

Central Lancashire Local Plan Examination Matters, Issues and Questions

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:

Yes, policies ST1-3 are effective and set a clear direction as to how decision makers should react to a development proposal.

a) In relation to policy ST2 are the requirements in relation to bus access into sites necessary and justified?

Yes. NPPF (2023) paragraph 109 / NPPF (2024) paragraph 110 instructs that the planning system should enable a genuine choice of transport modes. NPPF (2023) para 116a / NPPF (2024) paragraph 117a qualify this however by necessitating that applications for development should “*as far as possible*” facilitate access to public transport through layout. Criteria 5c) does not require all development to facilitate bus movement. It is qualified by the term “*where appropriate,*” consistent with the intention of national policy.

b) In relation to criteria 5b) is the requirement to mitigate any detrimental impact reasonable? How should cumulative impacts be taken into account?

The purpose of criterion 5b is to be read alongside NPPF (2023) paragraph 115 / NPPF (2024) paragraph 116. Criterion 5b addresses detrimental impacts in terms of capacity and congestion, whilst the NPPF paragraphs exclusively address highway safety. Although often interrelated, these metrics are subtly different. In summary:

- ‘Capacity’ refers to the maximum number of trips or vehicles that can pass through a specific point on the transport network in a given time period, often expressed in “trips/vehicles per hour”, without a breakdown in the operation of the transport network occurring.
- ‘Congestion’ refers to elevated levels of delay, operational inefficiency, and crowding (of users or vehicles) which occurs when a part of the transport network approaches or reaches its capacity for more than a short period of time. Congestion typically results in the growth of queues beyond their typical lengths, traveller stresses resulting in erratic or hostile behaviours, and increased safety risks.

- ‘Highway safety’ refers to the actual or perceived likelihood and severity of accidents on the highway network resulting from a combination of design and user behaviours. Highway Safety relates not only to the statistical likelihood of an accident occurring, but also its potential severity, and the elevated perception of a threat to safety or personal security experienced by vulnerable road users (such as pedestrians, cyclists, children, the elderly, women, and disabled users) that can result.

Local tests can therefore be set for ‘Capacity’ and ‘Congestion,’ whilst the test regarding ‘Highway safety’ is prescribed within the NPPF (i.e. “severe”). It is expected that cumulative impacts would be identified within a Transport Assessment required by criteria 7.

c) Are there any omissions in the policies and are they sufficiently flexible?

There are no omissions. NPPF (2023) paragraph 109 / NPPF (2024) paragraph 110 acknowledges that transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, which should be reflected within Local Plans. The settlements within Central Lancashire range from a city to hamlets. The policies are consequently drafted to be sufficiently flexible to deliver an appropriate level of sustainable transport, consistent with the location and size of an application site.

d) Do the Councils propose any modifications to these policies and the supporting text and if so, are they necessary for soundness?

No modifications are proposed, as the CLAs consider the transport policies to be sound as drafted.

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?

The Transport Assessment (IT06 and IT07) provides a robust and comprehensive assessment of the transport impacts arising from the proposed development.

NPPF (2023) was not prescriptive regarding how Transport Assessments should be prepared. NPPF (2024), paragraph 109 however now instructs that transport policies should be informed by a “vision-led” approach, which the assessment’s ‘decide and provide’ methodology adopts at its core.

The ‘decide and provide’ approach involves setting a vision and then identifying the resources/infrastructure necessary to achieve that vision. ‘Decide and provide’ consequently prioritises the transport user hierarchy (i.e. walking, cycling, and public transport first) from the outset.

Transport impacts were explored methodically by:

- Assessing existing transport infrastructure capacity and identifying areas of potential stress due to projected development;
- Modelling future demand scenarios, including peak-hour congestion, modal shifts, and land-use changes;
- Integrating sustainability goals, such as reducing car dependency and promoting active travel modes (walking, cycling, public transport); and
- Proposing mitigation strategies for both strategic and local transport corridors and junctions across Central Lancashire.

The assessment consists of 3x stages:

- Stage 0: This stage involved high level qualitative assessment of the proposed allocations to help evaluate sites using a consistent set of criteria (high, medium, and low impact rating). It offers a high-level perspective of each site's attributes and highlights areas where further investment may be crucial to achieve sustainable transport.
- Stage 1: This stage involved the preparation of a Transport Evidence Base, which draws together all available evidence on current transport provision and movement across the three districts and cross-boundary with neighbouring areas. It evaluated the cumulative transport impacts of proposed allocations and identified key junctions and corridors likely to experience increased demand.
- Stage 2: This stage involved a more detailed analysis and modelling of development scenarios, including the testing of mitigation options. This phase developed a comprehensive mitigation strategy, and scenario tests utilising strategic models to assess the cumulative transport impacts of both sustainable and highway interventions alongside the development proposed in the plan.

A suite of 45 documents forms the assessment, presenting a comprehensive and robust study. The Inspectors can therefore be confident that the recommended measures within the assessment will provide effective mitigation for its identified effects.

Recommendations within Stage 2 of the Transport Assessment have been applied to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and its associated schedule ([IT08](#) + [IT09](#)). The Stage 2 recommendations are consequently to be delivered through the IDP and other documents cited within Policy ST1.

14.3 a) Do Policies ID1-ID3 provide an effective framework to ensure the delivery of the necessary infrastructure?

In accordance with NPPF (2023) paragraph 20(b)(c)(d), the strategic policies ID1 Infrastructure Planning Principles; ID2 Developer Contributions and Planning Obligations and, ID3 Digital and Communications Infrastructure collectively make sufficient provision for a variety of infrastructure, providing an effective framework within which infrastructure is identified and planned for. This includes securing onsite and/or offsite mitigation to offset development impacts.

The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and Schedule ([IT08](#) + [IT09](#)) identifies mechanisms for funding and delivery of necessary infrastructure. Items within the IDP are generally strategic in nature, to be predominantly delivered by national/regional infrastructure providers. The CLAs will work in partnership with the providers to ensure a coordinated approach towards infrastructure delivery. The IDP will however be a key tool within the development management process as contributions from developers may be sought to help secure the items identified in the IDP.

Policies ID1-ID3 also make provision for all other typologies of infrastructure via developer contributions, identified by other policies within the CLLP (including HS5, HC3, HS7, EN6 and site allocation Key Development Considerations).

The planning process (beginning at pre- application stage) following the adoption of the CLLP, will be the forum where partners including the CLAs, developers and infrastructure providers, engage and identify what infrastructure & developer contributions are necessary and how these are to be secured.

Where necessary infrastructure is identified by a statutory infrastructure provider, but the requisite funding sought through developer contributions cannot be provided, this is unlikely to deliver sustainable development. In this instance, the CLAs will use Section 106 and Section 278 legal agreements (and planning conditions where appropriate) to secure the necessary infrastructure. Contributions from Section 106 agreements may be pooled to meet the costs of infrastructure, where this meets the legal tests set out in the Community Infrastructure Regulations. The IDP ([IT08](#) and [IT09](#)) will be reviewed periodically to reflect changes happening over the Plan period, as and when necessary.

As a two-tier administration, the CLAs work closely with the upper tier, LCC in the planning and delivery of infrastructure, including (though not exclusively) related to highways, education, and flood risk. The CLLP policies provide the framework within which the CLAs and LCC will work in collaboration, with LCC policies and guidance notes providing supplementary detail including Infrastructure and Planning (September 2017) ([IT10a](#)), Infrastructure and Planning Annexe 1 Highways (September 2017) ([IT10b](#)), Infrastructure and Planning Annexe 2 Education Contribution Methodology (July 2025) ([IT10c](#)), and Infrastructure and Planning Annexe 3 Drainage and Flood Risk Management (September 2017) ([IT10d](#)). These documents are published on LCC website.

b) Are the policies requirements supported by up-to-date evidence? How will the requirements of the policies be kept up to date?

Yes. The CLAs have also worked with other infrastructure providers to update the IDP (IT08 + IT09). The table below provides details of the policy requirements and the corresponding up-to-date evidence, noting that as set out in question 14.3 (a), where LCC have the strategic responsibility, the evidence will be prepared and published by LCC.

Table of Evidence Relating to Developer Contributions

Policy Requirement	Infrastructure Type	Evidence
ID1, ID2	a) Highways, Sustainable Travel, and transport improvement	LCC Evidence (IT03, IT06a, IT07, IT07a, IT07a)
ID1, ID2	b) Provision of public transport services	LCC Evidence (IT06a, IT07, IT07a, IT07a)
ID1, ID2,	c) Public realm	Central Lancashire Playing Pitch Strategy Assessment Report September 2018 Central Lancashire Open Space Assessment Report February 2019 Chorley Council Open Space Study Standards Paper February 2019 South Ribble Open Space Study Standards Paper February 2019 Preston Open Space Study Standards Paper February 2019 Central Lancashire Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sports Strategy Assessment Report October 2025 Central Lancashire open Space Assessment Report October 2025 Chorley Council/South Ribble/Preston Open Space Study Updated Standards Paper October 2025 Chorley Council
ID1, ID2, HS5	d) Open Space and Green Infrastructure	See above
ID1, ID2, HS5	e) Outdoor and indoor sport pitches and facilities	See above
ID1, ID2, HC3	f) Education provision	LCC Evidence DC11 Appendix One (page 13)

Policy Requirement	Infrastructure Type	Evidence
ID1, ID2,	g) Health Facilities	Lancashire and South Cumbria Integrated Care Board Section 106 Monies & Community Infrastructure Levy Funding Policy and Procedure for Health Facilities
ID1, ID2, HS7	h) Affordable Housing	HO02, HO03, HO04,
ID1, ID2, HC3	i) Community Infrastructure	A Bereavement Service Feasibility Report for Chorley Borough Council V1.4 June 2025 Allotment Provision in Chorley: Summary Report' dated January 2025. PCC Cemetery Study
ID1, ID2, EN6	J) Biodiversity off- setting	Lancashire Local Nature Recovery Strategy Lancashire Local Nature Recovery Strategy Evidence and Technical Information
ID1, ID2	K) Other site-specific contributions	As required

The requirements of the policies will be kept up to date with a regular review of the delivery of the IDP and the periodic refreshing of the supporting evidence. Local government reorganisation is currently expected to progress across Lancashire with completion by April 2028. Once the unitary councils are established, it is expected that new Plans will be progressed quickly in accordance with the emerging local plan process and the requirement for a new local plan to be adopted within five years of a unitary authority's vesting date (PPG Paragraph: 074 Reference ID: 61-074-20190723). The requirements of this policy will be reviewed for effectiveness as part of this process.

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?

Yes. The typologies tested include a sum of £9,339 per unit in S106 contributions, based on costs for education and public open space (see [IT05](#): Table 5.10). This sum is considered cautious and can therefore account for any unusual / local contributions, such as those identified within the IDP. The Strategic Sites include a sum of £19,995 per unit, which is a generous allowance per unit and reasonable for the level of details that currently exists for the sites at this stage. The viability testing also includes existing CIL rates. The assumptions used are reasonable, up to date and were informed by consultation detailed within Appendix 5 + 6 of IT05.

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

Yes. The CLAs consider that the role for viability assessment is primarily at plan making stage, and the policies do include sufficient flexibility for cases where viability is below policy compliant. Policy ID2 paragraph 4 includes provisions where viability is contested as a result of developer contributions and sets out the steps to be taken. The accompanying policy narrative (paragraph 10.13) elaborates this further. The PPG (Paragraph: 007 Reference ID: 10-007-20190509) sets out circumstances where site specific viability assessments may still be needed where infrastructure or site costs are unusually high (i.e. above what we have included in our viability testing) or a change in economic circumstances. Where circumstances may improve, a review and clawback mechanism can be incorporated which is also set out in the accompanying text to policy ID2 (paragraph 10.13).

e) Are there any omissions from the proposed policies and supporting text?

There are no omissions.

14.4 In relation to Appendix 2 is the plan sufficiently clear as to how its implementation will be monitored?

Yes. The Monitoring Framework in Appendix 2 confirms that the CLAs will review the Local Plan policies at least every five years in accordance with the NPPF. The Monitoring Framework sets out which policies are relevant to each of the objectives of the Plan and identifies indicators to monitor the performance of these policies. A minor amendment is proposed to the Monitoring Framework to ensure that the loss of employment land and premises to other uses is effectively monitored (see response to Question 10.1(a)). Where evidence indicates policies are not performing as well as intended, particularly with regards to housing and/or employment provision the CLAs will consider reviewing the CLLP. See answer to Question 1.11 for further detail.

The plan ensures necessary infrastructure requirements are secured (on and offsite) to support new development and mitigate any impact of development on the community and environment. The Plan is supported by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Update ([ID08](#)) and the Updated Infrastructure Schedule. ([ID09](#))

Delivery of infrastructure is linked to the delivery of housing and employment sites and will be secured through the planning application process. The CLAs have proposed indicators to monitor the delivery of housing and employment throughout the plan period. Delivery of housing and employment sites will result in the required infrastructure being provided.