the North Wrennels Lane, Eccleston</p> <p>PCS1: supported as it appears to favour the development of the landowner's site as this option allows limited development in rural local service centres including Eccleston. It also states that detailed boundary changes to the Green Belt may be necessary, and in the case of the above site would be essential for this site to be developed to allow it to meet local needs.</p>				<p>Paragraph 1012 now states that: "No changes are anticipated to the strategic extent of the Green Belt within Central Lancashire."</p> <p>Support acknowledged. Detailed matters will be raised in the Site Allocation DPD.</p>
101	Agent on behalf of Landowner	<p>Relating to land to the East of Chorley Lane, Charnock Richard and Land to the North of Goose Green Farm, Much Hoole. The landowners are in favour of PCS1 as criterion g) appears to favour the development of the above sites. Additionally para 6.19 states that detailed changes to Green Belt boundaries may be necessary, which would allow these sites to be developed.</p>				<p>Paragraph 1012 now states that: "No changes are anticipated to the strategic extent of the Green Belt within Central Lancashire."</p> <p>Support acknowledged. Detailed matters will be raised in the Site Allocation DPD.</p>
102	Agent on behalf of Landowner	<p>Relating to Land at Olive Farm, Hoghton. PCS1: this is supported; particularly part g) as this would favour development at the above site. Additionally para. 6.19 acknowledges that detailed changes to Green Belt boundaries may be necessary, and in this case would allow a site with good development potential to be developed for the purpose of meeting local housing needs.</p>				<p>Paragraph 1012 now states that: "No changes are anticipated to the strategic extent of the Green Belt within Central Lancashire."</p> <p>Support acknowledged. Detailed matters will be raised in the Site Allocation DPD.</p>
103	Individual	<p>Sporting Aviation has been ignored in Chapter 13 (Health and Wellbeing). There are no aviation sports facilities available for the general public within Central Lancs whilst other areas of the North West region have made significant steps in the provision of such facilities. Environmental benefits attributable to airfields - protect large areas of the environment within which flora and fauna can flourish. Community benefits including education. In relation to PCS16, there is a shortfall and there is also a developer (e.g. group of aviators) who would contribute and are currently attempting to provide such provision in Central Lancs but who are meeting considerable difficulties in the planning process. PCS16 d) - in the case of an aviation site this criteria is met. An airfield in Central Lancashire will contribute significantly to the wider Green Infrastructure Network.</p>			<p>Include a reference to the urgent need for a sports aviation facility within Central Lancs. Suitable locations for such activity should be identified. The positive environmental, rural and community benefits that can be attributed to such a facility should be clearly identified. The means whereby an aviation sports facility can be delivered in conjunction with a suitable private sector partner should be identified.</p>	<p>Due to its strategic role, it is not appropriate for the Core Strategy to refer specifically to sites for recreational flying and aviation sports. However Policy 13 (Rural Economy) has been amended to refer to recreation uses and storage.</p>
104	Individual	<p>There is a lack of suitable local sites to safely hangar and fly light aircraft. I have</p>				<p>Due to its strategic role, it is not appropriate</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
		to travel well outside the area when I get the opportunity to fly and the costs are very difficult for me - round trip of 72 miles. Need a local airstrip. Despite previous representations no provision has been made for recreational flying in the revised document despite government policy being to promote the sport (PPG13). Blackpool International Airport has a policy to attract large commercial aircraft and smaller aircraft are discouraged.				for the Core Strategy to refer specifically to sites for recreational flying and aviation sports. However Policy 13 (Rural Economy) has been amended to refer to recreation uses and storage.
105	Anderton Parish Council	The different text columns on a single page are confusing. The preferred options relating to each section need to be more distinct. PCS13: In supporting the sustaining of the rural economy it would be desirable to stimulate local markets. This could be done by the introduction of "modern market places" for the exclusive use of local businesses. These modern markets would bring together a wide range of local traders (foods, crafts, services etc) to satisfy local needs. A consequential effect for sustainability would be a reduction in the need to travel.		Encouragement and facilitation given to the creation of additional markets in rural areas for the exclusive use of local businesses, traders, home workers etc, for the satisfaction of local needs.		The layout of the Publication Core Strategy is simplified.  "Modern Market Places" can be accommodated within the terms of Policy 13 (Rural Economy).
106	Cllr Shannon on behalf of Ingol residents	Cllr Bill Shannon on behalf of the residents of Ingol Ward regarding PCS24. Request that the corridor from Lightfoot Lane to Tag Lane will be designated an area of separation, and protected from building under the new Local Development Framework. 82 newsletter slips from residents accompany this representation.	That the corridor from Lightfoot Lane to Tag Lane be designated as an area of separation and therefore protected from future development.			What is now Policy 19 (Areas of Separation and Major Open Space) has been changed to include the following text: "Areas of Major Open Space will be designated within the Preston urban boundary that prevent neighbourhoods merging, in particular areas between: (a) Ingol/Tanterton and Greyfriars/Cadley; (b) Sharoe Green and Fulwood."
107	Agent on behalf of Landowner	Relating to sites on Euxton Lane. Support to the preferred spatial option which allows for detailed Green Belt boundary changes and promotes the development of Chorley Town as a Key Service Centre.				Support noted. Is it not appropriate to comment on specific sites.
108	Agent on behalf of Landowner	Relating to Land at Bagganley Lane, Chorley. It is considered that the principles of PCS1 allow for the development of the above site and for that reason this option is supported. This site, with the virtual demise of the eco-town concept, offers a real opportunity for the sensible expansion of a sustainable community (Chorley), with enough critical mass to make the scheme worthwhile.				Support noted. Is it not appropriate to comment on specific sites.
109	Individual	PCS28: support all the measures that reduce car usage and promote walking. PCS24: support this option especially in relation to Chorley and Whittle-le-Woods, and Chorley and Euxton. PCS25: support, particularly 'development of Regional Park' and the idea of the 'Moorland Gateway'. PCS22bi particularly a 'central park' area, Yarrow and Cuerden Valley, Leeds and Liverpool Canal and other green wedges e.g. open grassy recreational area between Tootell Street housing estate and the Gillibrand housing development.			PCS28 c) needs to include "provision of edge of town car parks for access on foot to countryside". PCS28 e) needs to include "providing an increase in frequency of the bus service to Blackburn" PCS28 g i) add "and signage where appropriate". PCS28 g ii) add "and town centre to town edge pavements and paths. PCS25: The 'Moorland Gateway' needs small informal parking areas to the east of Chorley Town - near Bagganley Lane, From St and Cross Hall Lane. It also needs adequate linking footpaths (well signed and maintained) from the built up areas to the West Pennine Moors (Moorland Gateway) PCS22: In the case of the "Yarrow and Cuerden Valley" these would benefit from a linking footpath, going north-south, via Astley Park, Astley Village and Buckshaw Village"	Support noted.  What is now Policy 3 – Travel – aims to improve bus service provision and pedestrian facilities but the specific countryside access proposals are too detailed for the Core Strategy.
110	Cllr Hammond	No objection to the preferred Core Strategy but I must emphasise my support for the keeping of all green space within the present developed areas especially in the areas nearer the town and city centres. No land previously used for recreational purposes i.e. golf clubs, football or cricket pitches must be used for housing or industrial use. Enthusiastic about Core Strategy because of what appears to be a sustainable vision for the next 20 years.				Support noted. Policies 18 and 19 seek to protect recreational and other open land.
111	Individual	I agree that the strategy should protect the local identity of places by designating 'areas of separation' or green wedges.	It is vital that this policy applies to suburban areas as well as the countryside. Between Ingol & Tanterton and Fulwood, the corridor stretching from Lightfoot Lane to Tag Lane must be preserved and protected from further development. It is a high quality green space which helps to separate and define the communities and it is a key landscape, amenity and environmental asset. I therefore ask that this is designated an 'area of separation'.			What is now Policy 19 (Areas of Separation and Major Open Space) has been changed to include the following text: "Areas of Major Open Space will be designated within the Preston urban boundary that prevent neighbourhoods merging, in particular areas between: (a) Ingol/Tanterton and Greyfriars/Cadley; (b) Sharoe Green and Fulwood."
112	Little Hoole Parish Council	Option 1 is the preferred option of the Parish Council. The village of Walmer Bridge is mainly surrounded by green belt land. It is of high importance to retain the green belt land and the existing character of the Parish and the village in particular. There is a desire to retain the rural nature of the area and make the best use of the brownfield sites. The only land for development is on the southern side of the Parish next to the Fox Cub pub and restaurant. This land is identified in the Local Plan of South Ribble as designated for light industrial use. The land has laid dormant for well over twenty years. It is fair to presume that this land has failed to attract development due to the nearby Longton Business Park where there are industrial units and warehouse facilities available. The site is now untidy and overgrown and re-designation to mixed housing would clearly benefit the site. A mixture of bungalows, detached and terraced properties would not be out of character, and a doctor's surgery and chemist could also form part of the development. It is appreciated that Government targets have to be met on housing but this Parish Council would like to have some input into housing and development with a view to retaining the character of the area. This Parish and				Future development at Little Hoole/Walmer Bridge is expected to be small in scale (Policy 1(f) – Locating Growth). The site specific issues relating to land adjacent to the Fox Cub needs to be considered as part of the Site Allocations DPD. "Place shaping" and respecting the existing character of places is recognised as an important principle - see Policy 5 (Housing Density) for example.  The public transport issues raised are addressed at Policy 3(d) – Travel.

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
		Walmer Bridge in general is a rural area with good existing facilities. It is important to retain these services and not spoil the area with over development. Public transport: the services from north to south of the Parish are satisfactory but there is a need for a bus service from east to west to link this area and neighbouring villages to Leyland and Chorley. A direct link from this area to Chorley hospital would be beneficial. It is important to make improvements where necessary but also important to retain the character and elements of the area that already exist.				
113	British Wind Energy Association	Avoid using generic phrases which simply seek to encourage the use of energy efficiency, renewable energy and pollution and waste management. Planning authorities should not make assumptions about the technical and commercial feasibility of renewable energy projects (e.g. identifying generalised locations for development based on mean wind speeds). Local planning authorities should not require applicants for energy development to demonstrate either the overall need for renewable energy and its distribution, nor question the energy justification for why a proposal for such development must be sited in a particular location. BWEA supports policies for the mandatory requirement of onsite renewables in new developments, as requested by Yvette Cooper. BWEA recommend looking at the Renewable Energy Toolkit for planners, developers and consultants, developed by the London Energy Partnership for further guidance on policies on renewable energy and sustainable construction methods.	The LDF should include a robust criteria based policy that will be used to assess all applications for renewable energy developments. It is important that the plan presents a positive, objective and robust approach to renewable energy for the wider and local benefit. BWEA recommend that the council include specific development control policy on renewable energy, focusing on the key criteria that will be used to judge applications, and providing direct reference to PPS22. Policies should not be restrictive and policies designed to safeguard the character and setting of listed buildings, conservation areas and greenbelt etc should have regard to the positive contribution that renewable energy can play in reducing the Council's overall CO2 emissions.		Recommend the inclusion of an overarching climate change policy within the Core Strategy and the inclusion of discrete proactive policies on energy efficiency, renewable energy, sustainable design and construction, within the Development Control DPD, in order to provide detailed policy direction on each issues. BWEA recommends that the development plan provides a brief outline of the different renewable energy generation technologies, and equally encourage and promote all forms of renewable energy. The potential for an Energy Services Company and site-wide CHP should also be considered for future inclusion.	Tackling Climate Change is detailed throughout the Core Strategy as a Cross Cutting Theme. The Cross Cutting Themes are key aspects to successful place shaping and harnessing economic growth. Tackling Climate Change is a policy area in its own right but also has cross-cutting significance so is referred to at the start of each chapter.  There is no need for one overarching policy, especially if merely repeats national policy. A criteria based policy (what is now Policy 28 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Schemes) is included in the Core Strategy - it is not proposed to prepare a development control plan. An outline of different technologies is provided in PPS22 (technical annex).
114	Individual	Lack of provision in Central Lancashire area for recreational aviation. 1) Amount of travelling incurred to access current limited provision. 2) Other recreational facilities (not of interest to me) are provided. 3) Flying sites help maintain an open aspect of the countryside. 4) Local provision would offer opportunities for interested youth organisations (e.g. schools, colleges, cadets, scouts). 5) Flying sites are uncultivated and provide wildlife habitats for small mammals, insects and plants.	Recognition of need to address the lack of facilities for recreational aviation in the Central Lancashire area.			Due to its strategic role, it is not appropriate for the Core Strategy to refer specifically to recreational flying and aviation sports. However, sites for Policy 13 (Rural Economy) have been amended to refer to recreation uses.
115	Hutton Parish Council	PCS1 - Hutton Parish Council support para g) regarding the nature and size of development in smaller villages. PCS28 - Hutton PC supportPCS28h) regarding improvements to the road network which is a clear statement of "the best approach to planning for travel" Para 15.23 page 138 however introduces some dilution of decisiveness and lack of urgency into these statements in respect of the Penwortham Bypass and improving the A582 and linking to the A59.	A better wording for para 15.23 would be '....In the Western Parishes essential schemes are completion of the Penwortham bypass to relieve current serious congestion, improvements to the A582 and provision of a better link between the A59 and the M65, M6 and M61 motorways.			The Penwortham Bypass and improvements to the A582 and A59 are referenced in what is now Policy 3 (Travel). The supporting text has been amended (now paragraph 7.17) to be more positive.
116	Individual	Support PCS7 - no detailed response given.				Support acknowledged.
117	Cllr R Cartwright	Empty homes, particularly former right to buy on 'estates' are an increasing problem. Robust policies need to be developed to respond to this problem. Green infrastructure: support the preferred option. Pleased at the emphasis and would like to see it strengthened. PCS28: Endorse the preferred option, but in the context, particularly of the former Longridge railway it needs strengthening to reflect the need to minimise the impact on adjoining residents	Not objecting, either supporting or seeking a strengthening of policies.			The issue of empty properties is addressed at paragraph 8.24, and in what is now Policy 6 (Housing Quality). Implementation will depend chiefly on wider housing strategies.  There is no specific reference in what is now Policy 3 (Travel) to the former Longridge railway line but it is a route that could be re-used.  Green Infrastructure support noted.
118	Individual	PCS1: No further development is justified in Preston's Northern suburbs, Penwortham, Chorley or Longridge on so called greenfield sites. This would clearly be in breach of government policy concerning the green belt. PCS11: Preston remains the 1960s car-orientated town it has always been with no attempt to pedestrianise it, with its main hospital in the suburbs and environmentally unsound (too warm, too bright, not healthy) indoor shopping centres.	PCS1: the above areas must not be developed at all; only brownfield sites or rundown urban areas should be developed. No strategic review of the green belt can be undertaken unless H.M government officially changes the policy. PCS11: It is doubtful this can ever be rectified unless and until Preston attempts to undo damage done to it by 1960s architectural and planning debacle. One of Preston's few remaining fine Victorian buildings, East Cliff, now obscured by hideous, soulless, multi-storey car park, now in the process of being built near railway station.	9.29: do not agree that it is either desirable or justified. This is purely political. The needs of Blackburn and Blackpool must not be jeopardised by Preston's over-inflated ambitions or Lancaster, as the COUNTY CAPITAL be adversely affected by the growth of 'Central Lancashire'	PCS7: must include adequately sound-proofed partitions between semi-detached houses and incorporated into building regulations. PCS11: truly radical overhaul of Preston's appalling traffic congestion problems before Tithebarn project is tackled. Tram system.	The preferred option (what is now Policy 1 – Locating Growth) is the most reasonable alternative and prioritises the development of previously developed land (PDL). However, there is insufficient PDL to meet housing and other development needs, so some greenfield development will be required. It is important to note that would not be in the Green Belt and no strategic review of Green Belt boundaries is envisaged.  What is now Policy 3 (Travel) seeks to reduce the growth in car use and encourage the use of other modes. Preston City Centre is the most sustainable location for office development.  The Tithebarn proposals reflect the need to regenerate this part of the city centre. The scale and impact of the scheme will be tested at public inquiry.  Comments regarding adequate soundproofing between semi-detached houses are too detailed for a Core Strategy.
119	The Brookhouse Group	PCS14 and the supporting text focus on the delivery of the Tithebarn redevelopment scheme within Preston City Centre. It is acknowledged that this scheme is important to secure and improve the status of Preston as a high ranking centre within the shopping hierarchy. However, the provision of appropriate food shopping facilities is also important to the overall vitality and viability of the City	PCS14 should specifically encourage the development of convenience shopping facilities within the City Centre in order to meet an identified shortfall and contribute towards the health of the City Centre.		PCS14 omits any reference to improving convenience shopping provision within the City Centre. The deficiency has been recognised by the Inspector dealing with the Preston Local Plan. PCS14 should make	What is now Policy 11(Retail and Town Centre Uses and Business Based Tourism) encourages all types of retail development to locate in Preston City Centre.

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
		Centre. At the present time there is a grossly inadequate provision which is harmful to the health of the centre. This was recognised by the Inspector dealing with the Preston Local Plan in 1998. The deficiency identified has yet to be rectified. The provision of new food retailing within the City Centre would contribute towards the regeneration of the City Centre and provide a more sustainable pattern of development.			specific reference to the need to improve food shopping at Preston City Centre.	
120	United Utilities	<p>Chapter 7: Supports the wording pointing out the importance of conserving and minimising the use of water. Whilst there is no shortage of potable water supply in the North West at the moment, environmental protection legislation, predictions on global warming and an increase in the number of households means that we cannot be complacent. Domestic consumption has been increasing over the last 30 years and this growth in demand is unsustainable. UU would therefore support all new homes being built with high levels of water efficiency in mind. Chapter 7: The consideration of the use of 'grey' water is commendable. However research has demonstrated that they are currently expensive to install and maintain, use significant amounts of energy and have public health concerns. Acceptable and sustainable use of such systems has not been proved and so UU cannot endorse their use at present.</p> <p>PCS4: there is no mention of the councils working with all the agencies responsible for various forms of surface water to facilitate Surface Water Management. The fate of surface water is key to UU's capacity to serve new development with drainage services.</p> <p>Chapter 2: RSS requires you to make the best use of existing resources and infrastructure which is stated in this paragraph. I haven't spotted any reference to this elsewhere and perhaps the councils should state their commitment to this principle at an appropriate place in the document?</p>	<p>Objection because although the encouragement to re-use 'grey' water is commendable, it is not currently sustainable. Remove the reference to 'grey' water re-use WITHIN buildings. Re PCS4: add that the councils are facilitating discussions with all the agencies responsible for surface water run off for surface water management purposes. Para 2.15: the councils should state their commitment to making the best use of existing infrastructure capacity at an appropriate place in the document - see RSS policy EM5.</p>			<p>Acknowledged. The supporting text to what is now Policy 29 (Water Management) states: "...there is considerable scope to continue this within buildings such as for toilets, as well as re-use of 'grey' water (that was previously used for washing purposes) for watering gardens and other landscaping areas."</p> <p>What is now Policy 29 (b) now refers to "Working with the regional water company and other partners to promote investment in sewage water treatment works to reduce the risk of river pollution from sewage discharges."</p> <p>Make best use of existing resources and infrastructure is an underlying principle of the Core Strategy.</p>
121	Cllr Buttle	<p>P.44: it is misleading for Cottam to be identified purely as an area for housing when the strategy emphasises the need for mixed use sustainable communities.</p> <p>PCS1: Whilst it is acknowledged that some greenfield development will be required on the fringes of the main urban areas, a clear case must be presented for doing so. It is not sufficient to simply state that opportunities exist (page 21) and Cottam is an existing strategic site.</p> <p>PCS8: on mixed use sites there are often issues regarding residents and businesses living in harmony together. If this is to be a preferred strategy, additional care should be taken to ensure that housing is adequately soundproofed and additional parking needs are met.</p> <p>PCS9e) how will an area be designated as 'unsuitable' for affordable housing? This needs to be included in the SPD (g).</p> <p>PCS11e) live/work units can be a source of friction between neighbours and more clarity is needed regarding this strategy - clear guidelines should be produced on what is acceptable.</p> <p>PCS12b) where developer contributions are sought towards funding of employment skills training and facilities, it should be local people who benefit.</p> <p>PCS13: 'urban related uses should be directed to the urban fringe areas' - Core Strategy is not site specific therefore it is difficult to identify urban fringes - planning applications should be considered on the individual merits of each site.</p> <p>PCS15c) shortfall in provision may not be initially evident when housing is built therefore health practitioners should be consulted as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>PCS24: areas of separation should be considered whenever an area is planned to expand eg Cottam. It would be beneficial to identify the 'boundaries of existing settlements before they become merged together.</p>	<p>PCS14d) needs to be more specific - how is the mix of uses to be maintained/improved to meet local need? Intensive consultation needed to determine what the local need actually is.</p>		<p>It is recommended that additional consultation before planning applications are submitted is cited as good practice for developers in Chapter 6.</p> <p>Clear guidelines as to what is acceptable in terms of live/work units, in order to reduce friction between neighbours. PCS16a) should be expanded to ensure that developers plan for a mixture of age ranges.</p> <p>PCS18: with reference to mixed use sites, residents would be greatly reassured if local businesses or community facilities were encouraged to provide CCTV or additional security. PCS27: when new developments are considered, additional parking should be a consideration, many areas are now 'open plan' and there is no provision at all for visiting cars, leading to congestion on residential roads. PCS28: Extensive research should be carried out to assess the demand for a park and ride at Cottam to ensure the facilities are adequate. Whilst it is acknowledged that a railway station would be beneficial to the area, concern that demand would exceed supply of spaces and commuters will be encouraged to park in the residential streets.</p>	<p>Reference to greenfield development opportunities, in what is now Policy 1 (Locating Growth), have been appropriately chosen.</p> <p>Promoting mixed use sites has been deleted from what is now Policy 4 (Housing Delivery).</p> <p>What is now paragraph 9.10 addressed the issue of live/work units and the potential impact on the surrounding area.</p> <p>What is now Policy 14 (b) (Education) states: "Asking developers to contribute towards the provision of school places where their development would result in or worsen a lack of capacity at existing schools." and what is now Policy 15 (Skills and Economic Inclusion) states: (b) "Liaising with colleges, training agencies and major local employers to develop courses and life-long learning and increase access to training, particularly in local communities that are the most deprived in this respect."</p> <p>(PCS14d) This is a detailed design matter. A Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document will be produced alongside the Core Strategy.</p> <p>What is now Policy 23 (Health) has been amended to the following: "(c) Seeking contributions towards new or enhanced facilities from developers where new housing results in shortfall or worsening of provision."</p> <p>The supporting text to what is now Policy 24 (Sport and Recreation) details that sport and recreation provision must keep up pace with community's needs. The Policy states: "Ensure that everyone has the opportunity to access good sport, physical activity and recreation facilities..."</p> <p>What is now Policy 26 (Crime and Community Safety) (b) states: "Encouraging the inclusion of Secured By Design principles in new developments." Paragraph 11.20 provides details of "Secured By Design."</p> <p>Policy 19 (Areas of Separation and Major Open Space) identifies areas of separation and major open space - to ensure that those at greatest risk of merging will be protected.</p> <p>What is now Policy 7 (Affordable Housing)</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
						<p>details, in part (f), that an accompanying Supplementary Planning Document will establish the following: the cost at which housing is considered to be affordable, proportions of socially rented and shared ownership housing, specific spatial variations of affordable housing need in particular localities and how much affordable housing will be sought.</p> <p>With reference to the comment regarding "the strategy emphasising the need for mixed use sustainable communities and as such it is misleading for Cottam to be identified purely as an area for housing..." Cottam is a strategic location comprising of Cottam Hall and the former Brickworks. The former Brickworks site will include retail, employment, and leisure uses as well as residential units. This is detailed in what is now Policy 1 (Locating Growth) and the supporting text.</p> <p>It is accepted that a Park and Ride at Cottam needs to be considered in detail.</p> <p>A Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (guided by Lancashire County Council's "Civilised Streets" publication, CABE's "By Design" and the Department of Transport's "Manual for Streets", should improve the design of all new housing, as well as applying what is now Policy 17 (Design of New Buildings).</p>
122	West Lancashire District Council	Consideration should be given to the level of employment land that the Preferred Core Strategy seeks to bring forward. The proposed requirement for 90ha of additional employment land, which is set out within the document, should be reviewed in light of changes made to the RSS. Consideration should be given to the inclusion of more cross boundary links between the Central Lancashire region and West Lancashire particularly in relation to the improvement of transport links. West Lancashire District Council support the recognition of the Ribble Estuary Regional Park within the PCS. West Lancashire also support the inclusion of a proposed new rail station at Midge Hall, which will provide the opportunity to enhance rail services between Ormskirk and Preston.				<p>The employment land provision figures have been recalculated and are consistent with Central Lancashire's share of Lancashire's sub regional total.</p> <p>What is now paragraph 3.10 acknowledges the Core Strategy takes account of cross-boundary issues with neighbouring districts outside of Central Lancashire, one of the detailed issue states: "Increased transport connectivity between Central Lancashire and Pennine Lancashire, West Lancashire and the Fylde coast." Policy 3 (Travel) refers to "Improving public transport by: improving main bus routes elsewhere."</p> <p>Support for the recognition of the Ribble Estuary Regional Park within the Core Strategy – noted.</p>
123	First Investments	PCS11: believe that Botany/Great Knowley strategic site should include retail and leisure use, as per the current use and local plan allocation. A mixed use allocation would ensure that the employment land can be developed through the delivery of a viable scheme. PCS14 Strategically important employment site would significantly benefit from the added viability and marketability provided by the mixture of uses. Consultation draft PPS14 includes retail and leisure amongst uses to be considered when planning for economic growth. It is important that large sites such as this contain a mixture of uses to ensure the sub-region can benefit from economic opportunities. Chorley Town Centre Retail Study (2005) identified significant growth in capacity for new comparison goods floor space. By 2015 the need will arise for 9350sqm of comparison goods floor space. Retail development would compete primarily with other out-of centre locations.	Botany/Great Knowley strategic site should include retail and leisure use. Such an allocation would not impact on the Town Centre and would improve the viability of the wider employment site.			<p>The Botany/Great Knowley site is not a Strategic Site, but is recognised as a sub regionally significant employment site. Retail use here would threaten the vitality and viability of Chorley Town Centre.</p>
124	Cllr Hudson	Would like to flag up that stronger protection of the rural countryside where pseudo agricultural buildings should not be allowed unless there is a valid sound business case. Also point out that the road infrastructure around the city should make provision for a further M6 junction south of Garstang to allow Wyre to grow without any deleterious affect on Preston residents.				<p>This issue is addressed in what are now Policy 13 (Rural Economy) and Policy 16 (Heritage Assets). The policies include sufficient safeguards.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.19 alludes to a potential M6 junction near Garstang.</p>
125	The Leyland Board	The proposals in the Core Strategy miss the point with regards the role of Leyland and South Ribble. The suggested policies fail to recognise or plan for Leyland's role in Central Lancashire and instead appear to label Leyland as a secondary location where economic growth will be stifled in favour of the status quo. Lack of priority given to the long term growth and development of Leyland and South Ribble. As drafted, the policies could lead to the stagnation of the town to the detriment of South Ribble and Central Lancashire. Role of Leyland severely understated - it is an admin, commercial and retail centre in its own right - not just	Whilst South Ribble has a comparable amount of employment land up to 2021 to Preston the Core Strategy fails to make the important link between this and the long term growth and transformation of Leyland and South Ribble. The Core Strategy should make this link and provide policies that positively encourage growth and transformation of Leyland and the Borough. The Core Strategy should make explicit		The Core Strategy should set out policies that will promote developments relating to Leyland railway station and its surroundings, thus seeking to strengthen its role within the sub-region and help to realise a latent opportunity to the benefit of the town	<p>The Vision has been amended to recognise Leyland's role: "Leyland will have built upon its world famous industrial heritage, driving forward change and economic growth in the town and borough to become an enterprise engine."</p> <p>The spatial portrait has now been reworded</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments	Suggested Changes	Other Options	Omissions	Responses
		<p>complementary to Preston - label of 'key service centre' is meaningless. Lack of understanding of the Leyland Masterplan - the residential element is ancillary and the reference is therefore erroneous.</p> <p>The reference to providing 100% affordable accommodation on all exception sites fails to recognise individual circumstances which arise as part of windfall opportunities.</p> <p>Chapter 9 presents a bias in favour of the growth of Preston. There is no reference to the opportunity to link Buckshaw and Cuerden to the development and regeneration of Leyland.</p> <p>Chapter 11 fails to recognise the opportunity for Leyland to play an important role as a hub for rural communities to benefit from increased services and economic opportunities. The phrase "continue to fulfil their localised function" is inappropriate as it does not promote Leyland and its opportunities.</p> <p>Chapter 14 does not recognise the importance of Leyland's culture and heritage. Chapter 15 fails to recognise the role of, and opportunities linked to Leyland Railway station</p>	<p>reference to the links between Leyland and Buckshaw/Cuerden, and it should emphasise Cuerden's role as a regionally important investment site, due to it being located in the most commercially attractive location in Lancashire. Need to recognise that encouraging growth in each of Central Lancashire's main settlements will benefit the sub-region as a whole. The Preferred Core Strategy states that it will "deliver Tithebarn"- this is misleading as it is out of the hands of the Preferred Core Strategy - instead it should read "support where possible the delivery of". Chapter 14: the whole of this section needs to be re-written in a manner that appropriately recognises and promotes utilisation of Leyland's culture and heritage to best effect, instead of extolling the virtues of Preston and paying only passing reference to Leyland (and Chorley). A comprehensive re-assessment of Leyland's role in Central Lancashire is necessary as a matter of priority. Leyland must be given a higher profile.</p>			<p>detailing various areas of South Ribble. What is now paragraph 5.5 (Chapter 5 - Spatial Strategy: Managing and Locating Growth) states:</p> <p>"In South Ribble advanced manufacturing and automotive industries remain important sectors with major employers including BAE systems at Samlesbury and Leyland Trucks, and significant public sector employers such as Lancashire Constabulary HQ. The knowledge economy is important in South Ribble, especially at Samlesbury, and the borough's economic regeneration strategy aims for it to become an enterprise engine by 2018."</p> <p>The description that was in paragraph 3.53 of the Preferred Option Core Strategy regarding "cheaper and middle income accommodation" has now been removed.</p> <p>The phrase has not been amended. The term was used in the Regional Spatial Strategy, but despite its revocation it is still considered an appropriately informative term. What is now Policy 1 (Locating Growth) details where growth and investment will be concentrated, including Key Service Centres.</p> <p>Any mention of the Leyland Town Centre Masterplan in the Housing chapter has been removed.</p> <p>Also in Policy 1 (Locating Growth) Lancashire Central, Cuerden has been identified as a strategic employment site. Details of strategic sites, including Buckshaw Village and Lancashire Central, Cuerden are given in what is now Chapter 5: Spatial Strategy - Managing and Locating Growth.</p> <p>With regard to the comment recognising the opportunity for Leyland to play an important role as a hub for rural communities – no change to reflect this comment.</p> <p>What is now paragraph 9.24 has been reworded:</p> <p>"Chorley and Leyland town centres operate at a different level to Preston city centre but for them to continue to fulfil their Key Service Centre role they require investment to maintain their share of retail expenditure. District and Local Service Centres provide for the day to day needs of local communities. It is important that these are maintained as convenient places to obtain basic goods and services."</p> <p>With regard to comment "Chapter 15 fails to recognise the role of and opportunities linked to Leyland Rail Station." - Too specific for a Core Strategy. However, Policy 3 (Travel) (d) details public transport will be improved by improving Leyland station.</p>
126	Patrick Burling Developments	<p>Preferred Option PCS11 f): The policy, as drafted, is unduly restrictive in respect of the future use of sites classified as 'Good Urban' sites in the Employment Land Review. As drafted, the policy risks 'Good Urban' sites which are ultimately unattractive to the market becoming disused over a prolonged period of time and making no effective contribution to physical or economic regeneration objectives. These comments are made with specific reference to the Edward Street/Winery Lane site (SS26) which is identified in the Employment Land Review document. The site assessment undertaken for this site confirms that it is affected by a number of environmental constraints and has a poor road frontage which combines to create an "average business image overall". The likelihood of this site being reused or redeveloped for business uses is therefore questionable and, as a consequence, the policy framework should be sufficiently flexible to allow its release for other land uses subject to relevant planning policy tests being satisfied.</p>	<p>The policy clause should be recast so as to introduce an element of flexibility which would allow such sites to come forward for non B Class uses providing that specified criteria are met.</p>			<p>The comments are too site specific for a Core Strategy. Site specific comments will be dealt with at the Site Allocations DPD process.</p> <p>What is now Policy 10 (Employment premises and sites) has been reworded for clarification.</p>