

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Content

Meeting 01 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with the Education Team at LCC.....	3
Meeting 03 Duty to Cooperate meeting with the Public Health Team at LCC	11
Meeting 04 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with the Education Team at LCC.....	13
Meeting 05 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with the Education Team at LCC.....	17
Meeting 06 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with Various Teams at LCC	19
Meeting 07 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with Education Team at LCC	26
Meeting 08 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with the Economic Growth Team at LCC	28
Meeting 09 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with the Education Team at LCC.....	30
Meeting 12 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with West Lancashire Borough Council	32
Meeting 13 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with Wigan Council	39
Meeting 14 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with West Lancashire Borough Council	41
Meeting 15 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with Transport for Greater Manchester* (Agenda only).....	43
Meeting 16 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with Bolton Council	44
Meeting 17 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with Wigan Council	46
Meeting 18 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with Blackburn with Darwen Council, Fylde Borough Council, Ribble Valley Borough Council and Wyre Borough Council.....	48
Meeting 19 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with West Lancashire	52
Meeting 20 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with Bolton Council, Wigan Council and Greater Manchester Combined Authority.....	56
Meeting 23 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with West Lancashire Borough Council	60
Meeting 24 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council.	65
Meeting 25 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Steering Group	67
Meeting 26 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Steering Group	72
Meeting 27 SFRA Steering group meeting	74
Meeting 28 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Steering Group	75
Meeting 29 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Steering Group	77
Meeting 30 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Steering Group	82
Meeting 32 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with Natural England.....	86
Meeting 34 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Steering Group	88
Meeting 35 Meeting with Natural England	89

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 36 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with Historic England	90
Meeting 37 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with Natural England	92

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 01 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with the Education Team at LCC

Central Lancashire Local Plan Review



Strategic Planning (Duty to Cooperate) between
Lancashire County Council as Local Education
Authority and Central Lancashire Local Plan



Thursday 17th October 2019 10am-12pm, County Hall

Notes form the meeting

ATTENDEES

Carolyn Williams, Central Lancashire Team	Chris Blackburn, Preston City Council
Zoe Whiteside, Chorley Council	Steven Brown, South Ribble Council
Alison Marland, Chorley Council	Jonathan Noad, South Ribble Council
Chris Sinnott, Chorley Council	Catherine Lewis, South Ribble Council
Ben Terry, Lancashire County Council	Andrew Curtis, Lancashire County Council
Mel Ormesher, Lancashire County Council	Lynn MacDonald, Lancashire County Council
Mike Kirby, Lancashire County Council	Marcus Hudson, Lancashire County Council
Chris Hayward, Preston City Council	David Cahill, Lancashire County Council
Drew Gough, Preston City Council	

1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND APOLOGIES

Apologies from Mel Ormesher, Chris Hayward, Jonathan Noad and Chris Sinnott.

Marcus Hudson MH Chaired the meeting and opened up with welcomes and invited all attending to introduce themselves to the rest of the group. MH understanding of this meeting was to start a new conversation with LCC Education to support the review of the Central Lancashire Local Plan. The early discussions will feed into the provision of school places across the three districts. It should be noted that item 6a Health and Transport was a late addition to the agenda however, there was not the time to ensure officers with specialist knowledge would be available. These specialist areas will be picked up in later meetings. There was a recognised need for the early introduction to move towards a Memorandum of Understanding MoU between all parties around the table and produce a Statement of Common Ground SoCG of all future requirements to ensure smooth adoption of the plan.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

2. LOCAL PLAN

a. Context

Carolyn Williams CW explained the structure of the Central Lancashire Local Plan team supported by officers from each of the three districts as required. CW explained the team is supported by a Joint Advisory Committee JAC made up of councillors from the three districts who also sit on specific committees within their districts.

The JAC is not a decision-making body. It is an advisory body which considers the challenges of the review and the approach to be taken in developing the new Local Plan. The JAC meeting dates will be circulated to LCC with the potential of officers attending to feed in specific issues of future school places and to explain the methodology applied to assist the JAC with decisions.

CW presented power point slides to the group as a brief overview of the local plan review. The council's main challenge will be allocating enough land for housing and employment to meet the housing targets. Two call for sites consultations have already taken place with a third planned as part of the issues and options consultation taking place from 18th November until 14th February 2020. The two previous consultations resulted in 495 sites being submitted, including duplications. Work is planned to assess the suitability and viability of the site suggestions to take forward as deliverable sites in the Preferred Options. The time required to complete the full assessment of each site suggestion may put back the planned preferred options stage.

Comments received from the districts regarding concerns from members regarding the perceived lack of school places. This issue was raised by Alison Marland AM from a recent Chorley members meeting, quoting the requirement of Chorley children to travel out of the borough to access schools and those travel distances required, especially the rural areas.

b. Timetable

Currently the timetable is 6 months behind schedule, however hoping to make time up. The plan is to move the review to Preferred Option by the end of 2020 however, early 2021 may be realistic based on the number of sites that need to be assessed.

The Issues and Options consultation will take place over a 12-week period 18th November 2019 to 14th February 2020, the third call for sites consultation will form part of this consultation.

The review of the local plan may also be affected by the additional work to review all evidence around issues of climate change, a factor the government has put on all councils and a subject that has been well publicised recently.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

The question was asked about the City Deal and how this sits with the Local Plan review. The response was that the City Deal delivery will sit outside of the housing targets per annum for the councils. How the planning teams deal with City deal housing numbers and how this will impact on education provision is still to be agreed. MH confirmed this.

c. Evidence

Zoe Whiteside ZW provided a brief update of the work so far to meet the new guidance from the government. The Standard Housing Method is applied to those areas with plans over 5 years old. (This method differs from the figures used in the Core Strategy with higher target figures for each district, in particular Chorley when you factor in Buckshaw)

All three councils will now be using this method; Chorley may have some concerns with their delivery as their availability reduces year on year. The target for the three councils is 1026 per annum and this figure will be used to inform a MoU (which will be lower target than the adopted Core Strategy) which will be presented to JAC for approval. The review team has engaged with Icen Projects Consultancy to provide the evidence and undertake an additional housing needs study. (However, this document has **not** been distributed due to errors within and will be corrected before it is distributed following approval at the next JAC meeting)

d. Housing Need

Based on the information it is expected **1026** new homes across the three districts per annum and split with the following percentages and targets.

District	Percentage	Housing for New Plan per annum
Chorley	27.5%	282
Preston	40%	410
SRBC	32.5%	334
Total	100	1026

Comments from the elected members have welcomed the new targets and applying the Standard Method as a starting point rather than aspirational higher targets of previous plans.

Lynn Macdonald LM asked how those figures stacked up against City Deal trajectories and Drew Gough DG responded that PCC are working on new trajectories, but the City Deal figures are likely to be much higher.

Chris Blackburn CB recognised the challenge of Preston not having a 5-year supply due to the undersupply from the Local Plan figures, and as such being open to building in areas not allocated. The new Standard Method is a minimum requirement.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Steven Brown SB commented that the housing targets for City Deal don't balance with member's aspirations and are looking towards Green Belt release for housing which will be challenging and a sensitive issue for the members to agree to, therefore the council are faced with a great challenge if the Green Belt land does not come forward.

3 SUMMARY OF KEY EVIDENCE TO DATE

The recent call for sites consultation received 495 potential sites however a lot of them are green belt and safeguarded land and will need to be assessed individually against detailed site assessment criteria as well as consideration of viability and deliverability. Chorley have put forward some site suggestions from the submissions received (around 69 sites) and this includes existing safeguarded land, the rest have just put out all site submissions received with no suggestions as to which could come forward. The general consensus is they fall short of sites to deliver the new housing target and employment land requirements.

There is a need to get CIL and viability in place for Preferred Options document. Affordable housing is more important to members than anything else on new developments which may affect the viability of some sites, education will be an additional burden for developers on top of this so could make some sites unviable.

PCC will be heavily reliant on NW Preston City Deal sites and will continue to grow in this area, in particular land around the Western Distributor Road. They hope to achieve a better distribution of development.

PCC do not have as much green belt as other districts and therefore it is not as sensitive an issue. There is likely to be a lot more development on the outskirts of Preston and across villages not just new settlements, this will impact on school provision in the area.

SRBC expect Green Belt developments and two large settlements to come forward, however, they may look to reduce or de-allocate development on the urban spine which creates concerns for delivery of housing, and higher delivery costs for education and highways infrastructure.

MH asked the CLLP team where do they see the way forward of scores or criteria of future housing around all infrastructure. CW responded that an Integrated Assessment Pro forma is being developed that will help in this process. This will consider environmental, social and economic impacts of Sustainability Appraisal (SA) as well as including health impacts (HIA) and Equality Impacts (EqIA).

AM commented that Chorley have taken forward land in principle as site suggestions, however these are subject to the assessments discussed. The site suggestions identify 185ha of land with significant targets in Clayton and Whittle-le-Woods. This includes existing

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

allocations that are considered suitable to be rolled forward for housing use. The members of Chorley ideally want to see a new Secondary school in this area and expansion of primary schools. AM provided a hard copy of the sites, but this was to be kept confidential until the Issues and Options consultation is launched.

MK asked if, when applying the criteria to housing, site assessments could take into consideration schools currently with existing capacity and that potential contributions are factored in at this early stage. The new DfE guidance from the government stresses that developers should be paying for infrastructure needs. LCC should be included in the appraisal of sites for early comment.

It was agreed the Central Lancashire team will provide site appraisals to LCC for comment of additional need at an early stage of the process, allowing adequate time for assessment

CB commented that viability should be applied from the outset not when the developer comes back in the later stages with viability issues, particularly around affordable housing.

LM secondary conversation and issues around equalisation needs to happen early in the process and have agreement on how it will be applied by all. There is some caution advised of committing too early for new school provision, it may be the case that the plan is revisited several times, in particular since the primary school base-line changes.

BT advised there is an emerging strategy on inclusion and the needs of early years and Special Educational Needs and Disabilities in school places planning. New school site footprint will need to be larger to accommodate the need, plus the costs per place for SEND places are much greater than with mainstream pupils due to some of the complexities approximately (50k per pupil as a guide). Other groups' needs such as early years, nursery and further education need to be considered in early discussions, as well as SEND.

AM asked about changes to the strategy based on the updated guidance from the DfE. LM responded that this is ongoing but will take place when more is understood of the new guidance and how it links with the strategy for Children and Young People which is currently under review.

3 EDUCATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS 2021-2036

a. Planning & Allocating for Educational Land Provision

MH asked about the evidence of lack of school places and the issues of travel. AM added that councillors can often look inward and can base their assumptions on district boundaries and don't always recognise the options across the district boundaries.

MK commented at this stage the DfE guidance for developers to pay for school places to mitigate their impact.

BT commented on the performance score cards from the DfE and the high level of forecasting accuracy LCC achieves. It should also be noted that the cost of pupil place

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

delivery by LCC is higher than the figure asked for by developers. However, in a challenging financial climate it is something that is being looked at to reduce this is ongoing work. Geographical Priority Areas (GPA) can influence choice when applying for a school. The Pupil Access Team work on GPAs and admission criteria and School Planning Team can make suggestions and try and influence but have no influence for academies who manage their own GPAs and admission criteria. This is particularly evident in Chorley with a high proportion of secondary schools converted to academy.

The current strategy looks to expand existing schools where appropriate to meet the need. Discussions took place around the modular approach of building which is something that LCC are looking at. It was agreed that it would be prudent to get elected members on side for this in advance rather than when the planning applications come forward. Building up within schools or developing new two storey schools on smaller sites has seen greater costs than single storey. Requirements of disability and safety require additional resources, for example lifts that require ongoing maintenance.

LCC can start with a headline position and define as detail is provided where the housing is likely to be built and information comes through the planning process. The approach has been used with the district councils in their LP process which has been through recent examinations. The overall need is assessed minus the surplus at that point across the schools.

LCC can provide with some accuracy the five-year position based on a number of factors that influence it. For example, the 5-year housing land supply from the districts, the birth rate and migration of pupils. Only housing with planning permission is used but the total housing of the plan can be applied hypothetically to inform of the areas of potential need as a headline. Forecasts beyond 5 years will be more heavily caveated. CLLP would need to provide information into this headline work.

LCC will retain the current pupil yield methodology and can supply a worst case and average yield scenario to the Standard Methodology, providing beyond this is caveated and assumed factors such as birth rates remain the same.

MK reiterated the challenging financial constraints LCC faces at the current time with a current stock of schools with condition issues that also need addressing, against the backdrop that the authority also faces a deficit of approximately 60m.

LM advised the basic need pot of money from government is set then divided out between authorities and is not ring fenced. LM also informed the group that there has been no basic need allocation from the government for 2022 and beyond due to the government delayed spending review. At the same time DfE have strengthened their message that developers should be mitigating the impact of new housing. Therefore, there is expected to be a greater need to secure developer contributions.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

5. THE ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION

The consultation will take place over 12 weeks from 18th November until 14th February 2020 and will include the 3rd call for sites consultation. The responses are to be coordinated by Richard Sharples LCC who has agreed this. Responses using Citizenspace which is an online consultation portal are encouraged. A number of drop-in sessions will be planned across the three district councils with some dates confirmed so far, a full list of the sessions will accompany the consultation.

It was agreed that a timeline would be drawn up and agreed for SPT to be involved in participation with as much information as possible to enable SPT deadlines alongside all of the other education delivery.

The JAC will be a useful way of getting the message across to councillors.

It was agreed to look to create a set of standard responses for the FAQ's regarding education to inform the public, in particular those that come through social media.

There is also a need to set timescales for the review of CIL as a key mechanism on costs. It is likely to maintain a level not increase due to viability.

6. NEXT STEPS

a. Health and Transport

It was agreed that this item was added late and therefore no colleagues were able to attend with specialist knowledge and will be addressed at further meetings ensuring that more notice can be provided.

Further evidence and report work is underway regarding Transport and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment SFRA which will determine some of the site evaluations of against flood risk which will set out if a development can proceed through to the next stage of evaluation. Work has taken place with LCC regarding the SFRA but has experienced delay due to information in a format that was unusable. This has now been scanned in but has set back the timescales for evaluating sites.

7 AOB and ACTIONS

There were no additional discussions under AOB however, there are a number of agreed actions.

School Planning Team;

Provide a summary headline of education position (including other services in education)

Provide a standard piece for social media responses for any education enquiries – FAQ document to be send. (LCC would be happy to discuss the content of the FAQ document further with districts).

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Provide the information of the standard footprint methodology

Expectations around school land should be stated (eg flat site, free from contamination etc.)

Central Lancashire Strategic Planning;

Provide list of dates for the JAC meetings and workshops for the purpose of attending and advising the members education needs and the forecasting process and improve member engagement.

Forward the housing paper from Icenl once corrections have been made and agreed by JAC.

All information can be filtered through Andrew Curtis SPT who will distribute across the team.

8 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING(S)

It was decided to look at a meeting date once the emerging consultation has closed. It is likely to be in March 2020. The Central Lancashire team are looking to use the Exchange as venue to host a developer's forums to take place in December 2019 and this includes presentations on skills and apprenticeships from the LEP Skills hub and Runshaw College. It was suggested that this event may be an opportunity for the needs of 16 to 19 education team to attend, something for the team to consider in their preparations.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 03 Duty to Cooperate meeting with the Public Health Team at LCC

Central Lancashire Local Plan

Duty to Cooperate session Preferred options Part 1

Discussion with LCC on health matters

3rd February 2023

Agenda and Follow-up Actions

1. Introductions
2. Update on the Local plan and areas still to be developed
3. Issues for discussion
 - PD approach to Hot food takeaways
 - Local PD's covering health issues and wider areas of health e.g. Active travel, 20 min neighbourhoods
 - Introduction of Active travel England – LCC view
 - Provision of extra care facilities for ethnic groups in Central Lancashire – No Council provision provided which addresses cultural need
4. Any issues to address in work going forward
5. Next steps

Note

One council response from LCC. Hot food takeaways advice and adaptable homes. Add link to LCC health pages to CLLP website

Main areas of comments around active design principles and broadening HFT= takeaway policy. Final area in support statement for all homes which are not socialist to be built to adaptable standards.

HR Takeaway policies. Gateshead and North Tyneside policies good learning point. These areas restructured HR outlets in most areas. Has resulted in a reduction in HFT's overall. On its own not tackling obesity but is helping. HFT's increasing in number across Lancs and within the most deprived areas. Exposes these areas to high density of poor food option and higher obesity levels in kids. Exclusion zone 400m around secondary schools, comfy with restrict on opening times, but want stinger on areas where they meet obesity thresholds.

- need direction of where to get this data.

Would restrict new HFT in all but 2 wards across CL. Blackpool have adopted a similar policy and was challenged by KFC. Can see areas adopted policy are successfully using this to refuse new HFT's Evidence will be part of the response to the Plan.

Rosendale did have something on the healthy food offer at an outlet by LCC asked them to remove that as no one can control it.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Active travel – Liveable neighbourhoods – East Lancs LURB fund award. 20 min neighbourhoods down to low traffic neighbourhoods. Use to implement across E. Lancs but want it adopted as design guidance for LCC.

Working group with transport colleagues for the Local plan and transport colleagues.

Integration of LCWIP

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 04 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with the Education Team at LCC

Central Lancashire Local Plan Review



Strategic Planning (Duty to Cooperate) between
Lancashire County Council as Local Education
Authority and Central Lancashire Local Plan



Friday 20th October 2023 10am-11.20pm, County Hall

Notes from the meeting

ATTENDEES

Emma Price, Central Lancashire Team

Carolyn Williams, Preston City Council

Zoe Whiteside, Chorley Council

Chris Hayward, Preston City Council

Katherine Greenwood, Chorley Council

Drew Gough, Preston City Council

Chris Sinnott, Chorley Council

Mel Ormesher, Lancashire County Council

1. Welcome and Introductions

Apologies from Chris Hayward and Chris Sinnott.

Mel Ormesher (MO) Chaired the meeting and opened with welcomes and invited all attending to introduce themselves to the rest of the group. MO understanding of this meeting was to start a new conversation with LCC Education to support the preparation of the Central Lancashire Local Plan. MO then stated that there is a willingness on behalf of LCC Education to meet in 4-6 weekly increments and explained the restructuring of LCC Education since the last meeting between them and the Central Lancashire parties.

2. Local plan progress – where we are and headline dates.

Zoe Whiteside (ZW) began with a description of the schedule for Local Plan deliverables. Working backwards from the consultation for Draft plan which is expected to take place in July/August of 2024, there is an expectation that the site selection process will be completed by December 2023/January 2024. Zoe Whiteside (ZW) explained that not all sites were assessed in full for the Preferred Options Part One consultation and therefore more work would have to be done to finalise sites, especially in Preston and South Ribble. The importance of submitting the plan for examination by the June 2025 and adoption December 2026 was stressed, especially for Chorley who is currently not meeting their 5-year housing supply needs.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

MO briefly explained that LCC Education is undertaking a consultation with the 12 Lancashire District Councils to ensure that each understands Education's methodology for choosing sites for school allocations. They are currently researching outside examples of two-tier systems to compile best practices and introduce a more streamlined process in Lancashire. ZW stated that this would be extremely helpful, and MO offered to present to members at the next JAC meeting.

ACTION: Emma Price (EP) to arrange for MO to be invited to speak at the next JAC on December 4th, 2023.

3. Site Selection update and key milestones

Katherine Greenwood (KG) provided an update on site assessments explaining that sites are currently under review by heritage, flooding, and highways. These assessments are projected to be completed and a final list of site options (along with site specific policies) provided by early 2024.

MO explained that Education has recently updated their 'shopping list' for what makes a good site for a school. They are also moving towards a two-form capacity for primary and four-form capacity for secondary schools.

ZW brought up the question of multi-purpose outdoor spaces for public and school use (outside of school hours). MO spoke about the merits of this but also the complications in terms of funding and safety. The issue of suitable land allocations being provided for schools was also mentioned as often sites are subject to flood risk and sloping which makes development difficult. LCC Education are currently reviewing a design code for school sites.

Carolyn Williams (CW) stated that the councils are still working on assessing the site allocations through the SHELAA process which could impact on the number of sites being considered suitable and consequently and future need for new schools to which MO responded that LCC Education would like to be kept informed early on about site allocations so that they can accurately predict the need for school sites. Engaging early would mean that the best sites would be chosen and would mitigate the potential for being given undevelopable sites.

MO explained the methodology for their decision to extend and/or build new schools. MO explained that when pupil numbers for an entire authority are broken down further, smaller areas often do not have the need that others do for a new school. MO also explained that negotiations with existing schools can be difficult because of the multiple parties involved (it is not solely LCC involved in Education, there are also Academy Boards and Religious bodies involved in many). MO also explained that projecting is difficult because birthrate overall is dropping, movement into and out of areas is what is driving pupil numbers which is difficult to accurately predict.

MO stated that there is a need for a policy in the new Local Plan regarding flexibility of community spaces. This is to ensure that if a site does not come forward for a school, it can be allocated for a different community use rather than housing.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

All attendees stated that it would be beneficial for a visual explanation of how LCC Education decides where and when schools are built be provided. This would be intended to help planning officers explain to members why a school is or is not being provided in particular locations. The need for a statement from LCC Education about school provision, and the complexities of it, was also emphasised. MO agreed and will provide a statement.

ACTIONS:

1. CW to set up a separate meeting with LCC education over City Deal.
2. CLLP team to review policies about community infrastructure.
3. MO to provide a statement and visual explanation of school provision methodology.

4. Schools Planning Team Written Representation to Part One Preferred Options

MO began by saying that LCC Education needs to know more information on a local basis but will work as hard as possible to have a statement on what they are provided. ZW emphasised that January 2025 is when sites will need to be locked down.

CW brought up a Preston specific school issue which will be addressed in a separate meeting as LCC is still consulting elsewhere on the topic.

5. General Consultation feedback from Preferred Options Consultation on school places/provision

Due to time constraints this item was unable to be discussed. However, given the discussions in other items it is clear that there is an understanding on behalf of LCC of local priorities and issues.

6. Methodology and process for assessing impact on preferred site options for schools' places – school planning areas /timings/ how it fits into the programme/what would be published as part of Preferred Options (draft Plan)

This item was touched upon in previous items and then circled back to in the final minutes. ZW asked where authorities specifically fit into the Education methodology/timeframes. MO explained the timeline for bringing an allocation forward, explaining that ideally, they are approached early on to assess a site's appropriateness. However, due to capacity, it is difficult to assess sites which will not be brought forward for 5-10 years. Conversations with landowners so far in advance are also difficult due to the speculative nature.

The main question raised was, how specific do the authorities need to be with their sites for schools? It was discussed in response that none of the Central Lancashire Authorities currently have the available lands for new school sites and therefore pinning down exact locations would be difficult. MO also stated that they are looking strategically at school provisions, especially for pupils with special needs and so thinking about this when allocating sites will be important.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

7. How new school place provision would be envisaged to be financed – land /development costs – Sec106/CIL etc.

ZW stated that this will be an important line in the new IDS.

8. Key messages/feedback to JAC /lead members about next steps

Due to time constraints, this item was not specifically discussed. However, under the first item it was agreed that MO will present at the next JAC meeting.

9. Preparation of a Statement of Common Ground

ZW explained the importance of an evolving and up to date Statement of Common Ground. A planning policy officer at Chorley Council is currently reviewing the existing SCG along with other examples and creating a draft which will be sent out to LCC and other consultees.

ACTION: send the draft Statement of Common Ground to LCC once completed.

10. AOB

There was no other business to cover at the conclusion of the meeting.

11. DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING(S)

The next meeting will take place before the JAC on the 4th of December.

ACTION: EP to set up the next meeting.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 05 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with the Education Team at LCC

Mel Ormesher is chairing

Date: 8/1/2024

Introductions

- Mel Ormesher
- ZW
- Katherine Greenwood
- Emma Price
- Catherine Thomas
- Ben Vickers
- Carolyn Williams
- Drew Gough
- Ben Terry
- Paula Durrant

Recap from last meeting

- Zoe update on the LP work
 - o Updating that we will be going straight to publication version and the next 12 months are focused on preparing a draft plan to be submitted on time (meeting gov. deadlines)
 - o SFRA level one completion for end of March followed by the part 2
- KG update on site selections
 - o Awaiting LCC highways, level one SFRA and part 1 transportation
 - o MO has requested information from last meetings actions (information from estates teams)
- ZW brought up members are keen to understand the process for schools allocation
 - o MO suggests we need to inform members at the right time
 - o MO states that the numbers sent in the first school projections can change over time and informing members of these expected changes is needed

BT suggests that housing need (housing projections including densities) is needed to determine school need. This information will also help determine which schools need to be expanded. ZW spoke about the representations received regarding schools and the importance of demonstrating to an inspector how school places will be accounted for. BT reassured that the forecasting approach will allow for sufficient information for inspection.

Action: send JAC dates to Mel (Speak with Paula and Ben to arrange JAC presentation)

Action: MO to send the 'shopping list'

Action: send LCC the next iteration of housing projections

ZW updated on the LDS and the decision to go straight to publication version rather than have a part 2 preferred options. ZW requests a methodology specific to CL to publish as evidence (a topic paper or evidence note). BT states that this will be used as evidence/justification in the inspection. BT

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

states that equalisation needs to be covered and has the biggest impact on funding. CW brought up the issue of funding coming from CIL in Preston due to City Deal. Marcus Hudson joined the meeting at 15:06 and explained that discussions are ongoing regarding City Deal and future funding for schools.

CW asked for clarification that the existing identified schools sites are still acceptable/in the mix and BT and MO confirmed that they are.

Action: send the statement of Common Ground once updated

Action: Julie to set up another meeting in the back end of February

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 06 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with Various Teams at LCC

Minutes

Topic	Action
Meeting Title	Duty to Cooperate: Strategic matters between the Central Lancashire Authorities and Lancashire County Council
Time and Date	10:00-12:25 pm Friday 18 th October 2024
Location	County Hall - CHG:05
Present	<p>Central Lancashire: Benjamin Vickers - Team Leader (Policy) (South Ribble) Carolyn Williams – Planning Manager (Preston) Chris Hayward – Director of Development and Housing (Preston) Elizabeth Hindle – Head of Planning and Enforcement (South Ribble) Emma Price - Planning Officer (Central Lancashire Local Plan) Eric Kwok – Project Manager (Central Lancashire Local Plan) Zoe Whiteside – Head of Spatial Planning (Chorley)</p> <p>Lancashire County Council: Andrew Ascroft - Senior Public Health Practitioner Chris Dunderdale - Senior Flood Risk Officer Emma Prideaux - Project and Planning Manager George Edmonson - Flood Risk Officer Marcus Hudson - Head of Planning and Transport Richard Askew - Major Transport Infrastructure Delivery Manager Robert Taylor – Planning and Environment</p>
Apologies	Catherine Thomas - Planning Manager (South Ribble) Gayle Wootton – Director of Planning and Property (Chorley and South Ribble) Katherine Greenwood - Principal Planning Officer (Chorley) Neil Stevens – Highways (Lancashire County Council) Ray Bennett - Highways (Lancashire County Council)

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Central Lancashire Local Plan Progress	
<p>EP informed everyone present that the meeting will be minuted and that the discussions will be used to inform a future Statement of Common Ground between the three Central Lancashire Authorities and Lancashire County Council (LCC).</p> <p>EP and CW presented a PowerPoint on the progress of the Central Lancashire Local Plan (CLLP).</p> <p>Topics presented included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What Duty to Co-operate is; - Previous Local Plan consultations; - The draft spatial strategy including: Spatial Vision and objectives, Settlement Hierarchy, and map; - The Local Plan document structure; - Ongoing and future evidence; and - Key strategic matters to be discussed. <p>RT raised a question about what the blank areas on the presented map are and CW responded that they are areas of Countryside which still need to be confirmed.</p>	<p>*Note</p>
Community Facilities	
<p>1.1 Education Provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CW stated that Preston City Council (PCC) have met with LCC separately - CLLP cannot provide a tenure mix for proposed allocations, LCC confirmed that because of this, they will work on a 'worst case scenario' basis (i.e. imagining every dwelling is a 4-bed) - CLLP will share the draft education policy with LCC - Concern was raised over supplying land for new schools - ZW raised concern over the Reg. 18 response from LCC education, discussions with LCC about future school sites in Chorley needs to take place - A separate DtC meeting with LCC education officers will be arranged - CW asked if LCC want education taken out of City Deal but still want S106 funding, MH confirmed - CW stated that Preston Northwest required its own assessment - MH stated that if there are proposed sites, a lot of work and surveying needs to take place, and quickly 	<p>*Note</p>

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ZW mentioned that this all links to the IDP and for Chorley, alternative sites might need to be in the Green Belt. Because of this, school places need to be confirmed by Reg. 19 - MH stated that it is difficult to prescribe school places. Master planning provides a comfort blanket. MH then suggested an education masterplan for Central Lancashire. - CW and BV confirm that masterplans will be required for strategic sites <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Wording in site policies will state that master plans will be required and must be informed by ‘x,y,z’ action plan. o Based on this discussion, it was agreed that CLLP will explore an education action plan document <p>1.2 Other Matters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ZW brought up the accelerated timeline for plan-making due to proposed changes to the NPPF and that speedy replies from LCC are needed. MH responded that LCC requires time and clear deadlines when requested by CLLP to look over policies etc. - It was agreed to build into the SoCG that any issues not fully resolved within this Local Plan, will be for the next one. - It was also agreed that funding and CIL will need to be addressed in the SoCG 	
<p>Public Health</p>	
<p>2.1 Hot Food Take-Aways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ZW opened the discussion by requesting Central Lancashire Specific topic papers/evidence from LCC for the hot food take-away policy and asking if they will come to examination to represent it – LCC agreed to attend examination - AA outlined three policies that LCC would like to be involved in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Hot food take-aways o Specialist Housing – aligned to Adaptable Homes o Active Design - AA said that he will provide CLLP with supporting data/evidence for the hot food take-away policy but need more information about what the proposed topic paper would need to contain. He stated that they can only provide a level of evidence that would be reasonably acceptable for any other policy to be based on 	<p>*Note</p>

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There was a discussion where concerns were raised about the strictness of the proposed hot food take-away policy and that the DM perspective needs to be considered. It would be difficult to have a ban on new hot food take-aways when they are often ‘anchor’ businesses for new developments and refusing them could negatively impact viability. On this basis, LCC agreed to adopt the approach taken in Rossendale’s Local Plan. <p>2.2 Residential Care</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ZW introduced the topic of residential care, stating that CLLP need to engage with LCC on the matter - CW brought up that a major concern for PCC is residential care which caters for Asian communities. Currently many do not meet religious and cultural requirements – MH and CW agreed to meet separately to discuss 	
<p>Transportation</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BV went through the draft policies explaining what they contain and what evidence documents were used to inform them <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o BV explained that some were difficult to write because the IDP and strategic transport assessment are not yet completed so the Reg. 19 policies may be more generic before modifications - RA suggested changing the title of ST2 to ‘sustainable <u>and active</u> travel’ – CLLP agreed - MH reminded everyone that this is an opportunity for a ‘vision-led’ approach, and the policies should reflect this – CLLP agreed to share draft policies with LCC - MH suggested a ‘white land’ policy for future transportation infrastructure needs – CLLP agrees - RA stated that Oxford have set the standard for active and sustainable travel – CLLP agrees to look at their policies - AA reminded CLLP to examine the Sport England Active Design Principles – CW confirms that we have incorporated them in the Plan - A discussion took place about the importance of access to sustainable travel options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Transport for the North’s Transport Related Social Exclusion (TRSE) indicator and tool were explained and suggested incorporated – CLLP agreed to consult with 	<p>*Note</p>

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

<p>TfN and other local transportation providers (especially those who responded to the Reg.18 consultation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DS stated the importance of making sure that sustainable travel is included in masterplans (especially in the phasing breakdown). DS also stated that modelling is LCC's priority, but policies must look at safety as a priority – there are currently discussions with Active England on the topic. - MH built off of DS point saying that CLLP needs to encourage more than just capacity and that if safety etc. is incorporated into the policy then it will provide better 'hooks' for everyone to use. - CLLP agreed to send draft policies to LCC and look into drafting a policy related to TRSE - RT stated the importance of considering the transportation links between new and existing developments – CLLP agreed to explore requiring this through master planning 	
<p>Environment</p>	
<p>5.1 Flood Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CW introduced the CLLP draft policies related to the environment - CD confirms that the LCC flood team has been consulted throughout the plan-making process and would like for this to continue – CLLP agreed to send draft policies to LCC - CD stressed the importance of ensuring that policies reflect all forms of flooding – he then confirmed that LCC have seen and commented on the L1 SFRA - CW explained that the L2 SFRA is currently being undertaken and will be shared once completed - CD discussed the multifunctionality of sustainable drainage systems and how these can be used for many things, including amenity purposes and as part of the Green Infrastructure Network <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o CD requested that through policy the CLLP encourages divers drainage systems and how these will be maintained over time (stressed that above ground is usually easier to maintain long-term) - CD also stated that it is important to consider where water goes, and how this links to highways infrastructure <p>5.2 Climate Change/Biodiversity Net Gain</p>	<p>*Note</p>

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RT confirms that Debbie King (LCC officer) is happy to be consulted about Biodiversity Net Gain for the CLLP - ZW confirmed that she has spoken with Debbie and that CLLP and LCC will work together, but in terms of timing this will likely be post-Reg.19 consultation through modifications - CD noted the link between BNG and sustainable drainage 	
<p>Economic Development</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CW began the discussion with an overview of the Employment Study outcomes stating that each authority can meet their own need individually. LCC raised a concern over strategic sites and CW stated that there is one site in PCC which is still under review for allocation as deliverability is questionable. - Emma Prideaux brought up the issue of strategic sites and how they may change over time (i.e., ones that seem unrealistic to come forward in this plan period could come forward quite quickly after a few years), and we need to be prepared for that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o CLLP agree to address this in the SoCG and amend as needed - CH stated that master plans need to be in place before a strategic site can be allocated and therefore it is not realistic for some to be included in this Plan - CLLP agree for the wording within the SoCG to about ‘working together and adjusting as time goes on’, and ‘not an issue in this LP but will be addressed in the next’. There is also agreement to hold a separate meeting specifically for strategic sites with LCC - CW raised the concern that for employment, many businesses do not want purpose-build and that self-build needs to be considered 	<p>*Note</p>
<p>Housing</p>	
<p>7.1 Housing Need</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ZW began the discussion by explaining the outcomes of the Housing Needs Study and how need will be met across the Single Housing Market Area (Central Lancashire) with Preston and South Ribble taking on some of Chorley’s need. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Further explanation was given to how monitoring will be done on an individual basis - ZW then went through each policy explaining where evidence is still in progress and therefore no final policy draft is available. 	<p>*Note</p>

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CLLP to send LCC the final site allocations (housing and employment) once confirmed <p>7.2 HMO Policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CW explained the HMO policy approach, specifically in Preston where an article 4 direction is being introduced banning new HMOs from the City Centre (following Blackburn’s approach) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Clarification is given that applications can still come forward, but the applicant will have to demonstrate need - PCC agreed to share the draft HMO policy and evidence with LCC - EH explained that South Ribble and Chorley have a different perspective on HMOs and the policy will reflect this. ZW confirmed. <p>7.3 Accessible Homes and Specialised Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AA brought up the need for all new homes to be built to M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings standard. The discussion was then about the needs for Future Homes to be incorporated, although this may become a viability issue. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o EH agreed to check with building control about the status of Future Homes. o AA agreed to recirculate the Adaptable M4(2) Homes Public Health Advisory Note - CLLP agreed to send the specialist housing draft and evidence report (once completed) to RT - MH brought up the need to provide for Children’s Homes and CLLP committed to consider including it in HS12: Specialist Housing or the next Local Plan - CLLP to include mention of parking for Children’s Homes in the Parking Standards policy 	
<p>Any Other Business</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RT requested a policy to protect waste allocations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o CW confirmed that CLLP have a policy on agent of change and that minerals and waste sites will be reflected in the policy map o CLLP agreed to liaise with LCC when building the policy map 	<p>*Note</p>

*Please see separate ‘Action Items’ note for a list of actions

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 07 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with Education Team at LCC

Minutes/Notes

Meeting Title Duty to Cooperate: Strategic matters between the Central Lancashire Authorities and Lancashire County Council Education

Time and Date 14:00-15:00 pm Monday 11th November 2024

Location Teams Meeting

Attendees

Central Lancashire:

Zoe Whiteside (Chorley)
Katherine Greenwood (Chorley)
Benjamin Vickers (South Ribble)
Carolyn Williams (Preston)
Emma Price (Central Team)
Eric Kwok (Central Team)
Georgia Smith (Preston)

Lancashire County Council:

Paula Durrant – School Place Planning Manager (Education)
James Teasdale – School Planning Officer (Education)
Julie Hartley – School Planning Principal (Education)

Apologies

Marcus Hudson – Planning (Lancashire County Council)
Ben Terry – (Education)

Items

Items
Presentation on CLLP Progress
<ul style="list-style-type: none">EP presented a PowerPoint outlining the progress of the Central Lancashire Local Plan which included the spatial vision, policy title list, and timetable
Round table discussion of education issues in each Central Lancashire Authority
<ul style="list-style-type: none">More information is needed about Chorley allocationsGood discussions are already happening between Preston and LCC. There is potential need for a new school in Northwest Preston and in Preston West there is need for master planning. CW asked about the City Centre as there is a potential need for primary spaces, there is also a development with higher amounts of bedrooms within units which could mean an increased need there.BV updated for South Ribble stating that they will be quite reliant on the draft policy and that Pickering's Farm has a primary school approved as part of the current permission, but they would like to know if there is any more education

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

<p>provision needed there. Longton will also be an allocation where there will be a big local impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• JH asked for further clarification on Pickering's Farm which BV responded stating that there will be approximately 2300 dwellings on the site• PD asked about the status of Curdale Garden Village which BV responded that it will not be included in this Plan as Green Belt is not being released. However, Cuerden will be allocated for mostly employment with a small element of housing.
<p>ACTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• South Ribble to send LCC their allocations list
<p>Draft Education policy for the Central Lancashire Local Plan</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• PD confirms that the list in the proposed policy is correct• JH asked about the status of Camelot as an allocation to which KG responded stating that it will not be allocated in this Plan.• BV confirms that the land adjacent to Golden Hills School that was promoted by LCC will be allocated
<p>ACTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Chorley and SRBC to send their allocation shapefiles to LCC• KG to send information on the 2 secondary school sites for Chorley to LCC
<p>Next Steps</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Home teams to complete the actions above• Central Lancashire to send the SoCG for review once drafted
<p>AOB</p>

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 08 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with the Economic Growth Team at LCC

Agenda

Meeting Title	Duty to Cooperate: Strategic matters between the Central Lancashire Authorities and Lancashire County Council (Economic Development)	
Time and Date	12:00-13:00 pm	Monday 11 th November 2024
Location	Microsoft Teams Meeting	

Attendees	Central Lancashire: Gayle Wootton (Chorley and South Ribble) Chris Hayward (Preston) Zoe Whiteside (Chorley) Carolyn Williams (Preston) Elizabeth Hindle (South Ribble) Emma Price (Central Team)
	Lancashire County Council: Emma Prideaux Marcus Hudson Peter Thomas

Apologies

Items		
1.	Introductions	5 mins
2.	Overview of last DtC Meeting Discussion	mins
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- EP (LCC) stated that these meetings came about through strategic meetings between GW and MH- In place to discuss the partnered working between CLLP and LCC for identifying how economic priority setting in CLLP can be	
4.	Strategic Sites	mins
5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Riversway- Salmesbury – not in a position to allocate (not deliverable at this time)	
6.	Statement of Common Ground	
7.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- LCC is concerned that Salmesbury enterprise zone could come forward quite quickly and worry that CLLP could miss out- GW Reviews happen every 5 years- ‘early trigger’ that if there is a trigger of earlier development of the area, then there will be an early review of the LP (for Cuerdale and Logic site) – not in a position at the minute but if there is an economic need shown then this could trigger and earlier review- ‘we will agree to share our knowledge of employment enquiries about needs’- not the fact that it’s an enterprise zone, it’s the nature of what’s going on there that’s attracting high-tech companies	

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cuerden – CH asks if its ‘close enough’ for development of those high-tech uses – EP (LCC) says no, maybe, but not likely - the importance is planning for these so they’re ready to go when they can come forward (EP (LCC)) - CH says our priority is getting the CLLP through – how do we make a statement saying ‘we recognise this, but will work it out for the next plan – EP N(LCC) likes GW statement that we could put the earlier review caveat in - GW looking for new land for an extension of EZ is not feasible – we haven’t done a green belt review as we have sufficient land to meet employment needs outside the green belt, we don’t have the applications/information for BE Group to adjust the report <p>BE Group report – CW we need to understand the enquiries LCC note they have received and need to know form LCC what we need to be looking at allocating. We can talk about adding in text for the employment section about how we see the plan developing, mention we are aware of the long-term goals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GW suggests we keep the plan as it is, put out the Reg. 19 consultation and then as a part of the response for the reg.19 we agree wording that would be in the SoCG saying the suggested text for the SoCG - Need to honour the ‘back and forth’ approach to SoCG drafting - CH suggests a ‘partial review’ of the CLLP rather than full looking particularly at these sites if evidence is available stating this is needed <p>ACTION: LCC confirm what they can share with LPA ACTION: LCC to share a list of enquiries to establish information on further employment need for strategic sites (EP LCC to discuss with Rachel the estates manager) ACTION: Map of employment allocations to be sent to EP LCC ACTION: Employment Policy Drafts to be shared in the coming days with LCC ACTION: CLLP have a go on wording for the SoCG and Reg. 19 response from LCC (end of next week)</p>	
9.	AOB	5 mins

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 09 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with the Education Team at LCC

Agenda

Meeting Title	Duty to Cooperate: Strategic matters between the Central Lancashire Authorities and Lancashire County Council Education	
Time and Date	13:00-15:00 pm	Tuesday 8 th April 2025
Location	Lancashire County Hall LP 1:03	

Attendees	Central Lancashire: Katherine Greenwood (Chorley) Benjamin Vickers (South Ribble) Carolyn Williams (Preston) Vicki Thompson-Spears (Central Team) Eric Kwok (Central Team)
	Lancashire County Council: Ben Terry – Education Emma Marriott – Education Julie Hartley – Education Paula Durrant – Education Marcus Hudson - Planning

Apologies	Helen Hatch (South Ribble)
------------------	----------------------------

Items

1. Introductions 5 mins
2. Minutes from last Meeting 10 mins
No further actions are required.
3. CLLP Progress – Regulation 19 Consultation and Education Needs 25 mins
EK explains the current progress on the Central Lancashire Local Plan. CLA has received a submission from LCC Education on 19 Dec 2024 in relation to the current update of the CLLP. Including the update of the school place demand. LCC Education is looking forward to further liaison with the CLA to determine how the education requirements from the Local Plan sites will be mitigated and the potential location of new school sites.

CLA also signed a statement of Common Ground with LCC to agree the housing development proposed in the CLLP will require growth in the local schools. Both parties agree that sites allocated in Policy HC3 will be safeguarded for education uses.
4. School Delivery Programme 15 mins
 - About the Funding and Timeframe for the identified need

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

BT confirmed that South Ribble can meet their school demand within the borough as the high school at Lostock and Penwortham had been expanded. South Ribble will not need to build extra/education school to meet the school place for their own needs.

However, there will not be enough high school places for Chorley in the future as the current demand is being met by the high school at South Ribble. Those supply will be decreased as they need to meet their own demand in the future.

Action: To send LCC Education the housing trajectory for all three districts.

Action: For Chorley, send the high school options to LCC Education.
(Note: Sent to LCC Education on 8.4.2025 by Eric)

Conversations concerning high school demand and limited availability within Chorley. Discussed CLA had previously sent site suggestions with three sites (now two with one ruled out), however, due to staffing issues/changes, the information has not been reviewed. This information has been re-sent to LCC for review.

- | | | |
|----|---|---------|
| 5. | Next Steps – Statement of Common Ground | 20 mins |
| 6. | AOB | 5 mins |

Action: To set up a regular meeting with LCC (including different departments, education, transport etc) before submission to discuss any outstanding plan/strategic planning matters

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 12 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with West Lancashire Borough Council

Duty to Co-operate Meeting, Central Lancashire and West Lancashire, Teams Meeting 9am 18/11/21

Attendees: Carolyn Williams (Central Lancs), Katherine Greenwood (Chorley), Zoe Harding (South Ribble), Zoe Senior (Preston) and all collectively representing the Central Lancs local authorities; Stephen Benge, Neil Macfarlane (West Lancs Borough Council)

Background

NM set out the background to the meeting. DtC is a legal requirement and WLBC have produced a DtC Statement to accompany the current Local Plan Scope, Issues and Options public consultation. This was the first meeting to take place between the local authorities since November 2019. NM said that it would be useful to use an amended template of issues, based upon the Liverpool City Region Statement of Common Ground (LCR SoCG) in order to work through the relevant matters in a structured way (completed below – thanks to ZS for helping this). This could identify matters for further consideration at future DtC meetings and those where there are no strategic / cross boundary issues which do not appear to need further discussion.

Local Plans

West Lancashire

SB outlined that West Lancs started work on new Local Plan in January 2020. Consultation on Local Plan Scope, I&O began on 18/11/21 and runs until 27/1/22. Late 2022 targeted for consultation on sites and development numbers, 2023 Publication stage with adoption by end of 2024. It proposes a 15-17 year plan period with less growth than in the previous (and ceased) draft Local Plan Review (LPR). Work on the earlier Local Plan Review started in 2017 and it had a 30 year plan period to 2050. Preferred Options consultation in 2018. A large amount of development was proposed; it focussed on Skelmersdale particularly, including M58 logistics provision. Members made the decision to stop work on LPR in autumn 2019. West Lancs have completed the circulated Central Lancs Housing Needs Questionnaire.

Central Lancashire

CW gave CLLP update on Local Plan timescales; I&O public consultation took place Nov 19 – Feb 20, an outcomes report was produced in autumn 20 and Preferred Options planned for public consultation in summer 2022. CW also updated on latest evidence base studies under preparation by appointed consultants e.g. Local Plan Viability and IA studies, and evidence base updates likely to be needed in future. Current staff shortage in CLLP team and staff resource pressures in home teams due to amount of housing public inquiries; update and background provided to these including MoU issues. The Inspector at the Pear Tree Lane,

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Euxton appeal considered that the MoU was out of date. Chorley wrote to government to say they are not progressing Local Plan because staff resources are focused on planning appeals but no response from government yet.

CLLP team aiming to address staff shortage with a Framework approach from January 2022 and have added some agency support staff.

1. The table below presents West Lancashire Borough Council's understanding of the strategic cross boundary matters jointly affecting our authority areas:

Strategic cross boundary matters	Description / summary of issues
<p>Planning for housing needs</p>	<p>SB – WLLP 324 homes / year average; 185 Standard Method. Iceini housing and employment needs study not yet complete – Members looking at this at moment but needs consulting on in coming months.</p> <p>In terms of CL, housing requirements resulting from the standard method were much higher for Chorley and lower for South Ribble and Preston when compared to the Development Plan. This was causing (unresolved) issues and there had been several housing proposal appeals; there was felt to be inconsistency in appeal decisions, some appeals were currently outstanding in Chorley and there was a JR in South Ribble. This was holding up Local Plan progress. Preston and South Ribble housing completions were above SM figures but Chorley were below.</p> <p>DLP Planning were undertaking work on the standard method and what would be an appropriate distribution of it (approx. 1000 dwelling p.a. in total) between the CL authorities. Housing densities work recently completed.</p> <p>Gypsy and Travellers WL had issues re flood risk Zone 3 affecting site suitability; trying to find sites – risk that the Local Plan could fail on this issue. Chorley have an identified need of 10 pitches. Informally agreed that CLLP can't meet West Lancs Gypsy and Traveller site needs due to need for land for housing and employment land supply across Central Lancs over the plan period and similarly WL could not meet CLLP needs.</p> <p>ZS at PCC to check whether land ownership has changed for the Rosemary Lane site PR4 OHB consulted upon in the CLLP Issues and Options Paper, formerly an LCC owned site with temporary permission (APP/N2345/C/10/2124104-9;</p>

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

	<p>06/2014/0032 – approved 08/07/14 for 2 years) – the land is not currently listed for sale or to let at: https://www.lancashire.gov.uk/business/business-services/land-and-property-sales/</p>
<p>Planning for employment needs</p>	<p>WL - Relatively low take up of local employment sites. No appetite in West Lancs for large scale logistics, need likely to be taken up by nearby authorities, including St Helens.</p> <p>CL - BE Group completed 1st draft of a partial Employment Land Study update for CLLP with a full update to be complete in 2022.</p> <p>CLLP –doesn't include EZs in Employment Land calculations because they meet a regional need. South Ribble need small and medium sized sites for employment.</p> <p>CW – Need to tie in with the Greater Lancashire Plan – West Lancs to look at this when available. CW has asked LCC for an update on this, who will attend DPOG in January 2022, need to find out what environmental and economic datasets that LCC has access to. Greater Lancashire Plan likely to focus on Samlesbury, EZs and UCLan growth – needs to be reflected in CLLP.</p> <p>Informally agreed that both the CLLP and West Lancs are unable to meet any of each other's housing and employment needs; both parties understand the importance of meeting own needs in own Local Plan areas.</p>
<p>Approach to the Green Belt</p>	<p>West Lancs will need GB release for next Local Plan. Will consider GB tests within a wider assessment of potential site allocations. Consultation running on approach to CLLP GB sent to West Lancs on 04/11/21; SB to respond.</p> <p>CL _ Land Use Study Green Belt issues – due to report in draft in Dec 2021 – checking GB boundaries and if any areas not functioning as well as others against the GB tests. A lot of the CLLP potential GB release sites put forward are not sustainable with poor or no transport or infrastructure links. Looking if need Safeguarded Land Policy going forward.</p> <p>Green Belt is unlikely to be an issue between the authorities but this should be kept as an item under review.</p>
<p>Approach to town centres, meeting retail</p>	<p>West Lancs Retail Study and Leisure Study completed by Peter Brett Associates in 2018. Lots of comparison retail expenditure leakage outside of the Borough, Study</p>

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

<p>needs and the retail hierarchy</p>	<p>recommends trying to clawback some of this. Gap in foodstore provision identified in north of Borough (although Aldi subsequently have planning permission near Tarleton). Future retail and leisure growth, particularly evening economy leisure uses recommended to be focussed to Skelmersdale town centre (other main WL centres are Burscough and Ormskirk).</p> <p>Since study has been completed there has been the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic and resultant increase in internet retail spend which will have affected town centre retail and leisure demand. Update of 2018 Study will be needed. Use classes change nationally (e.g. wide E use class) needs a policy response; presently want to allow for flexibility in changes of use but keep active frontages in daytime.</p> <p>CLLP retail and leisure evidence base provided by WYG studies, latest in 2019 but a refresh may be needed in light of impact of Covid-19. Identified retail and night-time economy use needs but have lost national multiple (chain stores) retailers in Preston and need to consider how this should be addressed. Town centre improvements at Leyland as part of a Town Deal.</p> <p>Animate scheme update (in Primary Shopping Area): A Development and Funding Agreement for the city centre scheme has been approved. A revised planning application was submitted in late 2021 App. Ref: 06/2021/1589. Subject to planning permission being granted, anticipated opening in spring 2024. The development is to contain an eight-screen cinema, bowling alley, restaurants, bars and a 'competitive social unit' e.g. crazy golf, climbing wall etc.</p> <p>Further to recent discussions with BDP, LCC and UCLan, Preston Station Quarter Regeneration Framework likely to come forward rather than as SPD. Stakeholder communications on the SQRF are being organised.</p> <p>Post meeting: NM has checked the WL Retail Study which indicates expenditure leakage from WL; there is some to Preston but generally appears to be limited competition between WL and CL areas. Conclude that the approach to town centres is unlikely to generate major issues between the respective authorities.</p>
<p>Planning for transport infrastructure and addressing impacts</p>	<p>Briefly discussed transport studies. NM of the view that transport matters in West Lancs are unlikely to influence / extend into CLLP area. Exception may be Bank Bridge,</p>

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

	<p>Tarleton in relation to east-west movement network resilience (if bridge temp closed). LCC have indicated they may investigate this in the future. WL have a Saturn model built by LCC to assess LP development options.</p> <p>Post meeting: having checked, this model's outer area extends into Central Lancs – all 3 authorities - so suggests this is a matter to keep under review.</p> <p>West Lancs has a Green Infrastructure (GI) and cycling strategy, which focuses on cycling and mentions linear parks and planned improvements to the Leeds-Liverpool canal, it proposes a West Lancs Guild Wheel style cycle route. There is a linear park on the west bank of the River Douglas that is partly under construction. See GI topic for details. LCC have indicated that the WL Highways and Transport Masterplan needs to be updated.</p> <p>Post meeting: The Skem Rail project, which would entail a new station in Skelmersdale connecting to the existing Liverpool Central – Kirkby - Wigan Wallgate railway line. is effectively at the end of GRIP3 (Option Selection with the completion of the Strategic Outline Business Case).</p> <p>Other potential future transport infrastructure was briefly discussed including Burscough Curves and the Ribble Crossing. Aspiration for the latter but unlikely to be delivered in CLLP period as no identified funding for it. CLLP team was not consulted on proposals for this.</p> <p>In terms of CL, LCC have not indicated they will update the CL Highways and Transport Masterplan. Chorley have commissioned a Stage 2 Transport Strategy to assess potential Local Plan sites; the Charnock Richard junction needs looking at. There is a combined rail study which looks at closed Midge Hall (on Ormskirk-Preston line) and Coppell stations. There is no date for the Lancashire LTP update.</p>
<p>Approach to digital inclusion</p>	<p>No identified strategic cross boundary issues.</p>

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

<p>Planning for utilities</p>	<p>CLLP – CW directly engaged with utilities stakeholders 2 years ago on CLLP.</p> <p>WL in communication with UU and other stakeholders.</p> <p>No identified strategic cross boundary issues.</p>
<p>Approach to coastal change management and flood risk</p>	<p>West Lancs: Hesketh Out-Marsh managed retreat approach in Shoreline Management Plan. Have a Level 1 SFRA (Dec 2019) and a detailed Level 2 SFRA (May 2020).</p> <p>Chorley Safeguarded Land linear site to east of town centre is at risk for fast and over 2m deep flooding according to EA data – West Lancs to share data (done). Chorley is looking at the site as part of the CLLP and is aware of the flood risk issue.</p>
<p>Renewable energy</p>	<p>2019 Renewable energy study done for West Lancs. May do an update; No apparent appetite for solar farms.</p> <p>CLLP – recent solar farm community energy site submitted for in last month so not in public domain yet (site location therefore withheld from note). Therefore, keep issue under review.</p>
<p>Approach to protection of internationally protected habitats</p>	<p>Not discussed in detail, one for a future meeting. WL have joined the Liverpool City Region Joint Recreation Mitigation Strategy, southern bank of River Ribble will be surveyed (Ribble Estuary is a European designated habitat site). The RMS will set an approach to mitigate for visitors from new residential development to European designated sites.</p>
<p>Approach to air quality</p>	<p>Not discussed and unlikely to be strategic cross boundary issues.</p>
<p>Approach to waste management</p>	<p>Not discussed and less likely to be strategic cross boundary issues.</p>
<p>Approach to minerals</p>	<p>Not discussed and less likely to be strategic cross boundary issues.</p>

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

<p>Approach to planning for community facilities, including healthcare, education and cultural infrastructure</p>	<p>Cultural infrastructure not discussed.</p> <p>Healthcare – Hospitals issue for Preston Royal Hospital and Chorley regarding ongoing proposals concerning accessibility of PRH from motorway from rest of Lancashire and urgent care at Chorley strategic changes proposed. Changing the hospital offer at both hospitals has been proposed but a consultation was not produced – West Lancs has seen some press articles. DPOG issue.</p> <p>Education – There is a shortfall of school places across high schools in Central Lancashire which may have scope to put pressure on school places at West Lancs. West Lancs not aware of any cross boundary issues for school places because of distance to CLLP area and poor transport links between the two areas.</p>
<p>Green and blue infrastructure</p>	<p>Discussed briefly, strategic cross boundary issues probably limited. Consider more at a future meeting.</p> <p>WL do not have a GI Strategy as such (The GI and Cycling Strategy is more about the latter). Evidence comprises an Open Space Study and a PPS (both 2018).</p> <p>River Douglas linear park – South Ribble implications, northern half under construction, Parish Council led project on west bank. Longstanding aspiration to bridge the river, is any funding available from LCC to do this? Would enable England Coastal path linkage into South Ribble (east bank of Douglas).</p>

a) Do you agree with the strategic cross boundary matters identified?

b) Are there any other strategic cross boundary matters which should be included within the table?

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 13 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with Wigan Council

Central Lancashire Local Plan

DtC session Preferred options Part 1

Discussion of Matters with Wigan Council

27th January 2023

Agenda and Actions

1. Introductions
2. Update on the Local plan – CW
3. Issues for discussion
 - Housing& Employment need
 - Transport links/improvements
 - School places
4. Any issues to address in work going forward
5. Next steps

Notes from the meeting

Mia Crowther on highways at TfGM, NH raised issue throughout. SRN capacity and impact on that. NH want each site to contribute to SRN. TfGM worked with them to address the NH issues raised and to make the sites suitable

Education – school age not changing much in wigan despite new developments, so not noticing increase in demand specifically. Shev high may provide capacity for Coppull but standish wont. Standish best school in area and oversubscribed. We are aware that education teams talk and accept some inward/outward migration for school places.

No appetite for train station serving Wigan in Coppull. TfGM looking at potential for station in Standish and more appetite for that but still hard to achieve. Issue with ability track to accommodate the increased traffic and HS2 main reason. Very costly development. Also looking at tram/train options. CW noted work they had done on this with the rail study, specifically with SRBC/West Lancashire side going into the Preston area and this involves work with Merseytravel.

Rationalising way people pay for bus – Bee network. Won't affect services that operate in Lancashire to GM, but could affect those from GM to Lancashire

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Failed LUF bids.

Plans for off road cycle routes, need for us to work closely on LCWIP work, contact below for who to inform work on the CLLP area LCWIP at wigan, maybe linkages to be made on work being planned.

Steven.riley@wigan.gov.uk.

Wigan doing transport update themselves above that done for the PfE, need to work with them on this

Wigan starting on LP now and will engage with us at key stages. CBC commented on first stage works in 2022

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 14 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with West Lancashire Borough Council

Duty to Cooperate Meeting with West Lancashire Borough Council

Date: 08/02/2023

Attendees

- Carolyn Williams
- Katherine Greenwood
- Jessica Jarman
- Georgia Smith
- Neil Macfarlane
- Christine Whittle

Introductions

Are all the sites those that have been submitted?

- Many sites in the GB
- Outstanding large applications
- Insufficient evidence
- Exceptional GB release
- Exploring the use of a growth option

Notes

Challenges of GB release for the plan

NPPF changes

Very little employment sites- commuter towns

Potential of allocated employment sites- under review

Position of not using each other to meet housing needs and traveling community

Meeting transit need, using approaches from Leeds and London

PPTS and cultural needs

Transit needs- illegal inhabitants

Bank bridge, junction 27

Update LLC masterplan for CL- running alongside the LP

Rail studies- Cottom Transforming Cities Fund

Positive feedback from the possibility of Midge Hall station

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Possible HS2 developments at Preston

Bee Network coming to Chorley

Part delivery of a linear park along western bank of River Douglas on the boarder of Chorley and South Ribble

England coastal path

Tram linkages to Sefton

Meeting with active travel LCC and WL

Linkages with Leeds and Liverpool canal (with Wigan) towpath

Tram train

Coastal management plan

Educational pressures towards West Lancashire

School need for Preston going to South Ribble, Leyland Town Centre taking Chorley need

Chorley educational capacity reached

Preston needs primary and secondary and have sites allocated for them

Expanding Reg 18

CHP proposals

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 15 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with Transport for Greater Manchester* (Agenda only)

Central Lancashire Local Plan

DtC session Preferred options Part 1

Transport for Greater Manchester

21st February 2023 at 10.00am

Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Update on the Local plan
3. Issues for discussion
 - Impact on highways of proposed schemes – Motorway/main roads
 - The Central Lancashire Highways and Transport Masterplan
 - The Central Lancashire Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan
 - Bus ticketing/franchising
 - GM Clean air zone Update
4. Any issues to address in work going forward
5. Next steps

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 16 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with Bolton Council

Central Lancashire Local Plan

DtC session Preferred Options Part 1

Discussion of Matters with Bolton Council

31 January 2023

Agenda and Actions

1. Introductions
2. Update on the Local plan – CW
3. Issues for discussion
 - Housing and Employment need
 - Transport links/improvements
 - School places
4. Any issues to address in work going forward
5. Next steps

Bolton involved in PfE- no housing sites just 3 sites for employment, but housing sites coming in anyway as have no 5yhts

PfE sets out housing for district level and employment for GM as a whole.

Housing has stepped trajectory but need a trajectory justification as EiP making them take theirs out. Having been able to say they have the numbers in the first 5 years so opposite to CLLP.

Lot of changes asked relate to wording. Lot of talk as to where policies directed i.e. at local plans or decision making. PfE is a spatial strategy level, need clarity on role of the plan.

Number areas proposing to add GB sites into the mix through LP's. In light of NPPF changes still carry on with EiP under current rules.,

PfE was to do GB release at the early stages so LP's would not revisit this, but that's not happened.

No progress in own LP.

GM on providing on employment deliberately as past growth trends below par for aspiration due to low past delivery

Bolton looked at employment sites for housing but most surrounded by industry.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

National Highways signed a SoCG with NH. NH insisted on work to do on the SRN and don't do a lot of work with them to remove objections in relation to the SRN. GM have done their own study on this and costed the work needed etc and done on worse case scenario.

HE played a big role in the EiP as well and CPRE and Gb groups

PfE has a policy on lorry parking

Education issues, need for secondary schools in the next 2 years to meet demand, and academies lowering position on intake numbers due to not wanting in year admissions.

G&T issue – issue that has been ducked in GM for some time. The GTAA suggested need for transit sites. PfE also ducked the issue, the GTAA was done 3-4 yrs ago, MCC have recently updated theirs after closing down a site recently. Bolton also having problems around their and management of their site too.

Need for transit G&T movements

Bus issues take up with Mia Crowther at TfGM.

Graham Langley in highways for LCWIP – also involved

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 17 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with Wigan Council

Wigan Borough Local Plan Preparation – Duty to Cooperate

Note of meeting

Wigan Council – Chorley Council

Date: 2 pm, 08 May 2024

In attendance:

Wigan Council: Stephen Lamb, Steven Riley

Chorley Council: Zoe Whiteside, Katherine Greenwood, Eric Kwok, Emma Price

Wigan Council (WC) provided a brief summary of the work undertaken so far for the emerging Wigan Borough Local Plan, including consultation on its scope and consultation on Options and Preferences.

It was explained that an Economic Market and Employment Land Assessment was being prepared, which indicated a need for better quality employment sites in the borough. Further Regulation 18 consultation was planned for June 2024 on economic growth and land for employment development. WC intended to undertake consultation on a draft plan in early 2025, with submission anticipated in June 2025.

Chorley Council (CC) stated that consultation on the draft Central Lancashire Local Plan was also intended to take place in early 2025, with submission in June 2025.

WC stated that none of the proposed new employment allocations in Wigan were in close proximity to Chorley. The employment allocation at M6 Junction 26, was identified as the closest allocation. WC stated that the development of this land could provide much improved road access to the Heinz site and Martland Park avoiding Orrell Post and Pemberton.

WC stated that they intended to meet their Places for Everyone housing requirement within the borough and that 6 potential housing allocations were identified in the Options and Preferences document, but that they were not located near the Chorley boundary.

Wigan stated that they intended to meet identified traveller need within the borough.

CC highlighted that there was significant pressure on secondary school place provision in the borough. WC said that they would liaise with their school planning team to see what the position was in the north of the borough.

No issues were identified in relation to cross-boundary health care.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Cross-boundary bus travel was identified as an issue, with some barriers to travel from Chorley to Wigan and Greater Manchester. WC are discussing cross-boundary transport matters with Lancashire County Council.

WC confirmed that they had met with Highways England to discuss impacts of the Local Plan on the strategic road network and that the site promoters had been asked to undertake preliminary transport assessments for proposed allocations.

CC asked whether Wigan had any plans to require biodiversity net gain of greater than 10%. WC do not anticipate inserting a requirement of more than 10% as part of the Local Plan process.

In terms of town centres and retail development, Wigan stated that the Galleries Shopping Centre redevelopment was well underway, and that this would diversify the town centre offer, introducing more residential and leisure uses, including a hotel.

Wigan confirmed that they would circulate the notes of the meeting for agreement.

Notes by Wigan Council, 28 May 2024

Circulated to Chorley Council for comment / agreement 28 May 2024

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 18 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with Blackburn with Darwen Council, Fylde Borough Council, Ribble Valley Borough Council and Wyre Borough Council

Minutes

Meeting Title Duty to Cooperate: Strategic matters between the Central Lancashire Authorities and Blackburn with Darwen, Fylde, Ribble Valley, and Wyre

Time and Date 14:00-16:00pm Wednesday 6th November 2024

Location Microsoft Teams Meeting

Attendees

Central Lancashire:

Emma Price – Planning Policy Officer (Central Team)
Eric Kwok – Project Manager (Central Team)
Katherine Greenwood – Principal Planning Officer (Chorley)
Carolyn Williams – Planning Policy Manager (Preston)
Elizabeth Hindle – Head of Planning and Enforcement (South Ribble)
Catherine Thomas – Planning Manager (South Ribble)
Shaun Knights – Planning Officer (Preston)
Georgia Smith – Planning Officer (Preston)

Neighbouring Authorities:

Laura Ainscow – Gorst Principal Strategic Planner (Blackburn with Darwen)
Julie Glaister – Planning Policy Manager (Fylde)
Eddie Graves – Principal Planning Policy Officer (Fylde)
Nicola Hopkins – Director of Economic Development and Planning (Ribble Valley)
Yvonne Smallwood – Planning Officer (Policy and Development) (Ribble Valley)
Fiona Riley – Planning Policy Manager (Wyre)
Len Harris – Senior Planning Officer (Wyre)

Apologies

Zoe Whiteside – Head of Spatial Planning (Chorley)
Benjamin Vickers – Principal Planning Officer (South Ribble)
Mark Evans – Head of Planning (Fylde)

Items

Item	Action
Presentation of CLLP Progress	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">EP presented a PowerPoint outlining the progress of the Central Lancashire Local Plan including the Spatial Strategy, Chapter breakdown and policy titles.	
Roundtable of plan-status of neighbouring authorities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">LA from Blackburn with Darwen began the discussion with an overview of their recently adopted Local Plan (2021-2037) (adopted in January 2024). They have an	

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

annual housing need of 447 net additional dwellings and 46.4 hectares of employment land needed over the plan period to 2037. Their strategic allocations in the plan include North East Blackburn which will deliver up to 1500 homes. Work is currently underway with consultants, Stantec, to prepare a masterplan for delivering the site. Junction 5 off the M65 is a strategic employment site and there are two mixed-use strategic sites in Blackburn Town Centre.

- JG from Fylde explained that their Local Plan was adopted in 2018 with a plan period of 2011-2032. There was a review to incorporate the standard method in 2021. The Plan outlines a requirement of 305 dpa and 62 hectares of employment which are both being delivered as expected. Currently, they are mainly working to update their evidence base (GTAA, flood risk, and an economic update with neighbouring authorities), which is all predicted to be finished shortly. They are currently experiencing staffing issues/a shortage of staff.
- NH from Ribble Valley outlined that they began a review of their Local Plan in 2019 which reached Regulation 18 but could not advance due to staffing issues. Regulation 18 may need to be repeated because of this. They are currently undertaking a flood risk assessment with JBA and LUC are reviewing their SHELAA and custom and self-build study. They are monitoring their housing stock and aren't planning on a Growth Agenda.
- FR from Wyre outlined that their Local Plan was adopted in 2019 with a plan period of 2011-2031. There was a partial update in 2023 to include the standard method. They are currently working on a full plan review and had Issues and Options this past summer. The new proposed standard method would mean a housing need of about 600dpa (a huge jump from the current 200). They are currently progressing a joint GTAA, SFRA and employment study with Fylde and Blackpool. They have a published SHELAA and are delaying the Plan review process until the new NPPF is published (new timetable to be published at that point).

Strategic Matter: Housing Need

- CW began the discussion by stating that Central Lancashire is expecting to be self-reliant for meeting their housing needs. When asked if neighbouring authorities would have capacity to take on need, the answer was no from all.
- LA asked if Central Lancashire is looking to release Green Belt land, and if the Cuerden Garden Village is expected to be included in the Plan. EH stated that their Green Belt is not being looked at for release in the Plan and the Garden Village will not be an allocation.
- A question was raised from EG about how the 1,237 housing need figure was decided. CW confirmed that the standard method number is less than what Central Lancashire will be using for the housing requirement, but this is because 1,237 is derived from a piece of evidence from DLP which takes into consideration growth requirements beyond the standard method.
- A discussion was then had about the impact of the new proposed standard method on the CLLP which CW confirms would meet the proposed transitional arrangements of a 200-dwelling difference per Central Lancashire Authorities.

ACTIONS:

- South Ribble to share allocations with Blackburn with Darwin and Ribble Valley once confirmed/completed
- Chorley to share allocations with Blackburn with Darwin once confirmed/completed
- Preston to continue meeting with Ribble Valley about Longridge
- Preston to send housing allocations to Fylde and Wyre once confirmed/completed

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Strategic Matter: Employment Need

- Central Lancashire started the discussion by stating that the employment need will be met within Central Lancashire.
- EG asked if there are any strategic employment allocations, to which CW responded by stating that the strategic locations in the Plan will be mixed-use rather than purely employment and that there should be no surprises about where they are located, all have been consulted on before.
- CW continued by stating that the Preston City Centre Plan is being reviewed which will look at housing and employment provision. The policy in the Plan will be the 'hook' for that plan.
- EG drew attention to the fact that there is a lot of growth planned for the West of Preston and asks if any new centres will be proposed as a result of this and how that will be incorporated into the retail hierarchy. CW responded saying that Preston West will be a key site – but it is long-term and will be master planned. Preston is working with LCC on education but can't confirm the retail hierarchy impacts in this meeting as it's at such an early planning stage.
- LA notes that the Blackburn with Darwen Local Plan identifies an economic growth corridor, the Blackburn growth axis that runs between Blackburn Town Centre to Samesbury Enterprise Zone and would like to highlight that they are looking to maximise the economic opportunities there and to improve connections from all transport options.

ACTIONS:

- Each CLA to send employment allocations to each neighbouring authority once confirmed/completed
- LA to send details of the economic growth corridor to Central Lancashire

Strategic Matter: Transportation

- CW began the conversation by noting that National Highways have flagged an issue on the M55 and for neighbouring authorities to be reassured that Central Lancashire is working with National Highways on the issue
- EG asked if Cottam Station is still being pursued and if it will be a strategic priority in the Plan. CW confirms it will be and that LCC have obtained planning permission for it to improve connectivity to UCLan and as a park and ride – funding is the main issue with it. The transport and highways plan will identify all of the above.
- FR identified that there is a capacity issue in Wyre and that development in Wyre feeds into Preston – improvements to Junction 2 have helped with this though. Their Issues and Options consultation flagged many issues that feed down to Junction 1 and they would like to be kept informed on the transportation study.
- CW asked Wyre what is being planned in the Barton area. FR said that everything will be feeding into that corridor, and they are working with LCC and National Highways about it.
- YS identified that the B5269 is an issue and CW assured that she has flagged the area as a concern with LCC and the transport consultants
- JG asked about the issue with the M55 and CW confirmed that Junction 2 M55 will become over capacity in the future, although it is not possible to say when.

ACTIONS:

- Central Lancashire to keep Wyre informed on the Transportation Study
- Wyre to reach out to LCC about information regarding the Central Lancashire transportation study

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• KG to check if the logistics park application is still live in Chorley and inform Blackburn with Darwen
Strategic Matter: Environment
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Central Lancashire began the discussion by outlining that the Level 1 Flood Risk Assessment has been updated and that they are waiting on the Level 2. Most of the issues that will be flagged will be site-specific and they do not anticipate any cross-boundary issues.• With regard to renewable energy, CW flagged one site that has outstanding planning permission on it
Strategic Matter: Community Facilities
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• LA asked if LCC are doing the School Places Study in house. CW responded stating that they provided an initial high-level assessment but there have been difficulties providing the level of detail that LCC would like to see at this time.• CW continued stating that Central Lancashire is aware of the shortfall in school places across the area and are working with LCC to address it, particularly in Preston where there is cross-border movement with Ribble Valley
Strategic Matter: Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• KG began the discussion by stating that there will be permanent pitch provisions where needed within Central Lancashire but the approach to transient needs will be negotiated stopping with a bank of council-owned sites on offer.• EG asked how many permanent sites will be allocated and KG responded that the GTAA is being updated and will be published in the coming weeks.• CW says that the two current sites is expected to be enough to meet Preston's need• FR stated that Wyre are also looking into the negotiated stopping approach and asked for more details about Central Lancashire's process. KG responded that each CLA will prepare a policy outside of the Local Plan which will identify sites (to be updated periodically).
ACTIONS: Central Lancashire to meet with Wyre and discuss negotiated stopping in more detail
AOB
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• LH asked what the Central Lancashire evidence base for Climate Change policies will be to which CW responded that there has been no specific commissions for it but we have looked at other authorities' policies for examples. In Preston specifically there is some background work related to renewable energy happening but it is not for the Local Plan. CW confirmed that Central Lancashire will not be going down the same route as Lancaster• EG asked about next steps for Duty to Cooperate and CW responded that specific issues/evidence/work will be shared as soon as they go through Central Lancashire members and that discussions about allocations close to borders are most important. Eventually, a Statement Of Common Ground letter will be sent around for signing
ACTIONS: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• LA to share information with Central Lancashire about Climate Change policies/evidence if requested.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 19 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with West Lancashire

Minutes

Meeting Title Duty to Cooperate: Strategic matters between the Central Lancashire Authorities and West Lancashire
Time and Date 14:00-15:15 pm Wednesday 13th November 2024
Location Microsoft Team Meeting

Attendees

Central Lancashire:
Emma Price – Planning Policy Officer (Central Team)
Eric Kwok – Project Manager (Central Team)
Katherine Greenwood – Principal Planning Officer (Chorley)
Elizabeth Hindle – Head of Planning and Enforcement (South Ribble)
Benjamin Vickers – Team Leader (Policy) (South Ribble)
Georgia Smith – Planning Officer (Preston)

Neighbouring Authorities:
Tom McGowan – Strategic Planning Manager (West Lancashire)
Neil Macfarlane – Senior Planning Officer (West Lancashire)
Billal Qureshi – Senior Planning Officer (West Lancashire)

Apologies
Catherine Thomas – Planning Manager (South Ribble)
Shaun Knights – Planning Officer (Preston)
Zoe Whiteside – Head of Spatial Planning (Chorley)

Topic
Presentation of CLLP Progress
EP presented a PowerPoint which outlined the progress of the CLLP to date including the Spatial Vision, plan chapter breakdown, policy title list, and ongoing evidence information.
Roundtable of plan-status of neighbouring authorities
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• TM updated that WL is pausing their consultation which was due to take place later this year because of updates to the NPPF and they will be waiting for the final version to be published. However, work is still ongoing on parts of the plan that aren't impacted by the proposed NPPF changes. They are also revising the CIL schedule, but work can't progress on that till the NPPF is published.
Strategic Matter: Housing Need
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• BV began the discussion with Pickering's Farm, Leyland. The site is proposed to have 2300+ dwellings and it is a Homes England site. He also mentioned Longton which is proposed to have 200+ dwellings and is near to the A59. Both allocations are near the WL border. There will also be a strategic site at Cuerden but this is located towards Preston, not WL.• BV then stated that there is no green belt release planned for this Plan• TM asks what infrastructure will be coming forward with Pickering's farm allocation and BV says that it will have a local centre and a master plan (it has outline permission) it has a crossroad which will run from east to west which should relieve pressure on the A59, talks with Homes England are ongoing and confirms its north of Leyland and that it is envisaged that supporting infrastructure will come from within

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Leyland rather than cross-border. A primary school is proposed as part of the allocation.

- BV confirmed that Longton is one site with multiple owners and a masterplan is being requested. The site is south-east of the settlement and occupies almost all of the land that isn't green belt.
- KG confirms there aren't any large allocations in Chorley and in proximity to WL. The largest site will be 300 houses. TM says there are no particular questions with allocations of that size. KG noted that Chorley have 37 housing and 7 mixed-use site allocations and that there is no proposed Green Belt release.
- NM asks about the former Camelot theme park site, but KG says it will not be going forward because we cannot demonstrate exceptional circumstances
- West Lancashire confirms that they have no capacity to take on any potential unmet housing need from Central Lancashire.
- TM asked if Central Lancashire will be meeting the affordable housing need and in particular provision for the elderly population? KG responded that we are still awaiting the updated HNDA before we know but we are not allocating specific sites for affordable or specialist housing, we will have policies that cover it generally across Central Lancashire to support delivery.

Strategic Matter: Employment Need

- KG began by stating that there are only 2 pure employment allocations in Chorley, there are 7 mixed-use and most are cat the M60 Junction with Botany Bay or focussed in the Centre.
- BV said that 95% of South Ribble's employment need will be met at Cuerden near the junction of the M65 and M6 which is LCC land. South Ribble has been working closely with them on the site (which is mixed-use but heavily leaning to employment). South Ribble will also have one more site where they are working with Ribble Valley called Samlesbury.
- TM asks if employment has been redistributed in line with the housing redistribution and KG confirms that it has as the distribution has been determined using a 1-1 commuter ratio .
- West Lancs were asked if they agree with the proposed employment figures, but TM stated that they would need to see the background to the needs assessment before West Lancs can agree to the figures.

Strategic Matter: Transportation

- BV started the conversation by saying that Central Lancashire is still awaiting evidence for the transportation policies, specifically the IDP and transportation report but the main idea is to promote walking and cycling as much as possible, lessening parking in Preston (but the parking standards will be the same as the revoked Regional Spatial Strategy but with the use-classes updated)
 - NM asks if we have a central Lancashire Saturn model and KG says that Jacobs are doing the assessment and are currently working on the modelling which will give us mitigation measures that will be put into the Plan
 - NM states that Bank Bridge is an issue in terms of east and west movement (along the A565 where it meets the River Douglas). There can be quite a lot of congestion and it's a matter of strategic resilience (if the bridge was temporarily closed) as its one of the only east west links and needs to be included in the modelling/clear what consideration that has been given (it's a potential pinch point)
- Post meeting note** – could Central Lancashire confirm the extent of the area considered as part of the transport assessment (how far it extends into the West Lancashire area).

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

- NM asks where the Cycling and walking Infrastructure Plan is up to. BV understanding is that it is still being finalised – NM says they have one that was adopted by LCC in May and that there is an ongoing issue crossing the River Douglas that needs to be considered

ACTION:

- Central Lancashire to confirm with Jacobs/LCC if a Saturn model is being used for the transportation assessment and feedback to WL

Strategic Matter: Environment

- NM asked if the SFRA will be updated in line with the National Flood Risk dataset (NaFRA2) due to be published in the New Year. BV says most likely but we will have to check with JBA (the SFRA consultant). NM clarifies that this is important as there could be cross-boundary issues.
- Local Nature Recovery Strategy: BQ says they have lowland raised bog, deep peat and coastal saltmarsh and asks if Central Lancashire has any irreplaceable habitats.

ACTION:

EK states that the LNRS information in Chorley is handled by our BNG officer and she can provide an update when she's back from leave.

- TM asks if the CLAs have considered the Shoreline Management Plan, especially Chorley and SRBC. BV and KG confirmed that we have not, and a separate meeting is proposed to cover that.
- TM asks if there are any cross-boundary water protection zones and asks about Anglezarke reservoir. EK clarifies that in the draft policy we do not identify specific zones
- BQ asks if CLA are proposing a policy requirement for higher BNG. EK confirms Central Lancashire is sticking with the national requirement of 10%.

ACTIONS:

- BV to check with JBA/Preston about SFRA update in the New Year
- CL to check with BNG officer about irreplaceable habitats
- BV to share GIS layer of irreplaceable habitats with WL
- CL to set a meeting with WL to discuss the Shoreline Management Plan

Strategic Matter: Community Facilities

- TM asked if there has been any engagement with what were the clinical commissioning groups (now Integrated Care Board). EP states that not since Regulation 18 to her knowledge.
- TM asks if there are any specific locations for cemeteries and crematoriums in the Plan. KG confirms there are two proposed extensions to existing cemeteries.
- NM asks about playing pitch strategy and asks if there is any cross boundary displaced/ unmet demand. BV and KG state they are unaware of any unmet demand and KG states that the PPS is being updated and it is envisaged that unmet demand will be met in CLAs. NM said he was only aware of displaced/ unmet demand being an issue WL has with sports clubs in the Wigan area and not the CLA area. Post meeting – having checked further in WL PPS 2018, there is also displaced/ unmet demand identified relating to Knowsley, Sefton and St Helens but not with CL.

ACTIONS:

- EP to look into previous consultations with clinical care groups

Strategic Matter: Gypsy, Traveller, and Travelling Showpeople Needs

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

- WL confirm they have no capacity to meet any unmet need for Gypsies, Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople from the CLAs
- TM asks if the consultant has been in touch with West Lancashire to discuss if there are any families looking to relocate between the two authorities
- TM asks about transit sites. KG clarifies that allocations will be for permanent need and transit need will be covered by negotiated stopping

ACTION:

- KG to ask ARC4 if West Lancashire was consulted for the GTAA update

AOB

- NM would like for the Dtc meeting note from December 2021 to be reviewed to see if any matters from that meeting identified for ongoing discussion then were missed in this one.
- BV asks WL if when they do start their plan up again if they will be looking at GB release. TM says that it depends on the housing requirement that they need to meet and if it rises to a figure of 605 dpa then they would be looking at green belt but they are looking into that and the extent and location of GB release is unknown at this time
- TM asks if there are any cross-boundary retail issues arising. BV says that Central Lancashire are updating the retail study and that in terms of SRBC, there are no retail allocations and the policies will be quite protectionist of existing stock but can't see any potential development being a cross-boundary issue. NM confirmed that there is likely little impact but would be good to keep under review.
- TM asked if the proposed SoCG will be multiple parties or individual between each adjoining LPA. West Lancs would have a 3 month lead in time to have SoCG signed-off by members. TM further asked whether the SOCG would need re-signing by all parties if one authority made changes to the SOCG.

ACTIONS:

- All to review the 2021 meeting note (previously circulated) to confirm if any issues were missed
- EP to look into the SoCG process more, determining if WL needs a separate one

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 20 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with Bolton Council, Wigan Council and Greater Manchester Combined Authority

Agenda

Meeting Title	Duty to Cooperate: Strategic matters between the Central Lancashire Authorities and Bolton, Greater Manchester and Wigan	
Time and Date	11:00-13:00 pm	Tuesday 26 th November 2024
Location	Microsoft Team Meeting	

Attendees

Central Lancashire:

Emma Price – Planning Policy Officer (Central Team)
Eric Kwok – Project Manager (Central Team)
Zoe Whiteside – Head of Spatial Planning (Chorley)
Katherine Greenwood – Principal Planning Officer (Chorley)
Shaun Knights – Planning Officer (Preston)
Georgia Smith – Planning Officer (Preston)
Rachel Peckham – Planning Officer (South Ribble)

Neighbouring Authorities:

Iona Macdonald (Bolton)
Thomas Godley (Bolton)
Ian Morgan (Bolton)
Andrew Chalmers (Bolton)
Nick Clarke (Wigan)
Stephen Lamb (Wigan)
Alex McDyre (Greater Manchester)
Philippa Lane (Greater Manchester)

Apologies

Topic	Action
Presentation of CLLP Progress	
Update - Purpose of today's meeting is to identify any and discuss any strategic matters between Central Lancashire and the neighbouring authorities, which could be later addressed in a statement of common ground. This is the final meeting. PowerPoint presentation on update of the local plan and objectives. Looking to meet Regulation 19 stage by January. However still waiting for a couple of key evidence documents, so draft policies are waiting for these before they are finalised.	
Roundtable of plan-status of neighbouring authorities	

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

<p>Bolton - haven't started yet, going to Council tomorrow with Local Development Scheme to start the process for issues and options stage by spring, then submission by December 25 under proposed NPPF changes. Ambitious but starting the process.</p> <p>Wigan - consulted on issues and options end of 2023, hoping to consult on a draft plan in February but might be slightly delayed to March. Draft policies have been sent to neighbouring authorities so any feedback would be appreciated by 6th December.</p> <p>Greater Manchester – GMCA on behalf of authorities of Greater Manchester produce plan which was recently adopted in March this year. It is subject to a legal challenge which is ongoing at the moment, the outcome of which, still don't know yet.</p> <p>Central Lancashire – All policies drafted now. Waiting for some evidence in relation to housing need and demand assessment and met with Arc 4 and update of the GTAA has been undertaken, did get some headline figures so have draft policies for those now.</p> <p>Chorley – currently have 37 housing allocations, two employment allocations and 7 mixed use allocations, spread out across the borough, mainly within settlement boundaries. There's been some release in the open countryside adjoining the trolley settlement boundary and we are proposing to allocate the majority of our existing safeguarded land because most of that did have planning permission already. So any remaining safeguarded land has been allocated unless there were constraints on it. Chorley have unmet housing need so now finalised supply, Preston and South Ribble can address Chorley's unmet housing need so isn't a need to release Green Belt land.</p> <p>South Ribble – Taking some of Chorley's requirement and using all safeguarded land so not proposing any Green Belt release. SR have 22 housing allocations, one mixed use and two employment sites.</p> <p>Preston - Mainly have open countryside, all of housing is being met through strategic sites and some housing allocations. Preston has 3 strategic sites, one of which is releasing a lot of open countryside to the west of Preston. For housing allocation, we have 30 allocation sites for that.</p>	
<p>Strategic Matter: Housing Need</p>	
<p>General questions asked and answered.</p> <p>What calculation is being used for the housing figures, the standard method? Housing requirement is taken from the housing study so higher than the combined standard method figure, hoping to progress under the transitional arrangements which we do meet.</p>	<p>Chorley to share allocations once they are ready.</p>

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

<p>Questions around HMO's and article 4 direction. Preston urban area are working towards an Article 4 direction.</p> <p>Wigan confirmed they have article 4 direction which covers 2 areas in leigh and within Wigan. They are also looking at releasing some Green Belt land.</p>	
<p>Strategic Matter: Employment Need</p>	
<p>Chorley – two allocations purely employment and seven mixed use allocations of housing and employment on them. Each authority is proposing to meet its need individually so have sufficient land to meet own employment requirements.</p> <p>Question - is there any land being allocated for office development or is it purely industry warehousing? There is one mixed-use allocation in the open countryside adjacent to trolley settlement boundary, but other than that it's all within settlement boundaries. Again, we don't need any Greenbelt release.</p> <p>In terms of the uses we've within the policies; we're just specifying a mix of uses. So some of them are considered suitable for offices, but we've actually put a range of use classes because it may be that the suitable for all three or different uses.</p>	
<p>Strategic Matter: Transportation</p>	
<p>Update - So as I said earlier, transportation study work is being done mainly through Count Lancashire County Council and Jacobs are the consultant undertaking that work. So we are still waiting for the final study to come through.</p> <p>But within these three policies here, active transportation and sustainable modes of transportation are being prioritised. So these should be finalised soon and we've been working closely with county to write these policies.</p>	<p>Send over reports when completed from the transport assessments.</p>
<p>Strategic Matter: Environment</p>	
<p>Update – Level 1 SFRA completed, level 2 is in progress and the completed of this could impact some allocation work. The level 1 identified what allocations keeping an eye on.</p> <p>CLA will share information on level 2 flood risk when completed.</p>	<p>Share level 2 flood risk outcomes when completed.</p>
<p>Strategic Matter: Community Facilities</p>	
<p>Update – working with LCC with the education process. Had several meetings with LCC and continue looking over education policy to ensure it is all right. We are working with county on it and making sure especially for those strategic sites in again more Preston area that that that will be covered there and they're working to understand our allocations and the impacts of that and the implications of that with on school places.</p>	
<p>Strategic Matter: Gypsy, Traveller, and Travelling Showpeople Needs</p>	
<p>Update – Met with consultant, it has increased the need within Chorley and Preston quite significantly since the 2/20/22 version. There's still no need in South Ribble and we've just given</p>	

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

permanent permission to a previously temporary authorised Gypsy traveller site which we will allocate in the plan. It was looking like in the previous study that was the only need that we had in Chorley. But in the last few months there's been unauthorised encampment in Chorley which has now generated additional need. The family own the land, and it was proposed for housing allocation. There is currently a planning application under consideration, so at this stage it is unmet need because its arisen so late in the plan process.

So we as part of the draught local plan, we have set out that it's, it's currently unmet need, but we will look to authorise or regularise the site. If permission isn't granted for whatever reason, then we'll commit to finding an alternative site within Chorley. And then in Preston, my understanding is that there's quite a lot of need has arisen from the existing authorised sites, lots of children on the sites that's generated significant future need over the plan. And there is another unauthorised site in Preston as well that they're looking to regularise. But again, there's children on that site. So all the additional need has arisen from those two sites. So that's something I think the council are in talks with land owners to identify particular sites. So at this stage it is unmet, but we are committed to addressing it within our own authority. So we wouldn't be looking for anybody else to address that need.

AOB

But in terms of the Greater Manchester Minerals and waste, I have been looking at our existing minerals and waste plans in light of how they compare against national policy planning, planning policy framework that's come in since they were adopted. So looking at various options on what we could do with those plans and how we might progress that in Greater Manchester. So there is a report on the forward plan to go to a meeting in December where the options would be discussed and an approach would be decided then. So we'll know more in December and be able to tell you about that then hopefully. And you're correct that that would be Lancashire County Council issue for us.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 23 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with West Lancashire Borough Council

Agenda

Meeting Title	Duty to Cooperate: Strategic matters between the Central Lancashire Authorities (CLA) and West Lancashire (WL)	
Time and Date	14:30-16:00 pm	Thursday 5 th June 2025
Location	Microsoft Team Meeting	

Attendees	Central Lancashire: Benjamin Vickers – Principal Planning Officer (South Ribble) Catherine Thomas – Planning Manager (South Ribble) Carolyn Williams - Planning Manager (Preston) Elizabeth Thornber – Head of Planning and Enforcement (South Ribble) Eric Kwok – Project Manager (Central Team) Helen Hatch – Senior Planning Officer (Policy) Jacon Lander – Senior Planning Policy Officer Vicki Thompson-Spears – Planning Policy Officer (Central Team) Zoe Whiteside – Head of Spatial Planning (Chorley)
------------------	--

Neighbouring Authorities:
Tom McGowan – Strategic Planning Manager (West Lancashire)
Steven Faulkner – Planning Services Manager

Apologies	Katherine Greenwood – Principal Planning Officer (Chorley) Paul Charlson - Head of Planning & Regulatory Services
------------------	--

Items		
1.	Welcome and Introductions	Vicki
2.	General Update on the Central Lancashire Local Plan (CLLP) 2023-2041 ZW provided an update on the progress of the CLLP. The Regulation 19 consultation was closed on 14 April. CLA are currently reviewing all the representation and will submit the plan to PINs on 30 th June as stated in LDS. Only minor typos, mapping, factual information can be suggested for amendments. A Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) will be a key document to identify the area that can be improved and agreed with different stakeholders. CLA are also	Zoe

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

	working with different consultees to sign a SoCG on different planning matters.	
3.	<p>Matters raised in WLBC regulation 19 Response:</p> <p>a. Adequacy of Transport evidence BV updated that a transport assessment is currently being undertaken by Jacobs procured by Lancashire County Council, which include Stage 0, Stage 1a/b and Stage 2a/b. At the day of the meeting, Stage 1b Report Transport Evidence is available. In the transport study, Jacobs confirmed that West Lancashire Area is in a fully modelling. Jacobs is using Saturn model in the methodology. BV also pointed out that Chapter 5 of the Stage 1b Report will be a particular interest to WL Area. Note: The transport assessment Stage 0, 1a and 1b reports have been shared with WL after the meeting.</p> <p>BV also advised that Jacobs has offered a meeting with WL to discuss the transport evidence in detail.</p> <p>BV stated that the rest of the report will be available by the end of June near the date of submission. It would be a high-level sustainable travel initiative</p> <p>WL replied that it was quite late in terms of receiving the transport assessment as part of the plan evidence from CLA</p> <p>ZW explained that CLA has raised the concerns to LCC (the party who procured this assessment). CLA agreed that there's no need to delay the submission as there aren't any significant impact from the transport assessment that would affect the plan.</p> <p>b. Adequacy of social infrastructure evidence HH stated the CLA assures with LCC School Education that there will not be any significant demand to West Lancashire school. An IDP has been prepared to set out all the identified school and Local Plan Policies, HC3 sets out site allocations for new schools.</p> <p>WL requested some written evidence from LCC Education regarding the school place demand and potential impacts toward West Lancashire.</p>	<p>Ben</p> <p>Helen</p>

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

	<p>SF pointed out that the draft SoCG, education section para 5, doesn't reflect the situation agreed by both parties. CLA agreed the need to tidy up the wording in this section.</p> <p>ZW explained that CLA has a long and ongoing conversation with LCC Education on the further school place need. The work is still ongoing, but CLA tried to address these by setting up 2 policies (HC3 and ID2) and the IDP to make a commitment on this matter.</p> <p>c. Clarity on policy HS13 Gypsy and Travellers JL explained CLA is currently working a topic paper on GTAA which can be shared with WL once it is finalised. Regarding the SoCG, there are number of ongoing works to address the shortfall. There will be an unauthorised site that seeks planning permission in the summer. Chorley will need to find additional land if being refused.</p> <p>CW confirmed that GTAA recommends the regulation of the unauthorised sites, considering the authorisation of that site.</p> <p>JL stated that a negotiated stopping will be implemented as reflected in HS13.</p> <p>TM asked the question that had been raised in the Dtc meeting in last November on whether West Lancashire is one of the consultee of that report.</p> <p>CW explained that the original report was completed in 2019, this assessment is a part of update which may not have consulted again with WL.</p> <p>TM also asked whether the clarify on the number of the pitch needs are identified in the supporting text and they should be included in the main policy.</p> <p>CLA think they are confident with the approach of this policy.</p> <p>TM suggests can pick this up from SoCG.</p> <p>d. Failure to comply with legal requirements of DTC</p>	<p>Jacob</p> <p>Zoe</p>
--	---	-------------------------

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

	<p>ZW stated that CLA had published an interim duty to cooperate statement and CLA will be submitting a far more comprehensive review and a more detailed statement and documentation on illustrating how the plan complied with the Duty to Cooperate.</p> <p>ZW further explained that this Dtc Meeting and the SoCG would help to address your concerns raised in Representation submitted by WL and believe that the Dtc has been met taken a proportionate approach on this.</p> <p>TM commented that WL representation was based on the document they had during the Regulation 19 consultation stage.</p> <p>e. Failure to comply legal requirements to survey the area as required by Reg 13 TCP Act CW stated that CLA got a full scoping report that support and want to understand which aspects did WL think CLLP didn't comply with.</p> <p>TM replied that the lack of transport and education evidence.</p> <p>CW further explained that the education and transport work are tied with the published IDP and a CIL review is currently undertaking alongside with the plan.</p> <p>f. Housing Trajectory WL concerned on any double counting from the allocated sites and committed supply.</p> <p>CLA confirmed that there won't have been double counting because only the allocated sites that have the permission will be listed in the housing trajectory. BV kindly offered to send WL an updated position of the five year housing supply.</p> <p>CW also elaborated that the site profiles also outline the progress status of each site allocation. Also, Preston will not need any windfall allowance as they can meet the housing requirement/supply.</p>	<p>Carolyn</p> <p>Jacob</p>
4.	<p>Shoreline Management Plan and Long Term Flood Risk CW mentioned CLA has been discussed with JBA and EA and confirm it would not have a significant adverse impact</p>	<p>Carolyn</p>

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

	<p>on the allocations about the new guidance. CLA is committed to publish the new SFRA mapping.</p> <p>CW stated that CLA has asked EA and JBA for their clarification and may include in the SFRA report.</p> <p>TM stated that looks beyond the plan period from 2050 onwards, council may need to address the flooding issue arising from Dongulas near Tarton.</p> <p>ZW mentioned that there is a scoping from solar farm and the neighbourhood plan , which will be consulted soon around that area.</p> <p>Tom asked whether EA support the draft policies.</p> <p>CW answered agreed not to change the policies, nothing required from EA and will update on the assessment (SFRA)</p>	
5.	<p>The draft Statement of Common Ground CLA stated that would review the response from TM and tried to send another version by next week.</p> <p>WL replied that just conscious on the short timeframe, may need to have further discussion</p> <p>CLA agreed to share further evidence, including the transport assessment and education. The education one is currently reviewing and revising and maybe available in next week or so.</p>	
6.	AOB	

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 24 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council

Minutes

Meeting Title	Duty to Cooperate: Strategic matters between the Central Lancashire Authorities and Blackburn with Darwen	
Time and Date	13:00-14:00	Wednesday 11 th June 2025
Location	Microsoft Teams Meeting	

Attendees

Central Lancashire:

Benjamin Vickers – Team Leader (Policy) (South Ribble)
Catherine Thomas – Planning Manager (South Ribble)
Elizabeth Thornber – Head of Planning and Enforcement (South Ribble)
Eric Kwok – Project Manager (Central Lancashire Local Plan) (Central Team)
Helen Hatch – Senior Planning Officer (Policy) (South Ribble)
Katherine Greenwood – Team Leader (Planning Policy) (Chorley)
Vicki Thompson-Spears – Planning Policy Officer (Central Team)
Zoe Senior – Senior Planning Officer (Preston)
Zoe Whiteside – Head of Spatial Planning (Chorley)

Blackburn with Darwen:

Darren Tweed - Strategic Planning and Transport Manager
Helen Holland -

Apologies

Carolyn Williams – Planning Manager (Preston)

Items

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Update on CLLP Progress
3. **Clarifications/ Discussion on Blackburn with Darwen's Regulation 19 Representation**

SR queried if the representation was directed as a site promotion within SR owned by BWD, BWD confirmed its about the site and some of the policies within the back of the representation.

BWD confirmed concerns with Samlesbury Strategic site and economic aspect.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

- Recognising the strategic importance/significance of Samlesbury EZ (cyber corridor)

BWD confirmed they raised the issues around the Samlesbury strategic site in last years' DTC meeting and didn't hear anything until receiving the Regulation 19 consultation.

SR confirmed that the Local Development Order (LDO) has been renewed therefore shows the commitment to the site and its deliverability.

SR also confirmed they sent out documents on housing and employment and confirmed BWD are not expected to take any of CLA's unmet need.

- Meeting the full employment/housing needs – issue of end date of the plan

BWD concerned that the NPPF, para 27c talks about long term 30 years ahead for strategic sites, however BWD concerned that SR haven't thought past the plan period. Also questioned a Green Belt review.

SR confirmed housing and employment need is met without needing a Green Belt release.

BWD Cuerden is addressing employment need, questioned if there is any deliverability on that site.

SR – got planning permission and is going forward

- Green belt review approach

As above, SR confirmed the housing and employment need is met and therefore a Green Belt review is not required and no need to release any Green Belt sites.

4. Draft Statement of Common Ground

Can add both parties agreed to progress on the Statement of Common Ground and list out the items that are not agreed in related to the economic needs and housing requirement.

5. Timescales and Next Steps

6. AOB

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 25 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Steering Group

Date 23/07/20

1. Attendees:

Johndaniel Jaques (CLT) Carolyn Williams (CLT) Alison Marland (CC) Lindsey Blackstock (CC) Zoe Harding (SRBC) Christina Marginson (PCC) Philip Carter (EA) Stephanie Bracegirdle (EA) Katie Duffy (UU) Rachel Crompton (LCC) Hannah Bishop (JBA) Michael Williamson (JBA).

2. & 3. Background update and Appendix B site Maps:

The draft SFRA Report and appendices has been circulated and maps will follow. Some people have commented on the Draft Report, others need to provide comments. There has been a technical hitch with the Appendix B interactive maps which has now been resolved. Once these are circulated, people will need review Appendix C looking at Columns X & Y (“Level 1 Strategic Recommendation” and “Development Considerations”) and fill out any comments in column Z “Council Decision on Allocation”.

I would suggest focusing first on the Strategic Recommendation A & B sites.

4. JBA update:

Gave an update about key findings in the Draft Report.

There are 96 sites that fall in Strategic Recommendations A&B.

Strategic recommendation A – recommend removal of these sites based on scale of risk – however when reviewing each site, we may want to look to deliver part of the site and can look to amend boundaries to remove areas of most risk. Decision of council to make final position on each site and then come back to the consultant with questions regarding the sites we want to retain.

May want to do a further assessment – level 2 for any A&B sites we wish to take further.

AM asked If excluding the area shown as flood risk from consideration, could we remove the need to do level 2? Yes could then go straight to developer led SFRA rather than level 2 SFRA.

EA view is that if a developer has interest in whole site onus on developer to consider a site specific assessment. If LA wished to allocate area excluded from flood risk then no further assessment needed, only needed if developer chooses to take more forward.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Recommendation C – 102 sites – could consider the sites design or alter layouts to mitigate issues.

Recommendation D – 579 sites - site specific FRA required as minimum but no level 2 SFRA.

Recommendation E – 101 sites - all in Flood Zone 1 according to national maps - no major issues to stop these sites. Still need approval from LA on these sites.

JBA have set out the EAs site specific comments – see Appendix E. Longton Brook (unpermitted development activity) and Higher Walton (surface water issues) are general areas of concern.

River Ribble is the main risk area for Preston, river Lostock for Leyland and Yarrow for Chorley. Main surface water risk being east of M61.

Reservoir risk – PCC city centre is vulnerable but very low risk. EA not previously wanted much info on reservoirs included for reasons such as this. The risk is remote and need to make this clear to readers.

5. EA Comments:

Main rivers identified in the report – few comments about interpreting powers EA has to do works, as EA do not have ownership and remains with riparian landlord. Few tributaries to main rivers also need to be added.

Fig 4.1 – Planning Policy ref does not link this to the SFRA/FRA.

Croston tidally influenced and needs picking up on.

Paste errors need correcting.

Reservoirs data issue – Gov.uk refers people to online mapping – getting hold of shapefile not possible as it has not been developed for use in large scale floor risk assessments. Can only view it online and use it via WMS in your own assessment, but no shapefile available. EA will not make an issue about lack of layers data in the SFRA. Still concern about sharing this widely. Looks at maximum possible extent should be affected if a reservoir fails. Is this different from emergency planning in that sense?

JBA have this for GM and Pendle authorities. EA guidance says we must show this, yet guidance from local EA seems to differ from what national guidance suggests.

EA view was not prepared for SFRA and as such should not be used for that purpose. Guidance online directs you to the online mapping only and not a shape file. JBA happy with that approach.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Provide a link online rather than the physical maps and note the fact that the EA are happy with this. EA will defend this approach at the examination.

Issues with Wigan angling club reservoir issue wording and concerns they cannot maintain this as do not have the funds to maintain this site.

JBA - Concerns that if site not being maintained it could cause issue for the future and we need to ensure account for concerns raised around this site. CC are aware of this site and issues and have spoken to reservoir owners to let them know of their requirements as owners of these sites.

Fig 6.2 ref to sequential test needs further clarification.

6.4.1 link through to BNG and the Environment Bill – opportunity to link this into SFRA as a benefit now.

FRM colleagues want any large sites which may get split up to be covered by a flood risk masterplan for the whole area which they will all need to comply with to reduce risk.

5. UU comments:

Provided some rewording. More concerned about what the Councils outcomes are from this work to inform their forward plan of works. UU have concern over a number of sites from the original list which they have concern over. Have around 56 sites they have concern with and updating that with the strategic recommendations from the SFRA. Liaising with their planning team on the sites and areas of concern- will provide further comments in next couple of weeks. Concerns around Goosnargh/Barton catchment with utilities increase needed – high risk list for supply and demand in the future. NW Preston area is another area of concern and under scrutiny from UU.

Still need to check on use of some data UU have released and whether that can be used for sharing with the public through the SFRA. KD to check and let us know.

6. LCC Comments:

Concerns over interpretation 5.7.2 LLFA assets – need to be clear LLFA does not own the assets consequently not appropriate to suggest LLFA should have programs for improvement for these assets but do need to flag these up to the owners themselves.

Recommendation 6 in 8.2 phasing of larger development. LCC have experience in managing the larger scale site assessment. Need to be able to allow developers to come forward at different stages of development. LCC to provide some specific comments on this. LCC will review the detailed sites when possible.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

LCC will provide their comments.

7. CC:

No specific comments from AM. LB – Need to map flood management scheme in Yarrow Meadows which is not shown and works in Astley park also need to be shown. Also works in Carr Brook park for wetland creation there. Report is useful for looking at areas for future flood prevention/habitat creation and looking at WwNP opportunities. LB to share this info with JBA to include these in the report.

Question from JD about if Chorley information is provided, can SRBC and PCC provide similar? JBA confirmed that the data as shown in the report is from a national data set they helped produce nationally a few years ago. LB can provide some maps of natural flood management we should include these too.

8. SRBC:

To provide feedback on RP returns from leave next week.

9. PCC:

No comments at this stage but will look at this ASAP and make comments now back doing planning work.

10. CLT:

5.3.4 Is there an issue with RoFSW mapping – is it robust? JBA will update this to clarify its old data that was an issue and the new data is fine.

5.6.1 LCC mapping issues – is there anything we can do? The Report does not provide any commentary about the implications of these incidents so do we need to have this in the report? LCC could provide commentary to say work has not been mapped with flood risk occurrences, but does highlight areas where there has been multiple flood risk issues that are notable. LCC to advise on a better way of reporting this information and maybe including it in an appendix.

Where JBA have asked for further data from CLA this was for information only, if there is not more data/mapping then this is sufficient for Report.

JD to get maps out by end July then 3 weeks to respond to this. LCC given leave commitments early Sept would be more realistic. HB to send through index and overview map of interactive maps in next few days.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

11. Reservoir Flood Risk:

See 5 EA Comments above.

12. Timeframe for Review:

A future meeting to review revised report may be necessary. There may also be a need for meeting between EA, CLT & JBA if necessary to discuss any specific issues.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 26 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Steering Group

Central Lancashire Local Plan

Discussion of SFRA matters

30th January 2023

Agenda and Actions

1. Introductions
2. Update on the Local plan – CW
3. Issues for discussion
 - SFRA Level 1 update and SFRA level 2 commissioning
 - Sustainable water management policy
 - Implication of site allocations
 - Need for allocation flood alleviation schemes
4. Any issues to address in work going forward
5. Next steps

UU confusion – identifying sites in the Samlesbury area. Need to understand what the thinking is, do we need the development in that area given changes to NPPF? UU need to commission growth of BB WWTW and this area directly impacts on that.

Odour work not complete for the area put forward. A smaller area not so close to the WWTW would be favourable. UU need to get flows to their inlet (nabs head area) and this is close to entrance to treatment works, then need to understand those flows and impact on the works. Odour issue needs highlighting for when considering most appropriate plots. Logik have not done any odour work.

Need certainty of the position on this site to understand what the impact will be on UU's future spend programme.

SFRA update – Site profiles – sewer flooding should not be in infrastructure section should be in flooding. Needs to be investigated in more detail to understand if sites can come forward as could affect the developable area.

Developable area applies to fluvial flood risk. We have taken account of EA comments – Savick brook part of site is in FZ 3 – needs level 2 work to understand what area of the site will be developed. High level PD looking good. SUDS body coming in so we need to firm that up in the PD.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

SFRA needs to do more than fluvial FR. Important to try and understand different FR issues interact with each other's. Longton site has a culvert, low point at front site – culvert contributes to some flooding so need knowledge from LLFA on local issues in that area. Could be a high surface water flood risk if site is at a low point for example, so need to understand these issues better.

Need to ensure the SRFA panel is established again for these sites.

EA won't always comment on culverts, but could comment on need for diverting water course and BNG etc.

Need developer to understand the issues on their proposed suggestions so we can plot the information and feed in comments better. Level 2 work will need to involve the site developer where possible to agree works upfront.

Policy needs to understand natural paths of water running through a site for all sites, even if not in a FR zone. Important issues in context of CC considerations.

On the PD, UU want multifunctional SUDS and mentioned 4 pillars sustainable drainage in the suds manual and building for a healthy life. Expect to see multifunctional suds in major allocation sites. Contribute to G&B infrastructure and BNG – Policy needs to be clear on that.

Water efficiently measures – UU keen to see us translate that into the optional standard in building regs for 110 litres per day in water supply, UU keen to see this taken forward in water supply. EA also supportive of this and struggle to get the evidence, but they will support UU in delivering this. BwD have done this, and EA have supported that policy. UU will provide the info they sent to BwD to us. Needs to be factored into the viability. HBF have objections.

UU provide infrastructure discount for those schemes which take this forward

EA need sites info sharing.

Reservoir FR – agent of change principle so developer has to pay for works now. UU not sure how it will work in practice as all developments downstream from reservoir should contribute to this cost. EA find this a grey area as don't provide comments on this, not a stat role for EA to comment on. And if did, where do you start and stop, can cross boundaries etc. Not sure been given proper thought. Look at raising comments on NPPF/G on this point to clarify how it will be done.

Rosendale picked it up in their LP EiP, EA were asked about it by inspector, not much EA could say, up to LPA to say happy but how can this be delivered in practice. Implies it's an infrastructure costs that's needs to be recovered potentially. The risk can change downstream.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 27 SFRA Steering group meeting

Central Lancashire Local Plan

Discussion of LLFA matters

31st January 2023

Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Update on the Local plan – CW
3. Issues for discussion
 - SFRA Level 1 update and SFRA level 2 commissioning
 - Sustainable water management policy
 - Implication of site allocations
 - Need for allocation flood alleviation schemes
4. Any issues to address in work going forward
5. Next steps

Follow-up Actions:

1. LLFA to provide changes they would like to add to the Policy Direction's. specifically, water management policy.
2. Site Allocations – LLFA have requested the shape file of the latest sites being considered
3. LLFA suggest the CLA's look at Lancaster policy on water as a good example
4. Each council to set up meetings with to discuss site issues with the LLFA as needed

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 28 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Steering Group

Date: 09/11/23

Introductions

Carolyn Williams (CW) – Preston City Council

Shaun Knights (SK) – Preston City Council

Catherine Thomas (CT) – South Ribble Borough Council

Benjamin Vickers (BV) – South Ribble Borough Council

Andrew Leysens (AL) – United Utilities (UU)

Mike Williamson (MW) – JBA

Laura Thompson (LT) – JBA

Emma Price (EP) – Chorley Council

Philippa Lane (PL) – Chorley Council

Apologies from the Environment Agency (EA) and Lancashire County Council (LCC)

Scope confirmation

CW confirmed JBA's proposed modelling approach to climate change and the functional floodplain has been accepted by the EA.

AL keen for sewer flooding to be incorporated into the SFRA. Need to be careful with sensitive historic flooding and modelling data. UU data wouldn't be shared on the SFRA maps but would feed into the screening.

Dialogue needed between UU hydraulic modellers and JBA to identify the available modelling / quality of modelling. Key is to understand whether the UU modelling is detailed enough to enable inclusion in the sequential testing process.

MW to discuss approach with JBA Fylde SFRA PM

Data requests

Data requests have been shared with the EA / UU / LCC / CRT / neighbouring district councils. LPAs to keep chasing the data requests.

Unsure on what information / spatial data LCC may have.

CRT to provide their overtopping / breach locations.

Programme

Local Plan deadline of June 2025. Ideally, Level 1 SFRA to be finalised and signed off by the beginning of May 2024. EA must sign off on the final SFRA.

The programme is tight and significantly dependant on the early provision of EA models and review periods.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Signed off Level 2 preferably by the beginning of November 2024. Again, potentially tight. MW proposes to carry out Level 2 scoping assessment once the sites assessment has been finalised, ahead of delivery of the final Level 1 SFRA.

Once the Level 1 site screening has been completed, it will become clearer on how many sites will be needing a Level 2 SFRA. Will feed into the scoping study which will detail the required Level 2 methodology which should be agreed with all stakeholders ahead of the Level 2 SFRA main stage.

Project meetings – agreed to have monthly meetings with CLA team and JBA. Potential meetings with the wider project team at each milestone (i.e. once the modelling is complete, site screening, functional floodplain).

A further meeting may be required with the EA and potentially LCC.

Contract

Preston to chase the contract and will sort out the purchase order. The contract has been shared with JBA Directors to sign.

Agreed invoicing schedule:

20% following inception (early December 2023)

60% upon draft delivery

20% on project completion

AOB

JAC meeting – evening of the 4th December at Chorley. Emma to send through details.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 29 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Steering Group

Date: 20/03/24

Introductions

Carolyn Williams (CW) – Preston City Council

Shaun Knights (SK) – Preston City Council

Zoe Whiteside (ZW) – Chorley Borough Council

Emma Price (EP) – Chorley Borough Council

Rachel Peckham (RP) – South Ribble Borough Council

Chris Dunderdale (CD) – Lancashire County Council

George Edmondson (GE) – Lancashire County Council

Philip Carter (PC) – Environment Agency Planning officer for CLA SFRA

Soraya Saghatchi-Moghaddam (SSM) – Sustainable places team EA

Laura Thompson (LT) – JBA

Freya Nation (FN) – JBA

Mike Williamson (MW) – JBA

Flood Zone 3b review

CW confirmed PCC have gone through Flood Zone 3b. Question of whether sites that have planning permission already need to be assessed through a Level 2 SFRA.

PC keen for Flood Zone 3b within sites, even if they have planning permission, to be addressed. Especially where new SFRA has more up-to-date information.

MW: JBA can look at these sites and see how FZ3b has been derived (e.g. whether from buffered watercourse or from detailed modelling). Also pointed out EA policy of no development within 8m of main rivers. LLFA generally 3 or 4m buffer from ordinary watercourses. If that covers 3b, it will need to be documented in site assessment spreadsheet.

CW noted this will be included in site proformas and SHELAA database

CD questioned whether sites with planning permission refers to sites already being constructed or not.

MW proposed that each council send JBA their sites with planning permission and whether construction has begun or not.

Agreed that each council will be sending this information on sites with planning permission that also have a high SW flood risk. If developers put in a new planning application, they will need new FRAs with new info.

JBA can check which modelled event has been used to create FZ3b. In some areas FZ3 could've been used which is the 100yr event. For sites like that, if JBA did at a later stage (e.g. L2 SFRA), model the 30yr, the FZ3b would likely be smaller. Once councils send over sites with planning permission, the source of data contributing to FZ3b (confidence in

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

modelling, age of model etc.) can be discussed for each site. Whether they need new FRA is up to the LPA.

ZW: There is a huge risk with sites that already have planning permission if they are in FZ3b. If planning has been consented, can't walk it back. How will this info be put into the public domain? Will need to be managed carefully.

CW: North west Preston has planning permission however a large proportion of the area is Flood Zone 3b.

PC mentioned an allocated site but there's FZ3b there. Already started building. From an EA perspective assessing FZ3b only applies to sites where building hasn't started. If a site has a full application and has approval then they can commence regardless of change of circumstance of the extent of risk. If it's an allocation that doesn't have permission yet (e.g. from last local plan) we could locate areas where development wouldn't be possible. If there isn't permission, this could be picked up through conditions and through discussing site plan. In the SFRA, how risk would be addressed, would be discussed for sites.

CW: The discussion of sites within FZ3b, which already have planning permission, would depend on when the SFRA findings are published. Should discuss this with members of the council. Sites that need a L2 SFRA assessment provide a cost issue. If sites have planning permission and have risk, they will already have FRAs. Would it be appropriate to require a L2 SFRA assessment?

ZW emphasised that sites within FZ3b that have planning permission, will need discussing with politicians. The publication of evidence (SFRA) could raise issues. There would be a benefit to holding off publication of evidence until the whole local plan is published.

CW agreed. Next steps for councils is to highlight to JBA which sites have PP and for the risk to be identified so EA can provide comments. LLFA can be consulted as well.

CD: some developers may have extent PP for 100 houses but put in a full app for 20 more houses. Flood risk on these sites will need to be addressed.

CW proposed making a note in pro-formas that changes to layout or design will need flood risk to be addressed. Could be an opportunity to tackle new flood risk information through pro-forma rather than suggesting sites need to be assessed in a L2 SFRA or submit new planning applications.

MW: where sites already have a FRA, this could save time and money from not needing to do a L2 SFRA site assessment.

CD: it depends on the developer. Need to be careful with language to avoid developers thinking they can do what they like.

PC: EA comments will be shared shortly. There are a few sites which EA will suggest can be removed from allocation due to the location of FZ3b.

SW flooding

CW: majority of Preston sites are affected.: what is the pragmatic approach we can take? A lot of sites are existing car parks etc. flooding from surrounding roads onto sites. Is there much point doing a L2 SFRA assessment for these sites. For hardstanding carparks, could we suggest that sites would require SuDS, landscaping etc. to improve drainage? If we have to do L2 assessments on these sites, the plan wouldn't be able to be published this year.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

MW: at this stage, in attempting to avoid a L2 assessment, you would need to look at changing boundaries or coming to agreement where wording in L1 for these sites dictates what should be done before development takes place. L2 would look at depths and hazards but wouldn't do any more detailed modelling which is saved for FRA/drainage strategy. For strategic sites we could do modelling in L2 SFRA. The national map is high level/coarse. Layout design decisions shouldn't be based on that. It's there to flag up serious issues or flow routes. Nafra2 work will be coming next year which will include a new national SW map which might show something different. Less confidence in urban areas due to assuming culvert dimensions etc. Problem with PPG is that anything with medium SW risk or above requires a L2. Anywhere where boundaries or safeguarding areas within boundaries from development could prevent need for L2. LLFA and EA will need to come to agreement if looking to avoid L2 assessment for all the SW sites. Basically every site has medium SW risk.

CW: PCC are more concerned with doing a L2 SFRA assessment for every urban site, especially where development has already taken place or for car parks. For greenfield PCC do agree that L2 assessment would be required.

MW: LLFA could look at sites with local knowledge from asset database to assess if SW mapping is accurate.

ZW emphasised that the CLAs don't want to get to inspection and have objections from legal/PPG/NPPF.

CD: LLFA don't have any bespoke guidance on SFRA. National guidance applies. Any relaxations would be LPA decision. No viable reason why LLFA would discount any sites where L2 is required.

PC: guidance saying we need to do an assessment appropriate to the scale of risk. E.g from fluvial perspective, the L2 will need to be very comprehensive. Don't need to go to full blown L2 for every site. Comes down to what the actual risk is. Would've though there would be some flexibility there.

JBA will assess surface water depths through a L2. When you look at depth of flooding it's often shallow (<300mm/200mm) so not really any barriers to development. So L2 can be useful then.

For a L2 assessment JBA will look at all sources of risk and comment on it. If there's no fluvial or tidal risk, we focus on SW. Would be cheaper but we would still comment on other sources like reservoir and groundwater. However, if there is only SW risk, reports won't as much time and are cheaper.

Action for councils to send list of sites with planning permission, LPA comments and EA comments.

For sites where highways are flooding, JBA would look at site access and escape for emergency services and emergency escape routes through the L2.

CD: displacing SW elsewhere would not be acceptable.

CW: SuDS would be required/proposed for most of these SW sites.

MW: JBA can do runoff calculations to be included in L2 SFRA.

ZW: how would SW runoff be translated into policy. Would SuDS be promoted and incorporated into design?

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

CW: include this as requirements/wording/agreement in pro formas.

MW: other councils have taken recommendations from L2 assessment and put their own comments/wording into site pro formas.

ZW: the benefit of a L2 SFRA is that it tells residents rationale/justification for keeping sites in local plan.

CD: SuDS is capturing/conveying/storing rainfall from development site. Runoff from higher land is usually discounted and runoff/risk downstream is often worsened.

MW: that JBA do a CIA in the L1 SFRA as an appendix which considers runoff and SW from further up the catchment and includes all sites from neighbouring authorities as well. Main output from that is ranking catchments by level of risk of development upstream. Provides a number of policy recommendations based on level of risk. JBA will be delivering next week along with everything else.

CW stressed that the main take from today is for each council to provide a list of sites that fall within FZ3b that have planning permission. Whether that be full or outline. Reserved matters could address new risk info.

PC keen for councils to indicate if work has commenced on sites with Planning Permission.

CW raised that unless developers apply for new planning permission at a site, councils can't require more detail. Will flag these sites up as well. Can take a pragmatic approach to SW as Philip.

CD: LLFA will likely just say to apply the guidance. Decision of LPAs on how to take guidance forward. Looking at changing boundaries and potentially safeguarding land in high/med areas could be good. However, developers often put housing outside of risk area with SuDS in high risk area which doesn't allow SuDS to work properly. Be careful with wording.

ZW: need to be very clear with rationale/reasoning for which sites will need a L2 and which won't and which sites will and won't be de-allocated.

CW: emphasised that city centre sites with high SW issues are a particular issue. Most already have planning permission. Lots of these city centre sites need to be allocated, could be windfall if that saves time.

MW: as soon as JBA know which sites to take forward to L2 assessment, JBA can do an initial scoping study and provide a methodology.

L2 SFRA would need to be done by October as local plan going to councils in January.

CW hoping some of the site work will come forward before the full L2 SFRA so that councils can deal with this earlier.

CW: that will be the big strategic allocations e.g. North west Preston. Sites like that will need a L2, and hope findings don't rule them out. If local plan doesn't have these sites, we can't provide housing for other councils (Chorley).

Councils send FZ3b sites with planning permission to Shaun by Friday.

For SW, councils also send sites with planning permission to JBA

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

CD: councils should share their site assessment/approach to addressing SW with EA and LLFA with rationale as to why PPG isn't going to be followed if that is the case.

CW proposed that agreeing with LLFA to amend boundaries, removing risk areas, and then could allow these sites to be retained in the local plan.

ZW: Chorley may not have anywhere where boundaries could be changed and 20 or 30 sites have a high risk of flooding.

RP: Could look at sites with SW risk and FZ3b and where boundaries could be changed by 28/03.

PC: to avoid boundary changes plans could mark on the site an area which won't be developed or will be allocated for SuDS etc. Needs to be something clearly in the plan which shows the area at risk won't be developed. That could be a L2 assessment for some sites.

CD: that for floodplain, it will be easier to identify no build areas whereas for SW it's not that easy to identify no build areas as it will be spread across the site. For sites where it's not easy to remove, L2 more suitable.

CW: all councils to send over information on sites in FZ3b, sites with SW risk and further comments.

Another steering group meeting to be arranged following Easter and delivery of the draft L1 SFRA.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 30 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Steering Group

CL SFRA Steering Group: Sites Discussion Level 2 SFRA (16/05/2024)

Attendees:

Carolyn Williams, Preston City Council
Catherine Thomas, South Ribble
Elizabeth Hindle, South Ribble
Emma Price, Central Lancashire Local Plan
Bethany Foster, Lancashire County Council (LLFA)
Philip Carter, Environment Agency
Drew Gough, Preston City Council
Chris Dunderdale, Lancashire County Council (LLFA)
George Edmondson, Lancashire County Council (LLFA)
Shaun Knights, Preston City Council
Soraya Saghatchi-Moghaddam, Environment Agency
Rachel Peckham, South Ribble
Eric Kwok, Central Lancashire Local Plan
Katherine Greenwood, Chorley Borough Council
Laura Thompson, JBA
Mike Williamson, JBA
Freya Nation, JBA

CW: Meeting to get some agreement between the councils on what we'd like to do with the sites assessment. Could we do a combined approach for multiple sites in one area in the L2 SFRA site assessment, rather than individual site assessments. They will be grouped into allocations within the local plan. E.g. North west Preston. City centre sites in Preston have sw flood risk. If we did them individually, there would be 20 sites. Could we group these together and do a sort of FRA for the whole city centre.

MW: From our point of view, that would be fine. However, we would need to assess each site and its flood risk. We usually do a report for each site and a main report that brings it all together. We could assess each allocation but it would also be good to know what each site parcel is so we can comment on their individual risk. We would need to see the make up of the site allocations and go from there.

CW: The ones EA had concern about, the fluvial risk sites. Could we amend boundaries and/or exclude parts of the site for development to reduce the need for L2 assessment for each site.

PC: Yes, that seems reasonable for sites where there is a small amount of the site within flood zones. If there was a way of excluding these parts of the site from inappropriate development, that would be one way of doing things.

MW: Some councils have done 'conditions of development' documents where flood risk is small and trying to get agreement from the EA for those sites.

CW: That sounds good. For each council there are quite a large number of surface water risk sites.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

MW: The RoFSW is not that robust in city centres anyway due it not being representative of drainage networks in urban areas. So you could come up with some conditions that developers would have to adhere to.

CW: We will do L2 assessments for the sites which don't currently have planning permission and are at fluvial flood risk.

MW: For fluvial sites, we need the EA and LLFA's buy in. So, it would be good for them to tell us if they would require a L2 assessment for those sites. For example, if the LLFA have local detail on flooding in the area.

CD: The suggestion to wrap up a number of sites in one assessment, the LLFA wouldn't have a particular issue with that, especially if they are hydraulically linked. However, we would need each site to be assessed individually. I would like to know how the report would look. The longer the report, the more room for ambiguity there could be. How user-friendly would it be for developers and local authorities? For wording in the policies, we would like you (councils) to put forward some wording which the LLFA could possibly help with.

CW: If all city centre sites would need a level 2 assessment, we will just take them out of the local plan, and we'll say they will come forward as windfall sites. We have discussed it with the other authorities. The cost of doing L2 FRAs for each city centre site wouldn't be achievable. Probably more of an issue for Preston than South Ribble and Chorley.

MW: The next step for us, with regards to letting us know the requirements of the L2 SFRA. Once we know which sites need assessing we'll produce a scoping study with methodologies etc. Then we can share a cost with you and a methodology with the EA and LLFA and get their agreement on it.

PC: We've provided comments on all of the sites relevant to us (EA). Could you now list all of the sites you wish to bring forward and let us know whether a L2 assessment is required, and which source of flooding needs to be addressed.

MW: When the EA have agreed on the sites to be assessed, we (JBA) can provide a scope. A few sites need confirmation on whether they'll go forward to a L2 assessment or not.

CW: Yes, I think they were mostly surface water sites.

CD: We'd suggest having a clear table of sites which you wish to allocate and whether you propose to take them to a level 2 assessment or not. The table is currently a bit busy which isn't very useful for the LLFA.

CW: That's the issue. We don't know which sites we're going to allocate yet. So, for at the moment, for Preston, we will look at which sites to allocate depending on the findings of this work. So all of the sites in the current tables, are our sites for allocation since they haven't been withdrawn yet.

MW: For the LLFA and EA, we could produce a simpler table with the site name, the council and JBA comments and the white/un highlighted can be removed (as they're in FZ 1 so won't need a L2 assessment).

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

KG: Chorley have identified which sites will need a L2 assessment, but we had a few sites which we need clarification on whether they do need a L2 or if we can amend the boundary.

MW: For those sites, if we slim down the spreadsheet for the EA and LLFA with your comments on saying "Level 2 probably not required due to small amount of risk". Then the LLFA may come back and say they agree but recommend policy with conditions for development. When we have agreement for LLFA and EA then we can come up with some wording. Then the councils could work out which sites they do want to allocate/bring forward based on the EA and LLFA's comments.

PC: For the list of sites where there is a little bit of risk. Those are the ones where we're most likely to say to amend that boundary or don't develop those parts of the sites. What about where there is risk to other parts of the site.

CW: For large allocations we'd allocate them anyway. For the majority of sites, risk was mainly at the edge of the sites. It's only where flooding is pooling within the site, I have made comments on these sites with thoughts.

MW: For sites with a surface water flow path going right through the site, you would want to assess at L2 stage however, if the flow path is along the boundary, you can just avoid development in this area and recommend blue-green infrastructure etc.

CW: So we can get that narrowed down list back to you fairly quickly.

CT: We can get it by this week (South Ribble)

KG: We can just cut out all the ones that don't need a level 2. Which are sites with planning permission already in place (Chorley).

MW: For the EA, for sites which already have planning permission, if they're not being included in the local plan. Are we just saying that since they will already have had a site-specific FRA, they don't need to go through the L2 SFRA process.

PC: If they aren't going in the local plan, that's fine. If they are, then the recommendations from the site-specific FRA can be carried over. There is an argument on how long ago the FRA was done. It could be said that it is right to assess the sites again, maybe the CC allowances need to be updated. So probably just checking would be best.

CT: If planning permission has been granted, we can't revisit the Flood Risk Assessment.

PC: If you're allocating it and using a previous FRA to support that. There is nothing saying that the existing FRA is still appropriate.

CW: Though, these sites aren't going to come back to the EA with a new FRA. For individual sites where they've been built out, we won't assess again.

PC: For sites with outline planning approval and an FRA has been done, if you are allocating that site in your local plan, then you can use that FRA to justify that allocation. I suppose, it's just flagging that if that extant permission expired without being granted and someone submitted a new outline application, they would need to do a new FRA as it would no longer be applicable.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

CT: We understand that. That's a logical decision but we wouldn't want to revisit those sites at the current time.

CD: For sites with extant planning permission, there is nothing we can do about that. It's the sites with planning permission that has been lapsed, a new FRA would be required.

CW: Is it worth noting on the Pro-Formas, that if planning expires, a new FRA would be required.

CD: Adding that clarity that if extant planning permission expires or there would be a significant change to site layout/plan then a new site-specific FRA / review/ addendum would be required. To be agreed with the EA and LLFA.

CW: Once we've got the L1 SFRA done, and we start the L2 SFRA. Are you happy that this approach is okay with the EA? This will save time later on.

PC: Yes, we're happy with that. This is the evidence base that informs the Local Plan so if we sign off on the SFRA, we won't then question it within the local plan.

CW: So if we get stuff over to PC/CD tomorrow and copy JBA into it as well. Once the EA and LLFA have agreed with the sites to take forward, JBA can get started on the L2 scoping assessment. If you can get that to us fairly quickly, we can get the L2 started ASAP.

CD: Time scales will depend on how many sites there are. It would probably be a couple of weeks.

CW: Shall we say the end of the month then? Would that just be surface water then?

CD: Yes

CW: So we can progress forward with the fluvial sites with Philip's comments.

MW: We haven't had comments back on the L1 report or mapping yet.

CW: I was happy with it; my comments were more on the sites which will be taken forward to L2 assessment.

MW: Is the L2 all under the same contract?

CW: Yes, it is, I have approval up to a certain amount of money. So if that runs out, we can do a part 2. I just need to send you a new PO. Is it worth having another catch up to go over the final list or can we do that over email?

PC: I'm happy to agree over email.

MW: Once we've done the scoping out of the L2 sites, we can have another meeting once the EA and LLFA have reviewed the scope. Maybe mid-June? Then we can all sign off on the report.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 32 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with Natural England

Minutes

Meeting Title	Duty to Cooperate: Strategic matters between the Central Lancashire Authorities and Natural England	
Time and Date	10:00-11:00 am	Wednesday 12 th December 2024
Location	Teams Meeting	

Attendees

Central Lancashire:

Zoe Whiteside - Head of Spatial Planning (Chorley)
Katherine Greenwood – Principal Planning Officer (Chorley)
Benjamin Vickers - Principal Planning Officer (South Ribble)
Carolyn Williams – Planning Policy Manager (Preston)
Catie Haworth – BNG Officer (Chorley)
Emma Price – Planning Policy Officer (Central Team)
Eric Kwok – Project Manager (Central Team)

Natural England:

Isaac Lees (Natural England)

Apologies

Elizabeth Hindle (South Ribble)
Janet Baguley (Natural England)

Items

1.	Introductions
2.	Discussion about the PowerPoint on CLLP Progress
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• EP Presented the CLLP update slides

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

- IL stated that a key area of protection is areas of peat and that Natural England want to ensure a consistent approach to protection across Lancashire. CW assured that the CLLP has taken peat lands into consideration and that no allocations will be on those lands.
- IL stated that the CLLP should be linked to climate resilience and encourages the CLLP use Natural England's Green Infrastructure standards.
- CW assured IL that the CLLP contains a policy which protects soils
- CH asked IL how we can designate new areas for nature conservation when LCC are responsible for this. IL stated that it's a matter of looking at council-owned lands. CH stated that that would be a matter for the LNRS.
- IL stated that GMCA and Liverpool are mirroring each other for land banking and to look to them for examples.

3.	Next Steps
----	------------

ACTION: IL to send draft policy working to CH for how to include the LNRS in the Plan. IL clarified that if the wording cannot be included, just referencing the LNRS will be sufficient.	
--	--

4.	AOB
----	-----

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 34 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Steering Group

Central Lancs Level 2 Update Meeting 10/04/2025

Phillip (EA) provided an update based on EA updated mapping. Noted that the changes following NaFRA2 aren't as significant.

EA would be happy with either an update to each site report or to have a single addendum report.

HS4.4 – no Level 2 SFRA as there is already planning permission agreed for part of the site. Can probably get away with not doing one for this site. LPA agreed to redraw the boundary.

EC4.1 – no planning approval. No Level 2 SFRA completed. LPA to add wording to appendix 5 to cover off flood risk issues.

EC5.7 – NaFRA2 has increased flood risk to the site. More flood zone 3 now. Need to be aware of policy EC5 identifies the portion of the site that would be put forward for residential. EA requests LPA to reduce the portion of the site for residential.

Babylon Lane – EA wouldn't ask for any further work to be done as it isn't in a flood zone.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 35 Meeting with Natural England

Minutes

Meeting Title Duty to Cooperate: Strategic matters between the Central Lancashire Authorities and Natural England (NE)

Time and Date 10:00-11:00 am Friday 9th May 2025

Location Teams Meeting

Attendees

Central Lancashire:

Zoe Whiteside - Head of Spatial Planning (Chorley)

Benjamin Vickers - Principal Planning Officer (South Ribble)

Helen Hatch – Senior Planning Officer (Policy) (South Ribble)

Carolyn Williams – Planning Policy Manager (Preston)

Natural England:

Zoe Haysted (Natural England)

Alice Watson (Natural England)

Rachel Whitaker (Natural England)

Apologies

Katherine Greenwood – Principal Planning Officer (Chorley)

Items

1.	Introductions
2.	Discussion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Zoe updated Natural England on the CLLP progress.• NE suggested HS2.7 and EC2 in Chorley might have peat present in site. May need peat survey work• NE suggested wording could be included with a general policy, site-specific policy or key development considerations to guide peat protection Wording could say peat survey needed at planning application stage.
4.	AOB

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 36 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with Historic England

Meeting Title	Duty to Cooperate: between the Central Lancashire Authorities and Historic England	
Time and Date	10:05-10:33 am	Thursday 5 th June 2025
Location	Microsoft Teams Meeting	

Attendees

Central Lancashire:

Benjamin Vickers – Team Leader (Policy) (South Ribble)
Catherine Thomas – Planning Manager (South Ribble)
Elizabeth Thornber – Head of Planning and Enforcement (South Ribble)
Eric Kwok – Project Manager (Central Lancashire Local Plan) (Central Team)
Helen Hatch – Senior Planning Officer (South Ribble)
Lisa Roche – Senior Planning Officer (Preston)
Vicki Thompson-Spears – Planning Policy Officer (Central Team)
Zoe Whiteside – Head of Spatial Planning (Chorley)

Historic England

Emily Hrycan - Historic Environment Planning Adviser (North)

Apologies

Carolyn Williams – Planning Manager (Preston)

Items

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Discussion of Representation from Historic England on CLLP Regulation 19 Consultation

CT expressed gratitude to Emily Hrycan (EH) of Historic England for her support with the Heritage Impact Assessment prior to the Regulation 19 Consultation.

CT noted that EK had reminded EH ahead of the meeting that the Central Lancashire Authorities (CLA) aim to submit the Local Plan by 30 June 2025. Due to the delegation outlined in the Councils' Reports, CLA can only make limited amendments to the plan at this stage — specifically typographical, formatting, and factual corrections.

While CLA agreed with most of the proposed changes from Historic England, not all could be incorporated for the reasons stated above.

EH confirmed that Historic England is happy to work collaboratively with CLA on the representation and is willing to sign a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) to address the outstanding matters.

CLA agreed that further work can be undertaken post-submission to address Historic England's comments.

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

3. Next Step on Statement of Common Ground
EH will share examples of recently signed SoCGs from other authorities with CLA.

CLA will prepare a draft SoCG and aim to send it to EH within one to two weeks.

4. AOB

Appendix 2: Meetings Minutes

Meeting 37 Duty to Cooperate Meeting with Natural England

Minutes

Meeting Title	Duty to Cooperate: Strategic matters between the Central Lancashire Authorities, Natural England (NE) and Land Use Consultant (LUC)	
Time and Date	10:00-11:00 am	Tuesday 17 th June 2025
Location	Teams Meeting	

Attendees	Central Lancashire: Katherine Greenwood – Principal Planning Officer (Chorley) Catie Howarth – Biodiversity Gain Project Lead Vicki Thompson-Spears – Planning Policy Officer (Local Plan) Natural England: Alice Watson (Natural England) Rachel Whitaker (Natural England) Kate Nicholls (LUC)
------------------	---

Apologies

Items

1.	Introductions
2.	Discussion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">LUC noted Natural England’s comment that a strategic approach for the Sefton Coast Habitats Sites may not be necessary and that reference to this should be removed. Natural England confirmed that they are not concerned about in-combination effects on the Sefton Coast Habitats Sites and that existing safeguards are sufficient (e.g. the SSSI Impact Risk Zone trigger requiring consultation with NE for certain types of development).LUC queried Natural England’s reference in their consultation response to their support for new open space/green infrastructure and enhanced provision e.g. for dog walking and asked them to confirm whether this is intended to be good practice rather than ‘mitigation’ for impacts on specific Habitats Sites. Natural England confirmed that this was a reference to good practice and that no specific mitigation of this nature is required.Agree to work towards signing a statement of common ground.
4.	AOB