United Utilities Water Limited
Haweswater House
Lingley Mere Business Park
Lingley Green Avenue
Great Sankey
Warrington WA5 3LP

unitedutilities.com

[redacted]k

By email only: centrallancashireplan@chorley.gov.uk

Regulation 19 Consultation
Planning Policy Team
3rd Floor
Town Hall
Lancaster Road
Preston PR1 2RL

Your ref:
Our ref:
Date: 14-APR-25

Dear Sir / Madam

CENTRAL LANCASHIRE LOCAL PLAN 2023-41 REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION

Thank you for your consultation seeking the views of United Utilities as part of the Local Plan process. United Utilities wishes to build a strong partnership with all local planning authorities (LPAs) to aid sustainable development and growth within its area of operation. We aim to proactively identify future development needs and share our information. This helps:

- ensure a strong connection between development and infrastructure planning;
- deliver sound planning strategies; and
- inform our future infrastructure investment submissions for determination by our regulator.

United Utilities wishes to highlight the benefit of early, constructive communication with the councils and site promoters to ensure a co-ordinated approach to the delivery of any future allocations. We will seek to work closely with the councils during the local plan process to develop a coordinated approach for delivering sustainable growth in sustainable locations.

When preparing the Development Plan and future policies, new development should be focused in sustainable locations which are accessible to local services and infrastructure. We can most appropriately manage the impact of development on our infrastructure if development is identified in locations where infrastructure is available with existing capacity.

With regards to the draft allocations, we have undertaken an initial assessment of potential issues. This assessment is enclosed. The assessments relate to:

1. Sites with pressurised water main within the boundary;
2. Sites with a water network structure within the boundary;
3. Sites within 500m of a wastewater treatment works;
4. Sites with a pressurised sewer within the boundary;
5. Sites with a gravity sewer in the boundary;

6. Site within an easement within the boundary;

7. Sites with land owned by United Utilities within the boundary;

8. Sites in proximity to a sewer flooding incident;

9. Site on water catchment land;

10. Sites in goundwater source protection zone 1 or 2; and

11. Sites within an on-site modelled sewer flood risk.

These matters are addressed further below. Given the site-specific issues we have raised, we request the opportunity to liaise with you in more detail on the Key Development Considerations, which do not adequately address the concerns / constraints we have identified.

We wish to specifically note that a number of your site allocations do not include key development considerations. We **object** to this approach as we feel all sites should be guided by key development considerations to ensure that the constraints which we have identified are reflected by any application for planning permission at the site. For example, we note the intention to allocate land at Woodlands Southport Road, Chorley. This has a number of constraints that could affect the deliverability of the site, however there are no key development considerations which allow these constraints to be identified.

Our Assets

It is important to outline the need for our assets to be fully considered in any proposals.

United Utilities will not allow building over or in close proximity to a water main.

United Utilities will not allow a new building to be erected over or in close proximity to a public sewer or any other wastewater pipeline. This will only be reviewed in exceptional circumstances.

Site promoters should not assume that our assets can be diverted.

As you would expect, there are a range water and wastewater assets within, and in the vicinity of, the potential draft allocations that you have identified. It is critical that site promoters engage with United Utilities on the detail of their design and the proposed construction works.

All United Utilities' assets will need to be afforded due regard in the masterplanning process for a site. This should include careful consideration of landscaping and biodiversity proposals in the vicinity of our assets and any changes in levels and proposed crossing points (access points and services).

We strongly recommend that the LPAs advise future applicants of the importance of fully understanding site constraints as soon as possible, ideally before any land transaction is negotiated, so that the implications of our assets on development can be fully understood and agreed. We ask site promoters to contact United Utilities to understand any implications by contacting:

Developer Services – Wastewater

[redacted]

Developer Services – Water

[redacted]

Specific Concerns

With regards to the draft allocations, we have enclosed an initial list of site-specific issues / constraints. We request that **all** these issues are reflected in Key Development Considerations for **all** sites.

We have also provided some initial commentary on a selection of sites.

Growth in Longton / Hutton

In our comments to earlier local plan consultations, United Utilities highlighted concerns with the volume of potential development in Longton. We explained our preference for growth in any settlement to be proportionate to the size of the settlement. We expressed our preference that additional growth above and beyond that already identified in the adopted local plan is not brought forward in Longton so that the impact on our infrastructure, especially the public sewer, can be most appropriately managed. Notwithstanding this previously stated preference, we note the intention to allocate a number of significant development sites in Longton and nearby Hutton. As such, we request that the local planning authorities and promoters of these sites provide us with the detail of the foul and surface water drainage strategies as soon as possible. This will allow us to better understand the impact on the sewer network. It will also help to inform our decision on whether investment in this location should be prioritised.

Land South of Chapel Lane, Longton

Notwithstanding our above position, the sites in Longton include land South of Chapel Lane, which is affected by a range of flood risk issues. As outlined in our associated enclosure, the site is in proximity to existing sewer flooding incidents and a modelled sewer flood risk. We also note that the site is partially subject to surface water flood risk. As a result of past flooding incidents we believe that the entrance to the site is at a low point where which water naturally accumulates from surface water, an on-site culvert and as a result of flooding from the public sewer. We therefore strongly recommend that the policy for this site must identify the need to fully understand any flood risk concerns and ensure that any flood waters are not displaced.

We also note that this parcel of land is comprised of multiple land ownerships. As such, we request that policy identifies a clear need for a masterplan and an allocation wide infrastructure strategy to ensure that development is brought forward in a coordinated manner. This should address how the delivery of infrastructure between parcels of land will be coordinated and delivered. We would not wish to see development brought forward at the site in a fragmented manner to the detriment of a sustainable approach to the management of foul and surface water. In this regard, we request the following amendment to the Key Development Considerations:

'The site is in multiple land ownership. To ensure good placemaking, ~~where possible,~~ landowners must ~~should~~ work collaboratively across the site allocation to bring forward a masterplan and infrastructure strategy to ~~and~~ demonstrate a comprehensive and integrated development proposal.'

We also request the following amendments to the following consideration:

'The site has access to all utilities but has a record of sewer flooding which ~~should~~ must be considered as part of the development's design and masterplanning. Existing public sewers pass near to this site which modelling data and flooding incident data identifies as being at risk of sewer flooding. This will need careful assessment and consideration in the detailed design, masterplanning and drainage details for the site. The risk of sewer flooding could affect the developable area of the site and the detail of the design. Any sewer flood risk that affects the site must not be displaced. Early dialogue with United Utilities is ~~recommended~~ required prior to the submission of a planning application. Attention will be required to drainage within and from the site to ensure that there is no impact on surrounding watercourses. Careful consideration will need to be given to the approach to drainage including the management of surface water; the point of connection; whether the proposal will be gravity or pumped; the proposed finished floor and ground levels; the management of exceedance paths from existing and proposed drainage systems and any appropriate mitigating measures to manage any risk of sewer surcharge.'

Given the surface water flood risk concerns on the site, we recommend that you discuss the policy at this site with the Lead Local Flood Authority.

Emnie Lane, Leyland

We request that the key development considerations for this site are expanded to include:

- *'The site lies adjacent to the Leyland Wastewater Treatment Works and a buffer zone will be required informed by relevant impact assessments agreed in liaison with United Utilities and the council.*

- *24 hour access to the wastewater treatment works must be facilitated by the design and layout of development. This must ensure a suitable level of access for the operational vehicles that access the site and be designed to protect the amenity of residents.*

- *There is major wastewater infrastructure that passes through the site. Access to these assets must be maintained.'*

For confirmation, United Utilities has extensively engaged with Homes England on this site. This engagement is reflective of the above constraints.

Woodlands, Southport Road, Chorley

In accordance with our above comments, we are concerned that many sites are not covered by Key Development Considerations. United Utilities has objected to this approach. An example of our concerns are reflected in the risks we have identified in the enclosed information which identifies the following constraints / concerns at Woodlands, Southport Road, Chorley:

1) Significant wastewater infrastructure passes through the site;
2) There is a modelled risk of sewer flooding on site;
3) There is a record of sewer flooding having occurred on the site; and
4) The site is in proximity to Chorley Wastewater Treatment Works. Relevant impact assessments must be undertaken to establish if the site is developable.

Each of these constraints could affect the deliverability of this site and therefore it is critical that the site is covered by a series of key development considerations. We request that these constraints are reflected in the key development considerations for the site.

Corner of Manchester Road and Church Street, Preston, PR1 3BT

This site has large gravity sewers that pass through the site which may make development difficult as they would represent a significant on-site constraint. More details of a potential layout are required to better understand this site. We request that these constraints are reflected in the key development considerations for the site.

Former Alstom Works and Wider Site, Channel Way, Preston, PR1 8XL

There are major public sewers that pass through this site which will be a very significant constraint to development. There is also a record of on-site sewer flooding. More details of a potential layout are required to better understand this site. We request that these constraints are reflected in the key development considerations for the site.

Fulwood Barracks, Watling Street Road, Fulwood, Preston, PR2 8AA

There is a significant wastewater network structure within the site boundary. An appropriate stand-off distance will be required. This should be agreed in liaison with United Utilities. We are therefore supportive of the Key Development Considerations for the site.

North Of Hewlett Avenue

Various large sewer assets and associated combined sewer overflow. An appropriate stand-off distance will be required. This should be agreed in liaison with United Utilities. We request that key development consideration are also identified for this site which reflect these constraints.

Policy ID1 - Co-ordinated Infrastructure Provision

We wish to note that any growth needs to be carefully planned to ensure new infrastructure provision does not cause any unexpected delays to development delivery. The full detail of the development proposals are not yet known. For example, the detail of the drainage proposals or the water supply requirements. As a result, it is important that we highlight that in the absence of such detail, we cannot fully conclude the impact on our infrastructure over a number of 5-year investment periods and therefore as more detail becomes available, it may be necessary to co-ordinate the timing for the delivery of development with the timing for delivery of infrastructure.

Once more information is available with respect to specific development sites, which is often only at the planning application stage, we will be able to better understand the potential impacts of development on infrastructure and, as a result, it may be necessary to coordinate the delivery of

development with the timing for the delivery of infrastructure improvements. In this context, we are supportive of criterion 2c of Policy ID1.

We wish to highlight that the rural parts of Central Lancashire are often supported by infrastructure which is proportionate to its rural location. United Utilities wishes to emphasise that disproportionate growth in any settlement, especially small settlements, has the potential to place a strain on existing water and wastewater infrastructure. Therefore, when considering growth proposals, it is good practice to ensure that growth is proportionate to the size of the settlement.

Policy ID1 - Large Sites in Multiple Ownership

United Utilities has concerns regarding any large site allocations which are in multiple land ownerships. For example, we note the fragmented ownership at the Chapel Lane site in Longton. The experience of United Utilities is that where sites are in multiple ownership, the achievement of sustainable development can be compromised by developers/applicants working independently. We therefore encourage you to make early contact with all landowners/site promoters and challenge those landowners on how they intend to work together, preferably as part of a legally binding delivery framework and / or masterplan. We believe that raising this point at this early stage is in the best interest of achieving challenging delivery targets from allocated sites in the most sustainable and co-ordinated manner.

We recommend that future policy requires applicants to provide drainage strategies for foul and surface water. For larger sites, we would recommend that policy requires applicants to prepare an infrastructure phasing and delivery strategy. For strategic sites, we would recommend that early consideration is given to the infrastructure strategy as part of the preparation of the local plan and to ensure a co-ordinated approach to the delivery of new development and infrastructure. We recommend the following policy is included Policy ID1:

'Where applications are submitted on land which is part of a wider allocation, applicants will be required to submit allocation-wide infrastructure strategies to demonstrate how the site will be brought forward in a co-ordinated manner. The strategies shall be prepared in liaison with infrastructure providers and demonstrate how each phase interacts with other phases and ensure coordination between phases of the development over lengthy time periods and by numerous developers. Where necessary, the strategy must be updated to reflect any changing circumstances between phase(s) during the delivery of the development.'

In this context we also wish to highlight criterion 4 of Policy EN1 (Strategic Policy): Well Designed Places which states:

'4.Significant schemes will be required to provide a Masterplan, parameter plans, and a design code in support of their application.'

We are concerned at the reference to 'significant' is unclear. We believe the need to provide a masterplan should apply to all sites and not just significant schemes. For example, a self-build site of 5 plots should still be underpinned by a masterplan and infrastructure strategy to ensure that development and supporting infrastructure is not delivered in a fragmented manner. We therefore suggest that criterion 4 is amended to state:

'4.~~Significant~~ <u>All</u> schemes will be required to provide a Masterplan, parameter plans, and a design code in support of their application.'

Climate Change Strategic Objective and Associated Policy

United Utilities wishes to highlight its support for the Strategic Objectives in particular, Strategic Objective 1 – Climate Change. We also note Strategic Objective 7 relating to High Quality Development and Strategic Objective 9 relating to the Natural Environment which references a connected green and blue infrastructure network that plays a role in managing flood risk and delivery of measurable net gains. These strategic objectives help to ensure that the principle of a strong response to the challenge of climate change is embedded within the detailed policies of the plan.

As the LPAs will be aware, green infrastructure can help to mitigate the impacts of high temperatures, combat emissions, maintain or enhance biodiversity and reduce flood risk. Green / blue infrastructure and landscape provision play an important role in managing water close to its source. As the necessary link between green/blue infrastructure, surface water management, landscape design and water efficiency is outlined within the strategic objectives, it will help to ensure that the response to climate change is at the forefront of the planning and design process.

Use of Language within the Draft Central Lancashire Local Plan

We are concerned that there is a predominant use of the word '*should*' in the policy / key development considerations in the draft document. We request that use of the word '*should*' is revisited throughout the draft document to ascertain if it should more appropriately state '*must*'. This is because '*should*' suggests the consideration is a recommendation or advice, whereas '*must*' implies a clear obligation or requirement.

For example, within the key development considerations for North West Preston (page 32), it states that:

'The use of infiltration SuDS should be investigated.'

Noting that the requirement is simply to investigate, we request that '*should*' is amended to '*must*'.

Similarly, we note the development considerations for Fulwood Barracks (page 37), which state:

'The use SuDS should be investigated to address issues of surface water flooding onsite.'

Again, we request that '*should*' is amended to *'must'* given the significant nature of this site.

Policy EN10 – Development and Flood Risk

We request that this policy includes the following additional text regarding sewer flood risk:

'Where a risk of sewer / reservoir flooding has been identified, applicants must consult with the water and sewerage undertaker to confirm the nature and extent of any flood risk from sewers and reservoirs.

For sewers, the consultation must confirm:

a) if there are any sewer surcharge levels at the point of connection that could influence site design;

b) whether there is an incident of sewer flooding at, or in the vicinity of, the proposed development site; and

c) if sewer modelling data indicates that existing sewers that pass through or near to the site present a modelled risk of sewer flooding.

This information will help to inform whether to apply the sequential approach. Development should not be located in an area at risk of flooding. Applicants must demonstrate that proposals do not increase flood risk and are safe. Applicants must not assume that changes in levels or that changes to the public sewer (including diversion), will be acceptable as such proposals could increase / displace flood risk.'

We also recommend the following explanatory text in respect of sewer flood risk matters:

Explanatory Text

A range of sites have been identified as at risk of sewer flooding or in the wider vicinity of sewer flooding. In respect of these sites, the applicant must engage with United Utilities prior to any masterplanning to assess the flood risk and ensure development is not located in an area at risk of flooding from the public sewer. Applicants should consider site topography and any exceedance flow paths. Resultant layouts and levels should take account of such existing circumstances. Applicants must demonstrate that the proposed development would be safe and not lead to increased flood risk. Applicants should not assume that changes in levels or changes to the public sewer, including diversion, will be acceptable as such proposals could increase / displace flood risk. It may be necessary to apply the sequential approach and incorporate mitigating measures subject to the detail of the development proposal. Careful consideration will need to be given to the approach to drainage including the management of surface water; the point of connection; whether the proposal will be gravity or pumped; the proposed finished floor and ground levels; the management of exceedance paths from existing and proposed drainage systems and any appropriate mitigating measures to manage any risk of sewer surcharge.'

In instances where we have identified sites that are affected by sewer flood risk (see enclosed list), we request the following additional site-specific policy wording / key development consideration for each site. Where there is a modelled flood risk, we would recommend the following wording:

Recommended Policy

Modelled Sewer Flood Risk

Existing public sewers pass through and near to this site which modelling data (and / or flooding incident data) identifies as being at risk of sewer flooding. This will need careful assessment and consideration in the detailed design, masterplanning and drainage details for the site. The risk of sewer flooding could affect the developable area of the site and the detail of the design.

Where there is a record of flooding on-site, or in the vicinity of the site, we would recommend the following wording:

Recommended Policy

Sewer Flooding Incidents

There are flood incidents from the public sewer on-site / in the wider area. Applicants must engage with United Utilities to consider the detailed design of the site and drainage details. The risk of sewer flooding could affect the developable area of the site and the detail of the design.

In relation to the flood risks we have identified, we wish to liaise with you to ensure that these flood risks are fully reflected in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for Central Lancashire.

Foul and Surface Water Drainage

It is important to explain that the existing drainage systems are often dominated by combined sewers. This method of sewer infrastructure is a result of the time that it is was constructed, with combined sewers taking both foul and surface water.

The Environment Act 2021 places a clear obligation on sewerage undertakers in England to secure a progressive reduction in the adverse impacts of discharges from storm overflows to reduce the impacts on the environment and public health. Consistent with this obligation, we request that every effort is made to ensure that new development avoids discharging surface water to the existing public sewerage system. Surface water should instead discharge to more sustainable alternatives as outlined in the surface water management hierarchy. This will ensure the impact of development on public wastewater infrastructure, both in terms of the wastewater network and wastewater treatment works, is minimised. We adopt this position as surface water flows are very large when compared with foul flows. If there is a consistent approach to surface water management as part of new development, it will help to manage and reduce surface water entering the sewer network, decreasing the likelihood of flooding from sewers, whilst also minimising the impact on residents and businesses, and the impact on the environment.

New development should manage foul and surface water in a sustainable way in accordance with national planning policy. We wish to emphasise the importance of any policy clearly setting out the need to follow the hierarchy of drainage options for surface water in the national planning practice guidance (NPPG) which clearly identifies the public combined sewer as the least preferable option for the discharge of surface water and the need for priority to be given to the implementation of sustainable drainage systems, especially multi-functional sustainable drainage systems, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and NPPG.

United Utilities is supportive of the approach to address the issues of flood risk and surface water management as **two separate policies**. It is our view that a separate planning policy for each matter sets a clear process in relation to surface water management for **all** new development.

Paragraph 181 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) outlines that:

> *'When determining any planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Where appropriate, applications should be supported by a site-specific flood-risk assessment.'*

Noting that not all applications are required to submit a flood risk assessment, United Utilities wishes to outline that emerging policy should set an expectation that all applications will be required to submit clear evidence that the hierarchy for surface water management has been fully investigated to ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. We wish to recommend that policy requires applicants to submit a foul and surface water drainage strategy that fully investigates the

surface water hierarchy to minimise the risk of flooding and ensures that future development sites are drained in the most sustainable way whilst also being resilient to the challenges of climate change.

We wish to emphasise that the evaluation of surface water management opportunities should be undertaken early in the design process. It is imperative that the approach to design including site analysis is intrinsically linked to '*making space for water*'. Sustainable surface water management will be particularly important to consider in the context of the requirement for new streets to be tree lined. It is a national policy requirement that new streets are tree lined as stated in paragraph 136 of the NPPF.

We wish to recommend the following wording for inclusion as policy in Policy EN11.

Policy EN11: Water Resource Management

'1. All applications must be supported by a strategy for foul and surface water management.'

2. The design of proposals must assess and respond to the existing hydrological characteristics of a site to ensure a flood resilient design is achieved and water / flooding is not deflected or constricted.

3~~1~~. ~~Sustainable drainage systems shall be incorporated within development proposals as required to manage surface water run-off on-site, close to where it falls,~~ Applications will be required to incorporate sustainable drainage which is proportionate to the nature and scale of the proposal and should be designed to take account of climate change and urban creep. ~~Multi-functional sustainable drainage systems should provide water quantity, water quality, amenity, and biodiversity benefits.~~ The sustainable drainage must be multi-functional wherever possible, and designed in accordance with the four pillars of sustainable drainage, in preference to underground piped and tanked storage systems, unless, there is clear evidence why such techniques are not possible. The sustainable drainage must be integrated with the landscaped environment and the strategy for biodiversity net gain.

4~~2.~~ On greenfield sites, the peak run-off rate and the run-off volume must not exceed the existing greenfield runoff rates and volume for the same rainfall event including an allowance for climate change and urban creep.

5~~3~~. On previously developed land the peak run-off rate and run-off volume should not exceed the greenfield runoff rates and volumes for the same rainfall event, including an allowance for climate change and urban creep. Where this cannot be achieved (with a robust justification) and/or where no operational drainage system exists, a minimum betterment will need establishing and agreeing with the drainage approving body. The SuDS Manual suggests 30% betterment is the starting point, and the agreed betterment for the reduction of the existing peak run-off rates for the site must be achieved, based upon a model of the existing drainage system, where present and operational (30% is stated in the CIRIA SuDS Manual (C753), but the most up to date SuDS manual should be used). To demonstrate any reduction in the rate of surface water discharge, applicants must submit clear evidence of existing operational connections from the site with associated calculations on rates of discharge. Where clear evidence of existing connections is not provided, applicants will be required to discharge at a greenfield rate of run-off.

6. ~~4.~~ Development proposals should not seek to culvert any open watercourse and where possible should restore and enhance any watercourse to its natural state, including daylighting culverted watercourses unless appropriately justified.

7. ~~5.~~ Applicants shall demonstrate that surface water drainage from new development accords with the following sustainable drainage hierarchy:

a) Re-use and reduce surface water runoff (source control)
b) Infiltration
c) Surface water body
d) Surface water sewer
e) Combined sewer

8. ~~6.~~ All components of a sustainable drainage system shall be managed and maintained to an acceptable standard and offered for adoption where possible. ~~SuDS~~ Management and Maintenance Plans are required for SuDS and riparian watercourses to support development proposals.

9. ~~7.~~ Planning applications for major development shall include a completed Lancashire SuDS pro-forma within the sustainable drainage strategy

10. For any development proposal which is part of a wider development / allocation, foul and surface water strategies must be part of a holistic site-wide strategy. Pumped drainage systems must be minimised and a proliferation of pumping stations on a phased development will not be acceptable.

11. Landscaping proposals must evaluate and identify opportunities for sustainable surface water management. Landscaping proposals, including proposals for tree-lined streets, must be integrated with the strategy for sustainable surface water management.

We also recommend the following additional explanatory text.

Explanatory Text

Application of the hierarchy for managing surface water will be a key requirement for all development sites to reduce flood risk and the impact on the environment. Clear evidence must be submitted to demonstrate why alternative preferable options in the surface water hierarchy are not available.

Foul and surface water drainage must be considered early in the design process. Sustainable drainage must be integrated with the landscaped environment and designed in accordance with the four pillars of sustainable drainage (water quantity, water quality, amenity and biodiversity). It should identify SuDS opportunities, including retrofit SuDS opportunities, such as green roofs; permeable surfacing; soakaways; filter drainage; swales; bioretention tree pits; rain gardens; basins; ponds; reedbeds and wetlands. Any drainage should be designed in accordance with 'Ciria C753 The SuDS Manual', sewerage sector guidance, or any subsequent replacement guidance.

The hydrological assessment of the site must consider site topography, naturally occurring flow paths, ephemeral watercourses and any low lying areas where water naturally accumulates. Resultant layouts must take account of such circumstances. Applications will be required to consider exceedance / overland flow paths from existing and proposed drainage features and confirm ground levels, finished floor levels and drainage details. Drainage details, ground levels and

finished floor levels are critical to ensure the proposal is resilient to flood risk and climate change. It is good practice to ensure the external levels fall away from the ground floor level of the proposed buildings (following any regrade), to allow for safe overland flow routes within the development and minimise any associated flood risk from overland flows. In addition, where the ground level of the site is below the ground level at the point where the drainage connects to the public sewer, care must be taken to ensure that the proposed development is not at an increased risk of sewer surcharge. It is good practice for the finished floor levels and manhole cover levels (including those that serve private drainage runs) to be higher than the manhole cover level at the point of connection to the receiving sewer.

Holistic site-wide drainage strategies will be required to ensure a coordinated approach to drainage between phases, between developers, and over a number of years of construction. Applicants must demonstrate how the approach to drainage on any phase of development has regard to interconnecting phases within a larger site with infrastructure sized to accommodate interconnecting phases. When necessary, the holistic drainage strategy must be updated to reflect any changing circumstances between each phase. The strategy shall be prepared in liaison with infrastructure providers and outline how each phase interacts with other phases.

In addition to the above general policy relating to drainage, we request that you include site-specific policy regarding the approach to drainage when allocating sites, preferably informed by a flood risk assessment / drainage strategy. When allocating all new major development sites, we request that your site-specific policy clearly states that applicants must make space available in their proposals for multi-functional sustainable drainage. We recommend the following wording.

Recommended Policy / Key Development Consideration

Applicants must identify land at the site that ensures the delivery of multi-functional sustainable drainage in accordance with the four pillars of sustainable drainage which is integrated with the landscaped environment.

It is important that the new local plan and any associated design guidance includes clarity in relation to the requirement for sustainable drainage systems on sites. This clarity is critical to avoid regulatory / policy uncertainty and ensure a level playing to developers operating in a competitive setting when acquiring a site (see Sustainable drainage and new housing developments, Payne, Walker, Illman and Sharp, 2023). We strongly recommend that policy and design guidance clearly identifies the need for major developments to make space for multi-functional sustainable drainage systems. As evidenced in the aforementioned research, clarity of policy requirements will help to secure better sustainable drainage results in the final design of the development. We believe that adding this clarity to site-specific policy helps to remove uncertainty, which in turn helps to contribute to a level playing field during the land acquisition process.

Water Efficiency and Climate Change

We recommend that the local plan includes a policy requirement for new development to be built to the optional water efficiency standard prescribed in Building Regulations. A tighter water efficiency standard in new development has multiple benefits including a reduction in water and energy use, as well as helping to reduce customer bills. Building Regulations includes a requirement for all new dwellings to achieve a water efficiency standard of 125 litres of water per person per day (l/p/d).

At the current time, Building Regulations includes a requirement for all new dwellings to achieve a water efficiency standard of 125 litres of water per person per day (l/p/d). In 2015 an '*optional*' requirement was introduced which is currently set at 110 l/p/day for new residential development. This can be implemented through local planning policy where there is a clear need based on evidence. We have enclosed evidence to justify this approach. As you will see from the evidence, we believe that the optional standard can be achieved at no additional cost[1]. We are therefore supportive of criterion 3 of Policy EN1 (Strategic Policy: Well Designed Places). However, we recommend the following amendments:

3. All new dwellings must comply with the nationally described space standards, and higher water efficiency standards (currently equivalent to 110 litres/person/day). All major non-residential development shall incorporate water efficiency measures so that predicted per capita consumption does not exceed the levels set out in the applicable BREEAM 'Excellent' standard.

The Water Environment including Groundwater Source Protection Zones and Public Water Supply Catchment Land

The Environment Agency has defined Groundwater Source Protection Zones (SPZs) for groundwater sources, which are often used for public drinking water supply purposes. **The prevention of pollution to drinking water supplies is critical.** The SPZs signify where there may be a particular risk from activities on or below the land surface. Such activities include construction. The details of SPZs can be viewed on the website of the Environment Agency. We would also be happy to provide details if that would be helpful.

We wish to highlight that new development sites are **more appropriately located away** from locations which are identified as sensitive groundwater protection areas especially within and adjacent to Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1 (SPZ1) which is closest to the water abstraction point and the most sensitive. This is of relevance given the presence of SPZs in Central Lancahire. The location of SPZs can be found on gov.uk and we request that you refer to these in your approach to site selection. The position of United Utilities is that when considering a range of sites to meet development needs, it would be more appropriate to identify new development sites, which do not encroach on SPZ1.

Similarly, development proposals on water catchment land can have an impact on water supply resources and therefore we recommend that you include a policy which identifies the need to engage with the statutory undertaker for water to determine whether any proposal is on land used for public water supply catchment purposes. Please get in touch for information on the location of catchment land in the borough.

In cases of wind energy proposals on water catchment land, the applicant should seek to locate development so that the impact on public water supply is minimised through the location of the development and through the undertaking of appropriate risk assessments and inclusion of mitigation measures in the design and construction process. It is particularly important to avoid the location of new wind turbines on deep peat land. We recommend you include the following policy relating to water catchment land.

In this context, we wish to recommend the following amendments to Policy EN12:

[1] See Table 3 of Future Homes Hub Water Ready A report to inform HM Government's roadmap for water efficient new homes (April 2024)

Policy EN12: Protecting ~~Groundwater Source Protection Zones and Public Water Supply~~ the Water Environment and Public Water Supply

1. In consultation with the Council and relevant statutory bodies, applicants must, where required, consider the potential impacts on water quality resulting from the design, construction and operation of proposed development. Where necessary, development proposals should include measures to reduce any risk to the water environment and aim to protect and improve water quality.

2. ~~1.~~ Development proposals must accord with the latest national guidance on Groundwater Protection.

3. ~~2.~~ New developments must:

a)Not have a detrimental impact on ~~ground~~water quantity and quality ~~caused by water run-off into nearby waterway~~;
b)Consider effective and efficient disposal of wastewater; and
c) Seek to increase water availability, and protect, and where possible improve, the quality of the water environment ~~rivers or groundwater where possible~~.
4. ~~3.~~ Where necessary, applicants will be required to undertake a risk assessment (quantitative and qualitative) of the impact on the ~~ground~~water environment (including groundwater) and public water supply. Development will only be acceptable where it is demonstrated to the Local Planning Authority that there will be no unacceptable impact on the ~~ground~~water environment and public water supply.
5. Development proposals may need to be supported by appropriate management and maintenance plans to protect the water environment.

Explanatory Text

Any risk assessment will be expected to comprise a quantitative and qualitative risk assessment and mitigation strategy to manage the risk of pollution to public water supply and the water environment (including groundwater). The risk assessment should be based on the source-pathway-receptor methodology and provide detailed information on ground conditions. It shall identify all possible contaminant sources and pathways for the life of the development and provide details of measures required to mitigate any risks to the water environment and public water supply during all phases of the development. Subject to the outcome of the risk assessment, the mitigation measures may include the highest specification design for the new foul and surface water sewerage systems (pipework, trenches, manholes, pumping stations and attenuation features). It may also identify that the principle of development is not acceptable.

Careful masterplanning may be required to mitigate the risk of pollution to public water supply and the water environment. For example, open space should be located so that it is closest to the boreholes in a groundwater source protection zone in order to minimise the potential impact on groundwater. Similarly, windfarm proposals should be laid out to avoid unacceptable impacts on peat.

A development management plan will be required to identify the potential impacts from all activities related to the development both during construction and during the operational life of the proposal. The management plan shall address how activities on water bodies, groundwater, public water supply, and surface water will be managed through the identification and implementation of appropriate mitigation measures necessary to protect and prevent pollution of these waters. For

example, an appropriate management regime may be required for open space features in a groundwater source protection zone.

For sites located in a SPZ or on water catchment land, we request that the key development considerations / site-specific policy identify the constraint and the need for development to be appropriately mitigated / managed.

Policy EN4: Amenity
Development near to Wastewater Treatment Works and Pumping Stations

In accordance with our enclosed lists of sites, we wish to highlight that there are sites which are in proximity to wastewater treatment works / wastewater pumping stations. For these sites, we request that there is site-specific policy / a key development consideration which clearly references the need for relevant impact assessments and potential mitigating measures. This is specifically relevant to Land at Emnie Lane, Leyland and Woodlands, Southport Road, Chorley, which are addressed above.

We also request that Criterion 3 of Policy EN4 is amended at follows.

3. ~~Developments should be sited and designed to ensure that they would not have a significant negative impact on the operation of adjacent businesses and/or facilities ('Agent of change' principle).~~ ***'New development should ensure that the occupiers of new developments will enjoy an appropriate standard of amenity and will not be adversely affected by nearby uses and vice versa. When applicable, applicants will be required to submit the relevant impact assessments, outlining any adverse effects from the nearby site, and any required mitigation.'***

United Utilities Property Interests

According to our records some of the possible future development sites contain easements and rights of access which are in addition to our statutory rights for inspection, maintenance and repair. These easements and rights of access have restrictions that must be adhered to. It is the responsibility of the developer to obtain a copy of the document, available from United Utilities' Legal Services or Land Registry and to comply with the provisions stated within the document.

We recommend that the landowner/developer contacts our Property Services team at PropertyGeneralEnquiries@uuplc.co.uk to discuss how any proposals may interact with our land interest. Our easement, pipe structure and access rights should not be affected by the design and construction.

United Utilities Property Interests are included on the enclosed list. We request that these interests are reflected in the Key Development Considerations for all sites.

Reservoir Flooding

There are a number of reservoirs within Central Lancashire, each with its own reservoir flooding zone, showing how far flood water would spread from the reservoir in the unlikely event that a

reservoir failed. These maps are available on the Environment Agency website at https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map.

In relation to reservoir flood zones, we draw your attention to the advice within the National Planning Practice Guidance on Flood Risk and Coast Change. This states that the local planning authority will need to evaluate the potential damage to buildings or loss of life in the event of dam failure, compared to other risks, when considering development downstream of a reservoir.

Local planning authorities will also need to evaluate in Strategic Flood Risk Assessments (and when applying the Sequential Test) how an impounding reservoir will modify existing flood risk in the event of a flood in the catchment it is located within, and/or whether emergency draw-down of the reservoir will add to the extent of flooding.

When allocating land for development within a reservoir flood zone, local planning authorities should also discuss their proposed site allocations with reservoir undertakers (such as United Utilities) at the earliest opportunity, in order to:

- avoid intensification of development within areas at risk from reservoir failure; and

- ensure that reservoir undertakers can assess the cost implications of any reservoir safety improvements required due to changes in land use downstream of their assets.

Developers should be expected to cover any additional costs incurred, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework's 'agent of change' policy (paragraph 187). This could be through Community Infrastructure Levy or section 106 obligations for example.

The list of sites affected by reservoir flood risk are not included in the enclosed information. We will however provide this information by separate cover as soon as possible. We request that where sites are located in a reservoir flood risk location, the issue must be reflected as a constraint in a site-specific policy / key development consideration.

Summary

Moving forward, we respectfully request that the councils continue to consult with United Utilities for all future planning documents. We are keen to continue working in partnership with the Central Lancashire authorities to ensure that all new growth can be delivered sustainably. In the meantime, if you have any queries or would like to discuss this representation, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully

Andrew Leyssens
Planning, Landscape and Ecology
United Utilities Water Limited

Enc *Site Specific Issues and Constraints Identified by United Utilities Water Limited*