



The Planning Inspectorate

---

# **Partial Report to South Ribble Borough Council**

by **Susan Heywood BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Date 08 November 2013

---

PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004 (AS AMENDED)

SECTION 20

**PARTIAL REPORT ON THE EXAMINATION INTO THE  
SITE ALLOCATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES  
DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT**

Document submitted for examination on 26 October 2012

Examination hearings held between 5<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> March 2013

File Ref: PINS/F2360/429/2

## **Abbreviations Used in this Report**

AA	Appropriate Assessment
CIL	Community Infrastructure Levy
CS	Core Strategy (Central Lancashire)
DPD	Development Plan Document
EA	Environment Agency
EZ	Enterprise Zone
FZ	Flood Zone
HCA	Housing and Communities Agency
HSE	Health and Safety Executive
HTM	Highways and Transport Masterplan
IDP	Infrastructure Delivery Plan
LCC	Lancashire County Council
LDO	Local Development Order
LDS	Local Development Scheme
LEP	Local Enterprise Partnership
LP	Local Plan
MM	Main Modification
NE	Natural England
NR	Network Rail
PPTS	Planning Policy for Traveller Sites
RS	Regional Strategy
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SCI	Statement of Community Involvement
SFRA	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
SHLAA	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

## **Non-Technical Summary**

This partial report sets out the conclusions that, subject to further work currently being undertaken on Gypsy and Traveller site provision, the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document provides an appropriate basis for the planning of the Borough over the next 15 years providing a number of modifications are made to the Plan. The Council has specifically requested that I recommend any modifications necessary to enable them to adopt the Plan.

At this advanced stage of the examination, I do not anticipate that the recommendations on the matters covered in this report will be subject to revision unless there are exceptionally changed circumstances, such as the publication of revised planning policy. The modifications can be summarised as follows:

- The inclusion of a performance monitoring framework for effectiveness;
- Deletion of references to the Regional Strategy;
- Clarification of the scale of development envisaged in smaller villages, to ensure compliance with the CS;
- Alteration to policy B3 to ensure the Plan is positively prepared;
- Alteration to policy B6 to ensure consistency with the Framework;
- The inclusion of an explanation of the requirements for masterplans;
- Changes to clarify the extent of the Moss Side Test Track site and the support for improved public transport provision;
- Changes to the access requirements to the Heatherleigh/Moss Lane site to avoid placing unnecessary constraints on development;
- Change to the range of acceptable uses for the Cuerden Strategic Site to promote economic development;
- Changes to clarify the access arrangements required at the Samlesbury Strategic Site/Enterprise Zone to promote economic development and to include reference to the proposed Biological Heritage Site for clarity;
- Changes to clarify and update the housing figures and alterations to the phasing requirements to ensure a positive approach to housing delivery;
- Change to the employment land supply figures to accord with the CS;
- Amendment to ensure that the protection of employment sites is in accordance with the Framework;
- Alterations to the retail chapter of the Plan to avoid undue constraint on large retail outlets, to support the economic development aims of the Town Centre Masterplan for consistency with the CS, and to define retail frontages to ensure the Plan is effective;
- Amendments to Green Belt policies to reflect the Framework;
- Alterations to the policy referring to Areas of Separation to avoid undue constraint to development;
- Clarification that Green Corridors are Green Wedges as identified in the CS;
- Addition of a policy relating to biodiversity and nature conservation and reference to ecological networks for clarity and to ensure compliance with the Framework;

## Introduction

1. This partial report contains my assessment of the **Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD** (the Plan) in terms of Section 20(5) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended). It considers first whether the Plan's preparation has complied with the duty to co-operate, in recognition that there is no scope to remedy any failure in this regard. It then considers whether the Plan is sound and whether it is compliant with the legal requirements. For the reasons set out during the course of the examination, matters relating to a Gypsy and Traveller needs assessment and any necessary site provision will be considered in a supplementary report, once the Council has undertaken further assessment work.
2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) (paragraph 182) makes clear that to be sound, a Local Plan should be positively prepared; justified; effective and consistent with national policy. The starting point for the examination is the assumption that the Council has submitted what it considers to be a sound plan. The basis for my examination is the submitted Publication Plan July 2012, together with the Council's proposed minor post-publication changes detailed in Submission Document SRSD007a.
3. In accordance with section 20(7C) of the 2004 Act the Council requested that I should make any modifications needed to rectify matters that make the Plan unsound/not legally compliant and thus incapable of being adopted. This report considers all of the issues that I consider go to the heart of the soundness of the Plan and the main modifications that are needed to make the Plan sound and legally compliant, with the exception of modifications that may be necessary in regard to the provision of accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers. The main modifications are identified in bold (**MM**) and are set out in the Appendix to this report. They refer to all soundness matters except for provision of accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers, which will be specified in my supplementary report that will consider this sole issue.
4. These modifications have already been subject to public consultation and, where necessary, Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and I have taken the consultation responses into account in making my recommendations.

## Assessment of Duty to Co-operate

5. Section s20(5)(c) of the 2004 Act requires consideration of whether the Council complied with any duty imposed on it by section 33A of the 2004 Act in relation to the Plan's preparation. Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Plans) (England) Regulations 2012 prescribes those bodies required by Section 33A of the 2004 Act to co-operate in maximising the effectiveness of the preparation of a development plan, so far as relating to a strategic matter.
6. Following the submission of the Plan for examination, the Council produced a Statement of Compliance with the Duty to Co-operate and subsequent

addendum.<sup>1</sup> These documents list relevant joint working arrangements on a range of issues including housing, economy and travel to work. The documents set out how the Council has sought to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis with the relevant organisations and prescribed bodies on strategic matters.

7. The Council has set up a Joint Advisory Committee with the adjoining authorities of Preston and Chorley, assisted by Lancashire County Council. This has facilitated joint working on the Central Lancashire Core Strategy (CS) adopted in July 2012.<sup>2</sup> These joint working arrangements have continued through to the production of the Plan and are still ongoing. The Council has also sought to actively engage with other prescribed bodies, including other Lancashire authorities through the Development Plans Officer Group, and relevant organisations through regular meetings and joint working. The responses received from these bodies indicate that there are no outstanding issues of concern.
8. Matters relating to the assessment of need for and provision of sites for Gypsies and Travellers are currently the subject of joint working between the Council and the adjoining authorities of Preston and Chorley. The outcome of this will be considered in my supplementary report.
9. In relation to all other matters and in the absence of any substantive contrary evidence, the Council has worked with necessary partners upon matters of strategic importance and has ongoing processes and partnerships in place which indicates adequately that the duty to co-operate in relation to the preparation of the submitted plan has been met.

## Assessment of Soundness

### Preamble

10. The Plan has been developed having regard to the Central Lancashire Core Strategy (CS) and the Regional Strategy (RS) for the North West. In May 2013, the Government revoked the RS. The impact of this on the soundness of the Plan was consulted upon and I have had regard to the responses made. The Council proposes a modification (**MM02**) to remove reference to the Plan being compliant with the RS. Any further implications of the revocation, where relevant to the Plan, are discussed below.
11. The Plan follows on from the CS which was adopted in July 2012. It allocates sites across the Borough to meet the development needs of South Ribble up to 2026 in order to achieve the vision for growth as outlined in the CS and provide development management policies, which reflect local issues, upon which planning applications will be determined. Upon its adoption the Plan will replace

---

<sup>1</sup> CD 2.4 and 2.4.1

<sup>2</sup> SRE002

the South Ribble Local Plan, February 2000.<sup>3</sup> Together with the CS, it will form the statutory development plan for South Ribble.

12. During the examination it became apparent that the absence of any allocation of sites for the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers is not supported by an up-to-date Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA), as required by the Framework and Planning policy for traveller sites (PPTS). Therefore, it was not clear if the Plan is justified, or if it is not, how it should be rectified by main modifications. To justify its approach the Plan relies on the Lancashire Gypsy Traveller Accommodation Assessment 2007<sup>4</sup>, which covers the issue of need for Gypsies and Travellers between 2006 and 2016. It concludes that there is no need identified for additional residential pitches within South Ribble. This GTAA was found sound at the examination of the CS and on its basis the Plan does not allocate any sites.
13. At the time of adoption of the CS, the Framework and PPTS had just been published. Since then, well over a year has lapsed and the GTAA has become correspondingly more out-dated. Continued reliance on the 2007 GTAA conflicts with policy B of the PPTS. Furthermore, the 2007 GTAA was based on a 'need where it arises' approach. The report recognises the unsustainability of that approach and recommends (Recommendation 1 page 129) that the authorities within the study area seek to address the under provision of Gypsy and Traveller accommodation (estimated as between 126-147 new pitches before 2011 and 79-84 additional pitches before 2016 across the study area) by working across administrative boundaries both sub-regionally and across regional boundaries.
14. These factors indicate that the 2007 GTAA is not sufficiently up-to-date and that consequently, the approach of the Plan to not allocate sites for gypsies and travellers is not underpinned by robust evidence.
15. On submission of the Plan, the Council's intention was to commence discussions with neighbouring authorities with a view to commissioning a new study to assess need post 2016.<sup>5</sup> Further correspondence from the Council<sup>6</sup> following the examination hearings refers to the joint working arrangements with Chorley and Preston authorities on this matter. The Council has proposed new and condensed timescales which anticipates the completion of the GTAA at the end of 2013. In order to allow for the allocation of any necessary sites, the anticipated adoption date of the local plan would be the end of 2014 / beginning of 2015. However, this date is subject to change having regard to the results of the GTAA.
16. Due to the lack of robust, up to date evidence on this matter, I conclude that suspension of the examination to accord with the further revised timetable suggested by the Council is the appropriate action to be taken in order to make the Plan sound. This will entail the completion of a joint GTAA with Chorley and

---

<sup>3</sup> CD4.9

<sup>4</sup> CD4.7

<sup>5</sup> CD5.30

<sup>6</sup> CD2.13 & CD2.17

Preston Councils in December 2013. Further hearing sessions of the Plan would be reconvened in 2014, in order to consider the findings of the GTAA and any site allocations.

17. I am conscious that this delay could be prejudicial to the delivery of main-stream housing and could result in uncertainty in the development management process. Thus, consistent with the approach of the Inspector conducting the examination of the Chorley Local Plan, I have issued this partial report in order to avoid a policy gap pending resolution of the outstanding issue of provision for Gypsies and Travellers.
18. The examination remains open until I conclude that this matter is satisfactorily resolved, at which time I shall produce a further report to supplement this partial report. However, to avoid uncertainty for developers and those making planning decisions during the interim period, I have produced this partial report and its accompanying Appendix, which detail all matters of concern for the soundness of the Plan and my recommendations for remedying them, except for those which refer to Gypsies and Travellers.
19. For the avoidance of doubt, the Plan may not be adopted until it has been changed in accordance with all of the main modifications set out in the Appendix to this partial report and any which may be specified in the Appendix of my forthcoming supplementary report. However, because of the very advanced stage in the examination process that the main modifications set out in the attached Appendix have reached, significant weight should be attached to all policies and proposals of the Plan that are amended accordingly, where necessary, except for matters relating to Gypsies and Travellers.

### **Main Issues**

20. Taking account of all the representations, written evidence, the discussions that took place at the examination hearings and correspondence after the hearings I have identified six main issues upon which the soundness of the Plan depends.

### **Issue 1 – Plan Preparation and Legal Compliance. Has the Plan been positively prepared in compliance with all relevant legal requirements? Is it consistent with national policy and the Core Strategy?**

21. The Plan seeks to set out an appropriate means by which new development is managed. It follows on from the CS and is consistent with its spatial strategy, its housing and employment land requirements. The Plan also allocates strategic sites in accordance with the aims of the CS.
22. Subject to detailed matters considered below, the thrust of the Plan is consistent with the sustainable development aims of the Framework. The CS contains policy MP which sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. It is not necessary to repeat that policy in the Plan.
23. Concern was expressed regarding the public consultation that was undertaken

by the Council in relation to a number of the proposed site allocations. However, the requirements of the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)<sup>7</sup> have been met and the level and nature of the consultation undertaken was appropriate and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Plans) (England) Regulations 2012.<sup>8</sup>

24. The content of the submitted Plan has been informed by the process of Sustainability Appraisal (SA)<sup>9</sup> which has underpinned the preparation process since the early stages of the Plan development and which follows on from the SA process which was undertaken for preparation and production of the CS. Some concern was expressed that certain sites were filtered out at an early stage and not therefore subject to SA or consultation. Such sites were those under 0.4 hectares, sites within Flood Zone (FZ) 3 and sites in the Green Belt. Sites under 0.4 ha were considered too small to allocate, sites in FZ3 would only have been assessed if insufficient land was found to be available in FZs 1 and 2 and the CS indicates that there is no need for the release of Green Belt within the plan period. It is appropriate for the Council to have filtered such sites out at an early stage in the process. There is sufficient evidence to suggest, as confirmed by the Council,<sup>10</sup> that reasonable alternatives to the Plan's policies and site allocations were considered and that the reasons for discounting such alternatives remain valid. The SA evidence in support of the plan is considered adequate.
25. The Plan has been prepared having adequate regard to flood risk. The Central Lancashire Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)<sup>11</sup> underpins the policy approach of the plan, as confirmed by the Council's additional statement.<sup>12</sup> There is no evidence to suggest that the SFRA is flawed and the Environment Agency (EA) have confirmed that, subject to further detailed involvement in relation to one housing site, they have no outstanding concerns in relation to the Plan.
26. The Plan has been prepared with full regard to the provisions of the relevant Habitats Regulations and the Plan is supported by an adequate Appropriate Assessment (AA)<sup>13</sup> and evidence that the cumulative effects of the Plan have been considered. Natural England (NE) has confirmed that they have no outstanding concerns in relation to the Plan. A new policy is proposed to ensure that adequate regard is had to biodiversity in the implementation of the policies and allocations of the Plan. This is recommended as a main modification (**MM28**), for reasons of effectiveness and consistency with national policy.
27. Overall, other than the issues relating to Gypsy and Traveller site provision, my conclusion is that the Plan has been positively prepared in compliance with all

---

<sup>7</sup> SRSD004

<sup>8</sup> CD2.3

<sup>9</sup> SRSD005

<sup>10</sup> CD5.1.0

<sup>11</sup> SRE042

<sup>12</sup> CD5.1.0

<sup>13</sup> SRE008



relevant legal requirements and, subject to detailed discussion below, is generally consistent with national policy and the adopted CS.

**Issue 2 – Is the Plan's approach to housing justified by the evidence base and consistent with national planning policy and the Core Strategy?**

*Is sufficient land allocated to meet the objectively assessed needs over the plan period?*

28. The housing requirement targets for South Ribble were set out in the RS and carried forward into the CS. These figures were based on 2006 household projections. Having regard to the most recent, 2011, household projection figures the Council considers that these housing targets are still appropriate and, on the basis of the evidence before me, this appears to be a reasonable assessment.
29. The CS sets a minimum requirement of 417 dwellings per year to be provided within South Ribble (6255 dwellings over the plan period). Policy D1 and Tables 1 and 2 identify land to be allocated over the plan period, sites with existing planning permission and sites with current planning applications. Further information submitted during the examination<sup>14</sup> confirms that the Plan makes provision for 6869 dwellings over the plan period which is sufficient to meet the identified need.
30. The Housing Land Position Statement (HLPS)<sup>15</sup> indicates that during the period 2003-2013, there was an under-provision of 809 dwellings against the CS target. Paragraph 47 of the Framework indicates that where there has been a record of persistent under-delivery of housing, authorities should provide a buffer of 20% within the 5-year supply (moved forward from later in the plan period). Furthermore, CS Policy 4 sets out the need for the under-provision from previous years to be made up over the plan period (although concern has been expressed that this under-provision should be made up in the first 5 years of the Plan, a matter I return to below).
31. CD4.33 demonstrates that, together with housing commitments and other identified sites, the Plan makes provision for deliverable sites with an estimated capacity for 3484 dwellings over the first 5 years, without relying on windfalls. This is comfortably sufficient to meet the CS target of 417 per year, plus a buffer of 20%. It is likely that windfall sites will continue to come forward in addition to these identified sites. There have also been suggestions by some landowners / developers that some sites could accommodate more dwellings than the Council's estimates suggest. There is no evidence to suggest that the information contained in CD4.33 is fundamentally flawed, nor has the deliverability of any of the sites included within CD4.33 been challenged.
32. The Council considers that, since the revocation of the RS, there is no longer a requirement for it to make up the shortfall which occurred prior to the CS Plan

---

<sup>14</sup> CD4.33 (3.6.13 version)

<sup>15</sup> CD4.33

period. However, the requirement to make up the shortfall is set out in Policy 4 of the CS and if the Plan were not to make provision for this, it would not accord with the CS. Furthermore, the Council agrees that the evidence base which informed the RS housing figures is still valid and appropriate in the absence of more up-to-date evidence. The shortfall of 809 dwellings represents an unmet need for housing having regard to the most up-to-date assessment of need. Whilst the revocation of the RS allows the Council to set its own housing targets, this must still be based on robust evidence. There is no such evidence to suggest that the shortfall of 809 dwellings no longer forms part of the housing need.

33. Comments were made that the shortfall of 809 dwellings should be made up over the first 5 years of the plan. In applying a buffer of 20% the Council are already having regard to the under-provision from previous years and the buffer will provide choice and competition in the market for land, in accordance with the Framework. In addition, the Council indicates that 45 dwellings per annum are likely to come forward as windfall completions. This has taken account of completions between 2008 and 2013. These figures are not included in the 5-year housing land supply, but they do demonstrate that there is likely to be additional flexibility in the availability of housing land. Taken together, the 5-year supply, 20% buffer and likelihood of windfall completions lead me to the view that the Council has allocated sufficient housing land to meet its needs over the plan period. The approach to dealing with the shortfall over the Plan period is sound and would be in accordance with the approach in the CS.
34. The Council has suggested modifications (**MM15, MM16, MM17, MM18**) to update and clarify the information contained in policy D1, tables 1 and 2 and policy D2. I have further altered MM15 to reflect the updated information on the shortfall as indicated in the latest HLPS.<sup>16</sup> Policy D2 includes proposals to identify the number of dwellings to be constructed during each phase of the Plan. The Council proposes a modification (**MM19**) to ensure that this policy encourages housing development rather than seeking to manage and restrict the number of dwellings to be provided within each phase. These modifications are necessary for an effective plan that ensures a sufficient supply of housing to meet the needs of the local area.

*Are the allocated sites appropriate?*

35. The process of site identification has been informed by a range of evidence sources which include the SHLAA,<sup>17</sup> SA, individual site assessments<sup>18</sup> and the ongoing process of community engagement. Housing sites have been allocated in the Plan in accordance with the hierarchy for settlements set out in the CS. This hierarchy comprises the South Ribble Urban Area and Major Development Sites, the Key Service Centres of Leyland and Farington and the Rural Local Service Centre of Longton. In all other areas development will be confined to small scale infill, conversions and development for local need. The Council is

---

<sup>16</sup> CD2.18.4

<sup>17</sup> SRE015

<sup>18</sup> CD5.3.2

proposing a modification (**MM03**) to clarify that in exceptional circumstances, larger scale development may be appropriate in these areas. This would ensure consistency with the CS and that the Plan takes a positive approach to development.

36. Site N has been allocated for 45 dwellings in the village of Hutton, which is outside of the defined hierarchy. The Parish Council does not support this allocation, indicating that it is not promoted within the Hutton Village Plan<sup>19</sup> and that it will exacerbate existing traffic problems around the Grammar School opposite the site. However, the Council indicates that the site could be used to help ease traffic and parking around the school, and this requirement is included in the Plan. It argues that the site is needed to provide market housing to contribute positively to the viability and vitality of the village.
37. I note that this site was safeguarded in the South Ribble Local Plan for local needs development. As such, there has been a long standing intention that the site would be developed. There is no evidence that the removal of the 'local needs' element of the allocation would exacerbate any traffic impact that the development of the site would have. Whilst I acknowledge the traffic difficulties in the area, policies B6 and F1 should ensure that matters of highway safety and parking are adequately addressed through the development management process. Overall, it is reasonable of the Council to consider that the provision of parking facilities on this site may help to alleviate the difficulties in the surrounding area. I have no convincing evidence to the contrary.
38. Whilst I note the information in the Hutton Village Plan, this is not a formally adopted neighbourhood plan. The views of local people are important but they must be balanced with the need to plan positively for the overall housing needs of the area. The site has been adequately considered through the SA and I have no evidence to demonstrate that the site is not capable of being developed, albeit having regard to the traffic implications. Overall therefore I consider that the Council's approach is sound.
39. Sites M, V, X and Q have been allocated within the Rural Local Service Centre of Longton, in line with the CS settlement hierarchy. Although such allocations have been criticised in some representations for comprising greenfield sites, they are necessary to ensure that a 5-year supply of housing land is clearly deliverable and that sufficient housing land is provided within the Plan period.
40. Several other sites are allocated in the South Ribble Urban Area. I recognise that local residents in the areas surrounding some of these sites have expressed concerns about the allocations. In relation to site S in particular, concerns have been expressed about the impact of traffic at the nearby level crossing. The Council, through its discussions with the Highway Authority, is satisfied that none of the allocated sites (both within and outside the urban area) would create insurmountable traffic problems and I have no substantive evidence which would suggest otherwise. Network Rail (NR) was consulted on the allocations in the Plan, but did not raise concerns about the impact of the

---

<sup>19</sup> CD6.3.16

allocation of site S. I am aware of concerns raised by NR in relation to a smaller residential allocation (which has planning permission) to the south (site I). However, in that case, NR recommended a condition relating to the monitoring of traffic levels and funding for any necessary mitigation measures. Whilst it will undoubtedly be the case that additional traffic from site S would lengthen the queues at the level crossing, I have no evidence to suggest that this would cause insurmountable transport problems. There will be an opportunity to address detailed matters relating to the impact on the surrounding transport network at the planning application stage. Policy A1, discussed below, will ensure that contributions towards infrastructure facilities are secured through S106 agreements or CIL funds.

41. I note concerns expressed by one of the landowners of site S that the land has the potential to accommodate more than the 250 units indicated in Table 1 and policy D1. There appear to be a number of factors, including noise from adjoining motorways and potential impact on the level crossing, which could affect the final housing density on site S. I note the additional information submitted by the landowner in an attempt to demonstrate the feasibility of additional housing on that site. However, a full and open assessment of such matters would be expected at the detailed site planning stage. Together, the wording of policy D1 and the proposed amendments to policy D2 and its introduction make clear that the number of dwellings on each of the allocated sites is an estimate and that regular monitoring of the number of dwellings provided will take place in order to ensure that the Council provides sufficient housing land to meet its needs. Nothing in the Plan would preclude additional dwellings coming forward over and above the indicative 250 units should the Council be satisfied that this is appropriate following detailed assessment. Accordingly, I conclude that the Council's approach to site S, as outlined in policy D1, is sound.
42. Concerns were raised regarding impacts on highways, ecology and potential flooding issues at Site P, amongst other matters. It would appear that there are existing drainage problems in this area. The Water Cycle Study<sup>20</sup> indicates that parts of the site are within Flood Zones 2 and 3. However, a site specific Flood Risk Assessment would be expected to steer development away from high risk areas and would also be expected to ensure that the development does not cause flooding problems either on or off site. The EA have raised no specific concerns about the allocation of this site, but have indicated that they wish to be involved at the masterplanning stage. As stated above, the Highway Authority is satisfied that none of the allocations, including Site P, would cause insurmountable traffic or highway problems. The masterplanning stage will provide the opportunity to address these and other detailed matters of site development. Policy A1, discussed below, will ensure that contributions towards infrastructure facilities are secured through S106 agreements or CIL funds. Wildlife issues are addressed below. This site was safeguarded for future development in the South Ribble Local Plan. As such, there has been a long standing intention that the site would be developed. I conclude that the Council's approach to site P, as outlined in policy D1, is sound.

---

<sup>20</sup> SRE027

43. Some concerns were raised about the potential impact on wildlife on some of the allocated sites, particularly the greenfield sites (including Site P). The evidence base in relation to the Habitat Regulations Assessment<sup>21</sup> and the confirmation that NE has no concerns with the Plan lead me to consider that none of the allocations raise insurmountable concerns in this regard. The Council is proposing a biodiversity policy (**MM28**) which would ensure that adequate regard is had to the protection and enhancement of biodiversity in the detailed consideration of developments.
44. Concerns were also expressed about the potential for drainage problems to be created or exacerbated around some of the other allocated sites. It would appear that there are existing drainage problems in some areas. However, the Council points to the Water Cycle Study which indicates that there are no insurmountable drainage problems in relation to any of the allocated sites. I have no convincing evidence to the contrary, although it is clear that in some cases careful regard will need to be had to drainage and flooding issues in the detailed site development. For those allocations for which a masterplan is to be produced, the masterplan would be expected to outline these arrangements. Policy A1, discussed below, will ensure that contributions towards infrastructure facilities are secured through S106 agreements or CIL funds.
45. Overall, there is no conclusive evidence to substantiate the fears that the allocations, either individually or cumulatively, would have a significantly detrimental impact on local infrastructure. The site allocations within the Plan as a whole would provide an appropriate contribution to meeting housing need in the area and none of the allocations are unsound.

*Whether there are any other sites that should be allocated in the Plan*

46. The site allocations meet the relevant housing targets of the CS with an appropriate contingency surplus. They have all been subject to full SA and, subject to the main modifications in this report, are all sound. Therefore, it is unnecessary to make further allocations to make the Plan sound. Other sites have been put forward as alternative sites in the Publication Stage representations. Taking into account the written and oral representations, and my visits to these sites, I have considered whether they should have been allocated on the basis of the Council's methodology for site selection, as set out in the SA.
47. Land to the south of housing allocation DD is a greenfield site of some 1.9 ha in area. It adjoins a site on which planning permission has been granted for 36 dwellings. The site was considered at the 'Issues and Options' stage of the Plan, but discounted due to the presence of an Health and Safety Executive (HSE) Consultation Zone related to the Gas Holders site (now site DD). The gas holders have now been de-commissioned and the HSE have confirmed that the Consultation Zone has been revoked. The site is within the existing built up area and scores well on the SA criteria, as demonstrated by the information put

---

<sup>21</sup> SRE008

forward by the promoter of the site.<sup>22</sup> The Council has accepted that this would be a suitable site having regard to alternatives but consider that it could come forward as a windfall site in the absence of a specific allocation. Whilst I acknowledge that this site would have been suitable for allocation, as concluded above, it is unnecessary to make further housing allocations to make the plan sound. Accordingly, the Council's decision not to specifically allocate this site does not make the plan unsound.

48. Site BB, land adjacent to Barn Flatt Close, is a greenfield site within the village of Higher Walton. The site is located adjacent to the M6 motorway. It was not taken forward as a specific allocation in the Publication version of the Plan as the Council had concerns in relation to the constraints that noise from the motorway would impose on the site development. The SA also indicates that the site is in FZs 2 and 3. There were therefore deliverability concerns in relation to the site. The promoters of the site have supplied information to indicate that noise issues could be adequately overcome and the Council now accepts this. Nevertheless, the Council considers that, subject to satisfactory details, the site could come forward as a windfall site in the absence of a specific allocation. I consider that the site was correctly rejected for reasons of deliverability at the time the SA was undertaken. Whilst it may be possible to overcome the identified concerns, as concluded above, it is unnecessary to make further housing allocations to make the plan sound. Accordingly, the Council's decision not to specifically allocate this site does not make the plan unsound.
49. Land to the west of site Q is allocated as Protected Open Land in the Publication version of the Plan. It is a greenfield site located in the Rural Local Service Centre of Longton. The site was put forward in the Issues and Options Discussion Paper<sup>23</sup> as site reference SR030. The Council rejected the site due to its countryside location and the importance of the open land to the character of the area. The promoter of the site argues that, in terms of the sustainability indicators in the SA, this site is no different to the adjoining site Q. It is argued that considering the two sites together would allow for affordable housing to be provided.
50. The site forms part of a large area of open countryside which surrounds the village. It is important to the rural character of the village that the surrounding countryside is retained. Whilst I acknowledge that there is little difference between the site now being put forward and site Q, an important balance needs to be struck between allocating sufficient housing sites to meet the identified need whilst conserving and protecting the countryside and the character of the rural villages. In striking that balance, the Council has sought to allocate that part of the land closest to the existing residential development to the north and east. Other sites are also allocated elsewhere in the village, closer to the centre of the village and its services. These other sites will provide for affordable housing. I consider that the site was correctly rejected for reasons of impact on the character of the village. As concluded above, it is unnecessary to make further housing allocations to make the plan sound. Accordingly, the Council's

---

<sup>22</sup> CD6.3.5

<sup>23</sup> SRE053

decision not to allocate this site does not make the plan unsound.

51. Land off Wham Lane is located within the Green Belt to the east of New Longton. It is put forward as land for village development, potentially including land to provide a village centre, the re-location of the primary school and enabling existing drainage issues to be resolved. The potential for provision of affordable housing to meet local needs is also highlighted. However, the CS indicates that there is no need to make changes to the strategic extent of the Green Belt.<sup>24</sup> The location of the development would also be contrary to CS Policy 1. Although criticisms were made of the Council's approach to filtering out this site at an early stage in the process ie. before the consultation on the Issues and Options, it is reasonable for the Council to have discounted the site at that stage, given its Green Belt location. Notwithstanding the potential benefits which might ensue from the development of the site, it would also lead to a significant loss of Green Belt land. As concluded above, it is unnecessary to make further housing allocations to make the plan sound. There is no evidence to demonstrate that there is a specific need for this site for affordable housing. The evidence does not demonstrate that any other benefits would outweigh the harm caused by the loss of a large amount of Green Belt land. Therefore I conclude that the site was appropriately rejected for Green Belt and CS policy reasons.
52. Land to the south of Coote Lane, Chain House Lane is included as Safeguarded Land under Policy G3 of the Plan. Policy G3 is considered later in this report. The promoters of two adjoining sites consider that their land could be developed for housing in isolation from the wider Safeguarded Land to the west and north, known as Pickering's Farm. The Pickering's Farm allocation is considered in detail later in this report. Briefly, it comprises a large site currently allocated for housing development and a large amount of Safeguarded Land to the south of the allocated site. The sites currently being promoted are part of the wider Safeguarded Land. Physically the two sites are separate parcels of land and it would no doubt be possible for them to be developed in isolation. However, one of the benefits of promoting a comprehensive development of the larger allocated and safeguarded sites is that they would provide the opportunity to plan to meet the need for essential infrastructure improvements. Piecemeal development of smaller parcels of land within the overall site allocation is unlikely to provide the same opportunity.
53. The Council's assessment of the sites also indicates that they form part of a separation and natural break in the built environment between the built-up areas of Penwortham, Farington and Lostock Hall. As concluded above, it is unnecessary to make further housing allocations to make the plan sound. Accordingly, the Council's decision to allocate these sites as part of the wider area of Safeguarded Land does not make the plan unsound.
54. Land at Walton Park and Green Park, known as Lime Kiln Farm, forms part of the land proposed as the new Central Park area (under policy G6 which is considered later in this report). Green Infrastructure provision is to be funded

---

<sup>24</sup> CS para. 10.13

by a combination of CIL / S106 Agreement and other funding sources, as evidenced in the Central Lancashire Open Space Study<sup>25</sup> and the CIL Draft Regulation 123 List.<sup>26</sup> Furthermore, policy G7 allows proposals which involve the loss of Green Infrastructure to be considered having regard to alternative or improved provision and its impact on that Green Infrastructure. On the basis of the evidence therefore, I conclude that the Central Park area was correctly included in the Plan and proposals for its partial development were correctly rejected. The Council's decision not to allocate this site does not make the plan unsound.

55. I conclude that the site selection process has been properly applied to all other suggested sites and that there are no overriding reasons why any should be allocated to make the Plan sound.

**Issue 3 - Is the approach of the plan to employment and retail matters justified, consistent with national planning policy and capable of effective implementation?**

56. The Council's approach to employment and retail matters set out in the Plan has been informed by a range of evidence sources which include the CS, Employment Land Review<sup>27</sup>, Retail and Leisure Review<sup>28</sup>, Leyland Town Centre Retail Position Paper<sup>29</sup> as well as individual site assessments and ongoing public engagement.
57. The Plan allocates employment sites for local employment needs in various locations throughout the Borough. The Strategic Employment Sites at BAE Systems Samlesbury and Cuerden are large sites which can accommodate need arising in the wider Region. In line with the format of the Plan, further consideration is given to the Strategic Sites in the Major Sites section of this report.
58. The Council proposes a modification (**MM20**) to amend Table 3 in the Plan, which sets out the employment land requirement, to accord with the figures in the adopted CS. Policy 1 of the CS allocates land for employment use at two Strategic Sites at Samlesbury and Cuerden and these are taken through into the Plan and considered separately below. The Council propose a modification to Policy E2 in the Plan (**MM21**) to ensure that consideration can be given to the change of use of employment sites to other uses, subject to criteria set out in the CS. This modification is necessary to ensure consistency with the Framework and the CS.
59. I have no substantive evidence which would suggest any of the proposed employment site allocations are unsound and policies E1 and E2 are sound subject to the recommended modifications. Overall, I conclude that, subject to

---

<sup>25</sup> SRE019

<sup>26</sup> CD4.13

<sup>27</sup> CD4.11

<sup>28</sup> SRE017

<sup>29</sup> CD4.23



the proposed modifications, the Plan's approach to employment matters is sound.

60. The Plan proposes a retail hierarchy in accordance with policy 11 of the CS. A modification is proposed which removes reference to avoiding the need for large retail outlets (**MM22 & Appendix**). In order to ensure that the Plan is positively prepared and consistent with the Framework, this modification is required. Any such proposals would be considered through the normal development management process having regard to the Framework and policies in the adopted Local Plan.
61. The CS sets out the aim of maintaining and improving the vitality and viability of Leyland town centre, having regard to the improvements put forward in the Leyland Town Centre Masterplan.<sup>30</sup> Modifications (**MM22 & Appendix**) are proposed to policy E3 to support the economic development aims set out in the Town Centre Masterplan. This is required to ensure consistency with the CS. Modifications are proposed to more accurately define the retail frontages within the Town and District Centres (**MM22 & Appendix**) and these are required in order to ensure the effectiveness of the Plan.
62. Overall I conclude that, subject to the proposed modifications, the Plan's approach to retail matters is sound.

#### **Issue 4 - Are the Major Sites justified having regard to alternatives and are they capable of effective and timely implementation?**

63. The Plan identifies a number of Major Sites for both employment and residential led development. The identification and location of the sites is in line with the areas identified in the CS. The CS indicates that the Strategic Sites at BAE Systems, Samlesbury and Cuerden and the Strategic Locations at Penwortham and North of Farington are central to the achievement of the CS. The Council's approach to the identification of the Major Sites has been informed by a range of evidence sources which include the SHLAA, SA and Central Lancashire Highways and Transport Masterplan (HTM).<sup>31</sup>
64. The policies relating to the Major Sites all require the submission of a masterplan requiring the comprehensive development of the sites, the submission of phasing and infrastructure delivery schedules and programmes of implementation. The Council is proposing a modification (**MM06**) to clarify what form a masterplan should take. This will include the requirement for public consultation to take place on the proposals which will give an opportunity for local residents to become involved in shaping the development of the Major Sites prior to planning applications being submitted. The modification is necessary in order to ensure that the plan is effective in terms of the delivery of the Major Sites and the required infrastructure. However, it is important to ensure that a balance is achieved between the need for appropriate information to guide comprehensive developments of the Major Sites and the Government's

---

<sup>30</sup> SRE037

<sup>31</sup> CD4.36

drive to reduce the pre-application burdens on developers in order to prevent such requirements becoming a barrier to development. Accordingly, I have amended the wording of proposed paragraphs 6.0 and 6.1 in MM06 and these amendments are highlighted in bold in the text of MM06. Whilst not necessary for soundness, I consider that the inclusion of a definition for the term 'comprehensive development' within the 'Glossary of Terms' would ensure clarity for potential developers. Such a definition could usefully explain that it is not necessary for different landowners to develop the Major Sites simultaneously or in conjunction with one another.

65. Concerns have been expressed in relation to the traffic impact of many of the Major Sites on the surrounding road network. The HTM sets out the requirements for the strategic transport network having regard to the allocations proposed in the Plan. Lancashire County Council (LCC) indicate that they have no fundamental concerns with the Major Sites allocations in the Plan. Many of these will require the funding of substantial infrastructure and these matters will be dealt with through the site masterplans and detailed planning applications. In the short term, before the strategic highway schemes in the HTM come to fruition, LCC would expect developers to fund local transport infrastructure improvements. These matters would be secured having regard to policy A1 relating to Developer Contributions.

#### *Pickering's Farm*

66. The Plan identifies 79 ha of land at Penwortham and North of Farington, known as Pickering's Farm, for residential led development. This is an urban extension which provides for up to 1350 dwellings within the Plan period whilst allocating Safeguarded Land to the south to provide for development needs beyond the Plan period. The allocation is in accordance with policy 1 of the CS. The site has been considered against reasonable alternatives and is supported adequately by the SHLAA and the SA.
67. The Plan indicates that significant infrastructure improvements will be required to support the development of the site. This would include the Cross Borough Link Road, other traffic management measures, improvement to the Tardy Gate District Centre, community facilities including nursery and primary education provision, a local centre and health care provision and green infrastructure. Consideration will also be need to be given to foul and surface water treatment. These will be delivered through a combination of CIL and S106 Agreements and will be included in the agreed masterplan, phasing and infrastructure delivery schedules and agreed programmes of implementation. Landowners, including the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) as a major landowner, and developers have come together to form a consortium to take forward the development of the site and a development statement has been prepared. The evidence demonstrates that the development would be viable having regard to the infrastructure requirements and that there are no fundamental obstacles to the site's delivery.
68. Overall, the approach of the Plan to the Pickering's Farm site is justified by the evidence provided.

*Moss Side Test Track, Leyland*

69. This is a brownfield site which was formerly the Leyland Test Track. The site adjoins an existing employment park to the north and east and housing to the south. It was allocated in the South Ribble Local Plan<sup>32</sup> for a mixed use scheme with a high proportion of employment uses. The SHLAA subsequently identified the land as suitable for a higher proportion of housing (in the region of 750 dwellings are now envisaged). A draft development brief was prepared for the site in 2010<sup>33</sup> and the Council and joint landowner have formed a joint venture to take the site forward to a marketing exercise. The Council is proposing a modification (**MM07**) to correct the site area in the Plan and this is necessary for the purposes of clarity and precision.
70. Concerns were expressed in relation to the indicative highway arrangements in the draft development brief, the lack of public transport and the need for new local infrastructure. These matters will all be revisited through the required masterplan and the local population will have an opportunity for input at that stage. The Council is proposing a modification to emphasise the importance of public transport improvements (**MM08**) and to support the use of CIL funds to contribute to local infrastructure needs (**MM09**). These modifications are necessary in order to ensure that the Plan is effective.
71. The site has been considered against reasonable alternatives and is supported adequately by the SHLAA and the SA. The site is suitable for a residential led redevelopment, particularly having regard to the large amount of employment land available elsewhere in the Borough. Overall, the approach of the Plan to the Moss Side Test Track site is justified by the evidence provided.

*Land between Heatherleigh and Moss Lane*

72. This is a greenfield site of some 40 ha on the western edge of the existing urban area. It was allocated as Safeguarded Land in the Local Plan and was identified in the SHLAA as being a potential housing site. It is envisaged that the site could provide some 600 dwellings over the plan period. The HCA as a major landowner considers that more dwellings could be provided, but this will be a matter which can be resolved through the production of a masterplan and more detailed design of a development scheme. There is nothing to suggest that the Council's estimate of the number of dwellings which could be provided is fundamentally flawed. In addition, the Plan allows for the provision of community and leisure facilities if required and this would ultimately impact on the overall number of dwellings to be provided.
73. Bannister Lane physically separates the site into a northern and southern section. At the time of the hearing sessions the Council was considering an outline planning application for land on the southern section of this site. A masterplan has been produced for this part of the site and has been the subject

---

<sup>32</sup> CD4.9

<sup>33</sup> CD4.1

of a public consultation exercise.<sup>34</sup> Subject to amendment in relation to the Lowther Crescent / Hugh Lane access, the Council has subsequently adopted this masterplan for development control purposes. A development statement<sup>35</sup> and masterplan<sup>36</sup> has been prepared by the HCA for the northern section of the allocation. This has been endorsed by the Council as the basis of a public consultation exercise.

74. The Plan includes the restriction that the site shall not be accessed from Bannister Lane. However, the Council accepts that, in highway terms, the surrounding highway network could accommodate an increase in traffic from the development of the site. The Council indicates that this restriction seeks to mitigate the impact of development on the living conditions of the existing residents of Bannister Lane. However, there is the potential that such a provision could delay the development of part of the northern section of the site and this would not be in accordance with the positive stance to be taken to development having regard to the Framework. The Council proposes a modification (**MM10**) to indicate that Bannister Lane shall not be used to provide a *permanent* vehicular access. This would allow part of the northern section of the site to be developed using Bannister Lane as an access in the interim period, before the main access road is provided from the Flensburg Way roundabout to the north. This would be an acceptable balance between the need to take a positive stance to development whilst protecting the living conditions of existing residents.
75. A number of representations were made raising concern in relation to flooding issues in the vicinity of the site. The Council acknowledges that there is an existing problem in relation to surface water flooding in the surrounding area. Drainage and Flood Risk assessments have been carried out<sup>37</sup> which demonstrate that the site can be developed without exacerbating these existing problems. Careful attention will be required to these matters at the master-planning and design stages of the development. But, ultimately, there is no substantive evidence to demonstrate that the existing difficulties in this regard would render the allocation of this site unsound.
76. The site has been considered against reasonable alternatives and is supported adequately by the SHLAA and the SA. Overall, the approach of the Plan to land between Heatherleigh and Moss Lane is justified by the evidence provided.

#### *Cuerden Strategic Site*

77. This site is some 65 ha which was allocated as a Major Inward Investment Site in the Local Plan. It is a large greenfield site, well located for the M65 and M6 motorways. The Council considers that the site is capable of attracting regionally significant inward investment and this is supported by LCC<sup>38</sup> and the

---

<sup>34</sup> CD5.2.1

<sup>35</sup> CD5.2.3

<sup>36</sup> CD5.2.2.1

<sup>37</sup> CD...(AECOM) and CD4.35

<sup>38</sup> CD6.2.4

Lancashire Enterprise Partnership (LEP)<sup>39</sup> who have included this site in their City Deal application to the Government.

78. Major improvements are likely to be needed to the surrounding highway network in order to accommodate the development, in addition to the provision of drainage and green infrastructure. LCC are a major landowner and are seeking to actively develop a masterplan for the site to set out the likely phasing and infrastructure requirements. Another landowner with significant assets within the site has already produced a masterplan for discussion.
79. The Council proposes modifications to the Plan to include retail in the acceptable uses on the site (**MM11 & 12**). This recognises the potential requirement for higher yielding land uses as enabling development in order to fund the necessary infrastructure. This modification is necessary in order to ensure that the Plan is effective and positively prepared.
80. Overall, the approach of the Plan to the Strategic Site at Cuerden is in accordance with the CS and justified by the evidence base.

#### *BAE Systems Samlesbury*

81. The allocation of this Strategic Site is in accordance with policy 1 of the CS. The site, together with surrounding land, was given Enterprise Zone (EZ) status in 2011. In order to support the EZ the boundary of the Green Belt is altered to remove land to the south of the existing runway from the Green Belt. This alteration to the Green Belt boundary is required in order to be able to accommodate development within the EZ and therefore accords with the exceptional circumstances referred to in the Framework required for such an alteration.
82. A Local Development Order (LDO)<sup>40</sup> exists for land to the north of the runway which sets out the permitted uses as being for advance engineering and manufacturing and to include an education and training centre to be used as a Regional Skills Academy. BAE Systems are in the process of developing a masterplan for the development of the site and its infrastructure requirements in conjunction with the LEP and LCC. The LDO refers to development being in general accordance with the principles of the masterplan. A further LDO for the remainder of the site will be drafted.
83. The Council suggests a modification to the Plan (**MM13**) to include reference to the requirement for new / revised access points into the site and to ensure that the masterplan has regard to a proposed Biological Heritage Site within the site (**MM14**). These modifications are recommended to ensure clarity and that the Plan is positively prepared.
84. Subject to the suggested modifications the approach of the Plan to the Strategic Site at Samlesbury is in accordance with the positive approach to economic

---

<sup>39</sup> CD6.2.5

<sup>40</sup> CD4.20

development advocated by the Framework and is sound.

**Issue 5 - Does the Plan take a justified approach to all other policy matters which is consistent with national planning policy?**

85. Chapter B of the Plan sets out the hierarchy for development in accordance with that set out in the CS. Policies B1 and B2 relate to development within built-up areas and village development respectively. Policies B3, B4 and B5 relate to the protection of existing mixed use sites within the Borough. The Council has suggested a modification to policy B3, which relates to the South Rings Business Park at Bamber Bridge, to remove the need for a comprehensive masterplan, phasing schedule and design code (**MM04**). The Council seeks to ensure that this site is promoted for office, non-food retail, employment, leisure and recreation uses. The modification to the policy sets out these preferred uses rather than seeking to commit any future developer to produce a masterplan for the entire site. This modification to the plan will ensure that the policy for this site is positively prepared and consistent with national policy.
86. Policy B6 sets out design criteria for new development. The Council intends to place this into chapter G of the plan. This is not necessary for soundness, but I agree that it would sit more readily with similar policies in Chapter G. The Council has suggested a modification to ensure that the built heritage criterion within the policy complies with the Framework (**MM05**). I recommend that this modification is required to make the policy sound.
87. Chapter F refers to CS Policy 3 and sets out the key aims of the CS in this regard. Policy F1 sets out the proposed parking standards within the Borough. This policy is in accordance with national policy and is sound.
88. Chapter G of the Plan relates to the natural and built environment. The Council proposes to introduce a new policy to ensure that Biodiversity matters are adequately addressed in the consideration of development within the Borough. This modification (**MM28 & Appendix**) is necessary to ensure compliance with the Framework and CS.
89. Modifications are required to policy G1 relating to development within the Green Belt (**MM23 & 24**) in order to ensure compliance with the Framework. Policy G2 relates to the re-use of buildings in the Green Belt and sets out the circumstances in which these will be acceptable. The Council proposes a modification (**MM25**), which I endorse, to ensure that this policy takes a positive stance to such development.
90. Policy G3 identifies areas of land which are safeguarded for future development. The Council proposes to identify these areas by reference to numerals within the policy and on the policies map. This is useful for the purposes of clarity, although not required for soundness. G4 sets out the policy for Protected Open Land, whilst G5 identifies and sets out the need to protect Areas of Separation (these areas of land are also in the Green Belt). The Council proposes a modification to G5 to ensure that the policy does not seek to impose greater restrictions on development in Areas of Separation than in areas of Green Belt (**MM26**). This modification brings the policy in line with the CS and with national policy and is therefore necessary for soundness. Policy G6 relates to

land, within one of the Areas of Separation, to be defined as the Central Park area. Policies G7 and G8 relate to Green Infrastructure. These policies and allocations are in accordance with policy 19 of the CS which sets out the need for Areas of Separation between the settlements of Bamber Bridge and Lostock Hall, Walton-le-Dale and Penwortham and Farrington, Lostock Hall and Penwortham.

91. Policy G9 relates to an extension to Worden Park specifically linked to the development of allocated housing site P at Leyland Lane and Altcar Lane. Policies G10 and G11 relate to Green Infrastructure and playing pitch provision in connection with new residential development sites. Policy G12 seeks to ensure that Green Corridors are protected from development. The Council proposes a modification (**MM27**) to clarify that these relate to the Green Wedges identified in the CS. This clarification is necessary in order to ensure compliance with the CS.
92. Policy G13 relates to the protection of trees and woodlands. The Council proposes an alteration to include individual ancient and veteran trees in the definition of Ancient Woodlands. This is a useful clarification but is not necessary to ensure soundness.

#### *Conclusion*

93. Overall, and subject to the modifications recommended above, the policies in Chapters A, B, F, G and H are consistent with national policy and the CS. They are positively prepared are justified and there is no evidence to indicate that they will not be effective in their implementation.

#### **Issue 6 - Will the Plan be effective in its implementation? How will adequate and necessary infrastructure be secured in a timely fashion? How will the Plan be monitored and are there robust contingency provisions?**

94. The Central Lancashire Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)<sup>41</sup> and updated Draft Regulation 123 List<sup>42</sup> seeks, as far as is reasonable, to identify those elements of key infrastructure which will be necessary to ensure the successful implementation of the Plan objectives. The HTM also identifies the improvements to the strategic highway network required to support the delivery of the allocations in the Plan. Each of the Major Sites will be required to contribute to the delivery of the identified infrastructure through a combination of CIL and S106 funding. The submitted approach to the Major Sites which requires the production of suitable masterplans will be a reasonable means by which the specific infrastructure requirements arising from each of the Major Sites can be identified. This approach will be supplemented adequately by Policy A1 relating to infrastructure requirements.
95. The available evidence, which includes that of the County Council as highway and education authority, does not indicate any fundamental outstanding matters

---

<sup>41</sup> CD4.25

<sup>42</sup> CD4.13.1

of infrastructure concern which cannot reasonably be resolved as part of the development management process over the life of the Plan. Whilst I heard concerns in relation to the capacity of the highway, drainage and education infrastructure within the Borough, there is no substantive evidence to suggest that such considerations cannot be adequately managed through the development management process, nor that they would prohibit the implementation of the Plan and its development objectives.

96. The updated Draft Regulation 123 List and Appendices 1 and 2 of the HTM provide information relating to the priority and funding of key pieces of identified infrastructure. There is no reason to consider that the Council will not be in a position to ensure the timely delivery of necessary infrastructure through a combination of site specific actions linked to allocated sites in the Plan and ongoing co-operation with its partners.
97. The Council has adopted their CIL Charging Schedule<sup>43</sup> in conjunction with its partner authorities and the evidence<sup>44</sup> demonstrates that this has been set at a reasonable level to secure, together with other funding sources, the necessary funding for the infrastructure requirements of the Plan. The Plan contains adequate flexibility, within individual polices and in the requirements for the production of masterplans for the Major Sites, such that there is no reason to conclude that the objectives of the Plan are not capable of delivery for reasons of financial constraint.
98. The AMR process will be used by the Council to ensure the objectives of the Plan and the CS will be met. The Council proposes a modification to include the Performance Monitoring Framework in the Plan (**MM01 & MM31**) and I endorse this in order to ensure that the plan is effective in this regard. The Performance Monitoring Framework includes review and contingency actions, to ensure that the Plan is flexible enough to react to unlikely or unforeseen circumstances.
99. The available evidence indicates that adequate contingency and monitoring provisions are in place and the Plan will be effective in its implementation supported by the timely provision of necessary infrastructure.

## Assessment of Legal Compliance

100. My examination of the compliance of the Plan with the legal requirements is summarised in the table below. I conclude that the Plan meets them all.

LEGAL REQUIREMENTS	
Local Development Scheme (LDS)	The Plan is identified within the revised Central Lancashire LDS, September 2013, which sets out an expected adoption date of April 2014. The content and timing of the Plan are in accordance

---

<sup>43</sup> CD4.16a

<sup>44</sup> CD4.27 – CD4.29, CD4.37 & CD4.37.1



	with the revised LDS.
Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and relevant regulations	The SCI was adopted in March 2006 and consultation has been compliant with the requirements therein. Consultation has also taken place on the post-submission proposed 'main modification' changes (MM)
Sustainability Appraisal (SA)	SA has been carried out and is adequate.
Appropriate Assessment (AA)	The HRA has been carried out and is adequate.
National Policy	The Plan complies with national policy except where indicated and modifications are recommended.
Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS)	Satisfactory regard has been paid to the SCS.
2004 Act (as amended) and 2012 Regulations.	The Plan complies with the Act and the Regulations.

## Overall Conclusion and Recommendation

101. The Council is carrying out an assessment of the need for sites to be allocated for Gypsies and Travellers. In the absence of this assessment, the Plan is unsound. However, in order to assist the Council and other stakeholders as much as possible, this report sets out my partial recommendations on all matters other than those relating to Gypsies and Travellers.
102. The Plan has a number of deficiencies in relation to soundness for the reasons set out above which mean that I recommend non-adoption of it as submitted, in accordance with Section 20(7A) of the Act. These deficiencies have been explored in the main issues set out above.
103. The Council has requested that I recommend main modifications to make the Plan sound and capable of adoption. I conclude that, subject to the satisfactory completion and examination of further ongoing work on Gypsy and Traveller needs assessment and with the recommended main modifications set out in the Appendix, the South Ribble Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document would satisfy the requirements of Section 20(5) of the 2004 Act and would meet the criteria for soundness in the National Planning Policy Framework.

*Susan Heywood*

Inspector

This report is accompanied by the Appendices containing the Main Modifications

## Appendix – Main Modifications

The modifications below are expressed either in the conventional form of ~~strikethrough~~ for deletions and underlining for additions of text, or by specifying the modification in words in *italics*.

The page numbers and paragraph numbering below refer to the submission local plan, and do not take account of the deletion or addition of text.

### These modifications are based on the Modifications Schedule suggested by the Council (CD4.39)

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
MM01	2	2.3 (new)	<u>To monitor the success of the policies in this DPD, a performance monitoring framework has been developed (shown at Appendix 8). This identifies indicators relevant to the objectives of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy, the key document of the Local Development Framework. These indicators will be monitored each year through the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) so that a comparison can be made between the predicted effects of implementation of the Plan and the actual effects. Monitoring will help to identify how well the policies are working and also identify any adverse effects. If any adverse effects arise, the policies will be reviewed or mitigation measures developed to overcome and prevent further adverse effects. Appropriate contingency actions are set out in the performance monitoring framework.</u> Please note: the Performance Monitoring Framework will become Appendix 8 of the Plan
MM02	5	2.19 and heading	<del><b>Regional Spatial Strategy – North West of England Plan (2006)</b></del>  2.19 Although it is the government's intention to revoke this guidance through the enactment of the Localism Bill, it is still in force and accordingly, this document has to be in conformity with it.
MM03	8	3.6	3.6 Outside of the areas already identified above, South Ribble has a number of smaller villages, in the interest of sustainable development, growth and investment in such places, development will be confined to small scale infill, conversion of rural buildings and proposals to meet local need <u>and, where there are exceptional reasons, larger scale redevelopment schemes may be appropriate.</u>
MM04	16	Policy B3	Within the area defined on the Proposals Map at South

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			<p>Rings Business Park, Bamber Bridge, new development, re-development or change of use will be permitted to provide the following uses only:  <del>Offices, non food retail, employment, leisure, recreation and tourism facilities, provided that:</del>  <del>a) comprehensive development of the site is demonstrated through the submission of a masterplan;</del>  <del>b) A phasing and infrastructure delivery schedule is set out; and</del>  <del>c) The implementation of a high quality development in accordance with an agreed Design Code.</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Offices, non- food retail, employment, leisure, recreation and tourism facilities</u></li> </ul> <p>At the end of Policy B3 :</p> <p><b><u>Proposals Map Ref:a</u></b></p>
MM05	18	Policy B6	<p><del>Policy B6 Design Criteria for New Development</del>  <del>d) The proposal would not adversely affect the character or setting of a listed building and /or the character of a conservation area and/or any heritage asset;</del></p> <p><u>d) the proposal would sustain, conserve and where appropriate enhance the significance, appearance, character and setting of a heritage asset itself and the surrounding historic environment. Where a proposed development would lead to substantial harm or loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, planning permission will only be granted where it can be demonstrated that the substantial public benefits of the proposal outweigh the harm or loss to the asset.</u></p> <p>Justification            New paragraph 5.21  <u>5.21 Heritage assets are buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes that have heritage significance. They include designated heritage assets such as listed buildings and conservation areas and locally important assets such as locally listed buildings and locally important areas. The more important the asset, the greater the weight that will be given to its conservation. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, consent will only be granted</u></p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			<p>where it can be demonstrated that the substantial public benefits outweigh that harm or loss as set out in Paragraph 133 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>
MM06	20	<p>Insert after Major Sites for Development – Create new paragraph</p>	<p><b>Major Sites for Development</b>  <u>6.0 Where sites require a masterplan as part of a condition in the policy or justification text, including the preparation of an agreed Masterplan to achieve the comprehensive development of a Major Site the following applies. It is expected that a Masterplan will be prepared by the landowner/developer of the site in advance of the submission of any planning applications. It is the Council's intention that the draft Masterplan should be the subject of consultation with all stakeholders and interested parties, shall be <b>the subject of early discussion</b> agreed with the Council and thereafter adopted for the purposes of development management in the determination of subsequent planning applications.</u></p> <p><u>6.1 The Council welcomes early discussions with landowners/developers on the scope, content and process of preparation of a Masterplan. A Masterplan should set the vision for the site and the strategy for implementing that vision. It should include, <b>as appropriate</b> amongst other matters, an access and movement framework, green infrastructure and ecology mitigation and enhancement, a hydrology and drainage assessment, land use and development capacity analysis, infrastructure requirements, a viability assessment and a phasing and delivery strategy, <b>amongst other matters.</b></u></p>
MM07	22	6.13	<p>6.13 The Moss Side Test Track site, covering an area of <del>45 ha</del> <u>40.6 ha</u>, lies to the north of the residential area and west of the employment area of Moss Side.</p>
MM08	23	6.18	<p>6.18 . . . to serve the residential and employment areas <del>and</del> <u>off-site highway improvements and the provision of improved public transport to the development</u></p>
MM09	24	6.22	<p><del>6.22 CIL contributions resulting from development could be used to contribute towards regeneration schemes in Leyland Town Centre, improvements to Leyland railway station, an extension to and enhancement of Worden Park, bus rapid transit route connecting Preston, Tardy Gate and Moss Side and the reopening of Midge Hall Railway Station.</del>  <u>6.22 CIL contributions resulting from the development would be used to contribute towards local infrastructure</u></p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			<u>needs. In line with Core Strategy Policy 3 – Travel, the Council will continue to explore the feasibility and deliverability of the re- opening of Midge Hall Railway Station, which would provide significant public transport benefits to the site and to the adjacent residential and employment areas.</u>
MM10	24	6.25	6.25 Access to the site must be from Croston Road, Heatherleigh and Moss Lane (via the roundabout at Flensberg Way). <del>There is to be no access to the site from Bannister Lane. Bannister Lane shall not be used to provide a permanent primary or secondary vehicular access to the site so that the character and amenity of the Lane is maintained.</del> Section 106 or CIL contributions from the development would contribute towards local infrastructure improvements.
MM11	25	Policy C4	a) An agreed masterplan for the comprehensive development of the site, to include <u>retail</u> , employment . . .
MM12	26	6.31	6.31 Whilst this allocation will have an employment focus, there may be an opportunity for the provision of alternative uses such as <del>ancillary</del> retail, leisure and housing.
MM13	27	6.37	6.37 ... A Masterplan approach will be required to secure the delivery <u>and timing</u> of the necessary infrastructure. <u>This will include access arrangements for the A59 and A677 in order to fully realise the economic benefits of the Enterprise Zone at Samlesbury.</u>
MM14	27	6.39	. . against the loss of Green Belt and the impacts on the landscape and wider environment. <u>On part of the Enterprise Zone is a proposed Biological Heritage Site (BHS). The qualifying habitats and species of the proposed BHS should be retained, either in situ and/or through mitigation and/or compensation in accordance with Policy G16 – Biodiversity and Nature Conservation.</u>
MM15	28	7.3	7.3 Policy 4 of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy sets out the number of new houses required in the Borough <del>in line with figures contained in the Regional Spatial Strategy</del> , which equates to 417 dwellings per year . . . has therefore resulted in a shortfall of <del>560</del> <b>692 809</b> units, which will be . . .
MM16	31	Policy D1 and Table 1	See appendix for changes
MM17	31	7.16	<b>Justification</b>  7.16 . . . which consist of small sites with permission ( <del>average of under ten dwellings less than 0.4 ha</del> ),

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			other small sites . . .
MM18	32-34	Table 2	See appendix for changes
MM19	42	Policy D2	See appendix for changes
MM20	47	Table 3	Allowance for Losses needs amending from <del>35ha</del> to <u>17.5ha</u> in line with changes made to the now adopted Core Strategy Total column needs amending from <del>62ha</del> to <u>44.5ha</u> to reflect the above change.
MM21	51	Policy E2	<p><b>Policy E2 – Protection of Employment Areas and Sites (Publication Version)</b> Land is protected for employment uses including business, general industrial or storage and distribution (Use Classes B1, B2 and B8) as shown on the Proposals Map: a) in line with Core Strategy Policies 9 and 10 <del>and the Controlling the Reuse of Employment Premises Supplementary Planning Document; and</del> b) to support the local economy by ensuring there are jobs for local people and to attract commuters from outside the borough, at the following sites:</p> <p><b>Policy E2 – Protection of Employment Areas and Sites (Modified Version)</b> Land is protected for employment uses including business, general industrial or storage and distribution (Use Classes B1, B2 and B8) as shown on the Proposals Map: a) in line with Core Strategy Policies 9 and 10 (<u>Policy 10 does include a set criteria for the change of use to protected employment land if it was deemed appropriate within the plan period</u>) b) <u>The Controlling the Reuse of Employment Premises Supplementary Planning Document; and</u> c) to support the local economy by ensuring there are jobs for local people and to attract commuters from outside the borough, at the following sites:</p>
MM22	52-58	8.27 – 8.54	See appendix for changes.
MM23	66	G1 Green Belt	<p>Policy G1 Green Belt</p> <p>The area covered by Green Belt is shown on the Proposals Map. <u>As set out in the NPPF, there is a general presumption against inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Planning permission will not be given for the construction of new buildings unless there are very special circumstances. for purposes other than for:</u> <u>Exceptions to this are:</u></p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			<p><u>a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;</u>  <u>b) provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;</u>  <u>c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;</u>  <u>d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;</u>  <u>e) limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan; or</u>  <u>f) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.</u></p> <p><del>a) Agriculture and forestry uses;</del>  <del>b) Essential facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation, for cemeteries, and for other uses of land which preserve the openness of the Green Belt and which do not conflict with the purpose of including land in it;</del>  <del>c) The limited extension or alteration or replacement of a dwellings building provided the works do it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling building. This must be appropriate to the form and scale of the existing building;</del>  <del>d) The replacement of a building, providing that the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces</del>  <del>e) The re-use of existing buildings in accordance with Policy G2;</del>  <del>f) The limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use, which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development</del>  <del>eg) Proposals for renewable energy schemes may be acceptable in the Green Belt, providing they satisfy national guidance.</del></p>

Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			<p>There are a number of major developed employment sites within the Green Belt. These sites can be developed within their curtilage.</p> <p>These major developed employment sites should continue to secure jobs and prosperity without further prejudicing the Green Belt. Such development is considered appropriate in the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>
MM24	67	10.26	<p>10.26 The construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is strictly limited. <del>However, essential facilities such as changing rooms, stables, general farm buildings and residential garages for example may be acceptable if they maintain the openness of the Green Belt.</del> <u>Such proposals will be considered on their merits having regard to the requirements of the NPPF and Policy G1.</u></p>
MM25	68	Policy G2	<p>The re-use of existing buildings within the Green Belt will be allowed provided that it meets <u>the following criteria</u>:</p> <p>a) The proposal does not have a materially greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes <del>of</del> including land in it;</p> <p><del>a</del>b) The building is of permanent and substantial construction, of sufficient size and suitable for conversion to the proposed use without the need for additions or alterations which would <u>change harm</u> its existing form or character;</p> <p><del>b</del>) <del>Permission will only be permitted where the proposals significantly improve on the existing structure, or simply propose to rebuild the structure as it was originally;</del></p> <p><del>c</del>) <del>The development respects the design of the building where appropriate, unless the proposals improve the design of the building and provide visual improvements by using alternative materials</del></p> <p><del>c</del>) <del>The building is capable of conversion with minimal reconstruction;</del></p> <p>b) <del>d</del>) The proposed development would not result in an adverse impact in respect of noise, odours, emissions or traffic; and</p> <p>c) <del>e</del>) The building and site has access to a public highway available for use without creating <u>traffic hazards and without involving significant road improvements which would have an undue environmental impact.</u></p> <p>All applications . . .</p>
MM26	71	Policy G5	<b>Policy G5 – Areas of Separation</b>



Ref	Page	Policy/ Paragraph	Main Modification
			<p>The three Areas of Separation are shown on the Proposals Map as between:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bamber Bridge and Lostock Hall (Central Park);</li> <li>• Walton-le-Dale and Penwortham (including part of Central Park); and</li> <li>• Farington, Lostock Hall and Penwortham.</li> </ul> <p>The Council will protect this land from inappropriate development <u>in line with Policy G1 and the NPPF, other than Green Infrastructure uses, leisure and recreational uses, which would not adversely impact on the visual or spatial continuity of the Green Infrastructure and separation area.</u></p>
MM27	77	Policy G2	Policy G12- Green Corridors/ <u>Green</u> Wedges
MM28	80	A new paragraph after 10.77	A new policy is proposed – Policy G16 Biodiversity and Nature Conservation and accompanying justification.
MM29	80/81	A new paragraph 10.81	<p>New wording proposed to explain how the Council will incorporate forthcoming work on the ecological networks.</p> <p><u>10.81 As well as the need to protect, conserve and enhance designated sites it is also important to protect, conserve and enhance nationally and locally important species that use a variety of sites/habitats as part of a nature conservation network. Lancashire County Council, alongside the Lancashire Nature Partnership is producing an Ecological Network covering the County, including South Ribble's borough. Once finalised this will be an important contribution to the nature conservation agenda and will need to be protected, conserved, maintained and enhanced where appropriate. The Ecological Network will be presented in text and visually through maps within the Biodiversity and Nature Conservation SPD to ensure compatibility between the DPD, SPD and the Lancashire Ecological Network.</u></p>
MM30	98	Appendix 4 Retail Maps	In line with the retail policy amendments there have also been a series of alterations to the retail maps to provide greater clarity within the document.
MM31	New Page	Appendix 8	Add a Performance Monitoring Framework as <u>Appendix 8: Performance Monitoring Framework</u>

## Appendix to MM16 – Policy D1/Table 1

### Policy D1 – Allocation of Housing Land

The sites listed below (and as shown on the Proposals Map) are allocated for residential development (and related infrastructure which is to be delivered through CIL and/or developer contributions).

The allocated housing land equates to a total of ~~6,600~~ 6,576 dwellings over the Plan period.

**Table 1 – Allocation of Housing Land & Supply 2010 – 2026**

Proposals Map Ref	Site Name	Site Area (ha)	Estimated No of Dwellings
A	Group One, off Central Avenue, Buckshaw Village, Leyland	14.9	<del>260</del> <u>211</u>
AA	Fishwick's Depot, Hewitt Street, Leyland	0.5	19
B	Former Farington Business Park, Wheelton Lane, Farington	13.0	471
C	Land south of Centurion Way, Farington	3.2	<del>68</del> <del>64</del> <u>68<sup>45</sup></u>
CC	Land off Claytongate Drive, Lostock Hall	1.9	15
D	Former Prestolite Premises, Cleveland Road, Leyland	2.3	82
DD	Gas Holders Site, Lostock Hall	1.9	25
E	Former Arla Foods Premises, School Lane, Bamber Bridge	5.5	209
F	Roadferry Depot, Carr Lane, Farington	1.9	80
G	Dunkirk Mill, Dunkirk Lane, Leyland	0.7	35
GG	Wateringpool Lane, Lostock Hall	4.6	80
H	Vernon Carus and Land, Factory Lane, Penwortham	4.1	475
I	Hospital Inn Railway Crossing, Brindle Road, Bamber Bridge	1.9	42
JJ	Coupe Foundry, Kittlingbourne Brow, Higher Walton	2.3	80
K	Lostock Hall Gasworks, Lostock Hall	12.0	<del>200</del> <u>350<sup>46</sup></u>
KK	Land off the Cawsey	<u>2.8</u>	<del>70</del> <u>75</u>
L	Land off Grasmere Avenue, Farington	4.4	160
LL	Land off Long Moss Lane	<u>1.2</u>	27

<sup>45</sup> Amended to take account of planning application change.

<sup>46</sup> Updated to reflect recent planning application.

M	South of Longton Hall, Chapel Lane, Longton	3.6	80
N	Land off Liverpool Road, Hutton	2.4	45
O	LCC Offices, Brindle Road, Bamber Bridge	0.6	22
P	Land between Altcar Lane/Shaw Brook Road, Leyland	30.4	430
Q	Rear of Chapel Meadow, Longton	1.1	10
R	Land off Wesley Street, Bamber Bridge	6.9	175
			195 <sup>47</sup>
S	Land off Brindle Road, Bamber Bridge	22.7	250
T	Land off Browndge Road, Bamber Bridge	2.7	60
U	Rear of Dunkirk Mill, Slater Lane, Leyland	1.2	47
V	Land off School Lane, Longton	3.7	83
X	Land at Longton Hall, Chapel Lane, Longton	2.4	48
Y	Liverpool Road/Jubilee Road, Walmer Bridge	3.5	69
			72
Z	Lostock Hall Primary, Avondale Drive, Lostock Hall	1.5	30
	<b>Total</b>		<b>3900</b>
			<b>3876</b>
	<b>Major Sites</b>		
EE	Pickering's Farm, Penwortham	79	1350
FF	Moss Side Test Track, Leyland	40.6	750
W	Land Between Heatherleigh and Moss Lane, Farington Moss	40	600
	<b>Total</b>		<b>2700</b>
	<b>OVERALL TOTAL</b>		<b>6600</b>
			<b>6576</b>

## Justification

7.16 . . . which consist of small sites with permission (~~average of under ten dwellings less than 0.4 ha~~), other small sites . . .

<sup>47</sup> Updated to reflect recent planning application.

## Appendix to MM18 – Table 2

Table 2<sup>48</sup>

### Residential Allocations

Proposals Map Ref	Site Name	Site Area (ha)	Estimated No of Dwellings	2010/11- 2015/16 <sup>49</sup>	2016/17- 2020/21	2021/22- 2025/26
A	Group One, off Central Avenue, Buckshaw Village, Leyland	14.9	<del>260</del> <u>211</u>	<del>200</del> <u>144</u>	<del>6067</del>	0
AA	Fishwick's Depot, Hewitt Street, Leyland	0.5	19	0	19	0
B	Former Farington Business Park, Wheelton Lane, Farington	13.0	471	<del>100</del> <u>80</u>	<del>200</del> <u>220</u>	171
C	Land south of Centurion Way, Farington	3.2	<del>68</del> <del>64</del> <u>68</u>	<del>68</del> <del>64</del> <u>68</u>	0	0
CC	Land off Claytongate Drive, Lostock Hall	1.9	15	<del>15</del> <u>0</u>	<del>0</del> <u>15</u>	0
D	Former Prestolite Premises, Cleveland Road, Leyland	2.3	82	<del>82</del> <u>72</u>	<del>0</del> <u>10</u>	0
DD	Gas Holders Site, Lostock Hall	1.9	25	0	25	0
E	Former Arla Foods Premises, School Lane, Bamber Bridge	5.5	<del>200</del> <u>209</u>	80	<del>120</del> <u>129</u>	0
F	Roadferry Depot, Carr Lane, Farington	1.9	80	<del>80</del> <u>55</u>	<del>0</del> <u>25</u>	0
G	Dunkirk Mill, Dunkirk Lane, Leyland	0.7	35	35	0	0
GG	Wateringpool Lane, Lostock Hall	4.6	<del>79</del> <u>80</u>	<del>79</del> <u>80</u>	0	0
H	Vernon Carus and Land, Factory Lane, Penwortham	4.1	475	50	175	250
I	Hospital Inn Railway Crossing, Brindle Road, Bamber Bridge	1.9	42	42	0	0

<sup>48</sup> Phasing figures adjusted to take account of position at 2012/13 year end.

<sup>49</sup> Figures for 2010/11-2015/16 cannot be directly compared to the Housing Land Position Statement spreadsheet which relates to the number of dwellings **remaining** for the period up to and including 2015/16.

Proposals Map Ref	Site Name	Site Area (ha)	Estimated No of Dwellings	2010/11- 2015/16 <sup>49</sup>	2016/17- 2020/21	2021/22- 2025/26
J	Coupe Foundry, Kittlingbourne Brow, Higher Walton	2.3	80	20	60	0
K	Lostock Hall Gasworks, Lostock Hall	12.0	200 350	80 0	420 200	0 150
KK	<u>Land off the Cawsey</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>70</u> <u>75</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>30</u> <u>35</u>	<u>0</u>
L	Land off Grasmere Avenue, Farington	4.4	160	110 80	50 80	0
LL	<u>Land off Long Moss Lane</u>	<u>1.2</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
M	South of Longton Hall, Chapel Lane, Longton	3.6	80	40 20	40 60	0
N	Land off Liverpool Road, Hutton	2.4	45	20	25	0
O	LCC Offices, Brindle Road, Bamber Bridge	0.6	22	22	0	0
P	Land between Altcar Lane/Shaw Brook Road, Leyland	30.4	430	170 70	420 220	140
Q	Rear of Chapel Meadow, Longton	1.1	10	10	0	0
R	Land off Wesley Street, Bamber Bridge	6.9	175 195	50	125 145	0
S	Land off Brindle Road, Bamber Bridge	22.7	250	0 20	150 190	100 40
T	Land off Browndedge Road, Bamber Bridge	2.7	60	0	60	0
U	Rear of Dunkirk Mill, Slater Lane, Leyland	1.2	47	0	47	0
V	Land off School Lane, Longton	3.7	83	40	43	0
X	Land at Longton Hall, Chapel Lane, Longton	2.4	48	48	0	0
Y	Liverpool Road/Jubilee Road, Walmer Bridge	3.5	69 72	69 72	0	0
Z	Lostock Hall Primary, Avondale Drive, Lostock Hall	1.5	30	0	30	0
	<b>Total</b>		<b>3900</b> <b>3876</b>	<b>1574</b> <b>1245</b>	<b>1508</b> <b>1880</b>	<b>661</b> <b>751</b>

### Major Sites for Development (Residential Led)

Proposals Map Ref	Site Name	Site Area (ha)	No of Dwellings	2010/11- 2015/16	2016/17- 2020/21	2021/22- 2025/26
EE	Pickering's Farm, Penwortham	79	1350	300 <u>150</u>	475 <u>600</u>	575 <u>600</u>
FF	Moss Side Test Track, Leyland	40.6	750	80 <u>50</u>	325 <u>365</u>	345 <u>335</u>
W	Land Between Heatherleigh and Moss Lane	40	600	200 <u>144</u>	200 <u>360</u>	200 <u>96</u>
	<b>Total</b>		<b>2700</b>	<b>580</b> <b><u>344</u></b>	<b>1000</b> <b><u>1325</u></b>	<b>1120</b> <b><u>1031</u></b>

#### Other Sites (at June 2012 31/3/13)

Site Name	No of Dwellings	2010/11- 2015/16	2016/17- 2020/21	2021/22- 2025/26
Small sites with planning permission (<0.4ha)	246 <u>170</u>	246 <u>170</u>	0	0
Small Sites identified from the SHLAA (<0.4ha)	478 <u>121</u>	478 <u>121</u>	0	0
Large sites under construction (≥0.4ha) not listed elsewhere	498 <u>38</u>	498 <u>38</u>	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>622</b> <b><u>329</u></b>	<b>622</b> <b><u>329</u></b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

#### Totals

Source	No of Dwellings	2010/11- 2015/16	2016/17- 2020/21	2021/22- 2025/26
Sites with Planning Permission	1397	786	440	171
Sites with Current Application	835	240	345	250
New Allocations	1408	484	684	240
Residential Allocations	3743 <u>3876</u>	1574 <u>1245</u>	1508 <u>1880</u>	664 <u>751</u>
Major Sites for Development (Residential Led)	2700	580 <u>344</u>	1000 <u>1325</u>	1120 <u>1031</u>
Other Sites	622 <u>329</u>	622 <u>329</u>	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>6962</b> <b>7065</b> <b><u>6905</u></b>	<b>2712</b> <b>2776</b> <b><u>1918</u></b>	<b>2469</b> <b>2508</b> <b><u>3205</u></b>	<b>1781</b> <b>1784</b> <b><u>1782</u></b>



## **Appendix to MM19 – Phasing, Delivery and Monitoring of Housing Land Supply**

### **Policy D2: Introduction**

7.64 The Council is introducing a phasing policy to ~~ensure~~ encourage a steady supply of housing land availability across the Borough over the Plan period and secure the necessary infrastructure and other services required for sustainable forms of development. ~~Under Core Strategy Policy 4: Housing Delivery and Site Allocations Policy D1, the Council will review targets relating to housing completions or the use of brownfield land every year and adjust the phasing of sites included in Table 2 as appropriate to achieve a better match between the required targets and delivery.~~

7.65 Breaking down the forecast ~~need~~ delivery into five year ~~sections~~ phases ~~shows that there are deliverable and available sites within the Borough during the life of the Plan.~~ will also secure a better match between forecasts and actual house building. ~~The policy does not override the statutory requirement to keep plans under review.~~ House building activity will be monitored and measured against the indicative phasing in the policy Table 2. As monitoring is carried out it may become necessary to update the indicative phasing in Table 2 to reflect changing circumstances. These figures will be monitored and updated annually in the Housing Land Position Statement. ~~move sites between phases e.g. if insufficient sites from Phase 1 are being developed, sites from Phase 2 can be moved forward to maintain supply. If more housing development occurs through windfall development, greenfield sites can be moved into later phases. There may also be occasions where sites anticipated in later phases, where a long lead in time can be justified to come forward earlier, due to their size or infrastructure needs. will be considered for release in advance of the phase in which they are identified to come forward.~~

7.66 The phasing of units is indicative and has been informed by housing land monitoring work that records the number of units with planning permission and under construction; the 2012 Central Lancashire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA); and other site-specific information about the deliverability and sustainability of sites.

7.67 Throughout the Borough a number of sites already have a current planning permission and it is likely that many of these sites will be built during the next few years. However, should any of these applications lapse, applications for their renewal will be reviewed and considered in light of the Core Strategy, other policies and the current build rates in the Borough.

7.68 The Council has identified three phases which are as follows:

- Phase 1: 2010/11 – 2015/16
- Phase 2: 2016/17 – 2020/21
- Phase 3: 2021/22 – 2025/26



7.69 In phasing sites, account has been taken of the likely timescales for delivery bearing in mind the need for any supporting infrastructure and the need to prioritise previously developed land as far as is practical. Consideration has also been given to the need to include a rolling six year supply (taking on board the NPPF) of deliverable sites and that all sites are developable.

### **Policy D2 – Phasing, Delivery and Monitoring**

~~The release of housing sites as listed in Table 2 will be managed in order to:~~  
Housing sites are phased through indicative timescales identified in Table 2, in order to:

- Meet the scale of development required over the Plan period and
- Ensure that the scale and timing of development is coordinated with the provision of new infrastructure that is required.

Development will be ~~permitted~~ encouraged on sites in the following phases:

- Phase 1: 2010/11 – 2015/16
- Phase 2: 2016/17 – 2020/21
- Phase 3: 2021/22 – 2025/26

Phases 1, 2 and 3 are shown in Table 2

### **Control Mechanism**

Annual monitoring of the delivery of housing will be undertaken. It will include a review of Sites and Phasing within Table 2 and aim to ensure that a 5 year supply of deliverable sites (including a 20% buffer if appropriate, and if performance approves, the Council will look at reducing the buffer to 5% as part of the monitoring process), is maintained in line with the predicted, sites may be brought forward from later phases and others put back.

~~If the total number of dwellings permitted is above the total number of dwellings acceptable within a particular phase, the Council will review the sites within the remaining phases and bring forward where appropriate.~~

~~Once a planning permission has expired, there will be no presumption that it will be renewed unless a start has been made on construction. Any application for renewal of permission will be considered having regard to a demonstration of the deliverability of the scheme and the annual monitoring of housing site delivery.~~

### **Justification**

7.70 The phasing of housing land shown in Table 2 demonstrates how existing commitments and proposed allocations contribute to meeting the housing

requirement. Information about the delivery of sites has been drawn from assumptions made in the SHLAA and the Sustainability Appraisal.

7.71 Wherever possible, the Council will seek to bring forward previously developed sites during the first six years in line with the Core Strategy. Due to delivery issues with previously developed land, some greenfield land will need to be brought forward at a fairly early stage. The larger greenfield sites are also dependent on the delivery of significant infrastructure before the construction of any housing.

7.72 The pace of housing delivery will be monitored annually based on economic indicators and build rates. Depending on the results of monitoring, it may be necessary to adjust the indicative phasing of sites. ~~This might include looking at whether sites phased for future years can be brought forward if the delivery of homes in earlier phases is delayed.~~

## **Appendix to MM22a – Retail chapter as anticipated**

### **Retail**

#### **Introduction**

- 8.27 Core Strategy Policy 11 sets out South Ribble's shopping hierarchy of centres, showing Leyland Town Centre as the principal shopping area in the Borough followed by the District Centres of Bamber Bridge, Longton, Tardy Gate and Penwortham. In addition there is a network of supporting Local Centres within South Ribble. Having a retail hierarchy protects the centres by focusing growth and investment, it is also important to encourage developments of an appropriate type and scale.
- 8.28 The retail hierarchy directs retail development and town centre uses to Leyland Town Centre. Retail growth elsewhere will need to be of levels which are appropriate to the location. All new development within the centres should contribute to the attractiveness of the centre and enhance the use of the centre by offering vibrant, attractive, well designed centres with a good offer for local residents and visitors.
- 8.29 In line with Policy 11 in the Core Strategy there will be a presumption to focus main town centre uses in the defined centres. However, planning applications for retail schemes on edge of centre or out of centre locations will be assessed against the sequential approach within the NPPF.

#### **Leyland Town Centre**

##### **Policy E3: Introduction**

- 8.30 Within Leyland Town Centre, the protection of (A1) retail uses is the priority with cafés and restaurants acting as complementary uses to the daytime shopping facilities. Restaurants and pub establishments would support the evening economy which is currently limited in Leyland Town Centre, according to the Central Lancashire and Leisure Review, 2010. The conversion of the former Post Office on Hough Lane to a Wetherspoon's Bar and Restaurant could act as a catalyst for further investment in the Town Centre.
- 8.31 The development of the Tesco Extra store in Southern Towngate and the Morrisons store, together with the Argos Extra and the Homebase store on the former Farington Business Park site over the last ten years have brought in major investment into the town centre area. The Central Lancashire Retail and Leisure Review (2010) did not identify the need for any major new developments in the town centre. Investment now needs to focus on the core of the town centre around Hough Lane and Towngate.
- 8.32 A Leyland Masterplan was published in 2007 reflecting the key aspirations for the future of Leyland Town Centre, including opportunities to promote Leyland as a key shopping area, developing the evening economy for a range of users and public realm and access improvements. Policy E3 reflects these broad principles of the Leyland Masterplan by encouraging retail (A1) and cafés,

restaurants and bars (A3, A4) as priorities, whilst recognising other town centre uses (e.g. A2, B1, A5) could be appropriate to support the overall future as a vital and viable town centre.

8.33 Ongoing improvements to the town centre have been achieved through improvements made to Churchill Way, Chapel Brow and Hough Lane. The Masterplan has an economic development remit aimed at promoting investment within the town centre.

### ***Policy E3 – Leyland Town Centre***

The Leyland Town Centre boundary is defined in Appendix 4. Leyland Town Centre is made up of both Primary and Secondary Retail Frontages as set out below.

#### Primary Retail Frontage

Within the Primary Retail Frontage of Leyland Town Centre as identified in Appendix 4, planning permission will be granted for new buildings, redevelopment of existing sites, extensions to, or change of use of existing buildings for the following uses:

- a) A1 (Retail Uses) - which will be encouraged to achieve a minimum of 60% of the overall units within the Primary Retail Frontage;
- b) A3 (Café and Restaurant) uses and A4 (Drinking Establishments) uses - to enhance the evening economy; and
- c) Other town centre uses including A2 (Financial and Professional Services) and B1 (Offices) will be permitted subject to a 6 month marketing assessment;
- d) Living accommodation or B1 (Office) use will be permitted at first floor level.

#### Secondary Retail Frontage

The remaining area of the defined town centre (sitting outside the Primary Retail Frontage) is classified as the Secondary Retail Frontage (as shown in Appendix 4 and as described in the Justification).

Uses in these areas will be protected and enhanced wherever possible for A1 (Retail Use), A3 (Cafés and Restaurants) and A4 (Drinking establishments) may be appropriate to maintain the vitality and viability of the area. However, applications for the change of use of A1 retail premises to other town centre uses including A2 (Financial and Professional Services) and B1 (Offices) should be supported by a 6 month marketing assessment to provide evidence for this change of use.

#### Car Parking

New buildings, redevelopment of existing sites, extensions and/or change of use of existing buildings in the Town Centre will either be expected to use existing car parking facilities within the town centre (if they are in close proximity) or provide the appropriate level of car parking based on their location and type of development as set out in Policy F1 Parking Standards and Appendix 5.

## Justification

8.34 Leyland Town Centre is the key shopping area in South Ribble and Policy E3 promotes development within the town centre.

8.35 Maintaining and enhancing the vitality and viability of the town centre, primarily along Hough Lane and Towngate, is a main focus of Policy E3. Within the town centre and focussing on the Primary and Secondary retail frontages, there will be a presumption in favour of retaining and encouraging shops (A1 uses).

8.36 The policy applies to the primary and secondary retail frontages as shown on the Leyland Town Centre map in Appendix 4. The primary retail frontage in Leyland comprises the following properties:

- **Leyland:** No 4 to the Post Office/SPAR (inclusive) on the south side of Hough Lane and numbers 1 to 69 (inclusive) on the north side of Hough Lane, Asda store to the former Booths (currently a furniture shop) premises on Towngate and the Gables Public House on the corner of Towngate and Hough Lane (areas outside this boundary are classified as the Secondary Shopping Frontage areas).

8.37 Leyland Town Centre Retail Position Paper is updated on a bi-annual basis to provide a 'snapshot' in time of the current situation in Leyland Town Centre and provides evidence of retail trends which has informed Policy E3. This also acts as a mechanism through which to monitor Policy E3 and identify triggers where necessary. The Leyland Town Centre Retail Position Paper (October 2012) states that the Town Centre currently has approximately 50% A1 (Retail Uses) which is considered low for a Town Centre. As set out in Policy E3, A1 (Retail) is a retail priority in terms of maintaining vitality and viability of the Town Centre, as such a target of 60% is deemed achievable and appropriate over the plan period given past trends.

8.38 A marketing assessment will need to include written evidence of the marketing of the premises for a minimum period of 6 months to demonstrate lack of demand for A1 (Retail Uses).

## Development and Change of Use in District Centres and Local Centres

### Policies E4 and E5: Introduction

8.40 The boundaries of the District and Local Centres within South Ribble have all been reviewed to see if they are still fit for purpose. Maps showing the retail boundaries can be found in Appendix 4.

8.41 Core Strategy Policy 11 (e) states that the Council will maintain, improve and control the mix of uses in the existing District and Local Centres. This will also apply to the proposed centres within the Strategic Sites so as to appropriately serve local needs. The Core Strategy identifies the location of four District Centres in the Borough.

- 8.42 Local Centres play an important role in the borough's retail hierarchy as well as acting as social centres and places of employment providing the function of convenience shopping and community facilities to a local area. The Local Centres in the Borough vary in size, with some having only a handful of shops and others being larger which support a number of local shops and basic services, meeting local residents' daily shopping needs. In rural areas, larger villages perform an important role as the key service area for the community.
- 8.43 The scale and type of a development or proposal in District and Local Centres needs to relate directly to the role and function of that centre. Within these centres the Council will need to be satisfied there is no demand for retail property before granting planning permission for a different use in line with the policy. In the centres the provision of living accommodation or offices on the upper floors of the building will be encouraged so as to help make good use and maintenance of these upper storeys.
- 8.44 The following two policies; E4 and E5 define the District and Local Centres including the protection of certain uses.

### **Policy E4 – District Centres**

District Centres are allocated at:

- Liverpool Road, Penwortham
- Station Road, Bamber Bridge
- Tardy Gate
- Longton

The District Centres boundaries are set out in Appendix 4 of this document.

The District Centres will be protected and enhanced to maintain their vitality and viability.

Planning permission will be granted for new buildings, redevelopment of existing sites, extensions to, or change of use of existing buildings for the following uses:

- (a) A1 (Retail Uses) - which will be encouraged to achieve a minimum of 60% of the overall units;
- (b) A3 (Cafés and Restaurants) uses.

Applications for other district centre uses including A2 (Financial and Professional Services), A4 (Drinking Establishments) and B1 (Offices) will need to include a six month marketing assessment to provide evidence for a change of use from A1 (Retail).

### **Justification**

8.45 District centres have been designated in Policy 11 of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy. Boundaries for the retail centres have been set out within Appendix 4.

8.46 The purpose of this policy is to prevent the over proliferation of non-retail uses at the expense of retail provision within the centres. It is important to the vitality and viability of the district centres that the retail strength and appearance of these frontages is retained.

8.47 The District Centres comprise the following properties:

- **Penwortham:** 12 to 78, 27 to 79 Liverpool Road (all inclusive), and 2 Cop Lane
- **Bamber Bridge:** 145 to 187, 193 to 231, 148 to 200 (all inclusive) Station Road, and 1 to 3 Withy Grove Road

- **Tardy Gate:** 1 to 15 Hope Terrace, 6 to 26 Watkin Lane, 1 to 7 Victoria Terrace, 448 to 468 Leyland Road, 1 to 3 William Street (all inclusive).
- **Longton:** 56 to 98 (even numbers) Liverpool Road (98 Liverpool Road: Booths Superstore)

8.48 The Central Lancashire Retail and Leisure Review (2010) has provided the evidence to support the inclusion of a minimum of 60% A1 Retail use target as identified in the policy. A Retail Position Statement will be produced on an annual basis to provide a 'snapshot' in time of the current situation within the District Centres which will provide evidence of retail trends and act as a mechanism through which to monitor Policy E4 and identify triggers where necessary.

8.49 A marketing assessment will need to include written evidence of the marketing of the premises for a minimum period of 6 months to demonstrate lack of demand for A1 (Retail Uses).

### **Policy E5 – Local Centres**

Local Centres are allocated at:

- Kingsfold
- Earnshaw Bridge
- Farington
- Gregson Lane
- Higher Walton
- New Longton
- Seven Stars
- Walmer Bridge
- Walton-le-Dale

The boundaries of these centres are shown in Appendix 4 and described within the justification text.

Within the Local Centres A1 (Retail) uses will be protected and enhanced wherever possible in order to achieve a minimum of 60%. This is to maintain the vitality and viability of the centre.

Applications for other local centre uses including A2 (Financial and Professional Services), A3 (Cafés and Restaurants) and A4 (Drinking Establishments), and B1 (Offices) may be appropriate where it does not undermine the minimum A1 retail target as identified above.



## Justification

8.50 Boundary maps for the Local Centres are set out within Appendix 4. The Local Centre boundaries are defined as:

- **Kingsfold:** The local centre at Kingsfold is based on the existing commercial properties at Pope Lane and Hawksbury Drive.
- **Earnshaw Bridge:** This small centre is situated either side of Leyland Lane, south of the junction with Golden Hill Lane/ Longmeanygate.
- **Farington:** The Local Centre is dispersed with units from Railway Public House to Boundary Street on Preston Road, and at the junctions of Stanifield Lane, Crown Street and Mill Street.
- **Gregson Lane:** The Local Centre is dispersed with units on Gregson Lane and Alder Drive.
- **Higher Walton:** There is a concentration of local shopping facilities on both sides of Cann Bridge Street.
- **New Longton:** The Local Centre is dispersed with units located along Chapel Lane and on Station Road.
- **Seven Stars:** The Local Centre is located at and around the junction of Fox Lane, Leyland Lane and Slater Lane.
- **Walmer Bridge:** The Local Centre is dispersed with units located along Liverpool Old Road and at the junctions of School Street and Hall Carr Lane.
- **Walton-le-Dale:** The Local Centre focuses on retail and commercial uses on the west side of Victoria Road in Walton-le-Dale. (Nos. 140 – 202 Victoria Road – even numbers).

8.51 The purpose of the above policy is to prevent the over proliferation of non-retail uses at the expense of local retail provision within the Local Centres. It is important to the vitality and viability of the Local Centres that the retail strength and appearance of these frontages is retained where possible. However, as these centres vary in size and are affected by various local issues other uses as listed in the policy above may be more appropriate.

8.52 The Central Lancashire Retail and Leisure Review (2010) has provided the evidence to support the inclusion of a minimum of 60% A1 Retail use target as identified in the policy. A retail position statement will be produced on an annual basis to provide a 'snapshot' in time of the current situation within the Local Centres which will evidence retail trends and act as a mechanism through which to monitor Policy E5 and identify triggers where necessary.

8.53 A marketing assessment will need to include written evidence of the marketing of the premises for a minimum period of 6 months to demonstrate lack of demand for A1 (Retail Uses).

## Appendix to MM28 – Policy G16 – Biodiversity and Nature Conservation (and accompanying justification)

### Policy G16 – Biodiversity and Nature Conservation

The Borough's Biodiversity and Ecological Network resources will be protected, conserved and enhanced. The level of protection will be commensurate with the site's status and proposals will be assessed having regard to the site's importance and the contribution it makes to wider ecological networks:

~~Priority will be given to:~~ Regard will be had to:

- Protecting and safeguarding all designated sites of international, national, regional, county and local level importance including all Ramsar, Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation, national nature reserves, sites of special scientific interest and biological heritage sites, geological heritage site, local nature reserves, wildlife corridors together with any ecological network approved by the Council;
- Protecting, safeguarding and enhancing habitats for European, nationally and locally important species;
- When considering applications for planning permission protecting, conserving and enhancing the borough's ecological network and providing links to the network from and/or through a proposed development site.

In addition development ~~must adhere~~ should have regard to the provisions set out below:

- ~~a) The need to minimise impacts on biodiversity and providing~~ The production of a net gains in biodiversity where possible by designing in wildlife and by ensuring that any adverse impacts are significant harm is avoided or if unavoidable are is reduced or appropriately mitigated and/or, as a last resort, compensated;
- ~~b) The need to promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations;~~
- ~~c) The provision of opportunities for habitats and species to adapt to climate change;~~
- ~~d) The support and encouragement of enhancements which contribute to habitat restoration;~~
- ~~e) Protecting and enhancing existing habitats and features on all sites;~~
- f) Where there is reason to suspect that there may be protected habitats/species on or close to a proposed development site planning applications must be accompanied by a survey undertaken by an appropriate qualified professional;
- g) ~~In exceptional cases w~~Where the benefits for development in social or economic terms is considered to ~~significantly~~ outweigh the impact on the natural environment, appropriate and proportionate mitigation measures and/or compensatory habitat creation of an equal or greater area will be required through planning conditions and/or planning obligations.


## **Justification (Paragraphs to start at 10.78 in DPD)**

- 10.78 The borough includes an extensive network of sites important for biodiversity including the Ribble and Alt Estuaries SPA and Ramsar, an internationally important wetland habitat commonly referred to as one of the 'Natura 2000' Sites. Additionally this site is a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), as well as two other SSSIs in the borough at River Darwen and Beeston Brook Meadow.
- 10.79 Alongside international and national designations are a wide range of regional, county and local designations including Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS), Biological Heritage Sites (BHS), Local Nature Reserves (LNRs), and Wildlife Corridors all of which are an important part of the network of nature conservation sites and will be protected from development that will cause fragmented networks or isolate habitats. These designations are highlighted on the Proposals Map. This policy will also apply to any future designations that may arise over the plan period.
- 10.80 As well as the need to protect, conserve and enhance designated sites it is also important to protect, conserve and enhance nationally and locally important species that use a variety of sites/habitats as part of a nature conservation network. Lancashire County Council is producing an Ecological Network covering the County, including South Ribble's borough. Once finalised this will be an important contribution to the nature conservation agenda and will need to be protected, conserved, maintained and enhanced where appropriate.
- 10.81 Biodiversity has many important roles and functions including protecting biodiversity for its own sake, adapting to climate change, recreation, health and wellbeing etc. As part of a changing climate it is important to allow habitats and species the opportunities to adapt, making provision where possible. Ecological networks form an important basis for this and it is the Council's view that these networks should be maintained and enhanced, where appropriate to allow habitats and species the best opportunity to adapt to a changing climate. The Ecological Network will be presented in text and visually through maps within the Biodiversity and Nature Conservation SPD to ensure compatibility between the DPD, SPD and LCC's Ecological Network.
- 10.82 Protected habitats and species play an important role and are protected under European and National Law. Where habitats or species may come under threat, it is the developer's responsibility to assess and carry out all necessary surveys. Ecology surveys need to be provided by an appropriate qualified professional to assess the quality, quantity and value of biodiversity on site or near the site and how the proposed development may affect biodiversity. In certain cases development will not be permitted and in other cases mitigation/compensatory measures of equal area, quality and diversity, if not higher will

be required to reduce or overcome the impacts and where possible provide net gains or enhancements to improve the borough's nature conservation assets.

10.83 Further detailed guidance will be provided within a supplementary planning document.

**Appendix to MM30 – Updated maps to reflect main changes to Policies E3 and E4 –  
Leyland Town Centre – showing Primary and Secondary Retail Frontage**




- Legend**
-  District Centre Copy
  -  District Centre for Preferred Options
  -  Secondary Retail Frontage

**Leyland Town Centre**

  0:5000 









Legend  
■ District Centre Boundary

**Longton District Centre**

© Crown copyright and database rights 2011 Ordnance Survey 100022485 1:1,300 



**Bamber Bridge District Centre**





Legend  
District Centre Boundary

**Tardy Gate District Centre**

© Crown copyright and database rights 2011 Ordnance Survey 100022485

1:1,100



## **Appendix to MM31 – Performance Monitoring Framework**

### **Performance Monitoring Framework**

Successful management requires the ongoing monitoring of performance in order to measure the success or otherwise of specific policies. Improvement in performance can only be realistically achieved when properly informed about current performance. To this end it is important to identify key performance indicators which will enable progress to be monitored.

To offer certainty of success, progress of the South Ribble Site Allocations DPD will be monitored through the use of the performance indicators set out in the following appendices. The results will be reported in the Council's Annual Monitoring Report(AMR) to ensure regular review (and therefore increased confidence of success). The AMR is submitted to the Council's Planning Committee and published on the Council's website, to ensure transparency.

Each measure gives an indication of progress achieved according to each policy's objectives. For example, Gross Affordable Dwellings Constructed gives an indication of the progress of several policies as it is influenced by developer contributions (Policy A1), the allocations of housing land (Policies C1, C2, C3, D1), etc.

Targets have been set for each indicator, together with a trigger for review and contingency actions.

Appendix A (see separate document) gives details of the individual performance indicators such as frequency of collection, baseline information and targets.

Appendix B (see separate document) lists the policies contained within the South Ribble Site Allocations DPD and shows the relevant indicators against each.

