

Date: 19 June 2014

Your ref:

Our ref:

Please ask for: Helen Hockenhill

Extension: 5411

Direct Dial Tel: 01772 625411

Fax:

email: [forwardplanning@southribble.gov.uk](mailto:forwardplanning@southribble.gov.uk)



The Planning Inspectorate  
4/03 Kite Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
BRISTOL  
BS1 6PN

Civic Centre, West Paddock,  
Leyland, Lancashire PR25 1DH  
Tel: 01772 421491  
Fax: 01772 622287  
email: [info@southribble.gov.uk](mailto:info@southribble.gov.uk)  
website: [www.southribble.gov.uk](http://www.southribble.gov.uk)

FAO Susan Heywood  
Senior Housing and Planning Inspector

Dear Ms Heywood

## **SOUTH RIBBLE LOCAL PLAN – POLICY C4 – CUERDEN STRATEGIC SITE**

We have recently received correspondence in relation to Policy C4 (Cuerden Strategic Site) of the Local Plan. This correspondence relates to the proposed Modification (MM11) to include a 'retail' use within the policy. There are parties (both private and public sector organisations) who have informed us they do not believe the inclusion of retail within the development of the Cuerden site has been assessed appropriately. On this basis, they have indicated that if the authority is minded to adopt the Local Plan (on 23 July 2014) they will challenge the authority through a Judicial Review process.

Concerns that have been raised are as follows:

1. There is no evidence to support this major out-of-centre retail allocation;
2. That it is inconsistent with the Central Lancashire Core Strategy 2012; particularly Policy 1
3. That there could be serious impacts on nearby town centres;
4. That an out of centre unconstrained retail allocation raises issues of duty to co-operate; and
5. There are no proposed restrictions to the scale of retail on the site.

We have taken legal advice and considered a number of routes to try and address these matters, our preferred option being a further main modification, where we could offer clarification in relation to the retail use on the site and state that any town centre uses would need to satisfy the sequential and impact testing in line with paragraphs 24 and 26 of the NPPF. This process would allow further consultation to try and resolve the matter.

However due to the correspondence that we have received to date, we anticipate that a main modifications consultation process would lead to a number of objections being received, which could

lead to the examination being re-opened. We would like to seek your advice on how you think we should deal with this matter/potential challenge at this stage, the implications for the adoption process, along with indicative timescales.

Thank you for your assistance on these matters.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "H Hockenhill". The signature is written in a cursive style with a small comma at the end.

Helen Hockenhill  
Planning Manager