

EiP Statement

Central Lancashire Local Plan

Rowland Homes Limited

Representor ID A41

Our ref 67650/04/BOC/AKn
Date 6 November 2025

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

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Lichfields is instructed by Rowland Homes Limited ('Rowland') to make representations on its behalf to the Central Lancashire Local Plan ('CLLP').
- 1.2 This statement has been prepared in response to the Matters, Issues and Questions raised by the Inspector for the Matter 4 Examination in Public ('EiP') hearing sessions.
- 1.3 Separate representations have been submitted in respect of the following matters:
- 1 Matter 2 – Spatial Strategy Policies
 - 2 Matter 4 – Strategic Sites & Mixed Use Allocations
 - 3 Matter 7 – Housing Policies
- 1.4 These Matter Papers representations should be read in conjunction with previous submissions on the CLLP (Representor ID A41) as well as those made on other Matters listed above. Where relevant, the comments made are assessed against the tests of soundness established by the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') (December 2023) and the National Planning Practice Guidance ('PPG').
- 1.5 Rowland has an active interest in the site at Bagganley Lane, Chorley (allocation reference EC5.3) which has been identified for a mixed-use allocation in the CLLP.
- 1.6 Rowland is highly supportive of the draft mixed use allocation EC5.3 – Land at Bagganley Lane, Chorley and is committed to the development of the residential element of this allocation. Rowland recently submitted a full planning application in relation to the residential element of the allocation site which was validated on the 21st October 2025 (ref. 25/00907/FULMAJ). Rowland is committed to the fast delivery of this element of the allocation site which will make a significant contribution to the market and affordable housing needs of Central Lancashire and Chorley.

2.0 Planning Issues

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?

- 2.1 Rowland does not consider that the requirements in relation to bus access into sites is necessary and justified.
- 2.2 Bus access into residential developments is unlikely to be feasible on the majority of allocations in this plan given their size and is also dependent on private bus companies. Facilitating bus access into the site is therefore likely to cause delayed and lengthy process and could compromise the fast delivery of housing in Central Lancashire.
- 2.3 Paragraph 116 of the NPPF, states that applications for development should:
- ‘give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitate access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use.’*
- 2.4 Policy requirements for bus access into sites is not considered necessary given that future developments can sufficiently improve sustainable and active travel modes through other means and will be secured by the other principles set out in Policy ST2. It also does not factor in that future developments are focussed on sustainable locations (as evidenced in the chosen allocations for the CLLP) and may already benefit from close proximity to existing bus services.
- 2.5 In this instance, it would be preferable and more efficient to ensure good access to these existing links for future residents rather than rely on private bus companies. It is not considered that this requirement is in line with the principles of Paragraph 116 of the NPPF which focuses on maximising layouts to encourage public transport use rather than require negotiations with private bus companies to access future sites.
- 2.6 Policy requirements for bus access into sites is also not considered to be fully justified. The Viability Assessment prepared by Aspinall Verdi does not explicitly assess the viability constraints associated with providing bus access into sites which could be costly to the developer. Delivering routes on site suitable for buses requires the provision of wider routes which adds to the developers expense with no guarantee that a bus company will

want to divert provision through a site and result in the loss of developable area. On this basis, it is not considered that the requirement is fully justified from a viability perspective.

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

2.7 Rowland has no comment on this Matter.

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

2.8 Rowland does not consider that the wording is sufficiently flexible with regard to part 5 c) on bus access. Requiring bus access into sites may be a viability concern for future sites and prevent the fast delivery of housing in the Boroughs.

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

2.9 This Matter is not a consideration for the developer.