

CENTRAL LANCASHIRE LOCAL PLAN

EXAMINATION

MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS

9 October 2025

Inspectors Anne Jordan BA(Hons) MRTPI and Alison Partington BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

Programme Officer – Kerry Trueman

tel: 07582 310364 email: programme.officer@chorley.gov.uk

postal address: Pendragon House, 1 Bertram Drive, Wirral, CH47 0LG

This document sets out Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs) on the submitted Central Lancashire Local Plan. They will inform the hearing sessions which are due to start on Tuesday 2nd December 2025.

Please see the enclosed 'Hearings Programme' for details of the hearing dates. Further information on the examination process is set out in the accompanying 'Examination Guidance Note'.

Written Statements

In order to ensure the hearing events are focused, representors are invited to respond to the questions in this document. **Written statements should be submitted to the Programme Officer by Thursday 6 November (5pm)**, via the above email and postal address. Late responses and further documents received after this date will not be accepted.

Participants should only respond to the questions which directly relate to their previously submitted written representations on the Plan. Please clearly indicate in your statement(s) the question(s) you are answering.

You may choose to respond to all or some of the questions. There is no requirement to submit a hearing statement, and you may wish to rely on your original representations to the Plan. All previous written representations on the submission draft Plan will be taken into account.

In responding to questions regard should be had to the Councils' response to comments on the Plan (CD10) and the modifications they have proposed to the Plan (CD03).

Statements should be proportionate in length to the number of questions being answered and should not, in total, exceed 3,000 words per Matter. Extensive appendices will not be accepted. Separate statements should be submitted on each Matter. The Councils' hearing

statements should cover every question and respond to objections made at the submission Plan stage. The word limit does not apply to the Councils as they are required to respond to every question.

We are examining the Plan as submitted by the Councils. Therefore, we will not, at this stage, be considering the merits of sites for development not included in the plan (“omission sites”). Should we determine that there is a need for additional or different sites to be allocated, we will, in the first instance, ask the Councils to consider how they would wish to proceed with the Examination.

The questions concerning soundness are primarily focussed on the plan’s policies. Insofar as they relate to the plan’s soundness other elements of the plan, including the supporting text, will be considered as part of the discussion of the relevant policies.

Evidence documents

The submitted Local Plan and other evidence documents can be viewed on the Council’s examination webpage in the Local Plan Examination Library. A number of new documents have been added in the last few months, including Initial Questions from the Inspectors (and the Council’s responses).

The hearing sessions

The hearing sessions are due to start on Tuesday 2 December 2025 and will run for 4 weeks. It is intended to hold the sessions mainly at Preston Town Hall, Leyland Civic Centre and Chorley Town Hall, but some sessions may be run virtually.

If you wish to speak at the hearing sessions you will need to contact the Programme Officer in email/writing by **Thursday 23 October (5pm)**. You should indicate:

- Which matter/question number this relates to, and
- Who you are representing (where relevant)

Alternatively, you may prefer to watch the hearing sessions, rather than take an active part in the discussions. If you wish to observe any of the sessions, could you please notify the Programme Officer by the same date and respond to the questions above.

Further information

Please check the Council’s examination website for regular updates regarding the timing and format of the hearings.

If you have any questions about this document or the hearing sessions, please contact the Programme Officer.

**Central Lancashire Local Plan Examination
Provisional Hearings Programme (may be subject to change)**

Week 1

Tuesday 2 December at 9.30

AM - Matter 1a & 1b Legal Compliance and Overarching Issues

PM - Matter 2 Spatial Strategy

Wednesday 3 December at 9.30

AM - Matter 3 The Housing Requirement

PM – Matter 4 Strategic Sites & Mixed Use Allocations

Thursday 4 December at 9.30

AM - Matter 5 Housing Allocations Preston

PM – Matter 5 Housing Allocations Preston

Friday 5 December at 9.30

Reserve Session

Week 2

Tuesday 9 December at 9.30

AM – Matter 5 Housing Allocations Chorley

PM - Matter 5 Housing Allocations Chorley

Wednesday 10 December at 9.30

AM – Matter 5 Housing Allocations South Ribble

PM - Matter 5 Housing Allocations South Ribble

Thursday 11 December at 9.30

AM - Matter 6 Housing Supply

PM - Matter 6 Housing Supply

Friday 12 December at 9.30

Reserve Session

Week 3

Tuesday 13 January at 9.30

AM – Matters 8 & 9 Employment Land Need and Allocations

PM – Matters 8 & 9 Employment Land Need and Allocations

Wednesday 14 January at 9.30

AM - Matter 7 Housing Policies

PM - Matter 10 Economic Development Policies

Thursday 15 January at 9.30

AM - Matter 11 Healthy & Inclusive Communities Policies

PM - Matters 13 & 14 Climate Change Policies, Sustainable Travel Policies, Infrastructure Policies and Monitoring

Friday 16 January at 9.30

Reserve Session

Week 4

Tuesday 20 January at 9.30

AM – Matter 12 Environment Policies

PM - Matter 12 Environment Policies

Wednesday 21 January at 9.30

Reserve session

Matter 1a – Legal Compliance

Issue 1: Has the Council complied with the duty to co-operate and other relevant procedural and legal requirements in the preparation of the Local Plan.

1.1 In preparing the Plan did the Councils engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis with neighbouring authorities and other relevant organisations on cross-boundary issues, in respect of the Duty to Co-operate?

- What engagement with neighbouring authorities has taken place as to the scale and form of development proposed and any strategic matters arising from this? What are the cross-boundary issues relating to economic growth and employment land provision? What was the outcome?
- Are there any strategic cross-boundary issues in relation to any of the proposed site allocations and any general policies, and if so, how have they been considered via the Duty to Co-operate?

[Note: this question concerns the engagement undertaken by the Councils during the preparation of the Plan and does not directly relate to the content of the Plan and whether or not it is sound, which is considered under other Matters]

1.2 Has the Plan been prepared in accordance with the adopted Local Development Scheme (CD12)?

1.3 Has consultation on the plan been carried out in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and the requirements of the 2004 Act (as amended) and the 2012 Regulations?

1.4 Does the Integrated Assessment (IA) provide a comprehensive and robust basis to inform the strategy and contents of the Plan, particularly in terms of:

- (a) Its assessment of the likely effects of the plan's policies and allocations?
- (b) Its consideration of reasonable alternatives, including the development quantum and spatial distribution options? Does it capture all reasonable alternative site options put forward in the Plan preparation process? Can these be compared on a like for like basis?
- (c) Its explanation of why the preferred strategy and policies were selected?
- (d) Its assessment of the amount of development that would arise as a result of the provisions in the Plan?

[Note: This question focusses on the legal compliance of the IA in broad terms. The implications of the IA for the soundness of the plan are considered under other Matters.]

1.5 Is the Habitats Regulations Assessment adequate and does the Plan include all the recommendations identified in the assessment as necessary to ensure compliance

with the Habitats Regulations? Is it robust and convincing in its conclusion that the Plan will have no significant effects on the integrity of any European sites? In particular, how will cumulative effects be addressed on a site by site basis?

- 1.6 Does the Plan include policies to address the strategic priorities for the development and use of land in Central Lancashire? How are these identified in the Plan?
- 1.7 Does the Plan include policies designed to ensure that the development and use of land in Lancashire contributes to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change?
- 1.8 How have issues of equality been addressed in the Local Plan?
- 1.9 Does the Plan comply with all other relevant legal requirements, including in the 2004 Act (as amended) and the 2012 Regulations?
- 1.10 Does the Policies Map (CD02) correctly illustrate geographically the application of policies of the Plan?

Matter 1b - Overarching Matters

- 1.11 Is the Plan period (2023 - 2041) justified, effective and consistent with national policy which requires strategic policies to look at least 15 years ahead from adoption? Should the requirements/timescales for review of the Plan be set out in policy?
- 1.12 What are the implications of the transitional arrangements set out in paras 234 and 235 of the NPPF (Dec 2024) for the examination of the Plan?
- 1.13 How have made and emerging Neighbourhood Plans been taken into account and where is this evident?

Matter 2 – Vision & Objectives, Spatial Strategy & Location of New Development, and the Site Selection Process

(Policies SS1, SS2)

Issue 2 – Are the provisions of the plan in relation to the Spatial Strategy & Location of New Development justified and consistent with national policy?

This matter focusses on the broad spatial distribution of new development and on the process by which proposed development sites have been selected for inclusion in the Plan (Policies SS1, and SS2). The merits of individual site allocations are considered under Matters 4 and 5 and 8).

- 2.1 Is the proposed spatial strategy and the distribution of development (as set out in policies SS1 and SS2 supported by robust and up to date evidence and otherwise soundly based? In particular:
 - a) Does it reflect the vision and objectives of the Plan?
 - b) To what degree is the distribution of development set out in Policy SS2 based on the settlement hierarchy in Table 1?
 - c) Is the focus on the larger urban settlements justified and soundly based?
 - d) How were the proportions of development proposed for each settlement arrived at?
 - e) Would it provide sufficient development within rural areas and other settlements?
 - f) Does the distribution of employment related development take appropriate account of national and regional programmes and strategies?
- 2.2 What is the evidential basis for the settlement hierarchy in policy SS2? Is this consistent across all 3 authorities? Does this accurately reflect the pattern of settlements across the district? Is this up to date? How does this inform the development strategy? What other factors influenced the strategy, such as physical and environmental constraints?
- 2.3 What other spatial strategies and distributions of growth were considered during plan preparation, and why were they discounted? Where is the evidence for this? Were alternative approaches tested in the Integrated Assessment work?
- 2.4 Have the sites allocated for development in the Plan been appraised and selected in comparison with possible alternatives using a robust and objective process?
 - a) Is the site selection process transparent? How were different development constraints taken into account? Were they identified using up to date and appropriate evidence and guidance?

- b) Were constraints given relative weight in the site selection process? If so, how was this determined?
 - c) In relation to flood risk, were sites at low risk preferred over those at greater risk? How did the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) inform site selection? Does the SFRA2 reflect the most up to date flood-mapping? Where sites are proposed for development in areas of flood risk, does the Plan take a sound approach in how these matters will be addressed?
 - d) What account was taken of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land?
- 2.5 Does the Plan allow sufficient development in rural local centres, smaller villages and hamlets, rural areas and settlements to comply with paragraph 83 of the Framework? Are the proposed settlement development boundaries up to date and are these appropriately drawn? What factors were taken into account in designating these?
- 2.6 What are the Plan's assumptions in relation to the amounts and timing of development to be delivered through neighbourhood plans?
- 2.7 Are there any omissions in the policies and are they sufficiently flexible? Are there any proposed modifications to the policies and are these necessary for soundness?

Matter 3 – The Housing Requirement

(Policy HS1)

Issue 3 - Is the identified housing requirement justified and consistent with national policy?

- 3.1 Is the housing requirement of 23,652 homes during the 2023 – 2041 period (policy HS1) and a figure of 1,314 per annum (dpa), justified by the Council's evidence? Are the assumptions of the 2024 Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessments and Addenda (Doc HO10, HO11 and HO12) soundly based, particularly in relation to:
- a) Identifying a baseline figure;
 - b) Forecasts for economic growth;
 - c) Alignment of jobs and workers; and
 - d) Assumptions of housing requirements arising from economic growth?
- 3.2 How were the housing requirements of each authority arrived at? Will the proposed requirements adequately address the needs of each authority? Is the Plan sufficiently clear in relation to how a failure to supply housing in one authority will impact upon the other two authorities in relation to five year housing land supply?
- 3.3 In relation to Affordable Housing Needs, is the identified need for 438 dpa based on robust, up-to-date information? How has this been considered in the overall housing requirement?
- 3.4 Does the requirement adequately recognise the impact of housing need arising from strategic employment allocations and regional growth strategies? What assumptions have been made in relation to this?
- 3.5 Does the figure take adequate account of the needs of elderly residents and specialist housing?
- 3.6 Should there be a housing requirement for designated neighbourhood areas identified within the Plan (paragraph 66 in the NPPF Dec 2023)? If so, what should this be?

Matter 4 – Strategic Sites & Mixed Use Allocations

(Policies SS3 – SS6 & EC5 & 6)

Issue 4 – Are the proposed strategic allocations justified, effective, developable, deliverable, in line with national policy and otherwise soundly based?

Note: This matter focusses on the merits of the individual strategic sites and mixed use allocations, the process for selecting site allocations is dealt with in Matter 2.

Policy SS3 North West Preston/Bartle

- 4.1 Why was the site selected as a strategic site? What evidence supports the allocation in terms of:
- Size
 - Capacity
 - Layout
 - Infrastructure requirements
 - Assessment of the effects of development and necessary mitigations
 - Delivery
 - Viability
- 4.2 Does the policy provide sufficient information on site specific constraints and requirements such as the physical and social infrastructure that may be required as part of the development and its phasing?
- 4.3 Does policy SS3 provide clear direction as to how a decision maker should react to a development proposal? Are there any necessary modifications to the policy?

Policy SS4 – Fulwood Barracks

- 4.4 Why was the site selected as a strategic site? What evidence supports the allocation in terms of:
- Size
 - Capacity
 - Layout
 - Infrastructure requirements
 - Assessment of the effects of development and necessary mitigations
 - Delivery
 - Viability
- 4.5 Does the policy provide sufficient information on site specific constraints and requirements such as the physical and social infrastructure that may be required as part of the development?

- 4.6 Does policy SS4 provide clear direction as to how a decision maker should react to a development proposal? Are the Council's proposed modifications to the policy needed for soundness? Are there other necessary modifications to the policy?

Policy SS5 – Preston West

- 4.7 Why was the site selected as a strategic site? What evidence supports the allocation in terms of:
- Size
 - Capacity
 - Layout
 - Employment / Housing land split
 - Infrastructure requirements
 - Assessment of the effects of development and necessary mitigations
 - Delivery
 - Viability
- 4.8 Does the policy provide sufficient information on site specific constraints and requirements such as the physical and social infrastructure that may be required as part of the development?
- 4.9 Does policy SS5 provide clear direction as to how a decision maker should react to a development proposal? Are there any necessary modifications to the policy?

Policy SS6 – Pickering's Farm

- 4.10 Why was the site selected as a strategic site? What evidence supports the allocation in terms of:
- Size
 - Capacity
 - Layout
 - Infrastructure requirements
 - Assessment of the effects of development and necessary mitigations
 - Delivery
 - Viability
- 4.11 Does the policy provide sufficient information on site specific constraints and requirements such as the physical and social infrastructure that may be required as part of the development?
- 4.12 Does policy SS6 provide clear direction as to how a decision maker should react to a development proposal? Are there any necessary modifications to the policy?

Policy EC5 and EC6– Mixed Use Allocations – Chorley and South Ribble

4.13 For each site, why was the site selected as a mixed-use site? In particular:

- a) Have the site constraints been appropriately taken into account in the allocation of the site?
- b) How was the balance of employment and housing arrived at? Have the indicative yield, development mix and viability considerations been adequately addressed?
- c) Are the various requirements set out in the policy clear, justified and effective? Do the policies provide clear direction as to how a decision maker should react to a development proposal?
- d) Is there evidence that the development of the allocation is developable and deliverable during the plan period?
- e) Are there any omissions in the policy, and is it sufficiently flexible?

Matter 5 – Housing Allocations

Issue 5 – Are the proposed housing allocations justified, effective, developable, deliverable, in line with national policy and otherwise soundly based?

Note: This matter focusses on the merits of individual housing allocations, the process for selecting the sites is dealt with in Matter 2.

Housing Allocations - Chorley

(Policy HS2)

- 5.1 Do the sites allocated for residential development provide an appropriate range of sites in terms of their type and size?
- 5.2 Is each site allocated for residential development sound? In particular:
 - a) Have the site constraints been appropriately taken into account in the allocation of the site?
 - b) Are the various requirements set out in the policy clear, justified and effective?
 - c) Have the indicative yield, development mix and viability considerations been adequately addressed?
 - d) Is there robust evidence that the assumptions regarding the infrastructure required for the development are realistic and that it will be deliverable?
 - e) Is there evidence that the development of the allocations is viable and developable during the plan period?
 - f) Are there any omissions in the policy, and is it sufficiently flexible?
- 5.3 Does the policy provide sufficient information on site specific constraints and requirements such as the physical and social infrastructure that may be required as part of the development?

Housing Allocations – South Ribble

(Policy HS3)

- 5.4 Do the sites allocated for residential development provide an appropriate range of sites in terms of their type and size?
- 5.5 Is each site allocated for residential development sound? In particular:
 - a) Have the site constraints been appropriately taken into account in the allocation of the site?
 - b) Are the various requirements set out in the policy clear, justified and effective?
 - c) Have the indicative yield, development mix and viability considerations been adequately addressed?
 - d) Is there robust evidence that the assumptions regarding the infrastructure required for the development are realistic and that it will be deliverable?

- e) Is there evidence that the development of the allocations is viable and developable during the plan period?
- f) Are there any omissions in the policy, and is it sufficiently flexible?

5.6 Does the policy provide sufficient information on site specific constraints and requirements such as the physical and social infrastructure that may be required as part of the development?

Housing Allocations - Preston

(Policy HS4)

- 5.7 Do the sites allocated for residential development provide an appropriate range of sites in terms of their type and size?
- 5.8 Is each site allocated for residential development allocation sound? In particular:
- a) Have the site constraints been appropriately taken into account in the allocation of the site?
 - b) Are the various requirements set out in the policy clear, justified and effective?
 - c) Have the indicative yield, development mix and viability considerations been adequately addressed?
 - d) Is there robust evidence that the assumptions regarding the infrastructure required for the development are realistic and that it will be deliverable?
 - e) Is there evidence that the development of the allocations is viable and developable during the plan period?
 - f) Are there any omissions in the policy, and is it sufficiently flexible?
- 5.9 Does the policy provide sufficient information on site specific constraints and requirements such as the physical and social infrastructure that may be required as part of the development?

Matter 6 - Housing Land Supply

(Policy HS1 and Appendix 3 - Housing Trajectories)

Issue 6 - Does the Plan provide an appropriate supply of deliverable and developable sites to meet identified needs and align with national policy?

Note: This Matter focusses on the overall supply of land for housing. The merits of individual site allocations are considered under Matters 4 and 5, although our consideration of this issue will also be informed by detailed discussion of the deliverability of the specific site allocations in Matters 4 and 5.

In the light of Matter 3, we will reach a conclusion on whether or not the objectively assessed need for housing of 23,652 dwellings for the 2023-2041 period is justified. However, without prejudice to that, these questions work on the assumption that 23,652 dwellings is a soundly based housing requirement figure.

- 6.1 Are the assumptions that have been made to inform the trajectory justified in relation to the delivery of housing sites, in particular in relation to:
 - a) lead in times for grant of full permissions, outline and reserved matters and conditions discharge?
 - b) site opening up and preparation, and dwelling build out rates?
- 6.2 Is there a reasonable prospect that a total of 6,499 new dwellings will be provided by 31/03/41 on sites that had planning permission at 01/04/24?
- 6.3 Is there a reasonable prospect that the total of 13,440 new dwellings to be delivered through local plan allocations will be provided by 31/03/41?
- 6.4 Is there compelling evidence to justify a windfall allowance of 3,139 new dwellings over the plan period and to demonstrate that they will provide a reliable source of supply?
- 6.5 Has appropriate consideration been given to non-implementation lapse rates?
- 6.6 Overall, is there convincing evidence that:
 - a) Having regard to assumptions about commitments, allocations and windfalls the housing requirement across Central Lancashire between 2023 and 2041 is likely to be met?
 - b) A 5 year supply of deliverable housing land will exist on adoption?
 - c) The Plan provides specific, developable sites so that a supply of deliverable or developable housing land is likely to exist throughout the plan period?

Matter 7 – Housing Policies

(Policies HS5 – HS13)

Issue 7- Does the Plan set out positively prepared housing policies which are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

- 7.1 a) Are the requirements in Policy HS5 for the provision of open space and playing pitches by housing developments justified by robust and up to date evidence? Is there convincing evidence that the open space requirements can be viably provided?
- b) Is the policy sufficiently clear regarding the approach to be taken for off-site and/or financial contributions in lieu of on-site provision?
- 7.2 a) Does Policy HS6 provide an effective framework for ensuring an appropriate mix of housing will be delivered over the plan period? Does it provide sufficient flexibility to ensure site specific considerations are taken into account?
- b) Are the requirements relating to the provision of homes that comply with M4(2) and M4(3) of the building regulations justified by evidence relating to need and viability and are they consistent with national policy? Would it ensure the needs for specialist housing will be met over the plan period?
- c) Are the minimum density requirements justified and appropriate? What account has been taken in the density requirements for the delivery of on site BNG?
- d) Are there any omissions in the policy?
- 7.3 a) Does Policy HS7 provide an effective framework for maximising the delivery of affordable housing over the plan period? Based on the thresholds and requirements in Policy HS7, will affordable housing needs be met?
- b) Is there convincing evidence to show that affordable housing requirements, including on specialist older persons housing, would be viable? How were the thresholds for affordable housing and areas in which they apply arrived at? Are they based on comprehensive and up to date information? Is the use of “pragmatic scenarios” within the Whole Plan Viability Assessment a reasonable approach?
- c) Is there convincing evidence to justify the proposed tenure split for affordable housing units? Does it accurately reflect the requirements for affordable housing in the Housing Needs and Demand Assessments? Is it sufficiently flexible?
- d) Is the policy sufficiently clear regarding the approach to be taken for off-site and/or financial contributions in lieu of on-site provision? Is the 20% supplement for commuted sums justified?
- 7.4 a) Is the approach to rural exception sites in policy HS8 justified? Would it provide an effective framework?

- b) Are there any omissions in the policy, and is it sufficiently flexible?
- 7.5 Is the approach in Policy HS9 justified and is it consistent with national policy?
- 7.6 Is the approach in Policy HS10 justified and is it consistent with national policy?
- 7.7 Does Policy HS11 provide an effective framework to ensure the delivery of an adequate supply of custom and self-build plots over the plan period? Is the policy consistent with national policy?
- 7.8 Does Policy HS12 provide an effective framework that would ensure the needs for specialist housing will be met over the plan period? Does the evidence provide a robust assessment of the need for specialist housing? Given the need for older persons housing in particular outlined in the HNDAs, is a criteria based approach to meeting this need appropriate?
- 7.9 a) Does Policy HS13 provide an adequate framework to ensure the need for accommodation for Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople can be met as required by national policy? Is the Central Lancashire Gypsy and Traveller and Traveling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment 2024 Update robust in its identification of needs for pitches and plots?
- b) Is Policy HS13 a positively prepared, justified and effective approach to planning for the accommodation needs for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople? Does the Council's approach in relation to traveller sites generally conform with the expectations of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites? Has a robust and objective process been used to identify potential sites across the plan area?
- c) Are the requirements of the policy justified, clear and would they be effective?
- d) Are there any omissions in the policy, and is it sufficiently flexible?

Matters 8 & 9 – Employment Land Need and Allocations

Policies EC1 – EC4

Issue 8 – Are the provisions of the plan in relation to the provision of employment land justified and consistent with national policy?

- 8.1 Is the Employment Land Need figure of 173 hectares for the Plan period justified and are the assumptions and methodology from which it was arrived at soundly based? Does the assessment take adequate account of strategic employment needs, regional and national growth strategies and the specific locational requirements of different sectors?
- 8.2 Are the findings of the Employment Land Review in relation to the suitability of existing sites reasonable and are its conclusions in relation to existing supply soundly based? What is the identified supply of existing sites within the 3 Authorities? What is the resulting “shortfall” that the Plan seeks to address for the Plan period?

Issue 9 - Are the proposed employment allocations justified, effective, developable, deliverable, in line with national policy and otherwise soundly based?

- 9.1 How were employment sites selected? In particular:
- What factors led to their allocation?
 - Are they based on up-to-date evidence?
 - Were they selected in comparison with possible alternatives using a robust and objective process?
 - Does the site selection process take adequate account of the individual needs of each Authority? How far was this a factor in the selection of sites?
 - What account has been taken of regional and national growth strategies in determining employment need?
- 9.2 In relation to the following sites:
- EC2.1 Land East of the M61, Chorley
 - EC2.2 Former Gas Works, Bengal Street, Chorley
 - EC3.1 Former Alstom Works and Wider Site, Channel Way, Preston
 - EC3.2 Preston East Junction 31A M6
 - EC3.3 11 Roman Road Farm
 - EC3.4 Riversway, Maritime Way, Preston
 - EC4.1 Land North of Lancashire Business Park

- EC4.2 Land at Leyland Business Park, Farington

- a) Are the requirements set out in Policies EC2, EC3 and EC4 clear, justified and effective?
- b) Have the site constraints and off-site impacts been appropriately taken into account in the allocation of the site?
- c) Is there robust evidence that the assumptions regarding the infrastructure required for development are realistic and that it will be deliverable?
- d) Is there evidence that the development of the allocation is viable and developable during the plan period?
- e) Are there any omissions in the policies, and are they sufficiently flexible?

9.3 What is the identified supply figure of new business and industrial development land within the Plan? What factors were taken into account in how it has been distributed across the Plan area? Taken in the round, does the identified supply make appropriate provision for the future employment needs within the three Authorities for the Plan Period?

Matter 10 – Economic Policies

(Policies EC7-14)

Issue 10 – Does the Plan set out a positively prepared strategy and policies for business and industrial development, rural employment, retailing and town centres and the visitor economy which is justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

- 10.1 Are the requirements of policies EC7- EC14 clear, and would these policies be effective? In particular:
- a) Does the reference to Class E in the supporting text to EC7 take appropriate account of the potential effect of permitted development rights for change of use?
 - b) Have existing employment areas been identified on the basis of up to date and comprehensive information? What factors were taken into account in identifying sites for protection?
 - c) In relation to policy EC8 how would the criteria in relation to agricultural produce packing and distribution facilities be assessed?
 - d) In relation to policy EC10 is the policy sufficiently clear as to how proposals on land adjoining the UClan site will be considered?
 - e) In relation to policy EC11 is the Town Centre Hierarchy based on up-to-date evidence and is it sound? In relation to Primary Shopping Areas, does the policy and supporting text take appropriate account of the potential effect of permitted development rights for change of use? How were the thresholds for retail and leisure impact assessments defined? Is the policy sufficiently clear as to what is meant by edge of centre and out of centre locations?
 - f) In relation to policy EC12 is the reference to Class E(a) consistent with national policy? Should the Horrocks Quarter Opportunity Area be defined on the proposals map? Is the approach to ancillary uses soundly based? Should sites for education be identified on the policies map?
- 10.2 Are there any omissions in the policies and are they sufficiently flexible?
- 10.3 Are the Council's proposed modifications to these policies and the supporting text necessary for soundness?

Matter 11 – Healthy and Inclusive Communities

(Policies HC1 – HC7)

Issue 11 - Does the Plan set out a positively prepared strategy and policies for healthy and inclusive communities which is justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

- 11.1 Does HC1 provide an effective framework to achieving inclusive, safe and healthy places?
- 11.2 Are the requirements of HC2 justified by a robust evidence base and are they consistent with national policy? Will they provide an effective framework for determining applications?
- 11.3 Does the approach in HC3 provide an effective framework for retaining existing, and allowing new, community, health and education facilities including potential extensions to existing facilities? Is it justified for the policy to cover such a wide range of different types of use? Will it ensure the future needs for different types of facilities will be met?
- 11.4 Does HC4 provide an effective framework for new places of worship including those seeking to utilise existing buildings?
- 11.5 Is the approach in HC5 based on a robust and up-to-date evidence base? Will it be effective in ensuring the needs for new open space, sport and recreation facilities are met?
- 11.6 Is the approach for protecting existing open space, sport and recreational facilities in HC6 justified and consistent with national policy? Will it be effective in both retaining valuable facilities and making effective use of land and buildings?
- 11.7 Does HC7 provide an effective and justified framework to ensure the needs for cemeteries and crematoria over the plan period are met?

Matter 12 – Environment Policies

(Policies EN1-EN19)

Issue 12 - Does the Plan set out positively prepared policies in relation to the environment which are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

- 12.1 Are the requirements of Policy EN1 clear and would they be effective? Are they consistent with requirements set out in the 'Key Development Considerations' for the site allocations? Are the requirements justified by appropriate evidence, having regard to national guidance? What is the justification for setting the nationally described space standards and the water efficiency requirement at 110ltrs per day? How is this supported by evidence?
- 12.2 Are the requirements of Policy EN2 clear and would they be effective? Are they consistent with requirements in other policies within the plan?
- 12.3 Are the requirements of Policy EN3 clear and would they be effective?
- 12.4 Are the requirements of Policy EN4 clear and would they be effective? Does the policy take adequate account of the needs of established uses with regard to the "agent of change" principle?
- 12.5 Are the requirements of Policy EN5 clear and would they be effective? On what basis were the sites allocated for Green Infrastructure both within the policy and on the policies map identified and are they justified?
- 12.6 Are the requirements of the Policy EN6 clear and consistent with national policy? Would they be effective?
- 12.7 Are the requirements of Policy EN7 clear and consistent with national policy? Would they provide an effective framework for biological and geological conservation? How would no net loss of the ecological or conservation value of designated sites and delivery of net gain be demonstrated and when would net gain be expected? Where potential cumulative impacts have been identified, how would these be assessed on a site by site basis?
- 12.8 Are the requirements of Policy EN8 clear and would they be effective? Would they be consistent with the requirements in other policies of the plan and would they be viable?
- 12.9 Are the requirements of Policy EN9 clear and consistent with national policy? Would they provide an effective framework for species protection?
- 12.10 Are the requirements of the water related policies EN10-EN12 clear, effective, and would they be consistent with national policy? In particular:
- a) In relation to EN10 are the policy requirements in relation to agricultural land and flood mapping updates clear and would they be effective?

- b) Does Policy EN10 adequately reflect considerations in relation to flooding from all sources, including surface water flooding (pluvial and sewer)?
 - c) Does Policy EN11 and its supporting text provide clear guidance for developers and decision makers on how Sustainable Urban Drainage should be provided within developments?
 - d) Does Policy EN12 and the supporting text adequately explain its requirements in relation to safeguarding public water supply?
- 12.11 Are the requirements of Policy EN13 clear, effective and consistent with national policy. In particular:
- a) Does the policy provide clear direction in how the matter of “less than substantial harm” should be addressed?
 - b) Does the policy provide adequate direction in relation to development which may impact upon archaeological assets?
- 12.12 Are the requirements of Policy EN14 clear, effective and consistent with national policy. In particular, should the policy directly refer to water quality and unstable land? How will significant harm to soil quality be defined?
- 12.13 Are the requirements of Policy EN15 clear, effective and consistent with national policy. In particular:
- a) How were the thresholds identified in the policy arrived at?
 - b) Would policy EN15 provide an effective basis for directing a decision maker in light of the changes to national policy in the NPPF Dec 2024?
- 12.14 Are the requirements of Policy EN16 clear, effective and consistent with national policy? In particular:
- a) What is the justification for the 0.5 hectares site threshold in the policy?
 - b) How will a developer demonstrate compliance with criterion b)?
- 12.15 Are the requirements of Policy EN17 clear, effective and consistent with national policy? In particular, is the policy consistent with policy EN15 and paragraph 84 of the NPPF?
- 12.16 Are the requirements of Policy EN18 clear, effective and consistent with national policy? In particular:
- a) Is the policy supported by robust and up to date evidence to justify the policy?
 - b) How is it to be applied alongside Policy EN17?

- 12.17 Are the requirements of Policy EN19 clear, effective and consistent with national policy? In particular, should the policy refer to the impacts of development in relation to light pollution and impacts of tranquillity within National Landscapes?
- 12.18 Are there any omissions in the above policies? Are there any necessary modifications?

Matter 13 – Climate Change Policies

(Policies CC1-3)

Issue 13 - Does the Plan set out a positively prepared strategy and policies in relation to climate change, which is justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

13.1 Are the requirements of Policies CC1- CC3 clear, effective and consistent with national policy? In particular:

- a) In relation to Policy CC1 does the policy go beyond the requirements of national policy and in doing so, is it sound? How will “maximising opportunities” be assessed?
- b) In relation to CC3 does the policy provide sufficient clarity as to what the energy statement should contain and how the aims of the policy are to be achieved?
- c) Have the requirements of policies CC1-CC3 been appropriately considered within the Whole Plan Viability Appraisal and what are the anticipated cost implications of the policies?

Matter 14 – Sustainable Travel, Infrastructure and Delivery, and Monitoring

(Policies ST1-ST3 and ID1-ID3)

Issue 14 – Does the Plan set out a positively prepared strategy and policies for sustainable travel, infrastructure, delivery and monitoring which is justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

- 14.1 Do policies ST1-ST3 provide clear direction as to how a decision maker should react to a development proposal? Would these policies be effective? In particular:
- a) In relation to policy ST2 are the requirements in relation to bus access into sites necessary and justified?
 - b) In relation to criteria 5b) is the requirement to mitigate any detrimental impact reasonable? How should cumulative impacts be taken into account?
 - c) Are there any omissions in the policies and are they sufficiently flexible?
 - d) Do the Councils propose any modifications to these policies and the supporting text and if so, are they necessary for soundness?
- 14.2 Does the Transport Assessment of the Plan (Docs IT06 and IT07) provide a robust and comprehensive assessment of the transport impacts of the development proposed in the Plan? Would the recommended measures within the policy provide effective mitigation for its identified effects?
- 14.3
- a) Do Policies ID1-ID3 provide an effective framework to ensure the delivery of the necessary infrastructure?
 - b) Are the policies requirements supported by up-to-date evidence? How will the requirements of the policies be kept up to date?
 - c) Have the implications of policies ID1 and ID2 in relation to viability been appropriately tested? Are the assumptions in the Local Plan Viability Report (Doc IT05) reasonable and up to date and do they adequately reflect the scale and cost of infrastructure requirements for development in the Borough as set out in the revised Infrastructure Delivery Plan?
 - d) Are the policies sufficiently flexible? Do they take appropriate account of development in cases where viability is below that which would be policy compliant
 - e) Are there any omissions from the proposed policies and supporting text?
- 14.4 In relation to Appendix 2 is the plan sufficiently clear as to how its implementation will be monitored?