

Town And Country Planning Act 1990 - Planning Application Appeal

**PICKERING'S FARM SITE, FLAG LANE, PENWORTHAM,
LANCASHIRE PR1 9TP**

By Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd and Homes England

PLANNING PROOF OF EVIDENCE OF RICHARD WOOD

COUNCIL REF: 07/2021/00886/ORM and 07/2021/00887/ORM

APPEAL A REF: APP/F2360/W/22/3295498

APPEAL B REF: APP/F2360/W/22/3295502

**RICHARD WOOD
ASSOCIATES**



1.0 INTRODUCTION

Richard Wood BA (HONS) BPI MBA MRTPI

- 1.1 I am a Chartered Town Planner and a Member of the Royal Town Planning Institute (since 1991). I have worked as a planner in the public and private sectors for 33 years. I am a Director at Richard Wood Associates Ltd and work as an independent planning consultant. I hold an Honours Degree in Town and Country Planning and a post-graduate Bachelor of Planning Degree, both from the University of Manchester, and a Master of Business Administration degree from the University of Hull.
- 1.2 Previously I was a Director at O'Neill Associates, Chartered Town Planning Consultants in York, working for public and private sector clients. Prior to working in consultancy, I was Assistant Director for Strategic Planning and Transport at City of York Council and Head of Strategy at the Yorkshire and Humber Assembly (leading the preparation of the Regional Spatial Strategy).
- 1.3 I declare that the case and evidence which I have prepared and provided for these appeals is true and has been prepared in accordance with the guidance of the Royal Town Planning Institute. I confirm that the opinions expressed by me are my true and professional opinions and that this Proof includes all facts which I regard as being relevant to the opinions I have expressed. I am aware that as an expert witness my overriding duty is to the inquiry irrespective of by whom I am called. To inform my appraisal I have visited the appeals sites and surrounding locality.

Scope of Evidence

- 1.4 My evidence focuses on planning considerations. The Proofs of Dr Price, Mr Stevens, Mr Martin, and Mr Lloyd respectively address design, transport, air quality and financial viability matters.
- 1.5 A main Planning Statement of Common Ground (Main SoCG, CD10.4) and a Statement of Common Ground on transport matters (Mobility SoCG, CD10.5) have been agreed and submitted.

1.6 I have set out my evidence as follows:

- Section 2 outlines the background to the appeals proposals
- Section 3 explains the Development Plan and site allocation history
- Section 4 sets out the current Development Plan and Planning Policy context
- Section 5 considers other material considerations, including National Policy
- Section 6 examines housing land supply
- Section 7 undertakes a planning analysis related to the reasons for refusal
- Section 8 provides a summary and conclusions

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 The Main Statement of Common Ground (Main SoCG) sets out the background to the appeals sites and development proposals. In the Main SoCG (CD10.4):

- Section 2 sets out the location and description of the appeals sites, explaining that there are two adjoining parcels of land totalling 52.27 hectares referred to as 'Site A' and 'Site B',
- site characteristics are explained in section 2, with agricultural land being the dominant land use with a number of individual residential properties also located within the sites,
- Section 3 describes the planning history, which includes a single outline application submitted in December 2019 and withdrawn in March 2021, and two revised outline planning applications submitted in August 2021 and refused at a Special Planning Committee meeting in November 2021 (the appeals schemes),
- the proposed development is outlined in Section 4; application A includes principal means of access and residential-led mixed use development comprising of up to 920 dwellings and community facilities and infrastructure, and application B is for up to 180 dwellings and principal means of access, similarly all other matters are reserved,
- the appeal applications therefore propose up to 1,100 residential dwellings in total, with 30% proposed to be affordable dwellings, and,
- Section 4 also establishes that 16.09 hectares of green infrastructure is proposed across both sites and that an Illustrative Masterplan shows one possible arrangement of the proposed development.

2.2 As set out in the Committee Report (CD8.1), the allocated housing development site known as Pickering's Farm is approximately 79 ha in size and is bounded by the A582 Penwortham Way to the west; immediately to the north by the Kingsfold area of Penwortham; to the east lies the West Coast mainline with Lostock Hall beyond and to the south is an area of Safeguarded Lane with Chain House Lane beyond. The site is currently occupied by a number of individual properties in private ownership, the

majority of which are accessed via Bee Lane, Flag Lane, Lords Lane, Moss Lane, and Nib Lane which bisect the site.

- 2.3 The appeals proposals relate to parcels within the wider Pickering's Farm site that are within the appellants' control. These include most of the land to the western side of the wider site and to the southern part of the site. Within these areas, the land excluded is mainly existing residential properties and their boundaries, together with farms such as Crooks Farm and Balshaw Farm on Bee Lane, Holme Farm and Proctors Farm on Moss Lane. There are large parcels of land to the north and south of Bee Lane to the eastern side of the site which are also excluded from the outline boundary.

3.0 DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND SITE ALLOCATION HISTORY

3.1 The Pickering's Farm site has a lengthy background, with the Central Lancashire Development Corporation (now Homes England) acquiring parcels of land within the site in the early 1970's. A link road through the site was first proposed as part of the Central Lancashire New Town. Mr Lloyd's Proof at Paragraphs 2.1-2.19 explains the site promotion and assessment work which resulted in the Pickering's Farm development area receiving an allocation as a strategic location. In the following paragraphs I set out the development plan history, through to the allocation of the Pickering's Farm allocation in the current 2015 South Ribble Local Plan (CD5.2).

South Ribble Local Plan 2000 (CD10.32)

3.2 A South Ribble Local Plan was adopted in 2000 and was the first the first local plan to cover the whole of the Borough. It was prepared under the provisions of the Lancashire Structure Plan 1991-2006. Under Policy D8, Safeguarded Land, the Pickering's Farm site was allocated as Safeguarded Land for development needs beyond the plan period. This land would be kept free from new physical development and be kept open at least during the plan period or until the plan is reviewed. Planning permission would not be granted for development which would prejudice possible long term, comprehensive development of the land.

3.3 Policy T3 (TRANSPORT POLICY 3: LINK ROAD) of the SRLP 2000 (CD10.32, page 130) sets out that "A road will be constructed from the roundabout on Carrwood Road to Leyland Road in the vicinity of Bee Lane in order to open up land for development and to serve as a local through route. Traffic management measures will be undertaken on Leyland Road in order to limit any increase in road space for cars." The justification to Policy T3 states at para 9.26 that

A road was indicated in the New Town Outline Plan to link the proposed western and eastern primary roads, now built, and known as A582 Penwortham Way and A6 London Way, respectively. This link was not implemented by the New Town Development Corporation and the original route was abandoned for technical

reasons; but the Council believes that there remains a need to improve east-west links across the Borough. However, the provision of an east-west link would be dependent upon the release of land at Pickering's Farm for development, with the developers being expected to construct the road as part of their proposals. The Local Plan safeguards the land in the Pickering's Farm area and any development proposals on that land would need to be brought forward in a review of the plan. Similarly, the need for, impact of, and detail of, an east-west link road would have to be considered and tested in the future development plan process through reviews of the Structure Plan and Local Plan.

Central Lancashire Core Strategy (CD5.1)

3.4 The Central Lancashire Core Strategy was produced by the Central Lancashire authorities of Preston, South Ribble, and Chorley, with assistance from Lancashire County Council. As part of the development of this Core Strategy (adopted in 2012) a review of safeguarded land took place to enable the Borough to meet housing requirements. The Pickering's Farm site was identified as suitable to bring forward for development during the Local Plan period, subject to the necessary infrastructure requirements being met. The Pickering's Farm site is identified as a Strategic Location.

- Policy 1: Locating Growth sets out that; 'some greenfield development is required at the South of Penwortham and North of Farington Strategic Location (Pickering's Farm site).'
- Chapter 5: 'Managing and Locating Growth' at paragraph 5.28 advises that 'It is imperative that these Sites and Locations are accompanied by the timely provision of infrastructure otherwise these proposals will not be acceptable.
- The Core Strategy is also clear that there needs to be a comprehensive assessment of the transport network improvements to deliver the development of the strategic locations and wider development strategy (CD 5.1, para 5.51) and that increased infrastructure services arising from demand associated with new development is generally provided and/or paid by developers (CD5.1, para 6.3).

- 3.5 The Inspector who conducted the Inquiry into the Core Strategy, stated in the 'Report on The Examination into The Central Lancashire Publication Core Strategy Local Development Framework Development Plan Document' June 2012 (CD5.4, paragraph 22) that *"It is significant that there is no objection in principle from the Highways Agency and that the County Council as Highways Authority continues to support the Local Plan's proposals, with the important proviso that delivery of the scale and distribution of development now proposed will necessitate major additions to existing transport infrastructure to serve these 2 Strategic Locations."* Paragraph 19 of CD 5.4 explains that there are two additional strategic locations, including one at 'South of Penwortham & North of Farington'.
- 3.6 The 'South of Penwortham and north of Farington Strategic Location' is described at paragraphs 5.49 and 5.50 of CD5.1. This explains that *"the location is of strategic significance by virtue of its ability to significantly contribute to South Ribble's infrastructure and housing requirements"* and that significant investment will be required to help deliver development at this strategic location beyond capitalising on existing infrastructure.
- 3.7 At paragraph 5.51, the Core Strategy identifies that a comprehensive assessment of transport network improvements will be required to deliver the strategic locations. A Highways and Transport Master Plan exercise would be led by Lancashire County Council as highway authority. This Master Plan (CD7.2) sets out the strategic highway and transport measures that will be needed to support plans for future growth and development as part of an integrated transport vision (page 22). The link with the Core Strategy (CD5.1) is explained at page 17 as providing *"the spatial background to the development of our highways and public transport networks"*. : *'The Penwortham ~ Lostock Hall ~ Farington ~ Moss Side area can expect to see the development of up to 2,700 new homes at three major development sites. These developments will connect to the road network via the A582 and B5253 which are very busy single carriageway roads with significant congestion.'* The CLHTM concludes: *'that significant additions to existing highway infrastructure will be needed to support the development aspirations of Central Lancashire.'*

3.8 The Core Strategy (CD5.1, para 5.28) also explains how it is accompanied by an Infrastructure Delivery Schedule which identifies required essential strategic infrastructure. The Central Lancashire Infrastructure Delivery Schedules (CD10.33), re-published in January 2012, set out as a series of infrastructure delivery schedules for each District. For South Ribble this includes, under highway improvements, the Cross Borough Link Road, with developer contributions identified as the potential funding source.

South Ribble Local Plan 2015 (CD5.2)

3.9 Following the Pickering's Farm site's allocation as a Strategic Location in the Core Strategy, the South Ribble Local Plan (SRLP, adopted 2015) allocates three major development sites that are residential led (CD5.2, para 6.3). This includes Pickering's Farm, Penwortham. The SRLP establishes a detailed site boundary for the allocation, as shown on the proposals map (reference EE). The southern area of the allocation remained as Safeguarded Land, with the intention that this area would come forward beyond the plan period.

3.10 In reviewing site promotion, assessment and allocation work that took place leading up to the 2015 SRLP, Mr Lloyd (para 2.6) sets out (in summary) that this included:

- In 2007 the Appellants initially made representation for the site to be allocated in the Local Plan in 2007 through the Central Lancashire Urban Village – South Ribble (CD10.25, March 2007) report which at Appendix 5 provides a technical note on the CBLR
- the Central Lancashire Transport Study (CD10.28, 2008) produced by GVA which argued that the CBLR could help open up sites at Pickering's Farm and Lostock Hall Gasworks and could provide relief to the A582
- a HOW Planning (CD10.27, 2011) written response on behalf of Taylor Wimpey (in relation to Pickering's Farm) to the Inspector's matters raised, arguing why the site should be included in the Core Strategy as an allocated site and acknowledging that the site possesses key attributes relating to the CBLR

- An updated joint Development Statement for the site (CD10.26, 2013) which acknowledges the protection of land *required for the completion of the Penwortham bypass (Policy T1) and that TWUK and the HCA are committed to working with the Local Authority and LCC to explore options for the delivery of road infrastructure in the vicinity of Pickering's Farm in order to ensure that the development can be adequately accessed whilst limiting impacts on the wider road network.*" (CD10.26, page 16). A preliminary transport assessment had been undertaken by Arup which indicated that there was unlikely to be adequate capacity in the highway network to accommodate the traffic resulting from the Pickering's Farm development. The Pickering's Farm site provided the opportunity to make greater improvements to the network with the potential to extend the South Ribble Relief Road from Leyland Road crossing the West Coast Main Line to join the A582 (Penwortham Way).

3.11 Mr Lloyd also highlights the Council's Strategic Sites and Locations Assessment (CD10.29, 2011) which sets out that *"Infrastructure Requirements: Any significant development of the Strategic Location is dependent upon the delivery of the Cross Borough Link Road, the western end of which is intended to link the A582 (Penwortham Way) with the B5254 (Leyland Road)"*.

3.12 Similarly, the Inspector's Report on the Examination into the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (CD5.5, June 2015) at paragraph 65 states (with reference to the Pickering's Farm) that, *"significant infrastructure improvements will be required to support the development of the site. This would include the Cross Borough Link Road.....These will be delivered through a combination of CIL and S106 Agreements and will be included in the agreed masterplan, phasing and infrastructure delivery schedules and agreed programmes of implementation"*.

4.0 CURRENT DEVELOPMENT PLAN & POLICY

4.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Section 70(2) of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 provides that the Local Planning Authority shall have regard to the provisions of the Development Plan, so far as material to the applications, and to any other material considerations. As set out in the Main SoCG (CD10.4), the Development Plan that relates to the appeals sites comprises of:

- The South Ribble Borough Council Local Plan 2012-2026 (adopted July 2015),
- The Central Lancashire Core Strategy DPD (adopted July 2012), and
- The Penwortham Town Neighbourhood Plan (2017)

4.2 In the Main SocG (CD10.4) it is agreed that both the adopted South Ribble Local Plan (SRLP, CD5.2) and the Central Lancashire Core Strategy (CLCS, CD5.1) should be attributed full weight in the determination of the appeals. 'Weight' is also attributed to the Penwortham Town Neighbourhood Plan (PTNP, CD7.4) in the Main SoCG. The PTNP was made in March 2017, and I attach full weight to this plan. The Main SoCG (CD10.4) identifies policies relevant to the determination of the appeals proposals from all three parts of the Development Plan and indicates those policies referred to in the Council's Reasons for Refusal which are:

South Ribble Local Plan

- Policy A1, Developer Contributions
- Policy A2, Cross Borough Link Road (Development Link Road)
- Policy C1, Pickering's Farm, Penwortham
- Policy G10, Green Infrastructure Provision in Residential Developments
- Policy G11, Playing Pitch Provision
- Policy G17, Design Criteria for New Development

Central Lancashire Core Strategy

- Policy 17, Design of New Buildings
- Policy 30, Air Quality

4.3 Since the Decision Notice was issued agreement has now been reached on sports provision (see paragraph 7.30 below). The Main SoCG includes, at Section 9, a list and summary of seven technical matters that are not in dispute.

4.4 As explained at SRLP (CD5.2) paragraph 4.19, Policies A1 and A2 seek to ensure delivery of two key pieces of highway infrastructure within the borough – one of which is the Cross Borough Link Road (development link road) scheme. The supporting text at paragraph 4.17 (CD5.2) identifies that the two elements of infrastructure, *“will ensure that development across the borough can be delivered sustainably, which will enable both current and future communities to access the necessary jobs, homes, services, and amenities as they wish and need to. These schemes will enable economic growth, divert traffic away from the nearby centres (e.g., Penwortham) and free up road space for local traffic, buses, pedestrians, and cyclists.”*

4.5 **Policy A1 of the SRLP** is set out in full in CD5.2. This Policy sits in Chapter A, Delivering Infrastructure, which explains that the provision of infrastructure is an integral part of the SRLP and essential for the sustainability of towns and villages (CD5.2 para 4.10). The introduction to Policy A1 (CD5.2 para 4.11) explains that Policy A1 has been prepared to ensure that development proposals and planning applications include the necessary infrastructure provision as an integral part of the scheme. Policy A1 requires new development to both contribute to mitigating its impacts and contribute to the requirements of the community. A range of types of infrastructure that developments may be required to provide for are identified, including transport.

4.6 **Policy A2** requires that land will be protected from physical development for the delivery of the Cross Borough Link Road. The link road is identified as comprising of a road to be constructed from Carrwood Road to the Cawsey (criterion a) and a road to be constructed through the major development site at Pickering’s Farm (criterion b).

- 4.7 CD5.2 paragraph 4.18 establishes that the Cross Borough Link Road is an important route to act as a link road serving new developments and to improve east west travel across the urban area. Paragraph 4.20 further explains that the link road will improve accessibility in an east-west direction through the borough, increase community access to the range of services within the borough and help traffic flow on existing roads. The completion of the link road is to be delivered in the Plan period.
- 4.8 A phasing and infrastructure delivery schedule would be agreed, with provision through developer contributions and within an agreed timescale (CD5.2 paragraph 4.21). The link road also provides an opportunity to improve public transport and increase accessibility in this part of the borough (CD5.2 paragraph 4.23).
- 4.9 **Policy C1** sits in Chapter B, Areas for Development in the SRLP (CD5.2) and sets out specific policy requirements for the Pickering's Farm site, Penwortham. The policy requires:
- a) An agreed masterplan for the comprehensive development of the site which must encompass the wider area of the site including safeguarded land and to make provision for a range of land uses to include residential, employment and commercial uses, Green Infrastructure, and community facilities
 - b) A phasing and infrastructure delivery schedule
 - c) An agreed programme of implementation in accordance with the Masterplan and agreed design code.
- 4.10 The supporting text at Paragraph 6.6 (CD5.2) states that the Council has identified this 79ha site to *“provide for the development of up to 1350 dwellings and deliver the necessary infrastructure for the area”*. The site reflects the CLCS (CD5.1) emphasis on concentrating development in the Preston and South Ribble urban area. *“The comprehensive development approach of this site is crucial due to its size and strategic importance as well as to ensure delivery of essential infrastructure and local services”* (CD5.2, paragraph 6.7). This approach requires the provision of infrastructure to ensure a sustainable development. The requirement for the Cross Borough Link Road

is identified at paragraph 6.11 (CD5.2) - as a key piece of infrastructure that will need to be delivered.

- 4.11 **Policy G10 in the SRLP** seeks to ensure that there is Green Infrastructure provision in residential developments (of five dwellings or more). Standards are set out for different typologies of Green Infrastructure.
- 4.12 Design criteria for new development are set out in **Policy G17 in the SRLP** to help protect the local character and distinctiveness of the borough, encouraging community identity and a sense of pride within areas. The policy seeks to ensure that:
- a) Development proposals do not have a negative impact on existing and neighbouring buildings and the street scene
 - b) Layout, design, and landscaping are of a high quality, respecting the character of the site and the local area
 - c) Highway and pedestrian safety and the free flow of traffic would not be prejudiced
 - d) Heritage assets and the historic environment are appropriately addressed
 - e) There are no detrimental impacts on landscape features
- 4.13 **Policy 17 of the CLCS** (CD5.1) sets key considerations for ensuring that the design of new buildings takes account of the character and appearance of the local area. This reflects an emphasis on design solutions for all developments being based on a thorough site analysis and character appraisal of context (CD5.1, para 10.7). Layout, landscaping, and accessibility, linking in with surrounding movement patterns, and achieving Building for Life ratings of silver or gold are amongst the policy criteria.
- 4.14 Air quality is the focus of **CLCS Policy 30**, which aims to improve air quality through the delivery of Green Infrastructure initiatives and by taking account of air quality in prioritising measures to reduce road traffic congestion.

5.0 OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 Other material considerations relevant to the appeal proposals are the National Planning Policy Framework (CD4.1), the National Design Guide (CD10.20) and National Model Design Code (CD10.21), a series of Supplementary Planning Documents (CD6.1-6.6) and the emerging Central Lancashire Local Plan.

National Planning Policy

5.2 The National Planning Policy Framework July 2021 (NPPF, CD4.1) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. The NPPF states that *"the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development"* (Paragraph 7). Interdependent economic, social, and environmental objectives are set out under Paragraph 8:

- a) an **economic objective** – to help build a strong, responsive, and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation, and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure.
- b) a **social role** – to support strong, vibrant, and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering well-designed, beautiful, and safe places, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and
- c) an **environmental objective** – to protect and enhance our natural, built, and historic environment, including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.

5.3 Paragraph 8 (CD4.1) advises that the above three objectives are interdependent. Economic growth can secure higher social and environmental standards, and well-

designed buildings and places can improve the lives of people and communities. Therefore, to achieve sustainable development, economic, social, and environmental net gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system. At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development (Paragraph 11).

- 5.4 Section 5 of the NPPF supports the Government’s objective of significantly boosting the supply of new homes, so that a sufficient amount and variety of land comes forward where it is needed. The size, type and tenure of housing needed by different groups in the community should be reflected. Identified need for affordable housing should be addressed and is expected to be on-site. Local planning authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years’ worth of housing (against their local housing need where the strategic policies are more than five years old).
- 5.5 Healthy, inclusive, and safe places are promoted in NPPF section 8. Places should support social interaction, be safe and accessible and enable and support healthy lifestyles. Community facilities and services, school places and open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity are all important aspects.
- 5.6 Section 9 of the NPPF is focussed on **“Promoting sustainable transport”**. Development proposals should promote sustainable transport modes, provide safe and suitable access, be well-designed and cost effectively mitigate to an acceptable degree any significant impacts from the development on the transport network. Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. An appropriate mix of uses, and within large scale sites should minimise the number and length of journeys needed for different activities.
- 5.7 The emphasis on **“Making effective use of land”** is set out in NPPF Section 11. Paragraph 119 sets out the requirement to *“promote an effective use of land in*

meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions.

- 5.8 **“Achieving well-designed places”** is the focus of NPPF section 12. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Developments should function well and add to the overall quality of the area, be visually attractive, be sympathetic to local character and history, establish or maintain a strong sense of place, optimise the potential of the site, and create places that are safe, inclusive, and accessible. Paragraph 126 requires *“the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places”*. Developments should *“function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development”* (Paragraph 130 criterion b) and in optimising the potential of the site *“support local facilities and transport networks”* (criterion e). The importance of design quality is set out at Paragraph 132.
- 5.9 Planning policies and decisions should contribute to **conserving and enhancing the natural environment** (NPPF section 15) **and the historic environment** (section 16).

National Design Guide & Model Design Code

- 5.10 The National Design Guide (NDG, CD4.3) addresses the question of how we recognise well-designed places, by outlining and illustrating the Government’s priorities for well-designed places in the form of ten characteristics. The Guide is based on national planning policy, practice guidance and objectives for good design as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. The ‘Context’ characteristic focuses on the location of the development and the attributes of its immediate, local, and regional surroundings. The importance of a movement network that makes connections to destinations, places, and communities, both within the site and beyond its boundaries is highlighted (para 75). This should limit the impacts of car use by prioritising and encouraging walking, cycling and public transport, mitigating impacts and identifying opportunities to improve air quality.

SRBC Supplementary Planning Documents

- 5.11 The Main SoCG sets out Supplementary Planning Documents relevant to the planning appeals including: Employment and Skills (CD6.1); Open Space and Playing Pitch (CD6.2); Biodiversity and Nature Conservation (CD6.3); Design Guide (CD6.4) Affordable Housing (CD6.5); and Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (CD6.6).

The Emerging Central Lancashire Local Plan

- 5.12 In 2018, a review of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy and individual local plans was begun with a view to delivering a single Central Lancashire Local Plan (CLLP), reflecting both the shared strategic policy objectives and more detailed non-strategic policies up to 2036. Central Lancashire covers the geographical areas of Preston, Chorley and South Ribble and follows the previous collaboration between the respective Councils to produce the Local Development Framework. A Call for Sites exercise was undertaken in early 2019 and options and an Issues and Options consultation was held. The Councils are currently working to prepare a Preferred Options consultation paper for consultation and following this, a Local Plan for submission. The emerging Local Plan is still at a very early stage of development.

6.0 HOUSING LAND SUPPLY

- 6.1 As set out at paragraph 6.2 of the Main SoCG (CD10.4) it is agreed that the Council had a supply of 13.2 years deliverable housing sites as of 1 April 2022. This is based on the Housing Land Position Statement and update to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment as of 1 April 2022 (CD7.7). As explained at page 20 of CD 7.7, the Council's five-year supply is well above the average established by a study of 115 authorities in 2022 (5.72 years).
- 6.2 CD7.7 also explains (page 2) that South Ribble has comfortably delivered above its Housing Delivery Test Requirement over the past three years and evidence is set out that justifies why it is anticipated that this will continue to be the case in 2022. Appendix 3 of CD7.7 identifies the sites included in South Ribble's Five-Year Supply. The appeals sites do not form part of this supply.
- 6.3 Pickering's Farm is included in Appendix 5 – Allocated Sites – Current Position (page 60, CD7.7). A remaining site capacity of 1,100 dwellings is identified against the allocation with a planning status of 'not permissioned'.
- 6.4 The Council has accounted for the Pickering's Farm allocation in its housing trajectory as set out in the table below. Housing completions are anticipated to start in 2028/29 and thereby forming part of the Developable Housing Land Supply which is summarised in Table 9 of CD7.7 which sets out a Year's 6-10 supply of developable land for the period 2027/28 to 2031/32 and for the Years 11-15 developable supply for 2032/33 to 2036/37.

2028/29 Estimate	2029/30 Estimate	2030/31 Estimate	2031/32 Estimate	2032/33 Estimate	2033/34 Estimate	2034/35 Estimate	2035/36 Estimate	2036/37 Estimate	2037/38 Estimate
120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	20

Source: Planning Policy, South Ribble Council

- 6.6 The appeals proposals are therefore expected to start in Year 7, then contribute throughout the period to year 15 and then extending a further one year beyond this.

7.0 PLANNING ANALYSIS

7.1 This section considers the eleven reasons for refusal (RfR) for the appeals proposals set out on the Decision Notices (CDs 8.3 and 8.4). Each RfR is dealt with in turn, with cross reference to the Proofs and technical evidence of the other SRBC witnesses outlined at paragraph 1.4. Planning policy implications are then set out for each RfR.

Reasons for Refusal

1. It has not been demonstrated that the modelling methodology applied within the submitted Transport Assessment is acceptable. As such it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would not have a severe adverse impact on the local highway network. The proposal is therefore contrary to the requirements of para. 111 of the NPPF, Policy 17 of the Core Strategy and Policy G17 of the South Ribble Local Plan.

2. It has not been demonstrated that the scoping and composition of technical supporting evidence of the submitted Transport Assessment is acceptable. As such it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would not have a severe adverse impact on the local highway network. The proposal is therefore contrary to the requirements of para. 111 of the NPPF, Policy 17 of the Core Strategy and Policy G17 of the South Ribble Local Plan.

3. The proposed improvements to the Bee Lane bridge are not considered to be sufficient for the additional traffic, as well as increased number of pedestrians and cyclists resulting from the development, prejudicing highway safety and pedestrian safety. The proposal is therefore contrary to the requirements of para. 111 of the NPPF, Policy 17 of the Core Strategy and Policy G17 of the South Ribble Local Plan.

4. The application fails to provide adequate certainty that the section of the Cross Borough Link Road within the site, together with the necessary physical upgrading works to the Bee Lane bridge, will be delivered. The proposal is therefore contrary to the requirements of Policy A2 of the South Ribble Local Plan.

5. Policy C1 of the South Ribble Local Plan requires an agreed masterplan and design code for the comprehensive development of the site. The masterplan has not been formally agreed by South Ribble Council and the version submitted with the two applications does not meet the policy requirements.

6. Policy C1 of the South Ribble Local Plan requires the submission of a phasing and infrastructure delivery schedule and an agreed programme of implementation. The submitted documentation provides insufficient detail on how the site will be delivered and no detailed phasing plan has been submitted and no programme of implementation has been agreed. Therefore, the scheme is contrary to Policy C1.

7. Policy A2 of the South Ribble Local Plan seeks to ensure delivery of the Cross Borough Link Road through the major development site at Pickering's Farm. The two applications together with the Masterplan do not provide a firm commitment for the delivery of this key piece of infrastructure necessary to support the scale of development proposed. The scheme is therefore contrary to Policy A2

8. Inadequate information has been provided to address air quality impacts and insufficient mitigation has been identified to make the development acceptable. The proposal is therefore contrary to Paragraphs 185 and 186 of the NPPF and Policy 30 of the Core Strategy

9. The proposals will generate additional demand for sporting provision, and it is not clear how this would be addressed in the current planning applications. Nor is it clear how the concept of active design would be achieved in the scheme to deliver an active, healthy community and is therefore contrary to Policies G10 and G11 in the South Ribble Local Plan and Paragraph 100 of the NPPF

10. Due to the lack of an agreed Masterplan and commitment to providing the cross borough link road, the proposals do not follow the 'proper planning approach' or represent good planning for the area as required by the NPPF paragraphs 126 and 132.

11. No viability evidence has been submitted to enable an assessment of whether necessary infrastructure can be provided to support this important housing land allocation. As such the proposals are contrary to Policies A1 and C1 in the South Ribble Local Plan.

Reason for Refusal 1 (Modelling Methodology) and Reason for Refusal 2 (Transport Assessment and Technical Evidence) – Mr Stevens

- 7.2 Mr Stevens considers RfR 1 and RfR 2 as they are closely linked. On the modelling methodology Mr Stevens explains (para 4.1.5) that LCC have been working with National Highways and their consultants (WSP) to review the Vectos microsimulation model. Under 4.1.6 it is explained that this review cannot *“conclude that the model accurately reflects the operation of the wider model network and therefore the model is not suitable for assessment use.”* It is also considered (para 4.1.11) that realistic levels of vehicle demand have not been assessed and provided for with the use of the "Vision and Validate" approach which requires a step change in behaviour, a clear policy transition and a top-down approach rather than an isolated bottom-up approach by a developer (Mr Stevens para 4.1.14).
- 7.3 At paras 4.1.23 to 4.1.96 Mr Stevens details a series of concerns about the technical elements within the Transport Assessment and Technical Notes for the appeals proposals. Issues are identified in relation to traffic modelling, base traffic data, trip rates, distribution committed development, traffic growth, modelling results and the need for a clear auditable trail to definable impacts and necessary mitigation. Based on this analysis, Mr Stevens concludes that the technical assessment does not represent the likely impacts of the proposals and the modelling as presented is not acceptable to Lancashire County Council (LCC).
- 7.4 Section 5 of Mr Stevens evidence explains the Highways Traffic Assessment work undertaken by LCC to identify the impacts of the appeals proposals on the highway network. The approach is set out at Paras 5.1.7 to 5.1.34. Concerns regarding Network capacity (Mr Stevens 5.1.36) are addressed through a focus on seven key junctions

located in South Ribble, the future operation of which will be of great importance to residents and all users of the Local Highway Network in this area.

- Unacceptable safety issues for pedestrians, severe and significant harm for sustainable users of Bee Lane Bridge and severe impacts on the Bee Lane Roundabout are identified in relation to the B5254 Leyland Road/Bee Lane/The Cawsey roundabout
- Impacts on pedestrians and cyclists and the lack of a mitigation scheme to improve pedestrian desire lines/connectivity and crossing provision to and at the junction whilst maximising capacity for motorised users are identified at the B5254 Watkin Lane/Brownedge Road and B5254 Leyland Road/Coote Lane linked signalised T-junctions
- Until works on the A582 are committed and delivered in advance of impacts from the appeal site, mitigation is necessary to negate against the significant impacts from the development at the following locations/junctions (in terms of capacity and congestion).
 - A582 Flensburg Way/A582 Croston Road/Fidler Lane/Croston Road roundabout
 - A582 Croston Road/A582 Farington Road/Centurion Way roundabout
 - A582 Lostock Lane/A582 Farington Road/A5083 Stanifield Lane/B5254 Watkin Lane signalised roundabout
- Minor junction changes at A582 Penwortham Way/Chain House Lane Signalised Crossroads
- A scheme is necessary to negate against the significant impacts from the development at this location (in terms of capacity and congestion) at the M65/A6/A582 signalised roundabout

Policy Implications

- 7.5 I concur with Mr Stevens that the Transport Assessment with its "Vision and Validate" approach does not have clear regard to the requirements of NPPF para 110 (Mr Stevens para 4.1.16) – the impacts on the local or wider network or the consequences on safety and reliability. The Appellants' modelling does not (Mr Stevens 4.1.10):

replicate existing conditions; acknowledge existing concerns; fully report impacts (with development) or mitigate against impacts to maintain a safe and reliable network for all users (motorised and non-motorised). Mr Stevens (para 4.1.19) identifies conflicts with the requirements of NPPF para 112.

Reason for Refusal 3 (Bee Lane Bridge) – Mr Stevens

- 7.6 Mr Stevens sets out the constraints of the Bee Lane Bridge and explains why the appellant's proposals fail to provide safe and suitable access for all users. The needs for pedestrians or cyclists are not satisfied (Mr Stevens 4.2.8) and it is considered that the proposals will result in highway safety issues cyclists (Para 4.2.12) and pedestrians (Para 4.2.15). Further concerns include the lack of suitable consideration for vulnerable road users and their needs, such as those with mobility impairment and visual impairment (Para 4.2.17).
- 7.7 Concerns are also identified by Mr Stevens as to the location of the school (Para 4.2.18), the Road Safety Audit for the Bee Lane site access (Paras 4.2.21-4.2.26), safety and highway network impacts at Bee Lane / Leyland Road junction (Paras 4.2.30-4.2.31), the proposed new site access with Bee Lane (Paras 4.2.32-4.2.34) and crucial matters need to be agreed with Network Rail given that the bridges crosses the West Coast Mainline (WCML) (Paras 4.2.38-4.2.46). The appellant's proposals fail to provide safe and suitable access for all users.

Policy Implications

- 7.8 At paragraphs 4.2.19 and 4.2.20 Mr Stevens sets out conflicts with the requirements of NPPF Paragraphs 111 and 112 for the appeals proposals for the Bee Lane bridge.

RfR 4 Cross Borough Link Road Delivery – Mr Stevens

- 7.9 Mr Stevens addresses RfR 4 from Para 4.3 (along with RfR 7) and highlights the crossover with both RfR 3, Bee Lane bridge, and RfR 5, Master planning. The

background to the Cross Borough Link Road is set out by Mr Stevens (Paras 4.3.2-4.3.8) and explanation is provided of the road network surrounding the site and how it is intended to function and what function the CBLR will have (Paras 4.3.9-4.3.40) including that (4.3.11 and 4.3.12):

The A582 is located to the west of the site and the built environment. It forms part of the Major Road Network (MRN). The MRN comprises the most economically and regionally important 'A' roads that sit between the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and Local Road Network (LRN). These roads are designed in a manner which reflects their regional and economic importance.

The MRN is referred to as 'Strategic inter-urban non-trunk roads' in MfS2 (CD 10.38). This terminology captures the function of the A582 and its strategic use to satisfy inter-urban journeys (i.e., those between settlements rather than local movements).

- 7.10 Mr Stevens (4.4.9) highlights how the Appellants Transport Assessment states clearly that all but forty dwellings will take access from a proposed new signalised junction of A582 Penwortham Way. Access for 1,060 residential units (most of the dwellings) from the appeals site is by way of a cul-de-sac estate road for the, via the MRN. In contrast to an appropriately designed CBLR and bridge over Bee Lane, Mr Stevens (4.3.17) identifies that the appeals proposals would result in the use of the MRN for local journeys, undermining its purpose and longer journeys to be travelled which is not consistent with the NPPF which seeks to minimise the length of journeys. Potential difficulties are highlighted for some elderly or those with health or mobility issues to access onto the A582 which may present difficulties for residents to access amenities. Without the CBLR, Mr Stevens (4.3.19) also highlights that drivers will still inevitably use the shortest route from the A582 to access local amenities which will involve the use of local lanes, such as Chain House Lane and Coote Lane impacting on highway safety and amenity on the Lanes. Significant advantages for public transport, servicing, routing, and accessibility are identified from a CBLR in comparison to the proposed approach (Mr Stevens 4.3.27 .

Policy Implications

- 7.11 At paragraph 4.3.28, Mr Stevens sets out that the appeals proposals do not adequately meet any of the criteria A-D of Paragraph 112 (with reference to paragraph 3.1.6) or meet criteria A of Paragraph 106 of the NPPF. Mr Stevens summarises (4.3.37) that the appeals proposals are not in line with NPPF with reference to road hierarchy; appropriate connectivity and efficient access to local amenities; highway safety; inclusive design with consideration for all users, including those with mobility impairment; and public transport routing and accessibility.
- 7.12 The reliance on access onto the A582 for the majority of homes on the appeals site is not consistent with the NPPF which seeks to minimise *the number and length of journeys needed* (NPPF para 106). This single access is not fully inclusive approach and not in line with the NPPF paragraph 112b and not compliant with the NMDC (CD10.21), which emphasises the importance of a connected street network (paragraph 19), providing a variety and choice of streets for moving around a place and being direct, allowing people to make efficient journeys. Mr Stevens at 4.3.31 and 4.3.32 sets out how the appeals proposals do not accord with the National Model Design Code and explains that cul-de-sacs, as tertiary streets, are used for access to small groups or clusters of homes.

Reason for Refusal 5: Policy C1 and Masterplan – Mr Stevens

- 7.13 From a highways perspective Mr Stevens (para 4.4.3) considers that a Masterplan for the comprehensive development of the appeals site is fundamental to ensure development in this location does not simply come forward in a piecemeal manner. There is no agreed Masterplan and associated Transport Assessment provided by the Appellant for the comprehensive development of the whole allocation site. Concerns identified by Mr Stevens (4.4.13- 4.4.62) related to RfR 5 include:
- Land issues associated with the need to understand what is required for comprehensive site development and delivery of the CBLR; including land, in the

northeast corner, that may be required to deliver the full CBLR and new bridge over the WCML could potentially be given permission for development in advance of fully understanding what the requirements are in respect to the design of a new bridge over the railway

- the appeals proposal provides two separate piecemeal developments - one large cul-de-sac development of 1060 dwellings, accessed off the A582 Penwortham Way and one small cul-de-sac development of forty dwellings accessed off Bee Lane.
- Emergency access has not been agreed for the development parcels, with no provision of appropriate alternatives for emergency access
- A single access for 1060 dwellings present issues for servicing, maintenance, refuse collection and the routing for public transport into this major site
- The loss of existing access options for existing premises, with existing premises within the site losing access that they currently enjoy from at least one of the current site access points i.e., Bee Lane or Flag Lane.
- Access and Egress and Connectivity for Existing and Proposed Development, with unconstrained access to the existing lanes in a number of locations (the Appellant has stated there is to be no access to the lanes from the new development, however there are no details showing how the Appellant intends to address this issue).
- It is not adequately demonstrated how multiple public rights of way, crossed by new access roads, are to be maintained for pedestrians and equestrians.
- maximum parking standards are being progressed which promotes use of the private car
- a range of concerns about public transport
- concerns about shared space with a significant intensification of sustainable movements on these existing lanes
- lack of clear understanding and detail given to the access and location of the school site, and the further potential traffic and safety impacts that can be expected to result along Bee Lane and for sustainable users across Bee Lane bridge.

Policy Implications

7.14 Mr Stevens sets out (paragraphs 4.4.3 and 4.4.4) that the appeals proposals represent piecemeal development and that a comprehensive Masterplan has not been presented and can only be considered acceptable if it can be concluded that the highway and transport impact for the comprehensive development of the site has been fully assessed and that it can be delivered. Requirements of the National Model Design Code are considered by Mr Stevens at paragraph 4.4.56. The appeals proposals are contrary to the requirements of SRLP Policy C1 and do not meet the requirements of the NPPF as set out under the previous reasons for refusal considered above.

Reason for Refusal 5: Policy C1 and Masterplan – Dr Price

7.15 Dr Price has undertaken an assessment of the masterplan and design elements of the appeals proposals, and thereby RfR 5. As explained at para 2.1 by Dr Price, the Proof is set within the context of the Development Plan provided by the Central Lancashire Core Strategy (CLCS CD 5.1), the South Ribble Local Plan (SRLP, CD 5.2) and the Penwortham Town Neighbourhood Plan (PTNP, CD 5.5). It is also set within and informed by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, CD 4.1), The National Design Guide (NDG, CD 10.14), The National Model Design Code (NMDC, CD 10.16), Building for a Healthy Life (BHL 10.17) and the Central Lancashire Design Guide (CLDG CD 6.4).

7.16 Dr Price explains (para 2.5) how Building for a Healthy Life (BHL, CD 10.17) is the latest iteration of the long-established Building for Life tool, an industry standard method of assessing the quality of new developments. The twelve objectives set out in BHL form the basis for the analysis undertaken by Dr Price. At para 4.0.1, Dr Price also outlines how the use of BHL, and its predecessor Building for Life is embedded in the SLCS (Policy 17 p104, CD 5.1) and throughout the Central Lancashire Design Guide SPD (CD 6.4). These twelve objectives highlight key urban design issues and provide a list of criteria by which the masterplan is assessed by Dr Price.

- 7.17 In considering BHL as a whole, within Policy 17 of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy (p104, CD 5.1) there is a requirement for Building for Life Gold or Silver for all new residential developments. Whilst the gold and silver standards relate to the earlier Building for Life 20 assessment, it is Dr Price's firm opinion that the appeal proposals would not meet that threshold (Dr Price para 4.13.2).
- 7.18 Placemaking concerns are set out in the conclusions of Dr Price (paras 5.1-5.5) related to the impact of the way that the applications have come forward for outline permission, with a significant section of the overall site not included and the CBLR left incomplete. Dr Price (para 5.3) concludes that there remain a number of problems with the master plan, not least the inability to deliver the through spine road and make the proposals properly connected, which is a fundamental flaw which impacts on the successful creation of a place.
- 7.19 Secondly Dr Price explains how the masterplan and supporting design codes do not provide a level of detail to provide confidence that a successful place, based on the vision for 'The Lanes', can be delivered through the multiple reserved matters processes that will follow. Dr Price outlines how the design code included in the DAS (CD 1.17) leaves too much to be established through Reserved Matters and does not provide sufficient confidence going forward that a successful place could be delivered in a way that is locally responsive and builds on the special sense of place that the area possesses.

Policy Implications

- 7.20 Dr Price concludes at paragraphs 5.4 and 5.5 that the approach throughout is to leave too much to be established through Reserved Matters, which is exactly what Policy C1 of the SLRP (CD 5.2) and the need for a comprehensive masterplan and design code seeks to avoid. This is in contravention of Policy C1 of the SLRP (CD 5.2), Policy 17 of CLCS (CD 5.1), Paragraphs 127 and 130 of the NPPF (CD 4.1) and much guidance contained in the NDG (CD 10.15) and NMDC (CD 10.16).

Reason for Refusal 6: Phasing and Infrastructure Delivery Schedule Reason for Refusal 7: Ensuring Delivery of the Cross Borough Link Road

- 7.21 A Phasing Plan and an Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (as part of CD1.18) were submitted with the Planning Applications for the appeals proposals. Further to this an “Indicative Scheme Phasing and Implementation Plan – Draft for Discussion with SRBC June 2022” has been submitted by the Appellants (CD10.23).
- 7.22 Mr Stevens reviews the infrastructure included in this document (CD 10.23) and a Draft Section 106 Head of Terms (paragraph 4.5.3). The Proposed highway improvements are considered as limited by Mr Stevens (4.5.5). Whilst Mr Stevens (4.5.8) welcomes the proposed improvements for pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrians he does not consider that there is sufficient analysis of, or improvements to, the safety of users over the Bee Lane bridge. Concerns about public transport (4.5.9) include the lack of identification of funding for a Sustainable Bus proposed by the Appellants for serving the site by public transport which is required to ensure that sufficient services will be provided until the service becomes self-sustaining.
- 7.23 The phasing and implementation plan reflects the plans and schedule provided with the planning applications for the appeals proposals. As set out above the Council has fundamental concerns about the masterplan for the site as set out under RfR 5 above, drawing on the Proofs of Dr Price and Mr Stevens. These concerns are integral to Phase 1 which as paragraph 2.2 of CD10.23 explains, includes the delivery of essential infrastructure and the creation of key links within the development and connections to existing communities.
- 7.24 Fundamentally the Phasing and Implementation Plan has not been agreed with SRBC and does not ensure the provision of the CBLR and improvements to the wider highway network beyond the site, proposed improvements are limited.

Policy Implications

- 7.25 SRLP (C5.2) Policy A2 requires that land will be protected from physical development for the Cross Borough Link Road and criterion b establishes that this link road includes, *“a road to be constructed through the major development site at Pickering’s Farm as show diagrammatically on the Policies Map”*. The justification text to Policy A1 at Paragraphs 4.20 and 4.21 sets out that the section of the Cross Borough Link Road through the Pickering’s Farm Allocation *“will be implemented in accordance with an agreed phasing and infrastructure delivery schedule”* and *“will be provided through developer contributions and completed within an agreed timescale”*.
- 7.26 Policy C1 of the SRLP (CD5.2) requires the submission of *“a phasing and infrastructure delivery schedule”* (criterion b) and *“an agreed programme of implementation in accordance with the Masterplan and agreed design code”* (criterion c). The appeals proposals are contrary to these requirements of the Development Plan. In relation to criterion c of Policy C1 a programme of implementation has not been agreed with the Council and the phasing and infrastructure schedule does not ensure that the Cross Borough Link Road will be implemented through the Pickering’s Farm site.

Reason for Refusal 8: Air Quality, Mr Martin

- 7.27 Mr Martin’s Proof concludes (paras 5.1-5.3) that the appeals proposals fail to adequately address the impact on air quality from the development. The basis of the submitted air quality report is considered by Mr Martin to be inadequate. This is because the Local Highways Authority do not accept the submitted transport assessment, although it is acknowledged that the methodology behind the Report is acceptable. The application fails to adequately address the harmful air quality impact of the development on the locality and the health of residents, by failing to identify suitable mitigation measures.
- 7.28 It is set out in Mr Martin’s Proof that a way forward has been agreed to address the above issues including a revised air quality assessment (subject to agreement of the

transport assessment), a revised damage cost assessment for the development and the identification of mitigation measures. However, until the traffic data is agreed, the air quality impacts of the development cannot be confirmed. At paragraphs 3.8-3.10 Mr Martin identifies that several matters that have not been addressed as part of the mitigation - standard EV charging requirements for shared residential parking or local centre parking provision. Double counting is also occurring as a number of required measures are proposed as additional mitigation measures (with examples given of the provision of travel plans, and the provision of bus infrastructure). Information is not set out as to how pedestrian links, and segregated cycle paths would be improved.

Policy Implications

- 7.29 With regard to Policy 30 of the Core Strategy and the Planning Advisory Note (CD7.6), the appeals proposals do not improve air quality and do not support action through the planning system to improve air quality. In terms of material considerations, the appeals proposals are contrary to Paragraphs 185 and 186 of the NPPF. The appeals proposals do not ensure that the likely effects of pollution have been taken into account and opportunities to improve air quality or mitigate impacts have not been agreed.

Reason for Refusal 9: Sporting Provision

- 7.30 RfR 9 has now been resolved and withdrawn by the Council as it is agreed that that the matters raised by Sport England can be resolved with appropriately worded S106 obligations which will require financial contributions to be made on a phased basis to support the delivery of sports infrastructure as the construction of the development progresses.

Reason for Refusal 10: Lack of a Proper Planning Approach

- 7.31 The Proofs of Dr Price, Mr Stevens and Mr Lloyd and the summary analysis for the other RfRs in this Proof collectively demonstrate the lack of an agreed Masterplan and

commitment to providing the cross borough link road. The proposals do not follow the 'proper planning approach' or represent good planning for the area as required by the NPPF paragraphs 126 and 132.

Policy Implications

- 7.32 SRLP Policy C1 requires the submission of an agreed Masterplan for the comprehensive development of the site. Paragraph 6.9 explains that the masterplan is required to “ensure the delivery of a comprehensive development of the allocated site.” Paragraph 6.7 introduces Policy C1 and explains that “the comprehensive development of this site is crucial due to its size and strategic importance as well as to ensure delivery of essential infrastructure and local services”. Paragraph 6.10 sets out that “the comprehensive development of this site is dependent on the provision of infrastructure to ensure a sustainable development.” Paragraph 6.11 sets out that “a key piece of infrastructure that will need to be delivered is the section of the Cross Borough Link Road (development link road) as required in Policy A1. This policy requires developments to make contributions for infrastructure.
- 7.33 The appeals proposals do not provide a comprehensive approach and do not ensure delivery of essential infrastructure – they do not achieve the intent of Policy C1. Further to this, paragraphs NPPF 126 and 132 focus on the importance of place and design quality. Dr Price’s Proof identifies concerns about the placemaking approach for the appeals proposals.

Reason for Refusal 11: Viability and Delivery Issues

- 7.34 The evidence of Mr Lloyd relates to RfR 11 and to RfR 6, 7 & 10. The appellant’s longstanding and ongoing involvement with the Pickering’s Farm site and the approach to associated highway infrastructure is set out by Mr Lloyd (paragraph 2.6 onwards). Mr Lloyd reviews the site promotion and assessment evidence-based work that underpinned the allocation of the Pickering’s Farm site as a strategic location. This review identifies that the site’s allocation was dependent on the provision of key

infrastructure, including the CBLR (including an enhanced crossing over the West Coast Mainland Railway) and dualling of the A582 (Mr Lloyd paragraph 2.19). The Pickering's Farm site allocation is intrinsically linked to the delivery of CBLR (including the connection over the West Coast Mainline) and the improvements to Penwortham Way (including dualling) (Mr Lloyd paragraph 2.25). The appeals proposals do not provide for, or ensure the delivery of, this strategic infrastructure. A single major spine road (with a single point of entry and exit at a new junction onto the A582 Penwortham Way) will serve 1,060 dwellings. It is proposed that vehicles will be prevented from utilising the Bee Lane bridge and existing minor roads. The appeals proposals for up to 1,100 dwellings represents 81.5% of the total allocation (1,350 dwellings, Paragraph 6.6, SRLP, CD5.2).

- 7.35 The approach being taken by the Appellants is that they are making no direct contributions to fund the CBLR (including bridge works) and improvements to the A582 (Mr Lloyd paragraph 2.32). The cost associated with completing the CBLR will then be a burden on the remaining development parcels in the allocation, which represent only 18.5% of the total dwellings. Mr Lloyd explains (paragraph 2.32) that this would clearly create a major viability challenge for the remaining parcels of development land and call into question the delivery of the CBLR and the required upgrade to Bee Lane bridge across the West Coast Main Line. This is very likely going to result in the infrastructure not being brought forward on the grounds of viability.

Policy Implications

- 7.36 As set out by Mr Lloyd (paragraph 2.35) Policies A1 and C1 and their supporting justification in the SRLP are clear that developer/landowner contributions should fund the CBLR (including bridge works) and improvements to the A528. The approach being taken by the Appellants is that they are making no direct contributions to any of these elements. The allocation of the Pickering's Farm site was based on the requirement to deliver essential strategic infrastructure.

8.0 Summary and Conclusions

Introduction

- 8.1 The appeals proposals involve two applications for development. Application A includes principal means of access and residential-led mixed use development comprising of up to 920 dwellings and community facilities and infrastructure. Application B is for up to 180 dwellings and principal means of access, similarly all other matters are reserved. Up to 1,100 residential dwellings are proposed in total, with 30% proposed to be affordable dwellings and just over sixteen hectares of green infrastructure is proposed across both sites. An Illustrative Masterplan shows one possible arrangement of the proposed development.
- 8.2 The allocated housing development site known as Pickering's Farm is approximately 79 ha in size and is bounded by the A582 Penwortham Way to the west; immediately to the north by the Kingsfold area of Penwortham; to the east lies the West Coast mainline with Lostock Hall beyond and to the south is an area of Safeguarded Lane with Chain House Lane beyond. The site is currently occupied by a number of individual residential properties and farms in private ownership, the majority of which are accessed via Bee Lane, Flag Lane, Lords Lane, Moss Lane, and Nib Lane which bisect the site. The appeals proposals relate to parcels within the wider Pickering's Farm site that are within the appellants' control.

Allocation and Importance of the Pickering's Farm Site

- 8.3 The appeals sites form part of Site EE, Pickering's Farm, identified on the SRLP Policies Map (CD5.3) associated with Policy C1. Paragraph 2.2 of the Main SoCG confirms that the appeals sites are in a sustainable location. Local services and amenities are located in the local shopping centres of Kingsfold (1.1km), Middleforth (1.9km) and Liverpool Road (3.4km).
- 8.4 As explained in Sections 3 and 4 of this Proof, the Pickering's Farm is a strategically important location and allocation in the CLCS (CD5.1) and the SRLP (CD5.2)

respectively. The CLCS identifies 'Strategic Locations' under Policy 1: Locating Growth which sets out that 'some greenfield development is required at the South of Penwortham and North of Farington Strategic Location (Pickering's Farm site).' Pickering's Farm then forms one of three major sites for development allocated in the SRLP which are residential led.

- 8.5 SRLP Paragraph 6.4 (CD5.2) explains that "due to the size and importance of these (three) sites a comprehensive approach will be adopted that sets out the infrastructure needs and delivery mechanisms for the whole site and considers the relationship to existing communities". Specific policies are set out in the SLRP for each site. Summary tables on housing allocation on page 41 of the SRLP further reinforce the importance of the Pickering's Farm site, which is the largest allocation for housing providing almost 20% of the provision set out in the Local Plan.
- 8.6 The strategic allocation at Pickering's Farm is therefore central to the achievement of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy and the South Ribble Local Plan. Such an important site needs to be planned comprehensively and sustainably, with particular regard given to the delivery of infrastructure for the site and the surrounding area.

Housing Supply Contribution

- 8.7 The appeals sites would generate market and affordable homes. The sites do not form part of the Council's five-year housing land supply. A contribution of 120 homes per annum is expected to commence in 2028/29 (see section 6 of this proof) with build-out of the allocation anticipated in 2037/38. In total the appeal sites would contribute up to 1,100 homes, 81.5% of the overall allocation capacity of 1,350 dwellings set out in the SRLP.

Current Development Plan

- 8.8 There is an up-to-date development plan in place and full weight is given (and agreed) to the SRLP and the CLCS. Significant conflict would arise from the appeal proposals with a range of important policies that lie at the heart of the development plan. As set

out above the appeals sites are strategically important, as the majority of an important allocation in the SRLP. However, this does not mean that any development of the site is acceptable, as part of a planned and sustainable approach the development plan approach seeks to ensure that impacts and infrastructure are addressed for the site and surrounding area and community.

Conflict with the Development Plan

- 8.9 The proposed development does not satisfy important and fundamental policy requirements of the Development Plan. There is harm to Policy C1 - a masterplan, phasing and infrastructure delivery schedule and an agreed programme of implantation have not been agreed. None of the policy criteria have been satisfied. The Masterplan does not include the safeguarded land, it does not address the whole allocation. A comprehensive approach to this strategically important allocation is not put forward. This is a key emphasis and imperative of the Development Plan. Significant transport and design concerns have been identified about the masterplan.
- 8.10 Clarity and confidence that an appropriate development scheme can be achieved is required at this stage. There is a significant risk of delay and that by leaving issues to Reserved Matters and Conditions a materially different scheme could be brought forward. The key purpose of the plan led system is to provide certainty. The Council is not confident that a comprehensive and effectively master planned development will result for this strategically important site. Policy C1 requires confidence that all the key development and infrastructure elements fit together and can be delivered.
- 8.11 SRLP Policy A2 requires that land will be protected from physical development for the Cross Borough Link Road and criterion b establishes that this link road includes, “a road to be constructed through the major development site at Pickering’s Farm as show diagrammatically on the Policies Map”. The justification text to Policy A1 at Paragraphs 4.20 and 4.21 set out that the section of the Cross Borough Link Road through the Pickering’s Farm Allocation “will be implemented in accordance with an agreed

phasing and infrastructure delivery schedule” and “will be provided through developer contributions and completed within an agreed timescale”.

- 8.12 Policy C1 of the SRLP requires the submission of “a phasing and infrastructure delivery schedule” (criterion b) and “an agreed programme of implementation in accordance with the Masterplan and agreed design code” (criterion c). The appeals proposals do not meet these requirements of the Development Plan. In relation to criterion c of Policy C1 a programme of implementation has not been agreed with the Council and the phasing and infrastructure schedule does not ensure that the Cross Borough Link Road will be implemented through the Pickering’s Farm site.
- 8.13 The appeals proposals do not provide for, or ensure the delivery of, the strategic infrastructure of the Cross Brough Link Road. The link road is identified as essential infrastructure for the Pickering’s Farm strategic location and allocation site. Given the approach of the appellants, the cost associated with completing the CBLR will then be a burden on the remaining development parcels in the allocation, which represent only 18.5% of the total dwellings. This would create a major viability challenge for the remaining parcels of development land and call into question the delivery of the CBLR and the required upgrade to Bee Lane bridge across the West Coast Main Line. This is very likely going to result in the infrastructure not being brought forward on the grounds of viability.

Material Considerations

- 8.14 The delivery of housing and fulfilling the national imperative to boost the supply of new homes as set out in the NPPF is the principal material consideration. The appeals proposals will deliver up to 1,100 homes and form most of a strategically important sites for the delivery of new homes in the Borough. Bringing the site forward will help to deliver the Local Plan and its planned approach to the growth of the Brough and strategic objectives SO 5 (first part) and SO 8 of the Core Strategy (CD5.1)
- 8.15 As is the case for most development proposals of this nature economic and social benefits would arise from the development of new homes. The planning statement

for the appeals proposals (CD1.18) sets out that the proposals will support a number of economic benefits in terms of job creation and increased expenditure in the local economy. Social benefits include the provision of new homes and up to 330 affordable homes, a local centre with a range of provision, a two-form entry primary school and a mobility hub. In terms of environmental benefits, it is accepted that the developments will result in the provision of additional green infrastructure with associated net increases in biodiversity and publicly accessible open space.

- 8.16 The contribution to the housing supply and provision of affordable units would be beneficial. The estimated economic benefits are generic, some are temporary in nature, and some relate to funding for the Council. Net gains in biodiversity are expected from all development. Green infrastructure, biodiversity and open space gains are in effect largely mitigation measures.
- 8.17 The NPPF sets out that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development (section 2, paragraph 7). Inclusive places, promoting the use of sustainable modes of travel and reducing the need to travel and good design are all key aspects of sustainable development (sections 8, 9 and 12 of the NPPF). Section 7 of this Proof draws together key concerns about these issues in relation to the appeal proposals, which do not represent sustainable development.
- 8.18 The NDG introduces ten characteristics to illustrate the Government's priorities for well-designed places, which include: "Movement - accessible and easy to move around." The NDG states that a well-designed movement network provides a genuine choice of sustainable transport modes and limits the impact of cars by prioritising and encouraging walking, cycling and public transport. The proposed development would conflict with the NDG, which seeks to reduce reliance upon the private car and to move away from car use for short journeys.
- 8.19 The reliance on a single access to the Major Road Network for the majority of the homes on the appeals site and the lack of direct or indirect delivery of the Cross Borough Link Road to provide for local east-west movements also results in poor

connectivity to the adjoining urban area – falling short of the requirements of the NPPF, NDC and Core Strategy strategic objectives SO 2, SO 3, SO 4 and the second part of SO 8 9 (that the delivery of sufficient new housing *should also be based on infrastructure provision, as well as ensuring that delivery does not compromise existing communities*). The scheme would be harmful because it would increase car dependency, with implications for greenhouse gas emissions, congestion on local roads, and social exclusion. Existing communities living within the appeal site would be compromised in terms of access and communities in the wider area impacted by the effects of the appeals proposals on the highway network.

Overall Conclusions

- 8.20 The appeals are not in accordance with the Development Plan. There is very significant harm to fundamental policies of the Development Plan and to different policies. The appeals proposals would contribute to the delivery of housing, with some associated economic, social and environmental benefits. This material consideration does not overcome the conflict with the Development Plan. The appeals proposals would not result in the achievement of sustainable development, given the identified transport, design, and inclusion concerns about the appeals proposals.
- 8.21 The benefit of the main material consideration (the delivery of housing) is also tempered by the situation that the appeal sites do not form part of the Borough's five-year housing land supply and do not feature in the housing supply trajectory until 2028/29. There is not therefore an immediate need for housing to be provided at the appeal sites. Other sites in the Borough are providing this supply and the Council has a very healthy 13-year supply of deliverable sites.
- 8.22 Permission should not be granted because of conflict with the development plan. The planning analysis set out in section 7 demonstrates this conflict and explains the resulting harms. Material considerations do not indicate that the plan should not be followed. For the reasons set out above, I respectfully support the view that this appeal should be dismissed.