

OPEN SPACE AND PLAYING PITCH SPD – CONSULTATION STATEMENT

The Town Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

This statement has been prepared in accordance with the above regulations and in particular, Part 5, which relates to the progression of Supplementary Planning Documents to adoption.

Public participation is covered within the Regulations at paragraph 12, and a local planning authority before it adopts a Supplementary Planning Document, is required to prepare a statement setting out:

- (i) the persons the local planning authority consulted when preparing the Supplementary Planning Document;
- (ii) a summary of the main issues raised by those persons; and
- (iii) how those issues have been addressed in the Supplementary Planning Document

This information along with the Supplementary Planning Document must be available for a period of not less than 4 weeks before the document is adopted.

The SPD can be viewed on the websites of the three authorities. Additionally the document is available to view at the following offices:

The Civic Centre, West Paddock, Leyland PR25 1DH

Monday – Thursday 8.30 am -5.15 pm, Friday 8.30am – 4.45pm

Civic Offices, Union Street, Chorley, Lancashire PR7 1AL

Monday – Friday 8.45am -5.00pm

Town Hall, Lancaster Road, Preston, PR1 2RL

Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday 8.00am to 6.00pm

Thursday 10.30am – 6.00pm

The Draft Supplementary Planning Document was subject to a consultation process between 30th January and 13th March 2013.

In excess of 1,200 organisations/individuals were consulted, which included planning consultants/solicitors; housebuilders; businesses; charities; interest groups; councils/parish councils; councillors; government departments; social services etc. Given that the list is extensive it is not proposed to reproduce it in full within this statement however, the full list can be supplied on application to any of the three councils.

Twenty responses were received in relation to the consultation. A summary of the responses along with comments as to how the document has been amended to take account of the responses, forms Appendix 1 of this statement.

Appendix 1 – Summary of Representations and Responses

Ref	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Response
01	Network Rail	Network Rail has no comments.	Noted.
02	Civil Aviation Authority	It is not necessary to consult the CAA on strategic planning documents other than those with direct aviation involvement.	Noted.
03	Ingol & Tanterton Neighbourhood Council	Open spaces are an emotive subject with local communities. The Open Space SPD deliberately offers the option to developers of mitigation through a s106 contribution. Can we add a clause that local Councils and community groups should be consulted on the use of available s106 monies provided as a financial contribution in lieu of open space provision.	This SPD will identify whether new open space provision is required from a development or whether improvements to existing open spaces are required. It is the responsibility of each authority to identify suitable sites for new provision and to identify what improvements are required on particular sites. Parish Councils and community groups will continue to be consulted.
04	Lostock St Gerards FC	Would like to register our proposed scheme for consideration. Our football ground is currently surrounded by a large open space that has only just been made available for public use quite recently due to new housing developments in the area. Part of the original housing development was to include a new 11 a side football pitch with changing facilities. However for various reasons this was put on hold and the ground remains in a state that is unfit to use for anything. We have been in negotiations with Councillors and officials to seek some of the s106 money to act as a contribution to a lottery and Sport England grant in order to develop the site. Our aim would be to reintroduce the 11 a side football pitch as well as developing four small football pitches on the site which is a much needed facility for junior football in the community. Along with these pitches, we would also look to provide suitable and sufficient changing facilities and equipment storage areas. This would also prove to be a much needed park and recreational facility for the existing local residents of Lostock Hall and the numerous new residents from the new housing developments surrounding the ground. We hope the Central Lancs authorities give our proposed scheme its full support.	The purpose of the SPD is to determine the level of contribution for open space and playing pitch provision that is required from a new housing development. Each individual authority will determine how the s106 contributions are spent using the guidance within the SPD. Discussions need to take place with South Ribble Council on this proposed scheme.

Ref	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Response
05	LHJFC	<p>Interested in the development of land adjacent to St Gerard's football pitch on Wateringpool Lane in Lostock Hall. With local player demand and with changes to the playing formats introduced by the FA, Lostock Hall Junior Football Club are looking to increase their portfolio to 23 teams. We are looking to develop a girls academy for under 8's with a view to prepare and develop the players for under 9's league football. We feel that this development will be highly beneficial to girls football as there are few opportunities for local girls to participate in and around Preston. We currently use local rented pitches that are already over utilised and two girls teams have no dedicated pitch. We are in desperate need of more pitches for our current teams and to assist with the development of our girls section. I hope we can be considered in the development plans.</p>	<p>The purpose of the SPD is to determine the level of contribution for open space and playing pitch provision that is required from a new housing development. Each individual authority will determine how the s106 contributions are spent using the guidance within the SPD. Discussions need to take place with South Ribble Council on this proposed scheme.</p>

Ref	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Response
06	South Ribble Borough Council	<p>Paragraph 29 - why is South Ribble compared to Preston as an urban area and Chorley has a separate policy as it is classed as rural? Surely South Ribble is more akin to Chorley. What are the differences in policy?</p> <p>Page 7 - the parks and gardens section needs a review. South Ribble has identified a new Central Park in its Core Strategy and it will be crucial that developments in the area make a contribution to the creation of this major provision. Currently this section specifically says that new developments will not be expected to contribute and there is no reference to the Central Park.</p> <p>Page 8 - should the green corridors section refer to the Central Park?</p> <p>Page 9 - the playing pitches section makes reference to new pitches being allocated in the relevant LA's plan. Where are these in South Ribble when there is a pressure from local football clubs?</p>	<p>Preston and South Ribble Councils propose to assess open space provision on a ward basis. Chorley Council proposes to assess open space provision on a settlement basis rather than ward basis as this is considered more appropriate due to the rural nature of the Borough.</p> <p>The SPD has been amended to state that if a new park or garden is proposed within the accessibility catchment of a residential development then a financial contribution towards its provision will be secured from the development. The natural/semi-natural greenspace section has also been amended in this way.</p> <p>The Central Park scheme is included in the Regulation 123 List and the funding required will come from CIL.</p> <p>It is not necessary to refer to specific sites in the SPD. Open space sites and playing pitches will be allocated in each authority's Local Plan. Central Park is an allocation in South Ribble's Site Allocations DPD under Policy G6.</p> <p>The Playing Pitch Strategy does not identify the need for new playing pitch provision in South Ribble. It recommends that any deficit in provision can be addressed through improvements to existing playing pitches.</p>
07	English Heritage	<p>We are unable to comment on this occasion. We recommend you seek advice from the LA's conservation officer and from the appropriate archaeological staff. You should have regard to the NPPF and the Practice Guide accompanying PPS5.</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD has been drafted in accordance with the Framework.</p>

Ref	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Response
08	Natural England	<p data-bbox="533 164 1391 408">Evidence base section - note that you have referred to planning policies needing to be based on up to date assessments of open space and opportunities for provision. This section could go further to ensure there is appropriate quality and quantity of green space to meet identified local needs. We recommend the use of ANGSt as a useful tool that can help ensure adequate provision of accessible natural greenspace.</p> <p data-bbox="533 451 1391 730">Paragraph 9 sets out that the document is based on Core Strategy 24: Sport and Recreation. The SPD should also be based on Policy 18: Green Infrastructure and Policy 19: Areas of Separation and Major Open Space. The SPD states that it is consistent with RSS Policy EM3: Green Infrastructure but does not refer to green infrastructure elsewhere in the document. Due to the RSS soon to be revoked, the SPD needs to be based on more sustainable and locally specific policies to Central Lancashire.</p> <p data-bbox="533 774 1391 911">Pleased that the PPG17 typology natural and semi-natural greenspace is referred to in the SPD but disappointed that the SPD states that new residential developments will not be required to contribute towards new provision.</p> <p data-bbox="533 962 1391 1422">The SPD is an excellent opportunity to make reference to the natural environment, through recognising the benefits of the wider ecosystem services and minimising impacts on biodiversity when seeking opportunities for creating new and enhancing existing open space. It is also important to recognise that Green Infrastructure (GI) is intrinsically linked to open space provision. The SPD should provide a clear focus in relation to GI provision and where possible encourage such provision to be incorporated into new development. In addition the SPD could emphasise the multifunctional benefits of GI to biodiversity, amenity, recreation and health and wellbeing and the need to consider GI and demonstrate how GI and open spaces could link to the wider GI network. Consideration should also be given to the maintenance and management that green space require.</p>	<p data-bbox="1476 164 2096 371">The Open Space Study uses locally informed standards derived from consultation and quantitative and qualitative surveys. It does not focus on the ANGSt Standard as it uses a different methodology for identifying accessible natural greenspace based on current best practice.</p> <p data-bbox="1476 414 2096 659">Production of the SPD is specifically referred to in Core Strategy Policy 24. However, it is acknowledged that the SPD also has links to Core Strategy Policies 18 and 19. The SPD will therefore be amended to also refer to these policies. The RSS has now been revoked therefore the regional policy section will be deleted.</p> <p data-bbox="1476 702 2096 909">The SPD has been amended to state that if a natural/semi-natural greenspace is proposed within the accessibility catchment of a residential development then a financial contribution towards its provision will be secured from the development.</p> <p data-bbox="1476 962 2096 1455">The SPD deals specifically with open space provision within new residential developments. Links to the wider Green Infrastructure network will be taken into consideration when assessing the design of a residential development. Core Strategy Policy 17: Design of New Buildings requires new buildings to take account of the character and appearance of the local area including providing landscaping as an integral part of the development, protecting existing landscape features and natural assets, habitat creation, providing open space and enhancing the public realm. Each authority's Local Plan will also include a design policy taking into account more local</p>

Ref	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Response
		<p data-bbox="533 156 1368 252">We agree with the screening opinion that an Appropriate Assessment as part of the Habitat Regulation Assessment process is not required for this SPD.</p> <p data-bbox="533 300 1368 504">The Screening Document for Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment does not adequately address the screening of this SPD. It was published in April 2012 prior to this SPD being published and does not include an overview of this SPD. It is also based solely on the SPD being based on Core Strategy Policy 24 whereas we believe it should also relate to Policies 18 and 19.</p>	<p data-bbox="1476 156 2069 181">issues.</p> <p data-bbox="1476 229 2069 287">It is also proposed to prepare a Central Lancs SPD on nature conservation and ecology.</p> <p data-bbox="1476 335 2069 395">The Screening Document for SA and SEA has been reviewed and Natural England were re-consulted.</p>
09	Bretherton Parish Council	Bretherton Parish Council support the SPD.	Noted.
10	Lancashire County Council	<p data-bbox="533 651 1391 962">Supportive of the purpose and principles of the SPD. However there are concerns about the implementation of the SPD in Preston given that the Regulation 123 List submitted as part of the Central Lancashire CIL Examination includes reference to improvements/provision and maintenance of off-site public realm/ open space/ natural environment/ places for sport. This duplicates the provisions of the SPD and will lead to double charging. This raises serious concerns regarding the implementation and provision of open space which could in turn impact on public health and the delivery of healthy communities.</p>	<p data-bbox="1476 651 2080 818">The Regulation 123 List relates to specific infrastructure projects which will be funded by CIL. s106 contributions will not be requested for any projects within this list and CIL contributions will only be spent on identified schemes in this list.</p>

Ref	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Response
11	Leyland Cricket Club	<p>Both the Central Lancashire Playing Pitch Assessment Report and Playing Pitch Strategy and Action Plan fail to differentiate either between the grass surfaces quality needs of winter sports (football, rugby) and summer sports (cricket) or between the 'NGB pyramidal pecking order' of clubs (all sports) and clubs (cricket specific).</p> <p>On page 27 of the Playing Pitch Strategy and Action Plan in the table titled 'South Ribble' there appears to be a misleading reference to a Preston Playing Pitch Strategy (2007) in the table row 'cricket deficiency of...' table column 'key issues'.</p> <p>Both documents are flawed as far as cricket in Leyland is concerned for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Leyland CC is not mentioned in name, therefore 160+ years of heritage associated with that title is lost. - The recent closure of 4 cricket grounds in Leyland and the consequential absorption of the cricket community into one new grossly overstretched resource is not highlighted. - No reference to s106 funds available for a new cricket ground. - No comments re usage of a secondary school playing field with only a 1 year agreement undermining younger player development. - No mention of duplicate ground equipment resources available at Leyland CC to sustain a second ground. - No mention of inward investment associated with high profile, successful club. - No reference to development of girls and ladies cricket at the club. - No reference to ambition to become a Community Sports Enterprise. - No mention of the need for enhanced changing facilities to enable proper segregation of genders and junior/adult age groups during multi activity ground usage. 	<p>The Playing Pitch Strategy assesses outdoor sport and recreation facilities in accordance with the methodologies provided by Sport England. It includes football, cricket, rugby and artificial grass pitches.</p> <p>An error was made on page 27 of the Playing Pitch Strategy & Action Plan. It should state 'South Ribble's Playing Pitch Strategy' rather than 'Preston's'.</p> <p>The purpose of the Playing Pitch Strategy is not for the level of detail to be included. They look at broader issues and trends.</p>

Ref	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Response
12	Canal & River Trust	<p>PPG17 established that inland waterways and towing paths should be included in the definition of open space. The Town and Country Planning Association Policy Advice Note (PAN) on Inland Waterways (2009) describes inland waterways as a form of multi-functional green infrastructure. The various roles of inland waterways are identified as including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - recreation and leisure - accommodating a wide range of recognised watersports and informal recreational activities. - health and wellbeing - part of the 'natural health service' acting as 'blue gyms' encouraging and supporting physical and healthy outdoor activity. <p>In light of the above the Trust is disappointed to note that the Leeds & Liverpool Canal and Lancaster Canal are not identified in the Open Space Study as amenity greenspace or green infrastructure. The canals are not therefore taken into account in terms of the policy implications and recommendations. In the interests of completeness and to ensure the emerging Local Plan documents for Preston and Chorley are positively prepared, justified and effective, the Trust would suggest that the canals should be included in any future revisions of the report.</p>	<p>The Leeds and Liverpool Canal and Lancaster Canal are not identified in the Open Space Study as they do not fall within any of the open space typologies assessed. However, the concerns raised are covered by Core Strategy Policy 18: Green Infrastructure which seeks to manage and improve environmental resources. This includes investing in and improving the canal networks.</p>

Ref
13 Organisation
TB Planning

Summary of Representation

The Local Policy section should include reference to Core Strategy Policies 18 and 19 on Green Infrastructure and Areas of Separation and Major Open Space rather than focussing exclusively on Policy 24: Sport and Recreation that has a much narrower emphasis. Open space provision is clearly also about good design.

Fundamental concerns that the Open Space Study that provides the evidence base for the SPD has not taken into account significant open spaces in the vicinity of and within Ingol Golf Course. The most glaring omission is that of Jubilee Green which falls within the definition of natural and semi-natural greenspace. It is assumed that other areas of natural and semi-natural greenspace within Ingol Golf Course have been omitted because of the convention not to include golf courses within open space provision. This may be a valid approach in most instances, but the particular design of Ingol means that there are self-contained natural and semi-natural greenspaces within it that are fully accessible to the public. The Inspector at the Public inquiry into proposed development of the golf course recognised that the course and its environs was designed to provide open space for the expanding local community, not just to meet the demand from golfers. There are a number of areas that warrant identification and consideration the most extensive being Sharoe Valley between Conway Park and Walker Lane. It is inconsistent that this facility be excluded when Masons Wood in Fulwood is included. These omissions undermine the credibility of the study and there is a substantial deficiency in the ward.

Natural England recommend that people living in towns and cities should have an accessible natural greenspace of at least 2 hectares in size no more than 300 metres from home. It is disappointing that the study neither maps those communities that do not enjoy such a facility nor acknowledges the importance of areas of golf course lands that do not provide an accessible local facility for residents of Greyfriars and for some residents of the adjacent Ingol and Cadley wards. There are intense pressures for development in NW Preston and it is vital that open space facilities that existing and new communities be identified

Response

Production of the SPD is specifically referred to in Core Strategy Policy 24. However, it is acknowledged that the SPD also has links to Core Strategy Policies 18 and 19. The SPD will therefore be amended to also refer to these policies. The SPD will also supplement emerging Local Plan policies.

The purpose of the study is to set standards for the provision of open space, areas are not disadvantaged by the omission of sites. Whether the Jubilee Green site is included is being investigated as it could be included under a different name. It is noted that these comments are concerned with the Open Space Study rather than the SPD itself. Supplementary Planning Documents do not make policy and the comments are of little relevance to the SPD.

The Open Space Study uses locally informed standards derived from consultation and quantitative and qualitative surveys. It does not focus on the ANGSt Standard as it uses a different methodology for identifying accessible natural greenspace based on current best practice.

The SPD has been amended to state that if a natural/semi-natural greenspace is proposed within the accessibility catchment of a residential development then a financial contribution towards its provision will be secured from the development.

Ref	Organisation	Summary of Representation and protected from development and the role that they play be considered in the formulation of policy. It is also essential that proper provision be made of open space of all types as NW Preston is developed as a location for growth.	Response
		The policy provides an inadequate basis for securing contributions from developers towards open space provision as it dismisses the prospect of creating additional areas of natural and semi-natural greenspace on the back of new development despite local deficiencies and Natural England recommendations. On-site provisions of features associated with this typology is no substitute. It omits important open spaces from the schedule.	
14	Whittingham Parish Council	We would like to question whether the proximity to facilities will cover adjacent boundaries, namely Ribble Valley e.g. under para 40 'all new residential development within a 10 minute drive of an allotment site will be required to pay a financial contribution towards either new allotment provision or improvements to existing allotments.' The policy should be more specific that if development occurs in Central Lancashire and improved facilities are required, then these should be provided in Central Lancashire.	All financial contributions will be spent within the relevant ward/settlement and will not be spent outside Central Lancashire. Only sites within Central Lancashire were assessed in the Open Space Study.
15	Environment Agency	We strongly support that new residential developments will be required to incorporate green corridors into the design of the development where appropriate to link the site to existing green corridors, open spaces, cycle routes, community facilities, employment etc. This will help to further develop Green Infrastructure links across Central Lancashire.	Noted.

Ref	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Response
16	Indigo Planning Ltd	<p data-bbox="533 156 853 175">Our objection is threefold:</p> <p data-bbox="533 228 1384 938">1) Viability - we object to the substantial increase in open space provision that is suggested in the SPD. Off-site open space contributions are set to increase by over 40% of what is currently required by Chorley's Local Plan Review 2003. There is no justification for this. For a scheme of 100 dwellings it equates to an increase of £101,100. The SPD has no regard for the viability of open space contributions. It makes no allowance for negotiations where the level of open space provision threatens the delivery of development. This conflicts with para's 154 and 173 of the Framework. Furthermore, in an attempt to boost the delivery of new homes and support growth the Local Housing Delivery Group published 'Viability Testing Local Plans: Advice for Planning Practitioners' (June 2012) which called for planning authorities to strike a balance between the policy requirements necessary to provide for sustainable development and the realities of economic viability. It states "there should be both clear local justification for the adoption of local standards and policies, and reasonable returns for landowners." In order for the SPD to accord with the Framework it must be reworded to allow applicants to negotiate a lower contribution towards open space if full provision would render a development unviable.</p> <p data-bbox="533 986 1384 1337">2) Triggers/staging of contributions -SPD does not include reference to triggers/staging. Contributions are sought to accommodate the extra demand created by development, this does not come into effect until full occupation. We therefore request that the SPD clarifies that financial contributions towards open space should only be required post occupation. Contributions triggered upon commencement can prevent development coming forward and are attributable for the rise in unimplemented planning permissions across the country. Developers need time to build a scheme and the financial assurance of not having to pay contributions until they are required.</p> <p data-bbox="533 1385 1384 1447">3) Update open space provision - the evidence base is and will continue to be outdated as development proposals continue to come forward</p>	<p data-bbox="1476 156 2125 363">The cost per dwelling for each typology has changed compared to existing costs as the standards per 1,000 population have changed. However, there are likely to be few instances where a development will have to contribute towards all 6 typologies covered by the SPD.</p> <p data-bbox="1476 411 2125 834">Viability Evidence Studies were prepared for each authority for CIL. S106 contributions such as affordable housing and open space were taken into account when deciding the proposed CIL charge. However, if there are site specific circumstances where the required open space contributions will make the development unviable then evidence of this can be submitted as part of a planning application. This will be a material consideration in determining the planning application to support a reduced contribution. A section on viability has been added to the SPD making this clear.</p> <p data-bbox="1476 882 2125 978">Triggers/staging will continue to be dealt with as part of the planning application process and through the s106 Agreement.</p> <p data-bbox="1476 1026 2125 1337">The standards in the SPD are based on an up to date Open Space Study in accordance with the NPPF. Each authority will regularly update their open space provision and a record will be kept of where financial contributions have been spent. This will allow the current provision standard for each typology in each settlement/ward to be kept up to date and identify where new provision has resulted in there no longer being a deficit in provision.</p>

delivering and upgrading open space provision. It is therefore necessary for the SPD to include a framework for applicants to undertake their own open space studies which can be submitted with planning applications. This would determine the most up to date provision in the surrounding area and therefore result in a proportionate level of open space contributions. Instead of minimum local standards being set across the Borough's, minimum standards should be determined on a case by case basis, taking into account the findings of a local open space study which accompanies a planning application. This would fully accord with Core Strategy Policy 24 and NPPF para 73. Should the SPD remain as it is it would not accord with them as it prescribes standardised open space contributions based on an outdated evidence base.

- 17 Peel Land & Property Ltd Support the intentions of the SPD however there are concerns that it fails to make reference to viability and consider that this is fundamental to ensuring that contributions are not sought on projects where viability may prevent a site coming forward. There is a need to recognise that major development particularly those involving complex sites are often marginally viable and require a flexible and sometimes creative or innovative approach to bring development forward. To ensure contributions do not stifle development, there is a requirement to include the following paragraph within the SPD: "It is acknowledged that in certain circumstances a development may not be able to address all of the required planning obligations without the scheme being economically unviable. In such cases, planning obligations will be reconsidered, negotiated or waived following a thorough viability case being made in order to ensure that development comes forward."

There is no reference in the SPD to CIL Charging Schedule and draft Regulation 123 List which have been submitted for Examination. There is no explanation as to how the SPD will operate alongside CIL when implemented. The draft Regulation 123 List includes green infrastructure/public realm projects and it is essential to ensure that the SPD is drafted in a way which avoids double charging and provides clear information to developers as to what will be required in terms of

Viability Evidence Studies were prepared for each authority for CIL. S106 contributions such as affordable housing and open space were taken into account when deciding the proposed CIL charge. However, if there are site specific circumstances where the required open space contributions will make the development unviable then evidence of this can be submitted as part of a planning application. This will be a material consideration in determining the planning application to support a reduced contribution. A section on viability has been added to the SPD making this clear.

Paragraph 54 of the SPD states that financial contributions will be secured through a s106 Agreement and are in addition to CIL as CIL does not cover open space contributions. The green infrastructure and public realm improvements identified in the Regulation 123 List will be funded by CIL. There will be no double charging.

South Ribble currently apply a threshold of 5 dwellings. Preston and Chorley do not. Each

Ref	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Response
		<p>s106 contributions over and above CIL.</p> <p>There is insufficient justification for not including a residential threshold for Preston and Chorley such as the 5 dwelling threshold for South Ribble. This would prevent smaller sites coming forward.</p>	<p>authority wishes to continue with its existing approach. There is no evidence that the open space contributions will prevent smaller sites coming forward. Viability will be taken into consideration as stated above.</p>

Ref	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Response
18	How Planning LLP	<p>The Open Space Study and Playing Pitch Strategy were both prepared prior to the NPPF and in accordance with the companion guide to PPG17. Whilst this has not been withdrawn, it nevertheless reflects the Government's previous policy objectives for open space, sport and recreation. Both studies should be updated to reflect guidance in the NPPF. This will ensure that the SPD is based on robust and up to date assessments.</p> <p>The planning obligation tests aim to ensure that planning obligations seek only essential local contributions rather than more general contributions which are better suited to the use of CIL. Therefore any financial obligation for open space provision/improvements through a s106 Agreement must address an identified need, be spent locally and be financially viable/fundable without recourse to pooling monies from numerous other obligations. The above tests should be clearly defined so as to ensure lawful compliance with CIL Regulation 122(2).</p> <p>It is crucial that the three planning obligation tests are more clearly and transparently addressed in the SPD so as to ensure that the viability of developments is not threatened by onerous cumulative obligations that can stall and even prevent necessary development from coming forward. Viability is therefore a key factor that all Local Plans and SPDs must ensure is not compromised through inappropriate and overbearing policies, obligations and conditions. Suggest that reference be made within the SPD to ensuring both the viability and deliverability of schemes. One key method of ensuring this is to ensure that CIL Regulation 122(2) is clearly defined.</p>	<p>The Companion Guide to PPG17 is still in force and meets the requirements of the Framework which requires planning policies to be based on robust and up to date assessments of the needs for open space, sport and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision.</p> <p>The SPD has been amended to identify the planning obligation tests in Regulation 122(2) of the CIL Regulations 2010 and how the SPD meets these tests.</p> <p>Viability Evidence Studies were prepared for each authority for CIL. S106 contributions such as affordable housing and open space were taken into account when deciding the proposed CIL charge. However, if there are site specific circumstances where the required open space contributions will make the development unviable then evidence of this can be submitted as part of a planning application. This will be a material consideration in determining the planning application to support a reduced contribution. A section on viability has been added to the SPD making this clear.</p>

Ref	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Response
19	Adlington Town Council	<p>Hope that the implementation of the SPD will lead to an increase in the provision for allotments in the Adlington area as it was noted that based on the figures that Chorley Borough is less well provided for than either Preston or South Ribble.</p> <p>The Council hopes that the allocation of funding from developers for local parks, gardens and playing fields means funding is shortly made available for improvement of local facilities such as the Jubilee Playing Fields following the recent housing development at Grove Farm.</p>	<p>A new allotment site is allocated in Adlington in Chorley's emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>The SPD will be used to determine the amount of on-site open space provision or financial contribution for off-site provision. Any financial contribution will be required to be spent in the same settlement/ward. In the case of playing pitches, the financial contribution will be spent on the nearest proposed new pitches or nearest site identified as needing improvements in the Action Plan.</p>
20	Charnock Richard Parish Council	The Parish Council support the strategy.	Noted.