

Matter 5 – Other Plan Policies – the Council’s Response to the Inspector’s Questions

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

Chapter A – Infrastructure

1. What implications, if any, will the Community Infrastructure Levy have on the provision of infrastructure having regard to the Plan requirements?

- 1.1. In answering the above question it is useful to put the infrastructure development envisaged in association with the Plan into the wider historical context.
- 1.2. The Central Lancashire Core Strategy (CS) (SRE002) sought to bring forward proposals in two ways:
 - Allocate land to be developed as fully fledged Strategic Sites where there is a high degree of certainty over delivery.
 - Indicate the approximate extent of Strategic Locations within which land will be allocated for development in later Development Plan Documents
- 1.3. The above results in two main areas of substantive new build development:
 - Policy 4: Housing Delivery, envisages a total of 22,158 dwellings in the plan period up to 2026, with 417 per annum in South Ribble Borough
 - Policy 9: Economic Growth and Employment, identifies 454 hectares of employment land for development between 2010 and 2026.
- 1.4. An Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS) (CD5.5.1) was prepared in March 2011 for submission to the CS Examination and subsequently updated in January 2012 as part of the CIL preparatory work, which itemised the infrastructure projects already envisaged or probably needed after taking account of the quantity and broad location of development proposed in the CS and to record their likely implementation timescales, costs, sources of funding and deficits.
- 1.5. In his final report the CS Inspector was of the view that the IDS identified infrastructure projects that will probably be needed to support the quantity and broad location of development which the

Local Plan (CD4.9) proposes. He considered it thorough and comprehensive in its approach, and concluded that it along with the Performance Monitoring Framework an essential management tool in delivering the strategy of the local plan.

- 1.6. The County Council as Highways Authority did not raise objection in principle to the CS's proposals, but with the caveat that there must come a point where additional traffic can no longer be accommodated without unacceptable impacts or the need for much wider strategic infrastructure improvements to support further development. To this end the County Council stated it would be appropriate to produce a Highways and Transport Master Plan as a prerequisite to informing the production of detailed proposals for additional infrastructure to come forward, particularly at the Strategic Locations. The Inspector acknowledged that this was a sensible approach.
- 1.7. In response to the above the County Council has worked up a Highways and Transport Masterplan (CD4.3). It sets out the County Council's ideas for future highways and transport strategy for Central Lancashire up to 2026 and beyond. In particular it states that it considers the impact of development plans on the area in the future, including the approved Central Lancashire Core Strategy.

- 1.8. With reference to CIL and funding generally it states:

“Funding for this masterplan will come from many sources, not all of them public. A further component of the Local Development Framework is the ‘charging schedule’ for the new Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)”

.....

“The Core Strategy has put in place one single development plan for all the Central Lancashire area. The economic growth of all 3 districts is therefore interlinked and dependent on the success of the strategic locations that have now been adopted by all 3 districts. The infrastructure to support this development is also one single integrated solution to the need to provide for development in Central Lancashire and as such will draw on the CIL raised in all 3 districts to provide a significant element of funding for the programme.”

- 1.9. The Masterplan itemises the funding needed to support the plan (CS) and having considered all funding streams, specifically seeks CIL funding of £97.2 million over the period 2013/14 to 2022/23 from the three Central Lancashire Authorities. The infrastructure projects envisaged in the Masterplan have been included within the Draft 123 List (January 2013) (CD4.13), which has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 123(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, (CD4.15) and itemises the infrastructure that will in full or in part be funded by CIL. This 123 List forms one of the

supporting documents submitted to the CIL 'Examination', as discussed below.

- 1.10. The South Ribble DPD (SRSD001) discusses the need for a variety of infrastructure which reflects the projects in the IDS and states that this may be delivered via CIL or S106 contributions and has specific policies A2 and A3 which seek to deliver two key pieces of highway infrastructure:
 - A2 – The Cross Borough Link Road
 - A3 – The Completion of the Penwortham Bypass.
- 1.11. The LCC Transport Masterplan promotes the delivery of one element of this infrastructure, the Penwortham Bypass. The South Ribble DPD at Policy A2 advises that the Cross Borough Link Road will be provided through either CIL and/or developer contributions and completed within an agreed timescale.
- 1.12. The DPD is currently being updated to reflect the progress that has been made with the Masterplan with particular reference to the South Ribble Western Distributor, which includes A582 improvements plus the Penwortham Bypass.
- 1.13. DCLG Community Infrastructure Levy Guidance December 2012, (CD4.17) paragraph 8, requires local authorities progressing CIL to explain how the proposed levy rates will contribute towards the implementation of the development plan (which in this case comprises the Core Strategy and Site Allocations Development Plan Documents) and support development of the area.
- 1.14. The CIL Charging Schedules (CD4.16) are currently going through the prescribed stages towards adoption they were submitted to the Inspectorate for 'Examination' on 1 February 2013, and the examination should take place within ten weeks of this date. The proposed levy rates were subject to extensive viability work which concluded that they are set at a level that should not prejudice development and will not be the determining factor as to whether a development is viable.
- 1.15. Provisional estimates of the income that will be generated from CIL suggest if all of the houses and employment land in the CS comes forward for development, then depending on assumptions, such as intensity of development, a range of £114 to £122 million will be generated.
- 1.16. This income equates approximately to the CIL funding sought to implement the Masterplan. Therefore CIL funding should facilitate the

highway infrastructure to allow the development envisaged in the plan both through:

- The Transport Masterplan, which seeks to develop the Penwortham Bypass.
- The proposed Cross Borough link road which seeks part funding from CIL as set out in Policy A2 of the Plan.

Conclusion

- 1.17. The Core Strategy Examiner was of view that the infrastructure identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule was that probably needed to support the quantity and broad location of development which the Strategy proposes.
- 1.18. It was acknowledged at the time that a Master Plan was necessary to facilitate the highways infrastructure needed, which includes the Penwortham Bypass, within South Ribble Borough.
- 1.19. This exercise has been completed and a CIL contribution of £97.2 million is sought from CIL.
- 1.20. The CIL income envisaged from the main quantum of built development in the CS equates to a range of £114 to £122 million.
- 1.21. Therefore in accordance with Paragraph 8 of the Community Infrastructure Guidance December 2012, it is considered that the CIL will contribute positively towards the implementation of the development plan by seeking to initially provide the highway infrastructure needed to facilitate the development prescribed within the plan and when funding allows the other infrastructure projects during the plan period.

2. Does policy A1 pay adequate attention to the needs of all users of the transport network? Is the approach justified?

- 2.1. Policy A1 aims to ensure that new development contributes to the mitigation of any resultant impacts on all types of infrastructure. Sections a) to h) of the policy list the types of infrastructure for which a contribution may be sought, but makes it clear contributions are not limited to those expressly stated in the policy. Part c) of the Policy makes reference to transport infrastructure. The Council acknowledges that bridleway users are an important user of the highway network and should be referenced in the policy. A minor modification is being proposed to include this reference in part c) of the policy. (Minor Modifications Document Ref SRSD007a, number 5)

3. Is the provision of the Cross Borough Link Road (Policy A2) justified and deliverable having regard to the evidence?

- 3.1. Policy A2 describes the Cross Borough link Road in two sections, firstly from Carrwood Road to The Cawsey and secondly extending through the Pickering's Farm site.
- 3.2. This statement shall describe the justification and deliverability for both sections in turn.

Policy A2 a) Section from Carrwood Road to The Cawsey. Policy Background

- 3.3. There is a long established policy background for this section of the Cross Borough Link Road(CBLR).
- 3.4. In 1982 Central Lancashire Development Corporation obtained planning permission from the Secretary of State for residential development at Walton Park, the residential estate immediately to the north east of the CBLR. This incorporated a safeguarded corridor to permit the construction of the CBLR to the Lostock Hall Gasworks site.
- 3.5. The section of the CBLR from Carrwood Road roundabout to the eastern edge of the Lostock Hall gasworks site was included in the Walton le Dale, Bamber Bridge, Lostock Hall Local Plan adopted in 1986. The South Ribble Local Plan (CD4.9), adopted Feb 2000, continued this commitment in Policy T3.
- 3.6. The Policy stated that:

' A road will be constructed from the roundabout on Carrwood Road to Leyland Road in the vicinity of Bee Lane in order to open up land for development and to serve as a local through route. Traffic management measures will be undertaken on Leyland Road in order to limit any increase in road space for cars.'
- 3.7. The adopted Central Lancashire Core Strategy (July 2012) in Policy 3 Travel section h) ii) references the completion of a new road from Walton Park through to Lostock Hall. Policy A2 of the Site Allocations DPD carries through this policy intention.

Justification for the CBLR

- 3.8. At the time of the South Ribble Local Plan Inquiry, the Inspector when considering objections to Policy T3, identified that the road would bring substantial benefits in terms of its contribution to the strategy of the Local Plan, the achievement of sustainable development, the

restructuring of the local economy and the improvement of conditions on Browndedge Road and Leyland Road.

- 3.9. The CBLR is instrumental in opening up a number of sites for re-development.
- 3.10. South Ribble Local Plan Policy in Policy EMP6 allocates the Lostock Hall Gasworks site for a mixed employment/residential/commercial. In addition South Ribble Local Plan Policy HP1 allocated a residential development on Site f) Land East of Leyland Road. The Local Plan stated the need for both developments to contribute to the proposed link road in order to secure the infrastructure needed to enable their redevelopment.
- 3.11. These allocations are carried forward as Sites H and K of Policy D1 - Allocation of Housing Land in the Submission Version Site Allocations DPD and extended to include Site DD the Gas Holders site, Lostock Hall. The need for the CBLR to provide the highway infrastructure to enable these sites to come forward remains.
- 3.12. In addition to the above, the CBLR results in significant benefits with regard to improving local access in an East - West direction across the Borough to facilities including local retail and employment uses. It will improve access to the A6, the Capitol Centre Retail Park and, Preston City Centre. It results in the re distribution of existing local traffic, which will result in the reduction in traffic at the Tardy Gate junction on Leyland Road and Browndedge Road. This reduction enables public realm improvements to be made at the Tardy Gate District Centre, improving its attractiveness and accessibility for users.

Deliverability

- 3.13. In December 2006 National Grid submitted an outline planning application for the redevelopment of the Lostock Hall Gasworks site (12.1 HA) for a mixed use development including employment (B1, B8) Local Centre (A1, A2, A3, A4, A5) and residential development (C3) and associated access road.
- 3.14. In May 2007, a complementary application for the construction of a road bridge to link Carrwood Road and The Cawsey, providing access over the Preston Junction Nature Reserve was submitted by South Ribble Borough Council. Both applications were presented to committee and resolved to approve subject to Section 106 agreements. These applications were not progressed due to the downturn in the economy and certain commercial issues.
- 3.15. In January 2013 resubmissions of both applications were submitted to the Borough Council and these are in the process of determination.

The only alteration is that now the mixed use application on the Gasworks site no longer proposes employment uses (B1,B8).

- 3.16. Agreement has been reached in principle with the applicant National Grid that the Link road and Bridge will be funded and delivered as part of their residential scheme. This would be secured through a Section 106 agreement which is currently being re-negotiated.

Policy A2 b) Section through the major development site of Pickering's Farm

- 3.17. The section of the CBLR running from Leyland Road to the A582 through the Pickering's Farm major residential allocation provides access through this development and provides a link from the A582 to the first section of the CBLR.
- 3.18. The Development Statement for this site prepared by the HCA and Taylor Wimpey, referred to in detail in Matter 2, includes a Section on Infrastructure and outlines the Transport Strategy for the site. This document states that the main vehicular access points to the site will be taken from Penwortham Way(A582) with a secondary access from Chain House Lane. The extension of the CBLR from Leyland Road to Penwortham Way is outlined with the exact detail and specification of this road to be agreed. The conclusion section of the Development Statement outlines the benefits of the Pickering's Farm development in particular:
- 'enabling the completion of a key highways link, connecting Penwortham Way (A582) to Leyland Road; this is deliverable through the land controlled by the HCA and Taylor Wimpey.'*
- 3.19. This extended section of the CBLR, is needed to further improve east-west access across the Borough and extend the benefits of the first section of the CBLR, increasing local access to facilities and assisting to reduce traffic flows on the local road network in particular at Tardy Gate, Leyland Road/Brownedge Road junction.
- 3.20. The Council accepts that further work is required in relation to the specific route, the design and specification of this section of the link road. This will be undertaken with the landowners, HCA, Taylor Wimpey and the Highway Authority. Consideration will also be required of the overall scheme viability to ensure flexibility with regard to infrastructure delivery.
- 3.21. The Cross Borough Link Road is included in the Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Regulation 123 List of potential infrastructure schemes to be funded through CIL. This recognises that as stated in

the policy, the link road will be funded through either CIL and /or developer contributions.

- 3.22. In order to give further clarity to the role and purpose of the Link Road, the Borough Council is proposing some minor modifications to the justification to this policy. These will be outlined in the Statement of Common Ground agreed between the Borough Council and Lancashire County Council.

Chapter B – Areas for Development

1. Is there a need to provide for enabling development in order to secure the delivery of local affordable housing under Policy B2?

- 1.1. Paragraph 54 of the NPPF (CD4.7) considers the provision of housing to meet the needs of rural areas including the provision of affordable houses through rural exception sites where appropriate. It goes on to state that local planning authorities should in particular consider whether allowing some market housing would facilitate the provision of significant additional affordable housing to meet local needs.

- 1.2. Policy 7 of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy concerns Affordable and Special Needs Housing and in Part (a) of the policy requires 100% provision of affordable housing in respect of rural exception sites. This policy was found to be sound by the Inspector and in his report at paragraph 61 he states that:

‘There is a realistic prospect that the Local Plan will deliver a reasonable number of affordable homes in the plan period’

- 1.3. Policy B2 of the Site Allocations DPD (SRSD001) identifies sites in the Borough which the Council considers are appropriate to provide for local village development, including affordable housing, health care, employment and community uses.
- 1.4. The Council recognises the significant need for affordable housing in the Borough. Policy B2 aims to provide for village needs. These villages, New Longton, Much Hoole, Coupe Green, Mellor Brook, are all located within the green belt and the village boundaries are tightly constrained. The purpose of policy B2 is to provide land outside the green belt to meet the future needs of the village over the plan period. These needs could be affordable housing, community uses or employment needs. Allowing the development of market housing here, would reduce the opportunity to meet the wider development needs of the village, needs which may emerge over the plan period.

- 1.5. The Council acknowledges that the performance in delivering affordable housing over the last five years has been limited. This has been evident across the Borough as a whole, and is not specific to the rural areas. It is considered that the reasons for this are a combination of factors including the economic downturn, reduced rates of market house building and funding issues for Registered Providers. It is the case that a limited number of affordable housing units on the rural exception sites allocated under South Ribble Local Plan (CD4.9) Policy D9 have come forward in the plan period to 2006. This does not by itself indicate that these particular rural sites are not viable, or that some form of enabling development is required to bring these sites forward. It simply reflects the Borough wide picture.
- 1.6. The Central Lancashire Affordable Housing SPD (Document Ref SRE003) was adopted in October 2012 and Section H of the document gives guidance on Rural Exceptions as referenced in Core Strategy Policy 7.
- 1.7. Paragraph 55 of the SPD states that:
- 'In providing for affordable housing in rural communities, the aim set out in NPPF, is to be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs. Clear independent evidence of an identified local need for affordable housing is a prerequisite to considering whether, in line with the NPPF, allowing some market housing would facilitate the provision of affordable housing. Rural exception sites should provide 100% affordable housing as set out in Policy 7 of the Core Strategy.'*
- 1.8. In line with the above guidance, it is clear that Policy B2 sites, which are in effect rural exception sites, should provide 100% affordable housing.
- 1.9. The NPPF (CD4.7) in paragraph 54, states that a local planning authority should consider whether allowing some market housing would facilitate the provision of significant additional affordable housing to meet local needs. The guidance in the Affordable Housing SPD recognises this and allows consideration of other sites in rural areas for market housing. Each site would be considered on its individual merits. An assessment of the local affordable housing need in the proximity of the site would be required and a demonstration of how such a scheme will meet these local needs.
- 1.10. The Council is in the process of commissioning a Housing Needs and Demands Survey. This will provide more up to date information on rural housing needs in terms of tenure, size and types of properties required. It is anticipated that this work will be completed in June/July 2013.

- 1.11. In conclusion, Policy B2 complies with Core Strategy Policy 7 and the Affordable Housing SPD, which in turn are consistent with the NPPF. No alteration to Policy B2 is therefore considered necessary.

2. Is there a need for the comprehensive development of South Rings Business Park (Policy B3) through a masterplan?

- 2.1. The South Rings Business Park, extends to an area of approximately 16.2 hectares, and is designated as employment land under Policy EMP 1 of the South Ribble Local Plan (referenced as Site A). Outline planning permission for a mixed use development comprising A1, A3, B1, B2, B8 and C1 uses was granted by the Secretary of State following a 'call in' on 10 February 2000. This outline application was accompanied by a masterplan for the site, setting out the uses of various parcels of land. Subsequently a number of reserved matters applications have been approved for a B&Q store (A1 use), Holiday Inn (C1 use), Burger King (A3 use), public house and offices (B1 use) for Places for People.
- 2.2. The southern half of the site remains undeveloped and is continued to be marketed.
- 2.3. The Council is supportive of proposals to attract further investment in to the undeveloped southern part of the site and also facilitate appropriate re development and changes of use where proposed. However such proposals need to be developed in a coordinated way so that the existing employment uses and retail offer are protected and it can be ensured that any proposed uses are appropriate and complementary to the site as a whole. In order to achieve this, the Council considers that the preparation of a revised masterplan for the site would be appropriate.
- 2.4. Following consideration of the representation submitted by the landowner, Muse Developments through their agent HOW Planning (Representation ref 122), a Minor Modification to Policy B3 is proposed to alter the wording of the policy so that a masterplan may be submitted as part of a planning application (Minor Modification document SRSD007a, number 6).

Chapter G – Natural & Built Environment

1. Does the plan have adequate regard to the need to protect biodiversity? Are designated sites adequately referred to?

- 1.1. Since the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the Council recognises further policy work may be needed with regard to biodiversity and more specifically the issue of ecological networks.
- 1.2. The Council in particular notes the following paragraphs of the NPPF:
- ‘Minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity, where possible, contributing to the Government’s commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures’ (Paragraph 109, Page 25/26, NPPF).
 - ‘Local Planning Authorities should set criteria based policies against which proposals for any development on or affecting protected wildlife or geodiversity sites or landscape areas will be judged. Distinctions should be made between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites, so that protection is commensurate with their status and gives appropriate weight to their importance and the contribution that they make to wider ecological networks’ (Paragraph 113, Page 26, NPPF).
 - ‘Local Planning Authorities should: set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure’ (Paragraph 114, Page 26, NPPF).
- 1.3. Having had discussions with Lancashire Wildlife Trust (LWT) and Lancashire County Council (LCC) ecologists in relation to their received representations the Council has agreed to draft a biodiversity policy that relates to ecological networks and the hierarchy of designated biodiversity sites, where it considers that there is a policy gap (CD5.5.1). The Central Lancashire Core Strategy Policy 22: Biodiversity and Geodiversity and accompanying justification text does discuss opportunities to ‘conserve, protect, and seek opportunities to enhance and manage the biological and geological assets ... seeking opportunities ... to enhance and expand ecological networks’ (Policy 22). Paragraph 10.23 aligns to the hierarchy of designated biodiversity assets and paragraphs 10.24 – 10.25 expand upon ecological networks. The Council accepts that to ensure compliance with NPPF (CD4.7) further policy wording is required within the Plan to complement the strategic approach taken in the Central Lancashire Core Strategy (SRE002).
- 1.4. See suggested wording for a draft biodiversity policy and justification text in CD5.5.1. This will form part of our agreed Statement of

Common Ground with LWT and LCC. If the Inspector is minded, the Policy will be consulted upon after the hearings and before formal adoption of the Plan.

- 1.5. Additionally, the Council has agreed to produce an SPD covering guidance on issues such as green infrastructure, biodiversity requirements including surveys and mitigation measures and guidance relating to ecological networks. The SPD will aim to be adopted by 31 March 2014 and will have due consideration to public consultation through the formal preparation of the SPD and its subsequent adoption. LWT and LCC will be fully engaged within the preparation process.

2. Are policies G1 and G2 consistent with the NPPF?

- 2.1. The Council is satisfied that Policy G1 'Green Belt' and Policy G2 'The Re-Use and Adaptation of Buildings in the Green Belt' are essentially consistent with the NPPF (subject to one or two minor comments at the end of this section). As referenced below the NPPF (CD4.7) remains committed to the Green Belt and the need to preserve it to prevent urban sprawl through protecting the openness and permanence of the Green Belt. Policy G1 and Policy G2 are fully supportive to the overall policy aim of the Green Belt and set out criteria where development may be acceptable in line with the NPPF requirements.
- 2.2. In this context the Council in particular notes the following paragraphs of the NPPF:
 - 'The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence' (Paragraph 79, Page 19, NPPF).
 - Paragraph 80 (Page 19) of the NPPF which sets out the five purposes of Green Belt the Council's approach is wholly consistent with these purposes.
 - 'Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land' (Paragraph 81, Page 19, NPPF).

- 'Local Planning Authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy. Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan' (Paragraph 83, Page 20, NPPF).
- 'As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances' (Paragraph 87, Page 20, NPPF).

2.3. In view of the NPPF requirement to protect the Green Belt, the Council is compliant with this as it seeks to preserve the Green Belt boundary from the Local Plan 2000 (CD4.9) as it is, with the minor exception of a Green Belt review within the designated Enterprise Zone at BAE Systems in Samlesbury.

2.4. As alluded to above there are a few small areas where Policy G1 does not directly replicate national policy such as community forests, community right to build, mineral extraction etc. Paragraphs 90 – 92 of the NPPF are of direct relevance here. However, as these issues are presented within the NPPF the Council does not feel it is necessary to replicate national policy within the Plan in these instances.

3. Are the allocations of safeguarded sites (policy G3), Protected Open Lane (G4) and Green Corridors (G12) justified having regard to the alternatives and the availability of land for housing?

3.1. Yes, the Council is satisfied that the proposed allocations of the Safeguarded Sites, Protected Open Land and Green Corridors are justified having regard to the alternatives and the availability of land for housing. Included below are a series of tables which provide evidence for the above listed proposed allocations and detail their past allocation, proposed future allocation and justification for this approach.

Safeguarded Sites

Site Name	Proposed Allocation	Local Plan Allocation	Justification
South of Factory Lane and east of the West Coast Main Line	Safeguarded Land	Safeguarded Land	This site was safeguarded in the Local Plan (2000) for future development. When a review of all safeguarded sites was undertaken as part of the Site Allocations process it was seen that due to the amount of development coming forward in this area, mainly due to the proposed Major Site at Pickering's Farm, that it would be inappropriate due to Infrastructure requirements to bring all of the safeguarded land forward at the same time within this plan period. The lower half of this site has since received planning permission for market housing on appeal.
Southern area of the Major Development Site at Pickering's Farm, Penwortham	Safeguarded Land	Safeguarded Land	This site was safeguarded in the Local Plan (2000) for future development. When a review of all safeguarded sites was undertaken as part of the Site Allocations process it was seen that due to the amount of development coming forward in this area, mainly due to the proposed Major Site at Pickering's Farm, that it would be inappropriate due to Infrastructure requirements to bring all of the safeguarded land forward at the same time within this plan period.
South of Coote Lane, Chain House Lane, Farington	Safeguarded Land	Safeguarded Land	This site was safeguarded in the Local Plan (2000) for future development. When a review of all safeguarded sites was undertaken as part of the Site Allocations process it was seen that due to the amount of development coming forward in this area, mainly due to the proposed Major Site at Pickering's Farm, that it would be inappropriate due to Infrastructure requirements to bring all of the

Site Name	Proposed Allocation	Local Plan Allocation	Justification
			safeguarded land forward at the same time within this plan period.
Land off Church Lane, Farington	Safeguarded Land	Safeguarded Land	This site was safeguarded in the Local Plan (2000) for future development. When a review of all safeguarded sites was undertaken as part of the Site Allocations process it was seen that due to the amount of development coming forward in this area, mainly due to the proposed Major Site at Pickering's Farm, that it would be inappropriate due to Infrastructure requirements to bring all of the safeguarded land forward at the same time within this plan period.
Land off Emnie Lane, Leyland	Safeguarded Land	Safeguarded Land	This site was suggested during the Issues and Options and Preferred Options stage of the Site Allocations process as a potential site to be brought forward within this plan period for employment land. However, due to a wide number of objections from nearby residents, the allocation of Land off Altcar Lane for residential development which would create a significant amount of development activity and the lack of need for additional employment land to be allocated through this process, it was decided that this site should remain safeguarded for future development to be assessed within the next plan period.

Protected Open Land

- 3.2. Sites proposed for allocation within the Plan as 'Protected Open Land' were brought forward from the Local Plan (2000), previously allocated as either Policy D9: Local Needs in Villages or Policy D1 (e) Countryside Areas.

Site Name	Proposed Allocation	Local Plan Allocation	Justification
School House Farm, Liverpool Road	Protected Open Land	Countryside Designation	This site is located within Hutton on the boundary of the settlement and Green Belt. The site was a countryside designation in the Local Plan (2000) which had a similar yet more flexible function than the Green Belt. An adjacent site (Site N) which was allocated as Safeguarded within the previous Plan has been proposed for residential allocation to enable some development to occur in this area. It was not considered appropriate due to the scale of the area and its position within the hierarchy in Policy 1: Locating Growth in the Central Lancashire Core Strategy, to allocate this site for development and so the new allocation of Protected Open Land was considered appropriate.
Site South of Chapel Lane between Site M and Site Q	Protected Open Land	Countryside Designation	There are a number of sites within Longton which have been allocated for residential development, according with its position on the hierarchy in Policy 1: Locating Growth in the Central Lancashire Core Strategy. However, allocating all of the suggested sites would have been to allow a greater scale of development than was appropriate for the area. These sites have been proposed for allocation as protected open land to preserve the openness of the settlement in this area.

Site Name	Proposed Allocation	Local Plan Allocation	Justification
Site at Howick Hall Farm (Galloway)	Protected Open Land	Safeguarded	This site was Safeguarded for future development in the Local Plan (2000); however it is no longer considered appropriate for this site to be developed. There is a Biological Heritage Site covering the designation and due to the importance of designated biodiversity sites within the National Planning Policy Framework it is no longer considered appropriate to allocate as Safeguarded and as such the proposed allocation now relates to Protected Open Land.
Land off Daub Hall Lane	Protected Open Land	Local Needs in Villages	This site was no longer considered appropriate for local needs in villages due to its location at the edge of the settlement bordering on to the Green Belt boundary. As a result a site in a more sustainable location has been proposed for Village Development in Coupe Green where it is considered there is a need and this site was seen as more appropriate for Protected Open Land.
Land Adjacent to the Fields*	Protected Open Land	Local Needs in Villages	This site was no longer considered appropriate for local needs in villages due to its location at the edge of the New Longton settlement where development for community facilities would not have been in the most sustainable location. As a result a site in a more sustainable location has been proposed for Village Development and this site was seen as more appropriate for Protected Open Land.
Land off Long Moss Lane*	Protected Open Land	Local Needs in Villages	This site was no longer considered appropriate for local needs in villages due to its

Site Name	Proposed Allocation	Local Plan Allocation	Justification
			location at the edge of the New Longton settlement where development for community facilities would not have been in the most sustainable location. As a result a site in a more sustainable location has been proposed for Village Development and this site was seen as more appropriate for Protected Open Land.

- 3.3. It is worth commenting on these sites * that applications for market housing have been received. Land off Long Moss Lane has received planning permission for 27 dwellings at an appeal and the Council is awaiting the decision on an appeal for an application for market housing on Land Adjacent to the Fields.

Green Corridors

- 3.4. The sites that are proposed as Green Corridors within the Plan were carried forward from the Local Plan (2000) previously covered as Policy D10: Green Wedges (see below). The aim of the policy was to preserve areas of openness acting as a buffer to separate between developments and provide areas to enable access and potential recreational opportunities. It was considered appropriate to carry this designation forward into the Plan as the Green Corridors only occur within the existing built up area in the centre of South Ribble where their existence may be the only green buffer opportunity between developments.

Policy D10: Green Wedges
Planning permission will not be granted for development which would disrupt or destroy the visual or spatial continuity of open land within a green wedge.

- 3.5. The Central Lancashire Core Strategy Policy 18: Green Infrastructure discusses the need to (b) invest in and improve the natural environment, particularly; iii. where it contributes to the creation of green wedges and the utilisation of other green open spaces that can provide natural extensions into the countryside. Justification text in in paragraph 10.21 also discusses the wider benefits of green wedges and their role as providing ‘substantial areas of open space which lie within the main urban areas ... providing links to open countryside and

acting as wildlife corridors. As referenced in the Council's response to Matter 1 there is a technical inconsistency between the term 'green wedges' within the Central Lancashire Core Strategy and 'green corridors' used within the Plan. The meaning and intention behind the two terms is the same and a minor amendment has been proposed within Matter 1 to try and overcome this technical inconsistency.

- 3.6. Further, Matter 3: Housing discusses the availability of land for housing and was informed by calculations on the density of sites and the number of allocation sites required to meet South Ribble's housing requirement of 417 homes per annum. With this evidence referenced in Matter 3, the Council is satisfied that these above proposed allocations are appropriate and justified.