

Action 16:

Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) between the Central Lancashire Authorities, Homes England and Taylor Wimpey regarding the Key Development Considerations for Pickering's Farm (SS6)

Introduction

1. During the hearing held on 3 Dec 2025 to discuss Matter 4: Strategic Sites, Action 16 was recorded, which necessitates discussion between the Central Lancashire Authorities (CLAs), Homes England (HE) and Taylor Wimpey (TW) ('the parties'), pursuant to advising the Inspectors of the parties' preferred policy wording for Pickering's Farm's (SS6A) Key Development Considerations (KDCs).
2. The parties agree that the objective of the Pickering's Farm KDCs are to guide development in both the below scenarios:
 - I. The residual un-permissioned area not otherwise covered by permissions 07/2021/00886/ORM and 07/2021/00887/ORM; and
 - II. The entire allocated area if permissions 07/2021/00886/ORM and 07/2021/00887/ORM lapse.

Proposed policy wording

3. The Inspectors have instructed the CLAs to shorten all the Plan's KDCs, focusing the reader to the most important site-specific issues. KDCs relating to HS6, HS7, HS5 and EN16 have consequently been removed as they lack local detail. The residual KDC's have been updated to achieve the objectives set out above.
4. Discussions have been ongoing between the parties and the majority of the wording for the KDCs are now agreed, as shown in Appendix 1.
5. The only KDC that is not agreed, in full, relates to "Sustainable Travel (ST2)" and the proposed inclusion of the following text:

Such infrastructure may also include improvements to Bee Lane and Flag Lane bridges to ensure the safe/efficient movement of vehicles.
6. It is HE & TWs position that the inclusion of the above wording is not evidenced or justified, and as such, its inclusion is not required to make the policy sound.

7. As set out in HE & TW's Hearing Statement to Matter 4, the planning applications and associated appeals, which cover the majority of the proposed allocation SS6A, have already determined what infrastructure needs to be delivered in association with the development of the site. Detailed highways modelling was undertaken to support the planning applications, which assessed, not only the application boundary but the development of the wider policy allocation. It was evidenced and accepted by the Inspector, that there is no requirement to provide improvements to Bee Lane and Flag Lane bridges to ensure the safe/efficient movement of vehicles. The CLAs have not provided any highway modelling or evidence to justify that a different mitigation strategy is now required and as such the inclusion of the above wording is clearly not evidenced or justified, and as such, its inclusion is not required to make the policy sound.

8. The CLAs note HE & TW's position set out in para 6+7 above, however they consider this pre-judges the outcome of any new/updated transport modelling necessary if the permissions expire and for applications on the residual un-permissioned land. The requirement is qualified by 'may also include', which is intended to only apply only where this is evidenced through a future Transport Assessment.

Signatures:

[REDACTED]

Benjamin Vickers
South Ribble Council (on behalf of the CLAs)

[NAME]
Homes England

[REDACTED]

*Margaret Stanis
Authorised Signatory*

E98413

[REDACTED]

Adam Riding
Taylor Wimpey

Appendix 1

Policy	Proposed Wording By all Parties	Proposed Wording by CLA	Proposed Wording by HE &TW
Well-designed places (EN1)	<p>Much of the site has planning permission (07/2021/00886/ORM and 07/2021/00887/ORM) but is in multiple land ownership.</p> <p>To ensure good placemaking, landowners should work collaboratively to identify how the site will be brought forward comprehensively. This should be demonstrated through use of a masterplan and design codes.</p> <p>A masterplan and design code for the permissioned areas have been secured through permissions 07/2021/00886/ORM and 07/2021/00887/ORM. These permissions also include a Local Centre and Primary School. Whilst these permissions remain extant, designs of any future planning applications, for the residual areas of un-permissioned land, should complement the masterplan and design code secured by those permissions.</p> <p>If permissions 07/2021/00886/ORM and 07/2021/00887/ORM lapse, a new masterplan and design code(s) covering the whole allocation should be provided. The masterplan should include provision of a local centre (Classes E and Sui Generis) and a two-form entry primary school (Use Class F).</p>	-	-

OFFICIAL

Policy	Proposed Wording By all Parties	Proposed Wording by CLA	Proposed Wording by HE &TW
<p>Planning Obligations (ID2)</p>	<p>A planning contribution may be required in connection with any future grant of planning permission to help mitigate the impacts of development and secure affordable housing in line with policy ID2.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Sustainable Travel (ST2)</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>A Cross Borough Link Road (CBLR), linking the A582 (Penwortham Way) with the B5254 (Leyland Road) at Bee Lane Bridge, should be delivered on an alignment substantially in accordance with the masterplan approved within permissions 07/2021/00886/ORM and 07/2021/00887/ORM and in accordance with the specification and approach approved by those permissions.</p> <p>If planning permissions 07/2021/00886/ORM and 07/2021/00887/ORM lapse, necessitating new planning permission(s), these shall make similar provision for the delivery of the CBLR linking Penwortham Way to Bee Lane Bridge.</p> <p>The site should link to the wider highways network via multiple access points, including Penwortham Way.</p> <p>To secure planning permission on the residual areas of un-permissioned land or for a new permission if permissions 07/2021/00886/ORM and 07/2021/00887/ORM lapse, obligations may be required to provide traffic management</p>	<p>A Cross Borough Link Road (CBLR), linking the A582 (Penwortham Way) with the B5254 (Leyland Road) at Bee Lane Bridge, should be delivered on an alignment substantially in accordance with the masterplan approved within permissions 07/2021/00886/ORM and 07/2021/00887/ORM and in accordance with the specification and approach approved by those permissions.</p> <p>If planning permissions 07/2021/00886/ORM and 07/2021/00887/ORM lapse, necessitating new planning permission(s), these shall make similar provision for the delivery of the CBLR linking Penwortham Way to Bee Lane Bridge.</p> <p>The site should link to the wider highways network via multiple access points, including Penwortham Way.</p> <p>To secure planning permission on the residual areas of un-permissioned land or for a new permission if permissions 07/2021/00886/ORM and 07/2021/00887/ORM lapse, obligations may be required to provide traffic management</p>

OFFICIAL

Policy	Proposed Wording By all Parties	Proposed Wording by CLA	Proposed Wording by HE &TW
		<p>measures and the provision or improvement of walking and cycling infrastructure on existing roads penetrating the site and roads just outside the allocation boundary. Such infrastructure may also include improvements to Bee Lane and Flag Lane bridges to ensure the safe/efficient movement of vehicles.</p> <p>Provision should also be made for buses to penetrate the site.</p> <p>There are several Public Rights of Way (PROW), including complete North/South routes linking Chain House Lane to Kingsfold Drive and Coote Lane to Sumpter Croft. New pedestrian routes should link to the site's existing PROW routes.</p>	<p>measures and the provision or improvement of walking and cycling infrastructure on existing roads penetrating the site and roads just outside the allocation boundary.</p> <p>Provision should also be made for buses to penetrate the site.</p> <p>There are several Public Rights of Way (PROW), including complete North/South routes linking Chain House Lane to Kingsfold Drive and Coote Lane to Sumpter Croft. New pedestrian routes should link to the site's existing PROW routes.</p>
<p>Infrastructure Planning Principles (ID1)</p>	<p>An infrastructure delivery schedule linked to the phases of development on the site will be required. It is likely a new electricity substation will be necessary.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows (EN8) Ecology (EN9)</p>	<p>Historic agricultural use has embedded a field pattern often bounded by mature hedgerow and/or water courses. Development should, consequently, seek to protect and adapt to these features. Many of the mature hedgerows contain Tree Preservation Orders, necessitating a Tree Survey.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>

OFFICIAL

Policy	Proposed Wording By all Parties	Proposed Wording by CLA	Proposed Wording by HE &TW
<p>Designated Sites for Nature Conservation (EN7)</p>	<p>To provide certainty that the loss of functionally linked land within the site allocation will not adversely affect the integrity of SPA and Ramsar sites, a wintering bird survey is required alongside any planning application in accordance with Policy EN7.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Amenity (EN4)</p>	<p>The site is bounded by the West Coast main line railway to the east. The A582 (Penwortham Way) bounds the west of the site, which will likely be subject to highways upgrades. To ensure acceptable level of amenity for housing near these routes, a buffer should be included. If necessary, the Council will also seek a Noise Impact Assessment, including mitigation secured by condition and/or obligation. The stability of operational railway land should also be protected.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Flood Risk (EN10)</p>	<p>Sporadic areas within the site are at low risk of surface water flooding. The risk should be manageable through careful consideration of site layout.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Drainage (EN11) and Utilities</p>	<p>It is understood that the site has access to some utilities but not gas. The site is at risk of sewer flooding which will need to be given careful consideration in any subsequent applications. Early dialogue with United Utilities is recommended prior to submission of development proposals. Attention will be required to drainage within and from the site to ensure that there is no impact on surrounding watercourses.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>

Policy	Proposed Wording By all Parties	Proposed Wording by CLA	Proposed Wording by HE &TW
Heritage assets and archaeology (EN13)	An Archaeological Desk Based Assessment and/or the results of an archaeological field evaluation will be necessary for any parts of the site which do not have planning permission. The development may require a level of archaeological mitigation, in the form of preservation in situ, or by record, depending on the significance of any features encountered.	-	-