



Report of	Meeting	Date
Chief Executive	Central Lancashire Strategic Planning Joint Advisory Committee	Monday, 27 March 2023

## Preferred Options Consultation Part One: Outcomes and Next Steps

Is this report confidential?	No
------------------------------	----

Is this decision key?	No
-----------------------	----

### Purpose of the Report

1. To provide an early indication of the volume, type, spatial spread, and content of responses to the Part One Preferred Options

### Recommendations

2. To note the contents

### Reasons for recommendations

3. The report does not require any decisions, it is for information only.

### Other options considered and rejected

4. Not applicable

### Background to the report

5. The Part One Preferred Options Consultation was undertaken from Monday 19<sup>th</sup> December 2022 until Friday 24<sup>th</sup> February 2023. This report provides an interim summary of the responses we have received although there is a significant volume of work to do in the processing of these representations.
6. The digital platform, Citzenspace was the vehicle used to collect responses and is commonly used by a variety of public, third sector and private sector bodies including the DLUHC. The aim is to encourage as many representations as possible to be received digitally so that these can be easily collated, stored, and analysed.

7. However, as we found with Issues and Options Consultation, a vast number of respondents elected to submit written responses either on email or PDFs or by hard copy.
8. We are working through all the responses and so the information provided in this report is subject to change however it gives an *early indication* of the responses.

### **Total number of Response**

9. The tables below include the data collected to date, on responses, which sum to (estimated) 930 representations to the consultation plus 92 representations regarding sites. As stated above, this is subject to change because the team are still processing emails and hard copy submissions which have been scanned in at receipt and emailed to the team, many emails have up to ten responses attached.
10. The Citizenspace consultation is now closed and a total of **694** responses were received online. This number will increase as we will endeavour to add all or the majority of written representations (where feasible) onto Citizenspace. The ability to do this depends on the layout and volume of the representation. Many received do not follow the questions we asked in the consultation and therefore there would be an element of interpretation required to assign elements of a representation to a particular question. For this reason, this task will need to be undertaken by an officer with an understanding of plan making.
11. Unless we distil these responses, it become extremely onerous if not impossible to take them into account given the volumes and complexities.
12. Further, a number of handwritten representations have been made which will need to be manually 'typed up' into Citizen space as these cannot be edited using software, which is a resource intensive task.
13. Therefore, at this stage it would not be beneficial to undertake any detailed analysis of the data either the quantitative or qualitative responses because the content will change, and the assumptions therefore could not be relied on.
14. The Issues and Options Consultation undertaken at the start of plan making generated a total of 1,616 responses, of which, 1,200 responses came directly through Citizen Space, with the remainder in letter from both handwritten and electronic. Therefore, the level of engagement is down on the initial figures and whilst this may be as a result of sites included within the Issues and Options consultation, no longer featuring as proposed site allocations, therefore causing less concern, we will review our approach for the next consultation and ensure the online portal is both well promoted and questions easy to navigate.

**In total there were 236 new representations split as follows:**

<b>Chorley</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>Preston</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>South Ribble</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>Generic</b>	<b>29</b>

15. Detailed analysis is required to identify the proportion of all representations from each of the three Council borough areas plus those which are generic or non-specific.

#### Table of Responses by Type (Interim /subject to Change)

Type of Response	Preston	Chorley	South Ribble	Generic
<b>Citizenspace</b>				694
<b>Written on Email PDF or Word</b>	31	97	79	29
<b>Total Responses Received = 930</b>				

#### Call for Sites Four Submissions (Chorley)

16. 42 Call for Sites submissions were received. All submissions were assessed to see if they related to a new site or related to a site already submitted. If they related to a site already submitted the comments received were recorded as a Part One Preferred Options consultation response.
17. Details of the sites have been circulated to Home Teams and these will be shared with Elected Members locally as part of Portfolio Briefings and Local Plan Working Groups.
18. All new sites are being plotted onto GIS and added to the SHELAA database and will be circulated to home teams along with the call for sites forms providing further information on the site.
19. The Home teams will next complete the SHELAA assessment for each site and determine which sites should be considered further or discounted in line with the SHELAA methodology.
20. We have received around 50 submissions where amendments to sites already submitted and subject to consideration require an amendment.

#### Table of Call for Sites

Authority	(Estimated) New Call for Sites Received (including all land uses)	Number of Call for Sites Responses (amendments. Supporting documents)
<b>Chorley</b>	<b>17</b>	
<b>Preston</b>	<b>18</b>	
<b>South Ribble</b>	<b>7</b>	

## Attendance at Drop in Events

21. A total of 814 consultees attended the events across Chorley, Preston and South Ribble with details provided in the table below. This is comparison to 912 people for the events held as part of the Issues and Options events.

**Table of Attendance at Chorley Drop in Events**

Ward	Location	Date	Number of Attendees
Chorley North West	Union Street Offices	21/12/22	0
Chorley North East	Abbey Village Primary School	04/01/23	16
Chorley North and Astley	St Joseph's Parish Centre	05/01/23	15
Croston, Mawdesley & Euxton South	Mawdesley Village Hall	10/01/23	31
Eccleston, Heskin and Charnock Richard	Eccleston Library	12/01/23	16
Chorley South East and Heath Charnock	St George's CE Primary	16/01/2023	2
Adlington and Anderton	Adlington & District Community Centre	17/01/2023	49
Buckshaw and Whittle	Whittle-le-Woods Community Hall	19/01/23	121
Eccleston, Heskin and Charnock Richard	Charnock Richard Football Club	23/01/2023	10
Clayton East, Brindle and Hoghton	Brindle Community Hall	26/1/23	5
Euxton	Euxton Methodist Church Hall	01/02/23	21
Chorley North East	Heapey and Wheelton Village Hall	03/02/23	63
Coppull	Coppull Library	07/02/23	3
Chorley East	Scout Centre	09/02/23	14
Clayton West and Cuerden	Lancaster Lane Primary School	13/02/2023	0
Croston, Mawdesley and Euxton South	Bishop Rawstorne High School	15/02/2023	120
Eccleston, Heskin and Charnock Richard	Heskin Village Hall	16/02/2023	3
Chorley South West	Eaves Green Community Centre	20/02/23	15
<b>Total 504</b>			

## Preston

Ward/Community Hubs	Location	Date	Number of Attendees
City Centre	Preston Markets	9/01/2023	5
City Centre	Town Hall, Lancaster Road	12/01/2023	1
North West	Preston Grasshoppers	18/01/2023	40
Ashton&Lea	St Christopher's Church Lea	02/02/2023	33
Fulwood/Redscar	Norman Jepson	26/01/2023	14
	Sahara Centre		35
<b>Total 128</b>			

## South Ribble

Ward/Community Hubs	Location	Date	Number of Attendees
Leyland	Civic Centre	12/01/2023	5
Eastern	Canberra Club	01/02/2023	7
Penwortham	Penwortham Arts Centre	16/01/2023	10
Western	Longton Library	26/01/2023	6
Bamber Bridge. Lostock Hall & Walton Le Dale	Bamber Bridge Methodist Church	25/01/2023	154
<b>Total 182</b>			

## Duty to Cooperate

22. Section 110 of the Localism Act sets out the 'duty to co-operate' and applies to all local planning authorities, national park authorities and county councils in England – and to several other public bodies. The duty relates to sustainable development or use of land that would have a significant impact on at least two local planning areas or on a planning matter that falls within the remit of a county council and requires that councils set out planning policies to address such issues, and requires that councils and public bodies 'engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis' to develop strategic policies.

23. The NPPF (Paragraph 156) sets out the strategic issues where co-operation might be appropriate and Duty to Cooperate meetings with officers took place with the following partners:

- National Highways
- Transport for Greater Manchester
- Wigan Council
- Bolton Council
- West Lancs Council
- Environment Agency and UU
- LCC as the Lead Local Flood Authority

- LCC on health issues
- Uclan

24. A number of statutory consultees have been engaged as part of the site selection and SHEELA assessment process prior to the consultation and therefore whilst all were invited to engage in a formal Duty To Cooperate meeting, many were happy to submit a written response and continue to engage during the next phase of plan making.

### Statutory Consultee Responses

25. Responses from Statutory Consultees and other key bodies are crucial to ensuring we are meeting the requirements of NPPF and PPG for our Regulation 18 Consultation in plan making and that their views are fed into policy making and the site selection process.

26. The table below lists the representations we have received from these key partners. These representations will be shared across all three Councils and consideration given to the points made.

### Table of Responses from Public Bodies/Statutory Consultees/Other Local Planning Authorities

<b>Name of Organisation</b>
United Utilities
Network Rail
National Grid
Homes England
Natural England
National Highways
Campaign Protect Rural England
Sport England
The Wildlife Trust for Lancashire, Greater Manchester, and Merseyside
CBRE
Marine Management Organisation
LCC Schools Planning Team
LCC LLFA
LCC Health and Wellbeing
LCC Estates
LCC as Developer
House Builders Federation
West Lancs Borough Council
Network Rail
Environment Agency
NHS
MOD
Historic England
Canal and Rivers Trust
Fylde Borough Council
Blackburn with Darwen Council
Wyre Borough Council

27. A number of Parish Councils also made representations including Whittle Le Woods PC, Croston PC, Eccleston PC, Heapey PC in Chorley, Woodplumpton PC, Whittingham Parish Council and Grimsargh PC for Preston and Samlesbury and Cuerdale PC and Farrington PC for South Ribble.

### **Next Steps**

28. A clear methodology has been developed and agreed across all 3 Councils as to how we will go about populating the written representations onto Citizenspace, ensuring we are fully compliant with GDPR and our Data Sharing agreement and thereafter undertake the important analysis of the feedback, to inform the preparation of the Preferred Options Part One Consultation Outcomes Report and next stages of the plan preparation. The Planning Inspector at the EIP will expect to see due diligence carried out when processing and reviewing these representations we have received to ensure a meaningful and effective consultation process has taken place.
29. The 'Home Teams' will be responsible for undertaking some analysis and broad review of the responses received and the Steering Group will decide how best this exercise is undertaken, for example if a proportion of non-site-specific question responses are to be issued to each of the three home teams plus site specific responses.
30. Richard Wood Consultants will then undertake a further refinement of the analysis and will produce the formal Preferred Options Part One Consultation Outcomes Report which will come to each Council to agree and publish. This is an important document as it will be included in the EIP documents as the Inspector will want to be assured of a robust and meaningful consultation.
31. An outcomes report will be prepared which will outline the main themes and responses received and outline the Councils response to those.
32. The report alongside a detailed presentation will be presented to members of the JAC at a future meeting and the report will thereafter be approved for publication on the Central Lancashire Website.

### **Climate change and air quality**

33. The work noted in this report has no impact on the three Councils Carbon emissions and the wider Climate Emergency and sustainability targets of the Councils. The Local Plan is subject to a statutory test for impact on the environment (SA/IA) and these are being developed alongside the plan. This paper has no direct impacts.

### **Equality and diversity**

34. There are no implications arising from this paper and the Local Plan process requires an integrated Assessment is undertaken which takes account of impacts of the policies on equality and diversity.

### **Risk**

35. There are no risks directly associated with this paper, the Local Plan as a whole has a risk register and risks regarding the use of and storage of data collected during consultations are included and also covered by an Asset Register and a Central Lancashire Data Sharing Agreement

#### **Comments of the Statutory Finance Officer**

36. There are no direct financial implications of this report.

#### **Comments of the Monitoring Officer**

37. The report is for information and noting – there are no direct legal implications arising. The report simply provides an early indication of the volume, type, spatial spread, and content of responses to the Part One Preferred Options consultation – considerable work will be required to analyse fully all the responses received.

#### **Background documents**

There are no background papers to this report

#### **Appendices**

There are no appendices.

Report Author:	Email:	Telephone:	Date:
Zoe Whiteside (Head of Spatial Planning)/Katherine Greenwood /Carolyn Williams/Michelle Priestman	zoe.whiteside@chorley.gov.uk	5711	17/3/23