

Central Lancashire Local Plan

Preferred Options Consultation (Reg 18)
Consultation Statement

Main Report August 2023



Contents

Consultation Method and Response.....	3
Introduction	3
Background.....	4
Purpose of the consultation.....	4
What was included within the consultation?.....	4
Who we consulted?	5
How we consulted	5
Level of response.	6
Call for Sites Four Submissions.....	7
Attendance at Drop in Consultation Events.....	7
Summary of responses.....	9
Spatial Vision	9
Objectives	9
Spatial Strategy	9
Spatial Development Priorities.....	10
30-year Vision.....	10
New settlement proposal	10
Alternative development options could be considered beyond the Plan Period	11
Cuerdale Garden Village.....	11
Policy Directions	12
General Comments Field	25
Site Proposals	27
Preferred Housing Allocations for Chorley.	27
Preferred Employment Allocations for Chorley.	27
Potential Housing Allocations for Preston.	28
Potential Employment Allocations for Preston.....	28
Preferred Housing Allocations for South Ribble.	29
Preferred Employment Allocations for South Ribble	29
Next Steps	31
Appendices	32
Appendix A: Proposed Housing Allocation Site Comments	32
Appendix B: Proposed Employment Allocation Site Comments.....	61
Appendix C: Excluded Sites Comments	69

Consultation Method and Response

Introduction

This Part One Preferred Options is the next step in preparing a new local plan for Central Lancashire. The plan will apply to the boroughs of Chorley, Preston and South Ribble, and will set out where we expect development to take place in our communities, including the number and types of homes we need to provide and where, how we will enable places for employment premises to come forward to create new jobs and generate income for our local economy, how we will protect and improve our natural environment, taking account of climate change, and also provide the local services our communities need to work, learn, shop and enjoy leisure time.

The Central Lancashire Local Plan (CLLP) will replace the Central Lancashire Core Strategy (2012), the Chorley Local Plan (2015), the Preston Local Plan (2015) and the South Ribble Local Plan (2015). It will include both strategic and local (development management policies) and will bring all these policies into one plan.

This document explains how the three Central Lancashire Councils of Preston, Chorley and South Ribble undertook a consultation on the Part One Central Lancashire Local Plan Preferred Options document. It sets out how the Councils sought participation from communities and stakeholders across the three Boroughs. It covers:

- Which bodies and persons were invited to make comments
- How those bodies and persons were invited to make comment
- The material that was subject to consultation
- A summary of the issues raised
- How the comments received will shape the next version of the plan

This consultation statement complies with the three Councils' Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). Links to each Council's SCIs are below.

- [Chorley Statement of Community Involvement \(2019\)](#)
- [Preston Statement of Community Involvement \(2018\)](#)
- [South Ribble Statement of Community Involvement \(2013\)](#)

The SCIs each outline that the Councils are committed to effective community engagement and seek to use a wide range of methods for involving the community in the plan making process.

It sets out how the Council will involve the community and stakeholders in the preparation, alteration and review of local planning policy and the consideration of planning applications. The SCI proposes that the consultation methods and those engaged would vary according to the purpose of the consultation and the bodies or persons who the Council were keen to involve. For this report, who was considered a statutory consultee was determined through the creation of an all-encompassing list of statutory consultees from each authority's SCI. For the next consultation, a new list will be agreed upon, therefore some bodies which are considered statutory now could be subject to change.

Background

The new Local Plan for Central Lancashire was launched with the publication of the 'Issues and Options' Consultation which took place between November 2019 and February 2020. This was a first stage of consultation under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

The Issues and Options consultation document presented information on a number of topics which could affect how development takes place across Central Lancashire over the plan period. Topics discussed in the paper included housing; employment; education; retail and leisure; environment; health; and travel. The consultation also presented information on sites which had been suggested to the councils as locations for development. The Issues and Options consultation document did not set out proposed policy approaches or potential sites and this is the purpose of the Preferred Options consultation documents.

A Consultation Outcomes report was published in September 2020 and is available on the Central Lancashire Local Plan Website available here:

<https://centrallocalplan.lancashire.gov.uk/documents/issue-and-options-outcomes-report/>

Purpose of the consultation

The Preferred Options Part One Consultation was undertaken in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The purpose of the consultation was to invite views about the emerging Central Lancashire Local Plan, to ensure that local people, stake holders and other statutory bodies, can influence our local plan and ensure it is fit for purpose and meets our local needs and aspirations.

What was included within the consultation?

Our Preferred Options Consultation is being undertaken in two parts, Part One which included details of the strategic framework for our new Local Plan, such as the vision, objectives and spatial strategy, and setting out the ambition for the Central Lancashire economy, our communities, and our environment. These are important elements which lay the foundations for the rest of the local plan, shaping where growth will be focussed, of what type and the use, taking account of opportunities such as the City Deal and the National Cyber Force, with linkages to national, regional and sub-regional strategy including the new strategic framework; Lancashire 2050, whilst also ensuring we are place-making and nurturing biodiversity and the natural environment.

We also consulted on our emerging policies, referred to as policy directions, which included key strategic and local policies which set out development needs for housing and employment and also included proposals for potential site allocations for housing and employment (and mixed use). The rationale for proposing policy directions was because of the uncertainty due to changes proposed through emerging national policy and legislation and it was considered that as the world around us is changing so quickly, and national policy is also expected to change in the coming months, the detail of these policies may change over time. They demonstrate the objective and intent of the policy theme or objective identified, whilst recognising that exact wording may change between this consultation and Part Two Preferred Options.

Potential Site allocations proposals were also included in addition to details of sites which are still subject to further assessment work and therefore there is not a definitive proposal for these, this will follow in due course along with a refined list of site allocations. Other policy themes were

included too which included economy, health and inclusive communities, and the environment including climate change.

Part Two Preferred Options Draft Local Plan Consultation will follow and will feature all of the draft policies, both strategic and development management (also known as local policies) in addition to proposals for all land uses and it will set out what infrastructure will be required to support the growth that is planned for Central Lancashire.

What was presented in this consultation was not a full draft Local Plan or the final sites for allocation as there is still much work to do and so proposals included can and will be subject to change.

Table 1 Scope of the Part 1 Preferred Options Document

<ul style="list-style-type: none">❖ A spatial vision, strategic objectives, and sustainable growth principles - setting out the plan's ambition for our economy, our communities, and our environment (section 2)❖ A spatial strategy - directing where future development is located and overall spatial priorities for accommodating growth (section 3)❖ An overview of development needs – explaining the amount of housing and economic growth that we need to plan for (section 4)❖ The distribution and allocation of proposed/potential site allocations (section 5)❖ Development policy directions for a balanced housing market (section 6)❖ Development policy directions for a prosperous economy (section 7)❖ Development policy directions for healthy and inclusive communities (section 8)❖ Development policy directions for a high-quality environment (section 9)❖ Development policy direction for sustainable energy (section 10)❖ The approach to infrastructure delivery (section 11)
--

Who we consulted?

When consulting on a local plan it is important to have a robust consultation process that allows for contributions from all ages and interests across the plan area and is open and transparent. With that in mind the aim was to hear from as wide a range of people as possible including young people, businesses, community groups, interest groups, town and parish councils, landowners, housebuilders, transport providers, retailers, statutory consultees, and anyone else who wanted to contribute. Consulting with these groups was undertaken through a variety of means including emailing 1810 people on the Central Lancashire Local Plan Mailing list database alongside each authorities individual consultation database press releases, posts on social media and a series of face-to face consultation events held across the three boroughs in a variety of community locations.

How we consulted

The Part One Preferred Options Consultation was undertaken from Monday 19th December 2022 until Friday 24th February 2023. During this period, a range of consultation methods were used to

inform the public of the consultation and maintain interest and momentum in the process. The following methods were used to consult:

A number of social media posts were made on each of the three Councils' accounts (Facebook, Twitter etc) in addition to adverts on their own main websites.

A series of public exhibitions and question and answer sessions were held across the plan area through the consultation period. These were publicised on the Council's website and social media channels as well as by some parish councils through their social media. The events provided an opportunity for people to come along and speak to planning officers and or their local councillor about the proposals in the plan.

The digital platform, Citizenspace was the vehicle used to collect responses and is commonly used by a variety of public, third sector and private sector bodies including the DLUHC. The aim is to encourage as many representations as possible to be received digitally so that these can be easily collated, stored, and analysed. However, as we found with Issues and Options Consultation, a vast number of respondents elected to submit written responses either on email or PDFs or by hard copy.

Level of response.

There were 928 respondents to the consultation with an average of 160 comments per question related to policy directions. Of the 928 around 236 respondents submitted their representation by e-mail and mail and 742 respondents responded online.

The tables below include the data collected which sum to 928 representations to the consultation plus 92 representations regarding sites. A total of 742 responses were received online.

Work was thereafter undertaken to manually input all written representations onto the digital platform to ensure a comprehensive database of responses and to enable a robust and consistent method of analysis.

Table of Responses

Type of Response	Preston	Chorley	South Ribble	Other	Address Not Provided
Digital (Citizenspace)	131	247	191	51	122
Emailed or mailed in	31	97	29	29	
Total Responses Received	928				

The Issues and Options Consultation undertaken at the start of plan making generated a total of 1,616 responses, of which, 1,200 responses came directly through Citizen Space, with the remainder in letter from both handwritten and electronic. The level of engagement is therefore down on the initial consultation. This may be as a result of sites included within the Issues and Options consultation, no longer featuring as proposed site allocations, therefore causing less concern, but to ensure we capture as many responses as possible going forward, we will review our approach for the next consultation and ensure the online portal is both well promoted and questions easy to navigate.

Call for Sites Four Submissions

As part of this consultation invitations for new development sites were opened (a call for sites 4) and there were 92 sites submitted to the consultation for consideration as potential allocations for various uses, but predominantly housing. The majority of these were either resubmissions of sites we were already aware of and which have been assessed through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) or adjustments to an existing site. There were 42 completely new sites that hadn't been submitted in any previous consultations or through a 'call for sites' process.

Attendance at Drop in Consultation Events

A total of 814 consultees attended the events across Chorley, Preston and South Ribble with details provided in the table below. This is comparison to 912 people for the events held as part of the Issues and Options events.

Tables of events

Chorley

Borough	Date of Event	Time of Event	Venue	Number of attendees
Chorley	17/01/2023	3:30 – 6:30pm	Adlington & District Community Centre	49
Chorley	19/01/2023	4-7pm	Whittle le Woods Community Hall	121
Chorley	9/02/2023	4-7pm	Scout Centre	14
Chorley	5/01/2023	4-7pm	St Joseph's Parish Centre	15
Chorley	2/02/2023	4-7pm	Heapey and Wheelton Village Hall	63
Chorley	4/01/2023	4-7pm	Abbey Village School	16
Chorley	21/12/2022	1-4pm	Union Street Offices	0
Chorley	16/01/2023	4-7pm	St Georges CE Primary	2
Chorley	20/02/2023	4-7pm	Eaves Green Community Centre	15
Chorley	26/01/2023	4:30-7pm	Brindle Community Hall	5
Chorley	13/02/2023	4-7pm	Lancaster Lane Primary School	0
Chorley	7/02/2023	4-7pm	Coppull Library	3
Chorley	10/01/2023	5-7:30pm	Mawdesley Village Hall	31
Chorley	15/02/2023	4-7pm	Bishops High School	120

Chorley	12/01/2023	4-7pm	Eccleston Library	16
Chorley	23/01/2023	4-7pm	Charnock Richard Football Club	10
Chorley	1/02/2023	4-7pm	Euxton Methodist Church Hall	21

Preston

Borough	Date of Event	Time of Event	Venue	Number of attendees
Preston	9/01/2023	11-2pm	Preston Markets	5
Preston	12/01/2023	4-7pm	Town Hall, Lancaster Road	1
Preston	18/01/2023	4-7pm	Preston Grasshoppers	40
Preston	02/02/2023	4-7pm	St Christopher's Church Lea	14
Preston	26/01/2023	4-7pm	Norman Jepson	33
Preston	01/02/2023	1-3pm	Sahara Centre	40
Preston	08/02/2023	5-7pm	Preston Town Hall	15

South Ribble

Borough	Date of Event	Time of Event	Venue	Number of attendees
South Ribble	12/01/2023	2- 6pm	Civic Centre	5
South Ribble	01/02/2023	1-3pm and 5-7pm	Canberra Club	155
South Ribble	16/01/2023	1-3pm and 5-7pm	Penwortham Arts Centre	7
South Ribble	26/01/2023	1-3pm and 5-7pm	Longton Library	6
South Ribble	25/01/2023	1-3pm and 5-7pm	Bamber Bridge Methodist Church	10

Summary of responses

Spatial Vision

A total of 339 comments were received in relation to the spatial vision, 34.91% objections, 11.31% in support.

Comments relating to the Vision for Central Lancashire covered a wide range of key issues including ensuring that the environment is considered as highly as economic growth, establishing a strong focus on providing affordable and accessible housing, making sure that communities are sufficiently supported by infrastructure, and continuing to ensure that Green Belt and countryside areas are protected.

Statutory consultees provided suggestions for wording changes to strengthen and broaden the scope of the vision. Suggestions included adding a statement on the ability for the local plan to mitigate the impacts of climate change and protect local heritage.

Objectives

A total of 308 comments were received in relation to the Local Plan objectives, 27.05% objections, 21.89% in support.

Comments received stated that the wording is too vague, especially when referring to combating climate change. There was also a comment stating that the objectives need to ensure that maintaining an areas character does not adversely impact the need to deliver infrastructure. Another respondent commented that there should be an objective added to address inequality and deprivation. In general, comments were positive and stated that the objectives are taking Central Lancashire in the right direction and simply needed some adjusting to be stronger.

Statutory consultees were overall supportive of the plan objectives in principle, but many offered recommendations for wording changes to strengthen and broaden them. Natural England suggested that there be reference made to natural recovery networks and Lancashire County Council suggested that Central Lancashire's role as an economic centre be acknowledged. Others left general advice for language amendments.

Spatial Strategy

A total of 160 comments were received in relation to the Spatial Strategy, 22.41% objections, 8.73% in support.

Comments received mainly focused on the importance of developing near existing infrastructure and according to the settlement hierarchy. There was an emphasis on the importance of the Green Belt and countryside lands and many stated that the primary focus should be on sustainability of development.

Statutory consultee comments provided a mixed level of support and opposition with many suggested amendments. Homes England supports the housing requirement but would like to see further information about the distribution across the three authorities. Lancashire County Council believe the strategy should further demonstrate how key growth areas can link and support each

other across and beyond Central Lancashire. Many others support the spatial strategy but have refrained from commenting further until more information is provided.

Spatial Development Priorities

A total of 117 comments were received in relation to the spatial development priorities, 18.53% objections, 11.75% in support.

Comments related to the spatial development priorities focused on the desire to protect the Green Belt and focus development on brownfield lands and areas around existing towns and cities where infrastructure is already established. There was some site-specific feedback opposing development in Whittle-le-Woods, Croston, Cuerdale and Samlesbury. There was a comment which stated that the links between Central Lancashire and Manchester and Liverpool should be recognised in this section. There were also responses stating that affordable housing and environmental sustainability need to be recognised as higher priorities.

Statutory consultee responses were mainly in favour of the spatial development priorities with some echoing the public responses about preserving the Green Belt.

30-year Vision

A total of 206 comments were received in relation to the new settlement proposal, 23.71% objections, 11.75% in support.

Comments relating to the 30-year vision were conflicting with support and some hesitation. Many comments stated concern that the timeframe was too long and would not be able to appropriately respond to unexpected changes (such as pandemics, climate change, economic cycles etc.). However, some comments stated that they felt as though 30-years was appropriate to ensure there is some policy in place to guide development long-term.

Statutory consultees responses were overall in line with the public. Parish and Town councils were concerned that the long timeframe would make the plan inefficient for responding to changes and raised concern that it would cause an overestimation for development targets. Sports England and Homes England both support the vision but have identified changes and additional evidence requirements needed to support it.

New settlement proposal

A total of 183 comments were received in relation to the new settlement proposal, 24.03% objections, 5.39% in support.

Many of the comments received were in opposition to the new settlement proposal. There was an overall view that already developed, and brownfield areas should be regenerated first before new settlements are considered. Cuerdale Garden Village and Enterprise Zone developments were specifically mentioned several times in the responses stating that they represent unnecessary Green Belt development.

Statutory consultee responses mirrored the public's, stating that safeguarded and brownfield lands must be assessed fully before Green Belt lands should be considered.

Alternative development options could be considered beyond the Plan Period

A total of 215 comments were received in relation to the alternative development options. As this was an open question, opposition and support percentages were not taken.

Comments for this section spanned many topics. Many stated that there should not be a need for alternative developments beyond the Plan Period and that all need should be accounted for within it. There were also several comments stating the need to protect the Green Belt and countryside areas and emphasised that regeneration of town centres for housing options needs to be considered more. Another comment stated that more consideration for spaces to host the performing arts should be given. Provision for housing for first-time home buyers and older people was also raised as a concern needing further attention within the Plan.

Statutory consultees provided responses which were in line with the public. Homes England stated that brownfield and safeguarded sites must be considered before Green Belt lands. Other responses stated that regeneration projects and infill growth should be considered before anything else.

Cuerdale Garden Village

A total of 260 comments were received in relation to Cuerdale Garden Village, 28.56% objections, 3.45% in support.

The majority of comments received were in opposition to Cuerdale Garden Village, to the extent that comments for other consultation questions included opposition to the proposal as well. The key message from the responses is that the Garden Village is an unnecessary development in the Green Belt and that there are sufficient lands elsewhere in Central Lancashire to accommodate housing and employment need. The loss of natural greenspace is seen as contradictory to other proposed policy directions and the development of a new settlement away from already developed areas is seen as unsustainable for a number of reasons including access to sustainable transport, highways safety and essential infrastructure.

Statutory consultee responses echoed the concerns of the public. Homes England state that safeguarded and brownfield sites should be examined further before this proposal is taken forward and Samlesbury and Cuerdale Parish Council strongly opposed the development. Other consultees such as The Wildlife Trust and CPRE state that there is no justification for the proposal.

Policy Directions

Policy Direction 1: Sustainable Growth Principles

A total of 266 comments were received in relation to the policy direction, 26.29% objections, 21.77% in support.

This policy addresses how development will be directed to promote sustainable growth across the Plan Area, regenerate urban areas and Centres, and address inequalities across Central Lancashire.

Comments received support the promotion of development in previously developed areas and see access to amenities and infrastructure as a top priority. There is a strong view that the policy should be expanded to show how it will support sustainability and address climate change. Several comments expressed concern that the policy will only positively impact new developments and focus should be directed towards also improving the standards of existing communities. Responses emphasised the need for improved infrastructure in existing communities to support new growth and a desire for stronger policy deterring the development of Green Belt and countryside areas.

Statutory consultees were generally supportive of the policy. Many refrained from providing detailed feedback until the spatial strategy and site allocations have been finalised. In the meantime, wording was suggested which would strengthen the policy direction. Local Parish and Town Council feedback specifically stated that emphasis should be put on local need rather than general need for Central Lancashire.

Policy Direction 2: Spatial Approach

A total of 322 comments were received in relation to the policy direction, 34.91 % objections, 11.31% in support.

The spatial approach for Central Lancashire aims to direct development to meet the housing and development needs of the Plan Area whilst also broadly maintaining the current urban structure of a connected grouping of the city centre, towns and existing villages.

The policy direction states that it aims to minimise harm to the Green Belt unless necessary to meet development needs of Central Lancashire. This created many concerns from respondents stating that Green Belt development should be considered only as a last resort. Several comments specifically opposed Cuerdale Garden Village and there is a strong opinion that growth should be concentrated only in previously developed and urban areas, promoting regeneration and reuse of empty/underused buildings. Comments from statutory consultees echoed residents with concerns over development in Green Belt and rural areas.

There is also concern that new development could negatively affect the character of rural villages and countryside areas. Responses were concerned that focusing development away from existing build up areas, such as Preston City Centre and our existing main town centres, may cause un-even development distribution where housing would be concentrated away from areas providing employment.

There was overall support for the policy direction avoiding development in floodplains, supporting development according to the settlement hierarchy, and maximising the growth potential in Preston City Centre.

Policy Direction 3: Green Belt

A total of 330 comments were received in relation to the Green Belt, 30.17 % objections, 19.29 % in support.

This policy direction states that proposals within the Green Belt will be determined in accordance with national policy. Overall, comments supported this direction and the preservation of the Green Belt except in very special circumstances. Comments which opposed the direction stated that no development of any kind should be accepted in the Green Belt. There were also many comments which called for the policy to be stronger in refusing Green Belt development, identifying Cuerdale Garden Village as a contradiction to the policy. Cuerdale Garden Village responses are summarised previously on page 11 of this report.

Policy Direction 4: Development in the Countryside

A total of 248 comments were received in relation to development in the countryside, 25.86 % objections, 17.67% in support.

This policy direction aims to minimise the extent of development across the countryside by concentrating rural development in settlements which have scope to accommodate local facilities and other infrastructure to serve the development. Landscape settings and settlement character are also protected within this direction.

Comments were generally opposed to development in the countryside unless it is confined to brownfield lands. There was concern that the character of rural villages and the countryside could be negatively impacted by this policy direction and that no further development should be permitted in the countryside. There was, however, support for specific policies protecting Landscape Character Areas (LCAs) and landscapes surrounding particular settlements. Overall, comments suggested that the policy be strengthened to protect the countryside.

Statutory consultees were generally supportive of the policy direction only suggesting minor amendments to wording for clarity. One concern in particular was that the wording of the policy direction made it seem as though countryside development will be encouraged, which is not its intended purpose.

Policy Direction 5: Longer-Term Large-Scale Development Options

A total of 214 comments were received in relation to long-term large-scale development options, 24.89 % objections, 18 % in support.

This policy direction sets out the objectives which any new settlement or large-scale development will be expected to meet. The policy direction description includes reference to Cuerdale Garden Village and many comments were made in reference to that rather than the policy direction in general. Comments related to Cuerdale Garden Village were mainly in opposition.

Comments related to the policy direction in general however, were mainly supportive, although there was scepticism over the likelihood of delivery. Many comments called for the direction to be strengthened with language that will ensure sustainable development and the development of infrastructure sufficient to support new growth. Affordable housing and housing for older people was an identified gap in the policy direction.

Statutory consultees were generally supportive of the direction and recommended changes to the wording in order to strengthen key points.

Policy Direction 6: Settlement Network and Hierarchy

A total of 243 comments were received in relation to settlement network and hierarchy, 27.16% objections, 15.84% in support.

This policy direction aims to ensure that the focus and distribution of growth and investment will be in line with the settlement hierarchy across Central Lancashire.

Comments for this direction mainly related to the designations within the proposed settlement hierarchy tiers. Several comments stated that main urban areas should be considered under one tier rather than split between Preston versus Chorley and South Ribble. As in the responses for other policy directions, several comments emphasised the need to protect the Green Belt.

Comments from statutory consultees state that there should be mention of "brownfield-first" development in the policy direction points, not only in the description. Overall, the settlement hierarchy was supported, except for Samlesbury and Cuerdale Parish Council who request that their area be designated as tier 5.

Policy Direction 7: Vibrant Centres

A total of 128 comments were received in relation to vibrant centres, 13.15 % objections, 25.54 % in support.

Overall, comments were supportive of this policy direction. Several stated the importance of developing centres to be less car-centric, calling for increased pedestrianisation. Comments also suggested that a specific policy prioritising support for local businesses be added.

There is some concern that the development of town centres will result in a loss of local character and identity. There is also a call for centres to focus on more than retail, emphasising that a range of employment opportunities is the best way to create vibrant centres.

Statutory consultees support the policy direction overall with only one concern from Sport England suggesting that the use of town centres for sporting events be considered.

Policy Direction 8: Climate Change

A total of 181 comments were received in relation to climate change, 17.03 % objections, 26.29 % in support.

Several comments received suggested amendments to make it stronger. Responses recognise the importance of meeting net zero targets and believe that more measures should be put in place. Incentives for net-zero developments, tree planting, modifying existing buildings, Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)s development and protecting the Green Belt were all suggested methods for increasing the effectiveness of the policy direction.

There was some opposition to the policy direction, stating that the policy direction required over and above what is set out through national policy. There was also significant opposition to carbon offsetting being located off-site.

Statutory consultees comments echoed responses from the public and call for the strengthening of policies to meet net-zero and carbon neutral targets. The Environment Agency has pointed out that there is no mention of pollution control in the direction, Lancashire County Council suggest a carbon offset fund which flood risk and water management measures could be funded through, and South Ribble Borough Council's environment team suggested the addition of criteria where all developments of 1 or more dwelling of 500m² be net zero.

Policy Direction 9: High Quality Places

A total of 140 comments were received in relation to high quality places, 12.18 % objections, 30.60% in support.

This policy direction aims to ensure that development in the Local Plan Area creates beautiful, distinct buildings and places with a high-quality standard of design and a suitable degree of variety.

Overall, comments were supportive of the policy direction. Suggested changes included ensuring that design is in line with local character, enforcing stricter landscaping design guides, and prioritising carbon neutral developments. Developing and enhancing greenspaces was also suggested to improve this policy direction.

Statutory consultees were mainly in support of the policy direction. Several of the comments provided suggested amendments to strengthen the policy direction. Sports England suggested the policy direction refer to the 10 principles of active design, Historic England suggested that the reuse of buildings be encouraged, and Lancashire County Council suggested that health equity be included in the policy direction.

Policy Direction 10: 20-Minute Neighbourhoods

A total of 176 comments were received in relation to 20-minute neighbourhoods, 15.62% objections, 26.72% in support.

This policy direction aims to implement the principles of 20-minute neighbourhoods where possible in new developments.

Due to national press coverage at the time of the consultation on an ongoing consultation in Oxford on 15 Minute Cities, confusion over that concept was raised in responses received to this Policy Direction. Concerns were raised over monitoring and restricting the movements of residents due to this direction – this is not the purpose of the policy. The purpose of the policy is to develop accessible neighbourhoods where resident needs are met within a 20-minute radius. The take-away

from this confusion is that the policy should be rephrased and made clear for the next consultation period.

As was the case in feedback for other policy directions, comments emphasised that development should be restricted to a brownfield first approach, directing development away from green areas. The comments in support of the policy direction approved of the accessibility it would bring to areas in the Plan Area. There was scepticism however surrounding the ease at which existing areas could be retrofitted to meet the policy.

Statutory consultees were mainly in support of the policy direction. Lancashire County Council suggested title and wording change to combat public misconception and confusion, they also suggested linking the policy to work they are currently undertaking on the same subject.

Policy Direction 11: Scale of Housing Growth

A total of 259 comments were received in relation to the scale of housing growth, 36.42% objections, 6.25% in support.

Comments related to this policy direction reflected the concerns shared in other responses over the potential for Green Belt and Green Field development. Overall, respondents value the green areas highly and emphasise that brownfield and previously developed land should be developed first.

The comments in support of the policy direction approve of a mix of tenure and type but are sceptical about whether the infrastructure that will be provided to support the projected growth will be sufficient. It was suggested that the policy encourage place making and better-quality design that is in line with existing character and identity.

Statutory consultee responses were generally in support of the policy direction. They echo concerns from the public surrounding the protection of green areas but overall support the mix of tenure and type proposed in order to meet the housing targets for the Plan Area

Policy Direction 12: Indicative Distribution of Housing Requirements

A total of 192 comments were received in relation to the indicative distribution of housing requirements, 30.06% objections, 5.93% in support.

The housing distribution policy direction comments were divided regarding which council should be carrying out a higher level of development. Comments received tended to reflect a desire for protection in the district the responder resided, stating that development should be focused in the other areas due to the level of development they have seen where they live. There is a clear lack of understanding about how the housing target calculations are made and why there is a distribution between the three council areas. Other comments stated a general need for mixed tenure housing and a desire for brownfield development to be prioritised.

Statutory consultees were generally supportive of the direction.

Policy Direction 13: Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showperson Needs

A total of 100 comments were received in relation to the needs of Gypsy, traveller and travelling showperson communities, 18.43% objections, 12.61% in support.

A number of derogatory comments were received in relation to meeting the needs of the community, such comments have not been accepted by the Councils and will not be taken into account in the process of developing the Local Plan.

Comments focused on the protection of the Green Belt and emphasised that sites should be allocated in areas that will not put the Green Belt at risk of loss. Comments stated that further consultation with the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Show Person communities is needed in order to provide sites that will appropriately meet their needs.

Statutory consultee comments were generally supportive of the policy direction, Wyre Council has suggested that the number of required pitches be re-visited as it may be higher than stated.

Policy Direction 14: Scale of Economic Growth

A total of 142 comments were received in relation to the scale of economic growth (employment lands), 20.58% objections, 10.88% in support.

This policy direction sets out the minimum hectares of employment lands needed to support the economic growth projected over the plan period. Comments received, like in many of the other policy direction responses, focused heavily on the potential development in Samlesbury and Cuerdale with most comments opposing the development of these Green Belt areas. Opposition was also expressed due to the capacity of existing infrastructure and concerning public transport and sustainable travel options to employment land allocations. Residents are sceptical of the projected employment need and would like to see further evidence as to how the targets were established.

Comments in support of the policy direction pointed out the need for high-quality, sustainable design in new employment areas.

Statutory consultee comments were divided in support and opposition. National bodies supported the direction in principle but refrained from providing detailed feedback until site allocations are finalised and provided. Local Parish Councils such as Samlesbury and Cuerdale in South Ribble opposed the policy direction and state that the employment land supply target is too high for their area. The Lead Local Flood Authority emphasised the need for blue-green infrastructure to be provided in employment areas as well as within residential developments.

Policy Direction 15: Balanced Housing Market

A total of 144 comments were received in relation to a balanced housing market, 17.89% objections, 16.16% in support.

This policy direction addresses the provision for affordable housing, the mix and tenure of housing types needed, as well as considering the needs for affordable housing types suitable for older people and other elements which contribute to a diverse and balanced housing supply.

Comments for this policy direction were overall supportive. Respondents agree that there is a need for affordable housing and diverse housing options. There are concerns that the policy would be too strict and there should be exceptions made on a site-specific basis. A number of comments stated that there should be an increased provision for affordable housing and that the need for housing that meets the needs of first-time home buyer should be a priority. Criticism was also found relating to the supply of housing types and forms of accommodation for older people with respondents stating the policy direction needs to be more specific about how this need will be met i.e., specifically what measures will be put in place.

Statutory consultees were generally supportive of the policy direction, with the only feedback being wording changes to strengthen the policy. Historic England noted that the policy direction needs to be clear about preserving density patterns in protected areas. Lancashire County Council suggested an additional policy point be added stating that "100% of new build homes should be built in accordance with the requirements laid in out in M4(2) Accessible and Adaptable Dwellings unless this is superseded by M4(3) building regulations or other specialist requirements".

Policy Direction 16: Protection of Employment Premises, Employment Sites and Existing Employment Areas

A total of 71 comments were received in relation to the protection of employment premises, sites, and areas, 9.16% objections, 18.75% in support.

This policy direction aims to protect and maintain employment land supply and existing employment land sites, uses and allocations for industrial and business uses.

Overall, comments were supportive of this policy direction. There is a desire to retain existing employment areas for employment use and to support the local economy. A number of comments stated that the shift from traditional office work to hybrid and work-from-home models should be recognised within the policy direction. Vacancy and the duration of site marketing periods were also mentioned as respondents would rather see areas redeveloped than left vacant and "derelict". The overarching theme in many of the responses was that focus should be on retaining and further developing existing employment areas rather than developing new ones outside of established employment areas.

Statutory consultees were overall supportive of the policy direction and recognised the importance of protecting employment lands from redevelopment for alternative uses in supporting the local economy. There was some opposition to the potential development in the Samlesbury Enterprise Zone from the local Parish Council in South Ribble.

Policy Direction 17: Economic Growth Sector Strengths

A total of 59 comments were received in relation to economic growth sector strengths, 8.94% objections, 19.94% in support.

This policy direction sets out the sectors of the economy which will be supported, protected, and enhanced to promote economic growth in Central Lancashire. It also sets out the locations which are most appropriate for these sectors to be located.

Overall, comments were supportive for this policy direction and diverse in their feedback topics. A number of comments emphasised the need to protect agricultural businesses and existing manufacturing. Other comments stated the need to diversify sectors across the Plan Area and develop spaces that will attract high-skilled employment within sectors such as Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics. Responses related to the inclusion of energy sector employment stated that development should be restricted to green energy. Some comments echoed the feedback from the previous policy directions, reiterating that development should be focused in existing employment areas rather than creating new ones in the Green Belt or in rural areas/green field lands.

Statutory consultees were overall supportive of the policy direction with Historic England specifically supporting any development which reinforces and promotes local culture and heritage.

Policy Direction 18: Rural Economy

A total of 93 comments were received in relation to the rural economy, 12.39% objections, 18.75% in support.

This policy direction recognises the importance of a prosperous rural economy, especially in Central Lancashire where large portions are rural in character. The policy direction sets out how the rural economy will be supported through the Local Plan.

Comments for this policy direction are clear of the need to recognise the importance of the contribution this sector makes to the wider economy of Central Lancashire. Many of the comments stated the need to protect agricultural and Green Belt lands and there was an overall concern that allowing any development in these areas will result in the loss of natural habitats and heritage. Some policy wording suggestions were made in order to make the policy direction clearer. A number of comments supported the policy direction stating that small-scale and site-specific development schemes should be supported as they can help to boost the rural economy.

Statutory consultees were overall supportive of the policy direction but have concerns over the wording. Historic England and Samlesbury and Cuerdale Parish Council specifically have concerns that the policy will promote countryside development if it is not amended to restrict it.

Policy Direction 19: Development in Town Centres

A total of 65 comments were received in relation to the development in town centres, 5.93% objections, 28.34% in support.

This policy direction sets out the role of Town Centres in terms of the economy, culture, identity, character, services, facilities and activities in Central Lancashire.

The vast majority of comments were in support of this policy direction. Several comments stated that the focus on development and regeneration in town centres is positive and would benefit the areas. Some comments were sceptical of the policy direction stating that some Town Centres are "too far gone" and that regeneration will not work. Some comments also do not support the shift from car-centric to pedestrianisation, stating that they are concerned that this would reduce the accessibility of shops and could result in vacancies.

Statutory consultees were generally supportive of the policy direction. Historic England would like to see a policy point be added stating that exemptions will apply to heritage assets and in conservation areas. National Highways and Samlesbury and Cuerdale Parish Council specifically stated their support for the direction.

Policy Direction 20: Active Travel

A total of 112 comments were received in relation to active travel, 10.24% objections, 27.05% in support.

This policy direction aims to promote modes of active travel throughout the Plan Area and sets out how new developments should incorporate and encourage it.

Comments were overall supportive of the policy and the merits of supporting active travel were recognised. However, there was scepticism surrounding the ability for active travel to be meaningfully integrated and supported in rural areas. Many comments addressed the fact that the existing cycling and walking infrastructure is not sufficient and would like to see more specific policies about how it will be improved. The development of secure bicycle storage units in town centres was suggested as an option for increasing cycling in the Plan Area as well. Lack of public transport options such as bus and rail were also commented on with respondents expressing a desire for improved service. Some policy wording was also recommended which would add flexibility and exemptions to the policy direction criteria on a site-specific basis.

Statutory consultees were overall supportive of the policy direction as well. Sport England would like to see a more overarching policy wording that aims to create an overall active travel environmental and network rather than solely implementing active travel infrastructure into new large developments. The Canal and River Trust would like for their assets to be included in the policy direction due to their role as providers of vehicular-free active travel routes.

Policy Direction 21: Food and Beverage Uses and Hot Food Take-aways

A total of 56 comments were received in relation to food and beverage uses and hot food take-aways, 8.19% objections, 22.09% in support.

This policy direction aims to allow for the provision of hot food take-aways in Central Lancashire in appropriate locations while also ensuring that the health and well-being of residents is prioritised.

Comments for this policy direction were overall supportive. Concerns were raised over the prevalence of hot food take-aways in Central Lancashire and how they contribute to poor diets and health outcomes. There is a desire for stricter policies to be put in place to prevent large-chain fast food restaurants from developing and to prevent take-aways from being easily accessible to adolescents. There were also some comments which were concerned that the policy direction would hinder small business growth and effect the local economy. Those who shared this concern recommended that the development of healthier food options be promoted rather than restricting the development and location take-aways all together.

Statutory consultees supported this policy direction. Lancashire County Council recommended stricter policies which would restrict the development of hot food take-aways in wards where 10% or more of reception pupils or 15% or more of year 6 pupils are classed as obese, and wards which

fall within the 20% most deprived areas in England. Other comments also supported a stricter policy direction be put in place.

Policy Direction 22: Skills and Economic Inclusion

A total of 52 comments were received in relation to skills and economic inclusion, 4.96% objections, 25.59% in support.

This policy direction sets out how the three authorities will work with local employers to ensure the inclusion and development of skills of workers in Central Lancashire.

The comments for this policy direction were supportive. Respondents emphasise the need for this policy to be strong in order to meaningfully address inequality and deprivation especially given the evidence of the long-term educational impact of COVID-19 on deprived areas. There was some concern over the lack of educational infrastructure available to support this policy which partners concerns that the only training opportunities made available will not meet the needs and skill-levels of the community. There was also an expressed interest in providing opportunities for residents to learn how to run their own businesses.

Statutory consultees were overall supportive of the policy.

Policy Direction 23: Community Facilities

A total of 52 comments were received in relation to community facilities, 6.47% objections, 26.62% in support.

This policy direction sets out the process for considering the need for new and protection of existing community facilities across Central Lancashire.

Comments for this policy direction were overall supportive. There is an expressed desire for more community facilities specific to hosting events for the arts and sports. Ensuring that the venues are affordable for residents to rent was also commented on. The importance of accessible locations which do not adversely impact existing infrastructure and settlement patterns was also expressed.

Statutory consultees were generally supportive of the policy direction, echoing comments from the public. Feedback was provided to make the policy wording stronger and one comment pointed out that religious facilities should be included within the policy direction. The NHS commented on the direction expressing concerns that the changes of use of community facilities could potentially impact their ability to deliver services and that they would like policy wording to be amended to ensure they are appropriately protected from loss.

Policy Direction 24: Green and Blue Infrastructure

A total of 86 comments were received in relation to green and blue infrastructure, 8.62% objections, 27.37% in support.

This policy direction aims to ensure that existing blue-green infrastructure is protected and enhanced. It also outlines what is necessary of new developments in terms of the provision, enhancement, and protection of blue and green infrastructure.

Comments overall supported the policy direction, however, there is some confusion over the definition and function of blue-green infrastructure. Comments referred to new development areas that are in need of increased blue-green infrastructure, North West Preston was specifically mentioned a number of times. Many comments stated the need for blue-green infrastructure to be put in place before developments are occupied. Cemeteries were also proposed as an option for a dual-functioning asset of blue-green infrastructure, increasing the number and size of parks was another suggestion.

Statutory consultees were generally supportive of the policy. West Lancashire Borough Council stated their desire to work with the Central Lancashire authorities to ensure that the cross-boundary implications of green-blue infrastructure are considered. The Lead Local Flood Authority left extensive comments related to the terminology used in the policy direction, suggesting alternatives to make the direction stronger, and encompass more specific blue-green infrastructure measures. United Utilities also provided detailed comments on landscaping, groundwater source protection zones, water catchment land and provide policy suggestions relating to these. Historic England commented that the role of natural heritage assets should be recognised within this direction as well.

Policy Direction 25: Biodiversity

A total of 105 comments were received in relation to the vision and objectives, 8.41% objections, 28.45% in support.

This policy sets out the sites of international, national, regional, county, and sites of local biodiversity and geodiversity importance. It explains how areas of importance will be conserved and enhanced and sets out the requirements of biodiversity net gain in relation to new developments.

Comments were overall supportive of the policy direction and the important role of biodiversity is clearly recognised. A number of comments felt that the percentage of biodiversity net gain should be higher and that it should be mandatory for the provision to be on-site. There were suggestions for developments over a certain size to provide artificial refuges such as bird and bat boxes, and hedgehog highways. A few comments stated concerns that this policy would be a barrier to development and that net gain requirements should not exceed what is set out in national policy.

Statutory consultees were overall supportive of the policy direction. The Lead Local Flood Authority suggested an additional policy point be created to address the benefits of SuDS trees and tree pits.

Policy Direction 26: Trees and Hedgerows

A total of 123 comments were received in relation to trees and hedgerows, 11.64% objections, 29.42% in support.

The purpose of this policy direction is to set out requirements for preserving and increasing the tree and hedgerow coverage across the Plan Area. It also introduces the requirement of Agricultural Impact Assessments and how development proposals that could affect trees or hedgerow will be considered.

Comments related to this policy direction were supportive, but many called for stricter measures to be put in place. Many comments stated that they support the replacement of lost trees but would like to see that it be mandatory for replacement trees to be native and appropriate for the area. Tree management schemes were also suggested to ensure the long-term health of newly planted trees is considered.

Statutory consultees were generally supportive of the policy direction.

Policy Direction 27: Sustainable Water Management

A total of 92 comments were received in relation to sustainable water management, 6.90% objections, 32.00% in support.

The purpose of this policy direction is to acknowledge the need for and purpose of water sustainable water management systems in the Plan Area and establish what is required of developments to ensure that they are established and maintained.

Majority of the comments received supported this policy direction. Many responses emphasised the need for SuDS systems to be improved and expanded to respond to increased development and flooding events. Comments also stated that SuDS systems need to be subject to stricter monitoring to ensure that they are fit for purpose.

Statutory consultees were in general supportive of the policy, some left extensive notes on how the policy could be amended to strengthen the impact on flood mitigation. The Lead Local Flood Authority has recommended that the four pillars of SuDS be expanded within the direction and the Environmental Agency suggests that the connection between flood mitigation and climate change be made stronger. The Canal and River Trust would like for their assets be included in the policy direction.

Policy Direction 28: Historic Environment

A total of 46 comments were received in relation to the historic environment, 5.06% objections, 33.84% in support.

This policy direction sets out the importance of preserving and enhancing the historic environment. It also lists the forms of heritage assets which special attention will be paid to preserving and protecting.

The comments for this policy were overall positive, with one comment requesting that the definition of a heritage asset be provided. Other comments reiterate the importance of protecting and preserving the natural environment and support the identified list of assets in the policy direction.

Statutory consultees were overall supportive of the policy direction. However, Historic England made several recommendations that would improve the policy. They suggest wording which will clearly state how planning applications will be considered based on the policy and identify gaps in the policy direction such as mention of Conservation Areas and areas of national archaeological importance.

Policy Direction 29: Renewable Energy Generation

A total of 73 comments were received in relation to renewable energy generation, 7.76% objections, 27.59% in support.

This policy direction outlines how renewable and low carbon energy generating developments will be supported and encouraged.

The comments for this direction were generally supportive. There were however concerns over the cost and viability of the policy direction for homeowners, developers, and businesses. There is scepticism over the effectiveness of the policy for combating climate change and a small amount of comments saw no benefit to the policy. The inclusion of solar panels was seen as both a positive and negative with some comments supporting them but stating more needs to be done and some concerned over the cost of the provision and installation of the infrastructure. There was also opposition to windfarms and fracking.

Statutory consultees were overall supportive of the policy. The Ministry of Defence stated that they will need to be consulted on any large-scale developments, such as wind farms, which could affect safeguarding zones. Wyre Council was supportive of the direction and have requested a policy point be added to acknowledge the potential cross-boundary implications of renewable energy projects.

Policy Direction 30: Reducing Energy Use at the Development Scale

A total of 69 comments were received in relation to reducing energy use at the development scale, 7.76% objections, 29.09% in support.

The purpose of this policy direction sets out the ways for developments to reduce their energy consumption at all stages from materials used in construction to the energy outputs post-development.

Comments for this policy direction were overall positive. Many comments stated that development should be focused on regeneration of derelict and underused buildings and brownfield lands to increase sustainability. Some comments were concerned that the policy direction will make development less viable for developers and a few stated that the policy points exceed building regulations and are therefore too onerous.

Statutory consultees were overall supportive of the policy direction. National Highways is supportive of increased access to electric vehicle charging units and Cuerden Parish Council suggest that the minimum EPC of band C be raised for new build developments.

Policy Direction 31: Energy Reduction New Buildings

A total of 56 comments were received in relation to energy reduction new buildings, 6.36% objections, 29.85% in support.

This policy direction is specific to new buildings and sets out the requirements that new developments should follow to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and mitigate climate change.

The comments received were mainly in favour of the policy direction. Some comments would like to see more quantifiable precise language in the policy direction to further enforce the measures.

Comments in opposition to this policy direction stated that the measures should be, and are, incorporated into building standards and are therefore unnecessary in the Local Plan.

Statutory consultees were mainly in support of the policy direction, with some stating that the policy language should be stronger to increase the effectiveness of its implementation. Adlington Town Council echoed the responses from the public who disagree with the policy, stating that building regulations are the more appropriate means for this policy direction.

Policy Direction 32: Infrastructure Planning Principles

A total of 107 comments were received in relation to infrastructure planning principles, 11.10% objections, 22.42% in support.

This policy direction outlines how infrastructure delivery should be provided and enhanced by developers.

Comments were mainly supportive of the policy direction, however, there were many comments which stated support in principle but scepticism over delivery and monitoring. Comments made it clear that further detail needs to be added into the policy explaining what forms of infrastructure developments would specifically need to provide or improve.

Statutory consultees were overall supportive of the policy direction. Several left recommendations for wording changes that will strengthen and clarify the policy. Some, such as United Utilities, stated that more comments could not be made until they are shown specific site proposals.

General Comments Field

A total of 386 comments were received in the general comments field. These comments provided an opportunity for the public and statutory consultees to add any feedback they felt was not covered within the other consultation questions.

Many of the comments supported the Local Plan policy directions in general and provided suggestions for improving the scope of the Plan. Specific suggestions were the provision of:

- Addition policies which go into more detail about air quality and pollution mitigation
- A section on the implementation, enforcement and monitoring of Local Plan policies
- Policies related to how design of developments impacts the general health and well-being of residents
- Policies that acknowledge the impacts of noise and light pollution
- A glossary and references to use-class definitions

The most common comments, 83 in total, stated opposition to development in Green Belt and countryside locations. The second most common comment was related to infrastructure development, with 35 comments stating that existing infrastructure is not sufficient and must be improved before further development can be supported. It was also clear that there is confusion over the housing target calculations as the same feedback from policy directions 11 and 12 were often reiterated here.

Many comments were also received stating that the consultation procedures should be changed for the Part Two consultation so that its format is more inclusive and the consultation form is less time consuming to complete and more accessible for those without access to computers or with different needs.

Many of the comments received from statutory consultees were in report format and therefore most of their feedback was disseminated and placed into the responses for the appropriate consultation question. Many of the consultation responses in the general comments field were statements of overall support or opposition with an open invitation to consult further with them during the Plan creation process.

Site Proposals

Preferred Housing Allocations for Chorley.

General comments related to the preferred housing allocations in Chorley were mainly in opposition to the sites. Many comments stated that there were too many proposals on greenfield land and the focus should be on the regeneration and development of brownfield and urban sites. There was consistent opposition to development in Whittle-le-Woods, Heapey, Great Knowley, Croston, Mawdesley and Euxton and overall opposition to development in villages throughout the borough. There was also a comment stating that there is a lack of evidence provided explaining what has informed the site allocations.

There were many comments from statutory consultees which stated opposition and advice for further site assessment work. Bretherton Parish Council stated concern over the impact of development on local infrastructure, specifically the pressure on schools and traffic. The Wildlife Trust stated that moving forward all sites will need to be assessed based on their impact on Local Wildlife Sites (Lancashire Biological Heritage Sites), especially as it appeared to them as though the proposed allocations were not subject to this testing already. West Lancashire Borough Council commented that cross-boundary highway matters will need to be taken into consideration. Network Rail stated that safety features will need to be put in place in any site bordering railway assets. CPRE are opposed to allocations located in the Green Belt and request in-depth justifications for any that are located there. Lastly, Historic England and National Highways will need to see more evidence before making specific comments on allocations.

For summaries of comments related to each proposed allocated housing site, please see Appendix A.

Preferred Employment Allocations for Chorley.

General comments for the proposed preferred employment allocations in Chorley were concerned over the sustainability of the sites. Comments emphasised that development should be restricted to brownfield and previously developed lands. There was some support for the allocations with comments recognising the importance of employment lands for economic growth, however, more detail about what kinds of employment are being proposed was requested.

General comments from statutory consultees mainly included advice on how to further assess the proposed allocations. The Wildlife Trust stated that the potential impacts on Local Wildlife Sites (Lancashire Biological Heritage Sites) needs to be included to be in line with the NPPF. West Lancashire Borough Council commented that the cross-boundary impacts on the highways network should be considered. Network Rail stated that safety features would need to be implemented at any development which borders their assets. CPRE object to any development on Green Belt lands and Historic England and National Highways stated the need for more specific site studies to take place before further comments are made.

For summaries of comments related to each proposed employment allocation site, please see Appendix B.

Excluded Sites for Chorley

Only the discounted sites which received comments were recorded for this report. Most comments which related to the discounted sites were from developers and landowners arguing against the reasons for discounting. There were some comments in support of the decision to exclude the sites as well. Some statutory consultees left comments providing information about how their assets and interests could impact the sites. For summaries of comments related to each excluded site which received comments, please see Appendix C.

Potential Housing Allocations for Preston.

General comments related to Preston's potential housing allocations covered many concerns and provided several suggestions. A number of comments stated that green areas/open countryside and villages should be protected, and that affordable housing needs to be more of a priority. There were several comments concerned over the lack of sufficient infrastructure and stated that an increased population would have negative impacts on the area. Some comments stated that housing should be concentrated in the city centre and that there needs to be a diverse mix of housing such as building terraced housing rather than single detached estates. A lack of community infrastructure to support new residential developments was also addressed throughout the comments.

General comments from statutory consultees provided statements of opposition, support and advice for the proposed allocations. Sport England stated that per their policies, they are opposed to any development which results in the loss of all or part of a playing field, or developments which prejudices their use unless the proposed development complied with one of the exceptions to playing field policy. They pointed out that several developments in Preston are 300 or more proposed dwellings and they advise that sufficient provision of sports facilities be provided. Historic England state that more information must be provided in regard to heritage assets within proposed allocations. The Wildlife Trust state that further impact assessments need to be completed for the proposed allocations.

For summaries of comments related to each potential housing allocation site, please see Appendix A.

Potential Employment Allocations for Preston.

General comments related to potential employment allocations in Preston showed an understanding of the importance of employment lands overall, but made suggestions and raised concerns over the location of specific sites suggestions. Many comments stated that the sites are located too far from residential areas, over a 20-minute walk in some cases. A number of comments stated that green open space and countryside areas should not be used for employment and development should instead be focused in the city-centre, at existing employment areas and adopted employment land allocations, and brownfield lands. A comment was made supporting development in the Preston Docks and another stated that they support regeneration for employment in the city centre.

General comments from statutory consultees were a mix of site-specific comments and statements that further comments can only be provided when more information is given, such as allocation-specific policies. Sport England, National Highways, Network Rail and Lancashire County Council all await more information for comments. Woodplumpton Parish Council, National Grid, the Environmental Agency, and Grimsargh Parish Council all provided site-specific comments. Wyre Council and West Lancashire Borough council both commented that the cross-boundary implications of the proposed allocations should be considered. Historic England and United Utilities have both examined the allocations and suggest further studies be undertaken before moving them forward.

For summaries of comments related to each proposed employment allocation site, please see Appendix B.

Excluded Sites for Preston

Sites that were not chosen as potential allocation options in Preston were not discontinued in the same sense as Chorley and South Ribble. Instead, they have been identified as needing further assessment and are subject to change later in the Plan making process.

For summaries of responses which commented on these identified sites, please see appendix C.

Preferred Housing Allocations for South Ribble.

General comments regarding housing allocations in South Ribble focused on the need to protect Green Belt areas and character of villages. There is an understanding that growth is necessary, but the scale projected in the Borough is seen as too high. Comments were concerned that brownfield land has not been considered enough and that affordable housing will not be made enough of a priority. Some comments stated that development around transportation hubs is a practical approach and some comments stated that focusing on large-scale sites is a flawed one.

General comments from Statutory consultees including Historic England, Lancashire County Council, National Highways, National Rail, and Sport England stated that they cannot comment on the sites until further information and policy wording is provided. CPRE stated that they will not support any unjustified development on Green Belt lands and the Wildlife Trust commented that the potential impact on natural habitats must be examined in order to meet NPPF requirements. West Lancashire Borough Council stated that the cross-boundary impacts of the allocations need to be examined and the Environmental Agency provided advice for flood-risk management studies.

For summaries of comments related to each proposed housing allocation site, please see Appendix A.

Preferred Employment Allocations for South Ribble

General comments for employment allocations in South Ribble stated that focus should be on providing affordable employment units and diversifying the types of units available to accommodate the changing job market (such as working-from-home and coworking spaces).

Comments also stated that development of employment lands should be concentrated on brownfield and infill lands.

Statutory consultees stated that more information needed to be provided in order for them to give detailed feedback.

For summaries of comments related to each proposed employment site allocation, please see Appendix B.

Excluded Sites for South Ribble

Comments related to discounted sites in South Ribble were mainly from landowners and developers, questioning the reasons for discounting. There were also comments in favour of the removal of the sites.

For summaries of comments related to each proposed allocation site, please see Appendix C.

Next Steps

This was the first part of the Regulation 18 consultation and will inform Part Two Preferred Options Consultation which will be the full draft plan, which will take place in Spring/Summer 2024. A new Local Development Scheme (LDS) will be published later in 2023 which will set out the timeframe for the remaining plan-making process. The representations received will inform the preparation of the policies and an updated Consultation Statement will be produced following the Part Two Preferred Options Consultation which will include full details of how the Councils have taken account of the representations received and how these will inform the emerging Central Lancashire Local Plan going forward.

Appendices

Appendix A: Proposed Housing Allocation Site Comments

Chorley Preferred Housing Options

Site Name	Allocation Ref (if applicable)	Sheela ref	Number of open format responses	Summary of Reponses	Statutory Consultee Responses
North of Bond's Lane, Adlington	CH/HS1.1	n/a	8	<p>This site raised concerns over increased traffic on Park Road. There was also concern expressed over the sufficiency of existing infrastructure to support development. Doctors, dentists, hospitals, and schools are already under pressure.</p> <p>The landowners commented that the location would be sustainable as it has convenient access to public transport and existing facilities in Adlington.</p>	<p>Adlington Town Council have expressed concern over potential traffic congestion stating that the existing road network is insufficient to support growth. Concerns were also raised over potential flooding and lack of capacity in local schools and hospitals.</p> <p>The Canal and River Trust stated that due to the site's proximity to the Leeds and Liverpool canal, development should contribute towards the upgrading/improvement to the canal towpath surface and provide a towpath connection</p>

Land at Carrington Road, Adlington	CH/HS1.2	n/a	3	Two main concerns were raised in relation to this site, insufficient parking and a lack of access to Bond's Lane/Carrington Road.	Heath Charnock Parish Council are concerned over the site's overall impact on Adlington's infrastructure, stating that it is already under too much pressure to support growth. Adlington Town Council stated the same concerns, citing school capacity as a specific area in need of attention.
Land off Westhoughton Road, Adlington	CH/HS1.3	n/a	4	Part of this site is currently rented out for allotments. The potential loss of this use is a major concern for the community. There is also concern surrounding access to the A6, claims that the area is already unsafe to drive in and new development will make the issue worse. The landowner supports development of the site.	Heath Charnock Parish Council and Adlington Town Council are concerned over the level of development in the area in general. There is specific concern over the traffic implications of developing the site. United Utilities has identified a potential flooding issue on the site. They have advised on policy wording to ensure the site is developed appropriately.
Land South East Belmont Road/Abbey Grove, Adlington	CH/HS1.4	n/a	6	Traffic and main road access are main concerns with this site.	Heath Charnock Parish Council and Adlington Town Council raised concerns around access to the site. Access to Bolton Road is a specific issue and access through Grove Farm is heavily opposed to. A solution was proposed to provide access under the railway viaduct onto Huyton Road. Sport England has raised concern over the proximity to Adlington Cricket Club.

Land at Drinkwater Farm, Brinscall	CH/HS1.5	n/a	3	There is concern that the development of this site will negatively impact the traffic and other infrastructure in the area.	No comments
Parcels C1 and C2, Group 1, Buckshaw Village	CH/HS1.6	n/a	1	No comments	Euxton Parish Council are in support of this site but request it be referred to as in Euxton, rather than Buckshaw Village
Charter Lane, Charnock Richard	CH/HS1.7	n/a	9	There is concern that the area is too rural to support new development. Specific areas of concern are a lack of public amenities, pressure on infrastructure and flooding. There was some support for the development as well, stating the sites size makes it a sustainable location.	Sport England raised concerns over the impact of noise and ball strike risk from the adjacent primary school and playing fields. Charnock Richard Parish Council opposed the development.
Camelot Theme Park, Charnock Richard	CH/HS1.8	n/a	19	Many comments were in opposition stating there is not sufficient infrastructure available to support the development and it would result in a major loss of natural spaces.	Concerns over the loss of natural spaces (ancient woodlands and trees, Green Belt etc.). Sport England was concerned over the loss of a sporting facility. There was also overall concern over the provision of services and infrastructure.
Froom Street, Chorley	CH/HS1.9	n/a	13	Concerns that development here would promote the development of adjacent sites. Noise and emissions pollution due to proximity to the M61 is also a concern.	National Highways expressed concern over access to the site and ability to implement safe walking a cycling infrastructure to the Froom Street overbridge.

Land at Bagganley Lane, Chorley	CH/HS1.10	n/a	23	There was concern over the ability to sufficiently service the area, the loss of natural green space, and the potential for the development to cause a merging of Heapey and Chorley	There is sewer and water drainage management infrastructure used by National Highways and United Utilities which will need to be taken into consideration. Environmental Agency recommends removing the site and Heapey Parish Council is opposed.
Eaves Green, off Lower Burgh Way, Chorley	CH/HS1.11	n/a	6	Some opposition given a lack of existing services and infrastructure. There is however support for the site due to its location adjacent to an existing allocation.	Homes England supports the site. Cuerden Parish Council and Natural England have concerns including accessibility to amenities and protection of ancient woodlands
Land 120m South West of 21 Lower Burgh Way, Chorley	CH/HS1.12	n/a	4	Concern over the site being outside a 20-minute drive to amenities	Natural England emphasises the need to consider ancient woodlands Cuerden Parish Council was opposed to the site
Cowling Farm, Chorley	CH/HS1.13	n/a	9	There is an assumption that because the site has not come forward for development since the last Local Plan, it must not be appropriate. The topography was commented on stating it is difficult to work with and there is opposition to anything that causes the removal of trees and hedgerow.	Homes England supports the development
Crosse Hall Lane, Chorley	CH/HS1.14	n/a		Comments for this site were concerned over site access and flooding. There is also concern over	The Canal and River Trust were concerned over the assets they have adjacent to the site, including

				a loss of privacy and lack of existing amenities.	the Crosse Hall Bridge. There are major concerns over the capacity of the bridge.
Woodlands, Southport Road, Chorley	CH/HS1.15	n/a	6	There was some support for this site. However, there comments stating that maintaining the land as open space or development of a doctor's office or school would be more appropriate	Lancashire County Council supports the site. Natural England commented that ancient woodlands must be considered, and United Utilities stated that there is a potential sewer flood risk.
Great Knowley, Blackburn Road, Chorley	CH/HS1.16	n/a	19	Concerns over impact on infrastructure, wildlife, and natural green spaces. There is also concern over flood risk.	Cuerden Parish Council are opposed due to the potential negative impacts on local amenities and character The Canal and River Trust would like for the development of the site to positively impact their assets.
Botany Bay/Great Knowley, Blackburn Road, Chorley (awaiting planning decision)	CH/HS1.17	n/a	14	Concerns over flooding, infrastructure, and natural impacts from the development.	Cuerden Parish Council is opposed to the development. United Utilities have flagged a potential sewer flood risk and the Canal and River Trust would like for any development on the site to positively impact their assets.
Cabbage Hall Fields, Chorley	CH.HS1.18	n/a	1	There is an assumption that because the site was allocated in the previous Local Plan and was not brought forward, it must be an inappropriate site.	No comments.

Land adjacent to Northgate Drive, Chorley	CH/HS1.19	n/a	2	There is an assumption that because the site was allocated in the previous Local Plan and was not brought forward, it must be an inappropriate site.	National Highways raised concern over the likelihood/appropriateness of up to 20 dwellings. They state that building that many homes and allowing for the appropriate buffer between dwellings and the motorway will be difficult.
Bengal Street Depot, Chorley	CH/HS1.20	n/a	2	One comment in support due to it being previously developed land. One comment concerned over traffic impact.	No comments.
Former Gasworks, Bengal Street, Chorley	CH/HS1.21	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
Little Knowley Farm, Chorley	CH/HS1.22	n/a	19	Concern that the development is too large for the area and will cause large-scale development in the countryside. Also concerns over potential strain on infrastructure and increased traffic. Some comments stated that the development will promote a car-dependent lifestyle. One comment in support.	Heapey Parish Council shared concern over the impacts on local infrastructure. Cuerden Parish Council stated that the development would increase reliance on the car and would put pressure on local infrastructure. Environmental Agency stated that more research needs to be done to determine flood risk.
Cockers Farm, Limbrick, Chorley	CH/HS1.23	n/a	3	Concerns over impacts on local infrastructure and flood risk. A portion of the site is owned by a private resident who was not consulted.	Heath Charnock Parish Council shared concerns over impact on local infrastructure and stated that the existing needs improvement. Adlington Town Council are concerned over the level of proposed development in the area overall.

					United Utilities stated that the site has on-site modelled sewer flood risk.
Westwood Road, Clayton Brook/Green	CH/HS1.24	n/a	5	Concerns over impacts on local infrastructure and a statement that because the site was allocated in the previous Local Plan and was not brought forward, it must be an inappropriate site. There were also concerns over flooding. Some support for the site due to its proximity to highways infrastructure.	Sport England raised concern over potential prejudicial impact in terms of noise, lighting and ball strike risk on the adjacent St Bede's Catholic Primary School playing field.
Land to the East of Wigan Road, Clayton-le-Woods	CH/HS1.25	n/a	4	Comment stating the site should be removed due to unsuitable highways access from Shady Lane, increased traffic congestion and overdevelopment in the area.	Sport England expressed concern over the loss of an equestrian centre. Cuerden Parish Council stated concern over highway access. United Utilities stated that there is a record of sewer flooding in the vicinity of the site.
Land adjoining Cuerden Residential Park, Nell Lane, Clayton-le-Woods	CH/HS1.26	n/a	4	Comments stated that the surrounding roads are already operating at capacity and further development would overwhelm the system. Concerns over the loss of green space were also stated.	Cuerden Parish Council stated that the site already has planning permission. United Utilities stated that there is a record of sewer flooding in the vicinity of the site.
Cuerden Lodge, Clayton-le-Woods	CH/HS1.27	n/a	5	Many comments oppose the site and view it as unjustified development in the Green Belt.	Cuerden Parish Council is opposed to the development stating that despite it being on

				<p>Comments also state that it is not within a 400-800m radius of schools, hospitals, doctors, or transportation options and therefore unsustainable.</p> <p>One comment supports the allocation stating that its proximity to existing services and infrastructure.</p>	<p>brownfield lands, it is in the Green Belt and therefore should not be allocated for housing.</p>
North of Hewlett Avenue, Coppull	CH/HS1.28	n/a	3	<p>One comment in support of the allocation.</p>	<p>Sport England stated concern over potential prejudicial impact in terms of noise and ball strike risk on the adjacent playing field at Darlington Street.</p> <p>United Utilities identify various large sewer assets and associated combined sewer overflow on site.</p>
Mountain Road, Coppull	CH/HS1.29	n/a	0	<p>No comments.</p>	<p>United Utilities identified a record of sewer flooding in the vicinity of the site.</p>
Land adjacent to Blainscough Hall, Blainscough Lane, Coppull	CH/HS1.30	n/a	1	<p>No comments.</p>	<p>Sport England stated concern over potential prejudicial impact in terms of noise and lighting on the adjacent playing field used by Coppull United FC.</p> <p>United Utilities state there is a record of sewer flooding in vicinity to the site.</p>
Coppull Enterprise Centre, Mill Lane, Coppull	CH/HS1.31	n/a	2	<p>No comments.</p>	<p>Sport England have stated concern over the potential loss of a gymnastics and cheerleading club.</p>

					United Utilities have identified a record of sewer flooding in the vicinity of the site.
Orchard Heys Farm, Coppull	CH/HS1.32	n/a	1	One comment in support of the allocation stating that the existing use is no longer appropriate for the area.	No comments.
270 Preston Road, Coppull	CH/HS1.33	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
Out Lane, Croston	CH/HS1.34	n/a	84	<p>Many comments were in opposition to this application due to flooding. Out Lane is also seen as unsuitable for access to the site and traffic safety is a major issue causing opposition. Many comments also stated that the level of development is not appropriate for Croston and would negatively impact the character of the area.</p> <p>Landowners support the allocation but have suggested Moor Road for main access</p>	<p>Natural England raised concerns over the impact on designated species who rely on the site.</p> <p>Croston Parish Council were concerned over the lack of suitable site access and the impacts on existing infrastructure.</p> <p>The Environmental Agency provided advice for how the site should be assessed and United Utilities identified that the site has modelled on-site sewer flood risk.</p>
East of Tincklers Lane, Eccleston	CH/HS1.35	n/a	3	Comments were mainly opposed to the development, citing concerns over lack of sufficient infrastructure and the loss of natural greenspace. Concern was also raised over the	No comments.

				<p>potential negative impacts on the area's history and character.</p> <p>One comment supported the allocation stating that there are no technical or environmental issues that would prevent development.</p>	
Land South of Parr Lane, Ecclestone	CH/HS1.36	n/a	3	<p>Comments stated that the site conflicts with proposed policy directions. Responses also state that there is insufficient infrastructure in Ecclestone to support further development and that new developments will negatively impact the character of the area.</p>	<p>Sport England raised concern over the potential prejudicial impact in terms of noise and ball strike on the adjacent playing field to the south.</p> <p>United Utilities identified a record of sewer flooding in the vicinity of the site.</p>
Land South West of The Green and Langton Brow, Ecclestone	CH/HS1.37	n/a	5	<p>Comments raised concern that there is not sufficient infrastructure in the area to support new development and that the proposed allocation will not improve the existing community's well-being.</p>	<p>Natural England commented that the impacts on ancient woodlands and trees should be considered as per the NPPF.</p> <p>Ecclestone Parish Council were concerned over the impacts on local infrastructure.</p> <p>The Environmental Agency stated that the site has not been considered as part of the Level 1 SFRA.</p>
Land at Tincklers Lane, Ecclestone	CH/HS1.38	n/a	4	<p>Comments stated that the development will negatively impact the infrastructure, character and resident well-being in Ecclestone. There are also concerns over impacts to the Green Belt</p>	<p>Sport England raised concern over the potential prejudicial impact on the adjacent Ecclestone Cricket Club due to potential ball strike risk.</p> <p>United Utilities identified that there is a record of sewer flooding in the vicinity of the site.</p>

Pear Tree Lane, Euxton	CH/HS1.39	n/a	7	Comments raised concern over the traffic congestion the area is already facing, stating that increased development will make it worse. There is also general concern over increased pressure on infrastructure and natural green space.	Homes England supports the allocation. Euxton Parish Council object to the allocation due to site access. United Utilities identified that there is a record of sewer flooding in the vicinity of the site.
Land between Pear Tree Lane and School Lane, Euxton	CH/HS1.40	n/a	5	Comments in opposition to the allocation due to the increased pressure on local infrastructure and traffic congestion.	Euxton Parish Council object to the allocation due to site access. United Utilities identified that there is a record of sewer flooding in the vicinity of the site.
11 Wigan Road, Euxton	CH/HS1.41	n/a	3	Comments concerned over the impacts on local infrastructure and traffic congestion.	No comments.
Finnington Trading Estate, Finnington	CH/HS1.42	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
Land to the East of New Street, Mawdesley	CH/HS1.43	n/a	8	Comments were concerned over the scale of development, stating that it will change the character of the area and cause major pressures on the existing infrastructure. Flooding and environmental impacts were also raised as concerns.	Mawdesley Parish Council stated concerns that developing this area would leave only Green Belt land left for development past the plan period. Natural England state that the implications on surrounding natural habitats need to be acknowledged. United Utilities have identified that there is a record of sewer flooding in the vicinity of the site.

Rear of New Street, Mawdesley	CH/HS1.44	n/a	8	Concerns were raised over the pressures on local infrastructure and future impacts on Green Belt. There were also comments concerned over potential flooding.	Mawdesley Parish Council stated concerns that developing this area would leave only Green Belt land left for development past the plan period. Natural England state that the implications on surrounding natural habitats need to be acknowledged. United Utilities have identified that there is a record of sewer flooding in the vicinity of the site.
East of New Street, Mawdesley	CH/HS1.45	n/a	7	Comments stated that the scale of development will change the character of the area and cause major pressure on existing infrastructure. Flooding and environmental impacts were also raised as concerns.	Mawdesley Parish Council stated concerns that developing this area would leave only Green Belt land left for development past the plan period. United Utilities have identified that there is a record of sewer flooding in the vicinity of the site.
Land off Gorsey Lane, Mawdesley	CH/HS1.46	n/a	8	Comments stated that residents currently use the area for outdoor recreation and the loss of this use would be detrimental to their health. There were also concerns over the impacts on local infrastructure and potential future impacts on the Green Belt.	Mawdesley Parish Council stated concerns that developing this area would leave only Green Belt land left for development past the plan period. Natural England stated that the implications on surrounding natural habitats need to be acknowledged. United Utilities identified that there is a record of sewer flooding in the vicinity of the site.
Crow Nest Cottage, Mawdesley	CH/HS1.47	n/a	7	Comments stated that the scale of the development is inappropriate for the area, it will negatively impact the countryside and overload local	Mawdesley Parish Council stated concerns that developing this area would leave only Green Belt land left for development past the plan period.

				infrastructure. Flooding was also a stated concern.	Natural England stated that the implications on surrounding natural habitats need to be acknowledged. United Utilities identified that there is a record of sewer flooding in the vicinity of the site.
Land off Blackburn Road, Wheelton	CH/HS1.48	n/a	10	Comments are concerned that the proposed allocation is excessive and would have a negative impact on local infrastructure. There is also concern over the impacts on traffic congestion and road safety.	Cuerden Parish Council are concerned that the site allocation encourages a car-dependant lifestyle and the loss of natural greenspace. Lack of sufficient infrastructure was also a concern.
Blackburn Road, Wheelton	CH/HS1.49	n/a	11	Comments state that the development is excessive for the area and will have detrimental impacts on air quality and traffic congestion.	Cuerden Parish Council commented that the site encourages the continued growth of a car-dependent lifestyle and a loss of greenspace. It is also not within a 20-minute radius to key amenities.
Land North of Hill Top Lane, Whittle-le-Woods	CH/HS1.50	n/a	70	The comments for this allocation state that site access is unsafe, especially through Hill Top Lane. Concerns over capacity of existing infrastructure were also stated. There were also concerns over flooding, the loss of greenspace, and a lack of public transportation.	Cuerden Parish Council and Whittle-le-Woods Parish Council both shared concerns over access to the site. Existing roads are narrow, and safety is a major concern if there will be increased traffic.
Hill Top Farm, Whittle-le-Woods	CH/HS1.51	n/a	72	Comments are concerned over the access from Hill Top Lane. There are also concerns over the impacts on	Cuerden Parish Council and Whittle-le-Woods Parish Council both shared concerns over access

				local infrastructure, character, greenspace, and privacy.	to the site. Existing roads are narrow, and safety is a major concern if there will be increased traffic. Natural England commented that the site is located on deep peaty soil and would like to see greater importance given to this.
Land off Hill Top Farm, Whittle-le-Woods	CH/HS1.52	n/a	71	Comments are concerned over the access from Hill Top Lane. There are also concerns over the impacts on local infrastructure, character, greenspace, and privacy. There was some support for a development of a smaller size.	Cuerden Parish Council and Whittle-le-Woods Parish Council both shared concerns over access to the site. Existing roads are narrow, and safety is a major concern if there will be increased traffic. Natural England commented that the site is located on deep peaty soil and would like to see greater importance given to this.
Town Lane, Whittle-le-Woods	CH/HS1.53	n/a	91	Comments shared concerns over site access, pressure on local infrastructure, road safety and congestions. Flood risk was also identified as a concern. Design and impact on the character of the area was also stated. There is support for the allocation due to the technical work done at appeal.	Cuerden Parish Council stated that the allocation will increase car-dependency. Whittle-le-Woods Parish Council stated that the site should be removed due to its rejection at appeal due to lack of safe site access for all. The Environmental Agency commented that the site has not been considered as part of the level 1 SFRA and recommend level 2 take place.
Land adjacent to Delph Way, Whittle-le-Woods	CH/HS1.54	n/a	73	One comment raised concerns over potential contamination of the site due to previous historic uses. There are also concerns over the site's topography and lack of access	Cuerden Parish Council and Whittle-le-Woods Parish Council both raised concerns over the potential pollution on the site due to previous use as a waste depository.

				points. There are also concerns over impacts on local infrastructure. There is some support for the allocation due to its access to local highways and infrastructure.	
Land Bounded by Town Lane and Lucas Lane, Whittle-le-Woods	CH/HS1.55	n/a	21	Concerns over impacts on local infrastructure and traffic congestion. Also, comments concerned over site access and flooding.	Cuerden Parish Council state that the allocation will increase car dependency. United Utilities identified that there is a record of sewer flooding in the vicinity of the site.

Preston Preferred Housing Options

Site Name	Allocation Ref (if applicable)	Sheela ref	Number of open format responses	Summary of Responses	Statutory Consultee Responses
11 Roman Road Farm, PR1 4NQ	PC/HS1.1	n/a	4	No comments.	United Utilities modelled on-site flood risk
Former Whittingham Hospital remainder of the site, Whittingham Lane, Whittingham, Preston	PC/HS1.2	n/a	2	No comments.	Sports England raised concern over the loss of a playing field Homes England supports the site

Land off Riversway & west of Dodney Drive, Lea	PC/HS1.3	n/a	2	No comments.	National Grid has identified assets on the site Environmental Agency identified potential flood risk
Fulwood Barracks, Watling Street Road, Fulwood, Preston	PC/HS1.4	n/a	6	One comment in support of the site, and the landowners support the site allocation. Some comments concerned with the potential impacts on the site's heritage.	Sport England raised concern over the loss of a playing field. United Utilities have identified that there is a significant wastewater network structure within the site boundary and that an appropriate stand-off distance will be required.
Land to the East of Garstang Road, Broughton	PC/HS1.5	n/a	6	Some comments in support stating that the site no longer contributes to the character of the countryside. One comment concerned over the loss of countryside land and another concerned over the impacts on transportation and infrastructure.	Broughton Parish Council raised concerns over the site, specifically regarding a mains gas pipeline.
Land at Glencourse Drive	PC/HS1.6	n/a	24	Many comments of opposition stating that the site will remove important areas of natural land that the community relies on. Highway capacity concerns also raised. Flooding and drainage concerns also raised.	Environmental Agency recommended a flood risk and mitigation plan be made.
Land off Tudor Avenue Lea Preston	PC/HS1.7	n/a	4	Comment stated the allocation would be detrimental to biodiversity and visual landscape amenity.	Natural England raised concern over the potential impact on nearby assets.

					Environmental Agency recommended removal of the allocation. United Utilities identified on-site modelled flood risk.
The Larches, Larches Lane, Ashton on Ribble, Preston, PR2 1PS	PC/HS1.8	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
115 Church Street, Preston, PR1 3BS	PC/HS1.9	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
North Road, Preston, PR1 1TT	PC/HS1.10	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
Moor Park Depot, Moor Park Avenue	PC/HS1.11	n/a	11	Detailed comments on developers needing to take into account cultural needs of ethnically diverse communities, in respect of the number of bedrooms provided and layout of homes.	No comments.
Former Tulketh High School, Tag Lane, Preston	PC/HS1.12	n/a	4	Two comments stated that the site should remain for housing.	Sports England raised objection due to the loss of a playing field.
Land to the Rear of Laburnum House Farm and North West of Bartle Lane, Lower Bartle, Preston	PC/HS1.13	n/a	2	One comment of support.	Woodplumpton Parish Council oppose the allocation.

Land Adjoining Mayors Farm, Bartle Lane, Lower Bartle	PC/HS1.14	n/a	2	One comment of support.	Woodplumpton Parish Council oppose the allocation.
Corner of Manchester Road and Church Street	PC/HS1.15	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
Cottam, PR4 oLE, PR2 3GB, PR3 3ZS (PLP MD1: Cottam Allocation)	PC/HS1.16	n/a	4	One comment opposing any development in Cottam.	Homes England support the allocation. United Utilities identified On-Site Modelled Sewer Flood Risk. Natural England site close proximity to sensitive assets which will need to be examined.
North West Preston (PLP MD2: North West Preston allocation / strategic location)	PC/HS1.17	n/a	6	One comment suggested more density for the site, and another that supports it.	Sports England raised concern over the potential loss of a playing field. National Grid identified assets on the site. United Utilities identified on site modelled sewer flood risk.
Land North of Tom Benson Way	PC/HS1.18	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
Arkwright House, Midgery Lane	PC/HS1.19	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
The Unicentre, Lords Walk	PC/HS1.20	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
Southgate Works, St Georges Road	PC/HS1.21	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.

Grimshaw Street/Queen Street/Manchester Road, PR1 3DB	PC/HS1.22	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
Tulketh Crescent, Preston, PR2 2RJ	PC/HS1.23	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
6 & 7 Ribblesdale Place	PC/HS1.24	n/a	2	One comment identified a previous planning permission on the site.	Historic England raised concern over a Grade II* listed building adjacent to the site.
170 Corporation Street, Preston, PR1 2UQ	PC/HS1.25	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
Greenlands Labour Club, Chatburn Road, Ribblesdale	PC/HS1.26	n/a	1	No comments.	Environmental Agency state that an environmental permit will be required for development of the site.
Land at Browsholme Ave/Fair Oak Close, PR2 6EW	PC/HS1.27	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
Former Spindlemakers Arms, Lancaster Road North, Preston, Lancashire, PR1 2QL	PC/HS1.28	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
Preston Station Quarter Regeneration Framework Area	PC/HS1.29	n/a	4	General support for housing in the city centre.	Heritage England stated there is a lack of heritage evidence to support the allocation. United Utilities identified a record of sewer flooding in the vicinity of the site.

Former Alstom Works and Wider Site, Channel Way	PC/HS1.30	n/a	1	No comments.	Environmental Agency suggested that the LPA demonstrate that flood risk on the site can be managed.
Land West of Cottam and East of Preston Western Distributor	PC/HS1.31	n/a	11	Some comments concerned over capacity of local infrastructure. A number of comments in support of the allocation, stating density should be increased.	Sport England oppose the allocation due to the loss of a playing field. Wyre council requested the allocation be examined for cross-boundary impacts. Natural England cite proximity to sensitive assets as a concern. Woodplumpton Parish Council oppose mixed-use allocation. Canal and River Trust state that and development should positively impact their assets.
Stoneygate Opportunity Area, Preston	PC/HS1.32	n/a	4	One comment stated that the retail function of the site should be recognised. Another stated that the site has capacity for higher density.	Historic England stated that several assets could be impacted by the allocation. Environmental Agency commented that an Environmental Permit will be needed to develop the site.
Riversway Phase B Site Specific Policy, Maritime Way, Preston	PC/HS1.33	n/a	3	Comment in support of the site.	Natural England cites proximity to sensitive natural assets as a concern. United Utilities identified on-site modelled sewer flood risk.

Sharoe Green Hospital, Sharoe Green Lane	PC/HS1.34	n/a	1	No comments.	Sports England opposed the site due to the loss and/or prejudicial impact on the playing field associated with the Olive School. United Utilities identified on-site modelled sewer flood risk.
Appleby House, Appleby Street, Preston, PR1 1HX	PC/HS1.35	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
Former Gasworks, Ribbleton Lane	PC/HS1.36	n/a	2	Comments concerned over the odour from surrounding factories. Other comments state that the allocation needs to be mixed-use development. One comment stated it is ideal for housing.	No comments.
Ribble Heights, Fir Trees Place	PC/HS1.37	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
Land east and west of Dixons Lane, Grimsargh	PC/HS1.38	n/a	50	Comments raised concern over potential increased traffic congestion and the loss of natural space. Many comments suggested the area is being over developed and its local character is threatened.	Natural England states that the sites are within proximity to sensitive natural assets. Grimsargh Parish Council opposes the allocation.

South Ribble Preferred Housing Options

Site Name	Allocation Ref (if applicable)	Sheela ref	Number of open format responses	Summary of Reponses	Statutory Consultee Responses
Cuerden Strategic Site	SR/HS1.1	n/a	13	Comments for this site were split in support and opposition. The loss of agricultural land is a major concern and it is seen as too large of a development. Other comments stated that the site should include more housing in order to reach optimum and best use.	The site crosses over National Grid assets Natural England commented that the site is within proximity of Ribble & Alt Estuaries SPA Ribble & Alt Estuaries Ramsar, Ribble Estuary SSSI and Newton Marsh SSSI. These are particularly vulnerable to recreational disturbances.
Brindle Rd, Ph 1 (Persimmon - Brindle Park)	SR/HS1.2	n/a	18	Comments stated that there is already too much housing in the area and that additional development will negatively affect traffic congestion and road safety. It would also increase pressure on community facilities.	No comments.
Land off Croston Rd (aka Farington Mews, Keepmoat)	SR/HS1.3	n/a	2	One comment in support of the allocation due to proximity to developed areas	Natural England commented that the site is within close proximity of Ribble & Alt Estuaries SPA Ribble & Alt Estuaries Ramsar, Ribble Estuary SSSI and Newton Marsh SSSI. These are particularly vulnerable to recreational disturbances.
Land South of Chapel Lane	SR/HS1.4	n/a	44	Comments for this allocation were mainly in opposition stating that the development is too large and would negatively impact the	Sport England identified concern for the potential prejudicial impact on the adjacent St Oswald's Catholic

				<p>character and function of the village. Traffic congestion and road safety were also raised as concerns.</p>	<p>Primary School playing field, in terms of ball strike and noise.</p> <p>Natural England commented that the site is within close proximity of Ribble & Alt Estuaries SPA Ribble & Alt Estuaries Ramsar, Ribble Estuary SSSI and Newton Marsh SSSI. These are particularly vulnerable to recreational disturbances.</p> <p>Natural England identified that the site is in proximity to existing flooding incidents and partially subject to surface water flood risk.</p>
<p>East of Leyland Rd/Land off Claytongate Dr/Land at Moor Hey School/Bellefield (Belle Wood View)</p>	SR/HS1.5	n/a	1	No comments.	<p>Sport England identified the potential prejudicial impact on the adjacent Moor Hey School playing field, in terms of ball strike and noise.</p>
<p>Pickering's Farm, Penwortham, PR1 9TQ</p>	SR/HS1.6	n/a	35	<p>Comments in opposition to the allocation stated that it represents an unnecessary loss of natural green space and would negatively impact the health and well-being of residents.</p> <p>Comments in support state that it is a sustainable location which will provide essential affordable housing.</p>	<p>National Grid identified assets on the site.</p> <p>United Utilities commented that uncertainty concerning this option makes it difficult to assess the impact of development of their infrastructure.</p>

Land to south/rear of Longton Hall, Chapel Ln, Longton	SR/HS1.7	n/a	5	Comments are concerned that this allocation will result in the loss of greenspace and negatively impact the health and wellbeing of residents and the local character. The potential pressure on local infrastructure is also a concern.	Natural England identified that the site is within close proximity of Ribble & Alt Estuaries SPA Ribble & Alt Estuaries Ramsar, Ribble Estuary SSSI and Newton Marsh SSSI which are sensitive to recreational disturbance.
Moss Side Test Track	SR/HS1.8	n/a	4	Traffic congestion, pressure on local infrastructure and community facilities, and lack of transportation options were all commented on as concerns.	Natural England identified that the site is within close proximity of Ribble & Alt Estuaries SPA Ribble & Alt Estuaries Ramsar, Ribble Estuary SSSI and Newton Marsh SSSI which are sensitive to increased recreational disturbance
Rear of Dunkirk Mill, Slater Ln (aka Rear 102-118 Slater Ln)	SR/HS1.9	n/a	2	Some comments of opposition due to its location within an FRA. One comment of support.	No comments.
Land off School Ln/Old School Dr/Land to east of Reynard Cl (aka Kitty's Frm) - central part	SR/HS1.10	n/a	4	Comments concerned that the allocation would remove a wildlife corridor and designated paths. Also concern that it would negatively impact the character of the village.	Natural England identified that the site is in close proximity of Ribble & Alt Estuaries SPA Ribble & Alt Estuaries Ramsar, Ribble Estuary SSSI and Newton Marsh SSSI which are sensitive to increased recreational disturbances
Land off School Ln/Old School Dr/Land to east of Reynard Cl, Longton (aka Kitty's Frm) - eastern part	SR/HS1.11	n/a	4	Comments concerned that the allocation would remove a wildlife corridor and designated paths. Also concern that it would negatively impact the character of the village.	Natural England identified that the site is in close proximity of Ribble & Alt Estuaries SPA Ribble & Alt Estuaries Ramsar, Ribble Estuary SSSI and Newton Marsh SSSI which are sensitive to increased recreational disturbances

Lostock Hall Primary School, Avondale Dr	SR/HS1.12	n/a	2	One comment of opposition.	Sport England raised concern over the loss of a playing field.
Land off Croston Road (The Pastures - Tilia Homes - formerly Kier Homes)	SR/HS1.13	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
Land Sth of Hampshire Rd (Eccleston Homes - Holland House Farm)	SR/HS1.14	n/a	3	Comments concerned there is not sufficient infrastructure to support the allocation.	Sport England raised concern over the potential prejudicial impact on the adjacent playing field at Holland House Road, in terms of ball strike and noise.
South of Factory Lane, East of West Coast mainline, PR1 9TE	SR/HS1.15	n/a	2	One comment providing a vision document for the site.	Natural England identified that the site is within close proximity of Ribble & Alt Estuaries SPA Ribble & Alt Estuaries Ramsar, Ribble Estuary SSSI and Newton Marsh SSSI which are sensitive to increase recreational disturbances
Land off Carrwood Rd, Lostock Hall (Lancet Homes - The Copse)	SR/HS1.16	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
Brindle Road (Land adj Cttg Gdns) - Dorbcrest Homes	SR/HS1.17	n/a	4	Concerns over road safety, especially for pedestrians. Concerns also raised over the impact on resident well-being from the loss of greenspace.	Sport England raised concern over the potential prejudicial impact on the adjacent Bamber Bridge Football Ground, in terms of ball strike, noise and lighting
Land off Browndage Rd/Railway Sidings	SR/HS1.18	n/a	1	Concern over the provision of infrastructure to support the development.	No comments.
North of Bannister Ln and rear of 398 - 414 Croston Road	SR/HS1.19	n/a	1	Comments stating general opposition to all development in the Croston area.	No comments.

Land adjoining Longton Hall Farm, South of Chapel Lane	SR/HS1.20	n/a	12	Comments concerned that the allocation is too large for the area and will negatively impact local infrastructure, character and resident well-being.	Sport England raised concern over the potential prejudicial impact on the adjacent Bamber Bridge Football Ground, in terms of ball strike and noise. Natural England identified that the site is within close proximity of Ribble & Alt Estuaries SPA Ribble & Alt Estuaries Ramsar, Ribble Estuary SSSI and Newton Marsh SSSI which are sensitive to an increase in recreational disturbances.
Vernon Carus Site/Penwortham Mills, Factory Lane excluding Sumpter Horse Site	SR/HS1.21	n/a	3	One comment stating the site boundary needs to be updated.	Sport England raised concern over the potential prejudicial impact on the adjacent Vernon Venus Sports Club, in terms of ball strike and noise. A contribution should also be sought for additional demand for sporting facilities. Natural England identified that the site is in close proximity to a hydrological link to the Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone. Natural England is currently in the process of developing a Conservation Advice package for this site, however potential impacts to the MCZ may need to be considered.
Sumpter Horse (linked to Vernon Carus Site/Penwortham Mills, Factory)	SR/HS1.22	n/a	2	One comment stating the site boundary needs to be updated.	Natural England identified that the site is in close proximity to a hydrological link to the Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone.

					Natural England is currently in the process of developing a Conservation Advice package for this site, however potential impacts to the MCZ may need to be considered.
Gas Holders Site (Morris Homes) (aka Land off Wateringpool Lane)	SR/HS1.23	n/a	1	No comments.	Natural England identified that the site is in close proximity to a hydrological link to the Ribble Estuary Marine Conservation Zone. Natural England is currently in the process of developing a Conservation Advice package for this site, however potential impacts to the MCZ may need to be considered.
Brindle Rd, Bamber Bridge (Bellway - Grey Gables Farm) - Phase 2	SR/HS1.24	n/a	4	Concerns over road safety and pressure on local infrastructure.	No comments.
Land between Altcar Ln and Shaw Brook Rd (Wade Hall) (Redrow) aka Worden Gardens	SR/HS1.25	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
Land between Altcar Ln and Shaw Brook Rd (Wade Hall), Leyland (Homes England/Lovell), aka Shawbrook Manor	SR/HS1.26	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
Lostock Hall Gas Works, Leyland Rd/The Cawsey/Land at Leyland Rd (Morris Homes - St Mary's Park) aka Land	SR/HS1.27	n/a	1	No comments	Sport England raised concern over the potential prejudicial impact on the adjacent Lostock St Gerard's playing fields, in terms of ball strike and noise.

between Lyme Rd and The Cawsey					
Lostock Hall Gas Works, Leyland Rd/The Cawsey/Land at Leyland Rd (Morris Homes - St Mary's Park) aka Land between Lyme Rd and The Cawsey - additional area	SR/HS1.28	n/a	1	No comments.	Sport England raised concern over the potential prejudicial impact on the adjacent Lostock St Gerard's playing fields, in terms of ball strike and noise.
Land off Emnie Lane	SR-S1	n/a	1	No comments.	Homes England commented in support of the allocation.
Southern area of Pickering's Farm	SR-S2	n/a	25	Comments in support of the allocation stating accessibility to major centres and building on this land rather than Green Belt is a positive. Some comments in opposition stating it is too large a development.	No comments.
South of Coote Lane, Chain House Lane	SR-S3	n/a	2	Some concern over flooding and impacts on traffic congestion. Some comments in support of the allocation as well.	No comments.
Land off Church Lane, Farington	SR-S4	n/a	2	Concerns over flooding and increased traffic congestion, also concerns over impacts on local infrastructure. Some comments in support.	Homes England commented in support of the allocation.

South of Factory Lane and East of the West Coast Main Line, PR19TE	SR-S5	n/a	3	<p>Concerns over flooding and proximity to an SSSI. One comment stating the boundary needs to be amended.</p> <p>One comment in support.</p>	<p>Natural England identified that the site is within close proximity of Ribble & Alt Estuaries SPA Ribble & Alt Estuaries Ramsar, Ribble Estuary SSSI and Newton Marsh SSSI which are sensitive to increased recreational disturbances</p>
Cuerdale Garden Village	SR/GO	19S361	167	<p>Many comments were in opposition to this allocation. Many comments stated that it is not necessary for South Ribble to meet their 5-year supply and that the development is too large, it would connect Preston and Blackburn. Many comments were sceptical that sufficient infrastructure would be provided, and the loss of Green Belt was stated as unacceptable.</p>	<p>Samlesbury and Cuerdale Parish Council and CPRE are in opposition to the allocation.</p> <p>United Utilities stated that uncertainty concerning this option makes it difficult to assess the impact of development of their infrastructure.</p> <p>Blackburn and Darwen Council suggested an alternative site allocation.</p>

Appendix B: Proposed Employment Allocation Site Comments

Chorley Preferred Employment Allocations

Site Name	Allocation Ref (if applicable)	Sheela ref	Number of open format responses	Summary of Reponses	Statutory Consultee Responses
Southern Commercial, Buckshaw Village	CH/EP1.1	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
The Revolution, Buckshaw Village	CH/EP1.2	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
Land at Bagganley Lane, Chorley	CH/EP1.3	n/a	10	<p>Comments stated that the site allocation is often waterlogged and major improvements to road infrastructure would be needed to support the site.</p> <p>There were also concerns over the impacts on tourism at the Healey Nab.</p>	<p>National Highways has identified drainage assets on the site which would require protection.</p> <p>The Environmental Agency recommends a level 2 SFRA and United Utilities have identified that the site has on-site modelled sewer flood risk.</p>
Cowling Farm, Chorley	CH/EP1.4	n/a	5	<p>One comment in support of the allocation and suggests that more density could be supported on the site.</p> <p>Other comments state concern over the allocation's impact on roads and the natural environment.</p>	<p>Natural England stated the responsibility of Local Authorities to ensure sufficient detailed agricultural land classification (ALC) information to apply NPPF policies (Paragraphs 174 and 175).</p>

Woodlands, Southport Road, Chorley	CH/EP1.5	n/a	4	Support for the allocation	<p>Natural England stated the importance of considering the impacts on ancient woodlands and trees.</p> <p>Lancashire County Council Estates supports the proposed allocation.</p> <p>United Utilities identified that the site has on-site modelled sewer flood risk</p>
Botany Bay, Chorley	CH/EP1.6	n/a	8	Comments stated that the site is not on the public transportation network and will overload the road network during peak hours. There were also some comments in support of the allocation.	The Canal and River Trust state that any development on the site should positively impact the assets they have bordering it.
Land East of M61, Chorley	CH/EP1.7	n/a	6	<p>Comments stated that the site is not on the public transportation network and will overload the road network during peak hours. The wellbeing of local wildlife was also a stated concern.</p> <p>There were also some comments in support of the allocation.</p>	The Canal and River Trust state that any development on the site should positively impact the assets they have bordering it.
Bengal Street Depot, Chorley	CH/EP1.8	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
Land at Euxton Park Golf Centre, Chorley	CH/EP1.9	n/a	3	There were comments in support of the allocation and one stating that the site should be increased overall.	Sport England have identified a concern over the potential loss of a golf facility which is a sporting facility for employment use and potential

				One comment stated that the site should remain as open space.	prejudicial impact on the Preston North End Training Ground.
Land to the East of Wigan Road, Clayton-le-Woods	CH/EP1.10	n/a	2	One comment stating that the allocation should be removed due to unsuitable access from Shady Lane and threat to wildlife.	Sport England have expressed concern over the loss of an Equestrian Centre.
Land South West of The Green and Langton Brow, Eccleston	CH/EP1.11	n/a	3	One comment stating that travel/transportation needs to be a significant part of any planning application	Natural England commented that the impacts on ancient woodlands and trees should be considered. The Environmental Agency recommends a level 2 SFRA

Preston Preferred Employment Allocations

Site Name	Allocation Ref (if applicable)	Sheela ref	Number of open format responses	Summary of Reponses	Statutory Consultee Responses
11 Roman Road Farm, PR1 4NQ	PC/EP1.1	n/a	1	No comments.	United Utilities identified onsite modelled flood risk
Red Scar Site H, PR2 5NJ	PC/EP1.2	n/a	3	One comment in support of the allocation. Owner of the site supports the site.	United Utilities identified on-site modelled sewer flood risk and flood risk immediately adjacent to the site.
Preston East Employment Area, Bluebell Way,	PC/EP1.3	n/a	3	Some comments in support.	Environmental Agency commented stating the LPA will have to identify how the site will mitigate flood risk.

Fulwood, Preston, PR2 5PZ				One comment concerned over the loss of countryside and impacts on road infrastructure.	
Land at Red Scar Industrial Estate, Longridge Road, Preston, PR2 5NQ	PC/EP1.4	n/a	3	One comment stating capacity for further development elsewhere.	United Utilities identifies on-site modelled sewer flood risk.
Land to the East of Garstang Road, Broughton, PR3 5DL	PC/EP1.5	n/a	13	Some comments were in support of the allocation. Some comments object, stating the loss of natural areas as a concern.	United Utilities identifies on-site modelled sewer flood risk. Grimsargh Parish Council comment that site access should be through Cow Hill and design should be sympathetic to the countryside surroundings.
Former Goss Graphic Systems Ltd, Greenbank Street, PR1 7LA	PC/EP1.6	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
Sites within Preston Station Quarter Regeneration Framework Area	PC/EP1.7	n/a	2	No comments.	Historic England stated there is a lack of heritage evidence to support the allocation. United Utilities identified a record of Sewer Flooding in the vicinity of the site and on-site modelled sewer flood risk.
Former Alstom Works and Wider Site, Channel Way	PC/EP1.8	n/a	2	No comments.	United Utilities stated that there are major public sewers that pass through this site which will be a very significant constraint to development.

					Environmental Agency raised concerns over flood risk.
North West Preston, PR4 oLHPR4 oRU (PLP MD2: North West Preston allocation / strategic location)	PC/EP1.9	n/a	7	Comment opposing the site due to infrastructure delivery concerns. One comment in support.	United Utilities has identified a record of sewer flooding in the vicinity of the site. Wyre Council would like for the cross-boundary implications to be examined. Woodplumpton Parish Council opposes the allocation National Grid identifies assets on or near the site.
Stoneygate Opportunity Area, Preston, PR1 3XT	PC/EP1.10	n/a	4	One comment in support.	Historic England stated a lack of evidence to support the allocation. United Utilities have identified on-site sewer flood risk.
Riversway Phase B Site Specific Policy, Maritime Way, Preston, PR2 2HT	PC/EP1.11	n/a	2	No comments.	United Utilities have identified on-site sewer flood risk. Environmental Agency does not believe the site can be developed without increasing flood risk.
Oak Street, City Centre, PR1 3XD	PC/EP1.12	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
44-62 Corporation Street, PR1 2UP	PC/EP1.13	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
St Marys and St Marks, St Mary Street	PC/EP1.14	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.

22 to 24 Manchester Road, Preston	PC/EP1.15	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
-----------------------------------	-----------	-----	---	--------------	--------------

South Ribble Preferred Employment Allocations

Site Name	Allocation Ref (if applicable)	Sheela ref	Number of open format responses	Summary of Reponses	Statutory Consultee Responses
Farington Hall Estate	SR/EP1.1	n/a	1	No comments	Natural England identified that the site is within close proximity of Ribble & Alt Estuaries SPA Ribble & Alt Estuaries Ramsar, Ribble Estuary SSSI and Newton Marsh SSSI. These are particularly vulnerable to recreational disturbances.
Cuerden Strategic Site	SR/EP1.2	n/a	13	Some support due to convenient site location. Comments in opposition stating that it goes over and above employment need.	National Grid identified assets on site. Natural England identified that the site is within close proximity of Ribble & Alt Estuaries SPA Ribble & Alt Estuaries Ramsar, Ribble Estuary SSSI and Newton Marsh SSSI. These are particularly vulnerable to recreational disturbances.
Farington Moss, Land at Lodge Lane, Flensburg Way and Penwortham Way	SR/EP1.3	n/a	2	Many comments in support due to the convenience of the allocation's location and its size. One comment of concern.	No comments.

Moss Side Test Track	SR/EP1.4	n/a	4	Concerns over impacts on traffic congestion and lack of access from public transportation options.	Natural England identified that the site is within close proximity of Ribble & Alt Estuaries SPA Ribble & Alt Estuaries Ramsar, Ribble Estuary SSSI and Newton Marsh SSSI. These are particularly vulnerable to recreational disturbances.
North of Lancashire Business Park	SR/EP1.5	n/a	1	No comments.	Natural England identified that the site is within close proximity of Ribble & Alt Estuaries SPA Ribble & Alt Estuaries Ramsar, Ribble Estuary SSSI and Newton Marsh SSSI which are sensitive to increased recreational disturbances
Land Adjacent to Leyland Business Park	SR/EP1.6	n/a	0	No comments.	No comments.
Samlesbury Enterprise Zone	SR/EP1.7	n/a	63	<p>Comments for this allocation are weary but supportive if it developed "properly" (meaning if impact on Green Belt is kept to a minimum and sufficient supporting infrastructure is provided). One comment stated more clarification is needed to separate this allocation from the Cuerdale Garden Village.</p> <p>Some comments of opposition due to threat to Green Belt.</p>	<p>Natural England stated that the site is within close proximity of Darwen River Section SSSI</p> <p>Sport England are concerned over the loss of Samlesbury Golf Centre and Teaching Academy, and potential prejudicial impact on the adjacent playing field at Samlesbury Sports and Social Canberra Club.</p> <p>Blackburn and Darwen Council support the allocation in principle but have suggested an alternative location.</p>

					Lancashire County Council support the allocation.
--	--	--	--	--	---

Appendix C: Excluded Sites Comments

Chorley Excluded Sites

Site Name	Reason for exclusion	Sheela ref	Number of open format responses	Summary of Reponses	Statutory Consultee Responses
Dawson Lane, Buckshaw Village	Not considering Green Belt at the time	19C026	1	One comment challenging the reasons for discounting.	No comments.
Land off Springfield Road, Coppull	Not considering Green Belt at the time	19C042	1	One comments in support stating the site can deliver a residential extension to Coppull which is currently a constrained settlement.	No comments.
Pear Tree Lane, Euxton	Not proposing to allocate safeguarded land at the time	19C070	1	No comments.	Homes England supports the site to be brought forward.
South Road, Bretherton	Not considering Green Belt at the time.	19C072/19C233X	1	The site would allow for appropriate infilling to the Bretherton settlement boundary and allows the redefinition of a more defensible Green Belt boundary. Appropriate mitigation of risk of flooding can be dealt with through the effective masterplanning of the site.	No comments.
Nixon Lane, Ulnes Walton	Not considering Green Belt at the time.	19C074	1	One comment in support stated that the site has no significant insurmountable constraints. It is a logical urban extension of Leyland.	No comments.

Land off Ulnes Walton Lane, Ulnes Walton	Not considering Green Belt at the time and none of the site seems to be previously developed.	19C077	1	One comment in support stating that it has no insurmountable constraints and would be a logical extension of Leyland.	No comments.
West of Euxton	Not considering Green Belt at the time.	19C097	1	One comment in support of the site stating that it would be a logical allocation if Green Belt is considered.	No comments.
Harrison's Farm, Adlington	Evidence of need for cemetery extension/allotment provision	19C103	1	One comment in support stated that it is unclear why this parcel of safeguarded land has been discounted. It is available, suitable, achievable and there are no insurmountable constraints	No comments.
Land off Ulnes Walton Lane, Ulnes Walton	Not considering Green Belt at the time and none of the site seems to be previously developed.	19C146	1	One comment in support stating that the site does not meet the tests of performing a function of Green Belt privacy. The comment also stated that it has no significant insurmountable constraints and is a logical urban extension of Leyland.	No comments.
Toy Farm, Euxton	Not considering Green Belt at the time.	19C306/19C307	1	One comment in support stating that it represents a sustainable, logical opportunity for housing development adjacent to the settlement of Euxton.	No comments.
Tithebarn Lane, Heapey	Located in Area of Other Open Countryside. Site is greenfield and is a significant distance	19C312/19C410	1	One comment in support questioning the reason for discounting the site.	No comments.

	from the Chorley settlement boundary.				
Bolton Road, Adlington	Not considering Green Belt at the time.	19C379	1	One comment in support stating that it would help deliver housing on the edge of an already built-up area of Adlington, close to services.	No comments.
Brookfield, Chancery Road, Astley Village	Site has planning permission for Rugby Club redevelopment. Housing development was permitted adjacent to this site to support the Rugby Club redevelopment and this has been completed.	19C383	1	One comment challenging the reason for discounting the site.	No comments.

Preston Excluded Sites

Site Name	Reason for exclusion	Sheela ref	Number of open format responses	Summary of Responses	Statutory Consultee Responses
Land off Whittingham Lane	Discounted but subject to review.	19P008	4	Comments of concern over the site, support the discounting.	No comments.
Ingol Lodge, Cottam Avenue,	Discounted but subject to review.	19P009	1	No comments.	Canal and River trust stated that the site is adjacent to the towpath side of Lancaster canal. The canal is

Preston, PR2 3XH					carried on an embankment for part of the site and as such any development would need to provide an acceptable buffer/offset to the toe (bottom) of the embankment to ensure the structural integrity of the embankment and allow for its ongoing maintenance.
Land off Langley Lane, Broughton, PR3 5DD	Discounted but subject to review.	19P011	1	One comment challenging the reasons for discounting the site.	No comments.
Red Oaks Stables, Darkinson Lane, Lea, PR4 oRE	Discounted but subject to review.	19P013	1	On commenting challenging the assessment process and reason for discounting the site.	No comments.
Land off Inglewhite Road and Halfpenny Lane, Longridge, Preston, PR3 2DB	Discounted but subject to review.	19P028		On commenting challenging the assessment process and reason for discounting the site.	No comments.
The Old Rib, Halfpenny Lane, Longridge, Preston, PR3 2EA	Site now has planning permission and is under construction.	19P030	1	On commenting challenging the assessment process and reason for discounting the site.	No comments.
The Ashes, Halfpenny Lane, Longridge,	Discounted but subject to review.	19P032	1	On commenting challenging the assessment process and reason for discounting the site.	No comments.

Preston, PR3 2EA					
Land off Halfpenny Lane, Longridge, Preston, PR3 2EA	Discounted but subject to review.	19P033	1	On commenting challenging the assessment process and reason for discounting the site.	No comments.
Land at Swainson House Farm, Goosnargh Lane, Goosnargh, Preston, PR3 2JU	Discounted but subject to review.	19P034	1	Response questioning the reasons for discounting.	No comments.
Land at Eastway, Preston, PR3 5JE	Discounted but subject to review.	19P035	1	No comments.	Homes England supports the allocation of the site.
Bleasdale Road, Preston, PR3 2AR	Discounted but subject to review.	19P037	1	No comments.	Homes England supports the allocation of the site.
Land off Green Nook Lane, Longridge, PR3 2JA	Discounted but subject to review.	19P039	1	Comment challenging the discounting of the site and the assessment process, stating that the site would provide sustainable development.	No comments.
Vine House Farm, 38 Darkinson Lane, Lea Town, Preston, PR4 0RJ	Discounted but subject to review.	19P044	1	Comment challenging the discounting of the site and the assessment process, stating that the site would provide sustainable development.	No comments.

19 Whittingham Lane, Broughton, PR3 5DA	Duplicate site	19P050	1	Comment stating the site would detrimentally impact biodiversity.	No comments.
Land at Lea Road, Lea Town, Preston, PR4 0RA	Discounted but subject to review.	19P057	1	No comments.	Canal and River Trust stated that the Lancaster Canal passes along the northern boundary of the northernmost site and any development of the site should have a positive relationship and engage with the waterways
Jackson's Quarry, Lightfoot Green Lane, Fulwood, PR4 0AP	Discounted but subject to review.	19P058	1	Comment challenging the reasons for discounting the site.	No comments.
Bushells Farm, Mill Lane, Goosnargh, Preston, PR3 2BJ	Discounted but subject to review.	19P060	1	Comment challenging the reasons for discounting the site.	No comments.
Land to the north of Jepps Lane, Barton PR3 5AQ	Discounted but subject to review.	19P062	1	One comment in support of the site being allocated.	No comments.
Land North Of Pope's Farm, Woodplumpton Lane, Broughton, PR3 5JZ	Discounted but subject to review.	19P065	1	One comment challenging the reasons for discounting.	No comments.
Springfield Training Ground, Dodney	Discounted but subject to review.	19P066	2	One comment in support of the site, challenging reasons for discounting.	Canal and River Trust stated that the Ribble Link passes along the northern boundary of the site and

Drive, Lea, Preston PR2 1XR					any development of the site should have a positive relationship and engage with the waterways.
Land off Tudor Avenue, Lea, PR2 1YB	Discounted but subject to review.	19P067	1	No comments.	Canal and River Trust stated that the Ribble Link passes along the northern boundary of the site and any development of the site should have a positive relationship and engage with the waterways.
Land to the Rear of 25 & 27 Whittingham Lane, Broughton, PR3 5DA	Discounted but subject to review.	19P069	1	One comment in support of the site and challenging the reasons for discounting.	No comments.
Land at Helms Farm, Broughton, Preston, PR3 5DL	Discounted but subject to review.	19P071	1	One comment in support of the site being allocated.	No comments.
Moor Park Tennis Courts, Moor Park Avenue, Preston, PR1 6AS	Discounted but subject to review.	19P076	1	No comments.	Sports England opposed to the site due to the loss of tennis courts.
Land to the West of Bleasdale View, Catforth Road, Catforth, Preston	Discounted but subject to review.	19P100	2	Landowner supports the site.	Natural England raised concerns over proximity to of Ribble & Alt Estuaries Special Protection Area (SPA), Ribble & Alt Estuaries Ramsar, Ribble Estuary Site of Special Scientific interest (SSSI) and Newton Marsh SSSI.

Ambrose Hall Farm, Woodplumpton Road, Preston, PR4 0LJ	Duplicate site.	19P114	1	No comments.	Sports England raised concern/objection over the site due to proposed dwelling numbers.
Land East of Longridge Road, Grimsargh, PR2 5AQ	Discounted but subject to review.	19P117	1	One comment in support of the site.	No comments.
Toplands Farm Woodplumpton Road, Woodplumpton, Preston, PR4 0NE	Discounted but subject to review.	19P122	2	One comment in support of the site. On comment identifies site constraints.	No comments.
Site of Former Ingol Lodge, Bounded by Cottam Lane to the East, Savick Brook to the South and Lancaster Canal to the North, PR2 3XW	Discounted but subject to review.	19P123	1	No comments.	Canal and River Trust commented that the site is adjacent to the towpath side of Lancaster canal. The canal is carried on an embankment for part of the site and as such any development would need to provide an acceptable buffer/offset to the toe (bottom) of the embankment to ensure the structural integrity of the embankment and allow for its ongoing maintenance
Land off Darkinson Lane, Lea, Preston, PR4 0RH - West	Site was removed and split into 19P265 and 19P266.	19P245	1	No comments.	Natural England stated concern due to the site's proximity to Ribble & Alt Estuaries Special Protection Area (SPA), Ribble & Alt Estuaries Ramsar, Ribble Estuary Site of

					Special Scientific interest (SSSI) and Newton Marsh SSSI.
Land off Darkinson Lane, Lea, Preston, PR4 0RH - North East	Discounted but subject to review.	19P266	1	No comments.	Sports England raised objection / concern on this site due to potential prejudicial impact on the adjacent to Ashton and Lea Golf Course, in terms of risk of ball strike
Land South of Whittingham Lane	Discounted but subject to review.	19P269	1	One comment concerned over the site's location in the countryside and the potential negative impact on biodiversity.	No comments.
PR4 0RX	Discounted but subject to review.	19P293	2	One comment in support of the site.	Sports England raise objection / concern on this site due to Potential prejudicial impact on the adjacent tennis courts, in terms of lighting and noise.
Land West of Chipping Lane, Longridge, PR3 2NA	Discounted but subject to review.	19P297	1	One comment in support of the site, challenging the reasons for discounting.	No comments.
126a Whittingham Lane	Discounted but subject to review.	19P298	1	One comment in support of the site, stating it supports sustainable development.	No comments.
Land at Preston East, PR2 5SH	Discounted but subject to review.	19P082	1	One comment stated concern over loss of natural space.	No comments.

South Ribble Excluded Sites

Site Name	Reason for exclusion	Sheela ref	Number of open format responses	Summary of Reponses	Statutory Consultee Responses
Land at Pear Tree Farm, PR5 4EH	Disproportionate in relation to existing linear development, valuable as existing allotment use.	19S009, 19S010, 19S011, 19S14, 19S018, 19S028	4	Comments stating that allotments border the site, risk of flooding and negatively impact existing residents well-being.	No comments.
Land to Rear of 249 Chapel Lane, New Longton, Preston, PR4 4AD	Green Belt – was not assessed	19S017	1	Comments stating the site should be smaller and that it has received PIP for a further dwelling.	No comments
Land South of Flensburg Way, Farington, PR26 6PH	Green Belt – was not assessed	19S041	1	Comments stating the site should be considered in conjunction with the adjoining site.	No comments.
Land off Moss House Lane, Much Hoole, PR4 4TE	Green Belt – was not assessed	19S071 & 19S072	1	Comments challenging the discounting of the site.	No comments.
Land between Dunkirk Lane and Nixon Lane	Green Belt – was not assessed	19S075	1	One comment challenging the discounting of the site.	No comments.
Land between Marsh Land and Hall Carr Lane	Green Belt – was not assessed	19S076	1	One comment challenging the discounting of the site.	No comments.
Land at Cheshire House Farm	Smaller area taken forward under	19S077 (19S249)	1	No comments.	Homes England challenged to discounting of the site.

	19S249, excessive scale compared to the settlement				
Land South of Stryands	Green Belt – was not assessed	19S078	1	Comment challenging the discounting of the site.	No comments.
Land Between West Coast Main Line and Wigan Road, Wigan Road, Leyland, PR25 5DA	Green Belt – was not assessed	19S080	2	Some comments challenging the discounting of the site. Some comments stating it should not be brought forward due to access issues.	No comments.
Land to the North of Liverpool Old Road and West of Liverpool Road (A59), Much Hoole, PR4 4QB/ Land west of the A59 Liverpool Road, Much Hoole, Preston, PR4 4QB	Green Belt – was not assessed	19S089, 19S118	1	Comments challenging the discontinuing of the site.	No comments.
Land at Stilefield/Leigh House, South Ribble, PR5 5UP and Land at Lime Kiln Farm, South Ribble, PR5 5UQ	Within Central Park which acts as a green buffer between settlements and as such no development is acceptable.	19S094	1	No comments.	Homes England supports the site.

Land South of Chain House Lane, New Longton, Preston, PR4 4LJ / Land South of Chain House Lane, New Longton, Preston, PR4 4LJ	Not within settlement boundary and will not provide suitable extension to the boundary, scale unsuitable for location	19S098, 19S103	2	Comments challenging the reasons for discounting the site.	No comments.
Aspley House, Farington, South Ribble, PR4 4LE	Not within settlement boundary and will not provide suitable extension to the boundary, scale unsuitable for location	19S098	1	No comments.	Homes England supports the site.
Land North of Knoll Lane, Little Hoole	Green Belt – was not assessed	19S101	1	Comment challenging the reasons for discontinuing the site.	No comments.
Land to the South of Orchard Avenue, Penwortham	Green Belt – was not assessed	19S109	1	Comment challenging the reasons for discontinuing the site.	No comments.
Land North of Knoll Lane	Green Belt – was not assessed	19S111	1	Comment challenging the reasons for discontinuing the site.	No comments.
Land to the North of Back Lane, Longton, PR4 5BE	Green Belt – was not assessed	19S112	1	Comment challenging the reasons for discontinuing the site.	No comments.
Land at Olive Farm, Hoghton	Smaller site area taken forward	19S133 (19S155, 19S178)	1	Comment challenging the reasons for discontinuing the site.	No comments.

Lane, South Ribble, PR5 0JJ	(Boundary changed due to expansion of Whitfires)				
Land North and South of Fowler Lane	Green Belt – was not assessed	19S141	1	Comments stating the positives to the site and challenging the reasons for discontinuing.	No comments.
Shakespeare Foundry, Higher Walton	High risk of surface water flooding. Contamination risk from historic landfill, around 40% of the site at risk of flooding and flood risk cuts off one side of the site from the other.	19S161	12	Comments stating that the site should be developed as it is brownfield land.	No comments.
Prospect Hill Training Centre, Old Brown Lane, Walton Le Dale, PR5 6ZA	Green Belt – was not assessed	19S187	1	Comment stating the site should be assessed for housing and employment.	No comments.
Land at Branch Road, Mellor Brook, BB2 7NY	Not a natural extension of the settlement boundary, scale excessive for location	19S232	12	Comments stating confusion over why this site is discounted but not the Cuerdale Garden Village.	Blackburn and Darwin Council support the site allocation.
Windmill Hotel Site	Subject to outstanding appeal for petrol filling	19S263	2	Comment stating the site should be re-evaluated after appeal.	No comments.

	station and convenience store. Unable to make a decision on a proposed use at the time.				
Land North of Bakers Farm Brook Lane Much Hoole PR4 5JB	Green Belt – was not assessed	19S281	1	Comments challenging the reason for discounting.	No comments.
Land to the Rear of 96-100 Marsh Lane, Longton	Small garden site in existing built up area. Unclear on access arrangements and essentially set in back land beyond existing development on Marsh Lane	19S308, 19S334x (CLCFS01734)	1	Comments challenging the reason for discounting.	No comments.