Appendix 5 – Detailed Response Analysis by Question

Please note only questions where responses were expanded upon from what is presented in the main report are included in this Appendix. It does not provide responses for every question if additional detail was not required. Where further detail is not presented, this is identified.

1.   Vision and Objectives

Question 1

1.1.   No additional information is presented on Question 1, the full responses is presented in the main report.

Question 2

1.2.   Question 2 asked 'If not, what changes would you like to see?'.

1.3.   The majority of respondents commented on policy areas generally, highlighting the key focus they would like the plan vision to take, or the key issues that mattered to them in their area that the objectives should seek to mitigate or target. These are detailed below.

- The need to protect Green Belt/green field, open or agricultural land from development.
- To address climate change and the environmental issues.
- Recognise the role of Central Lancashire to the economic performance of the wider Lancashire region and the need to invest and grow this position, especially the high-tech manufacturing sector, and commitment to high quality development everywhere.
- Delivering enough homes to ensure land supply is sufficient to ensure viability and longevity of policies against speculative development and the soundness of the plan.
- Design areas to encourage sustainable transport and remove car dependency by improving public transport, including new stations, bus routes, safe continuous cycle/walking routes and improve air quality.

- Greater detail is needed in both the vision and objectives to provide sufficient reassurance as to the specific policy targets and indicators by which these will be monitored, providing public reassurance as to their achievability and deliverability. They should be evidenced and measurable.

1.4.   Issues around managing the scale, scope or impact of development included:

- Housing is delivered without account for the impact on local road or rail infrastructure, including impact on, congestion, road surface quality, road safety and the limited capacity roads and seek to mitigate these effects and monitor on an ongoing basis. Public transport nodes, networks, stations, capacity, frequency and reliability should be considered prior to and after development.
- Impact on local services and amenity. Consider impact on overstretched schools, nurseries, GPs, dentists and access to services e.g. banking.
- Focus on the local economy, employment, consider co-locating housing and employment.
- Focus development on available, substantial brownfield sites such as the now vacant Camelot Theme Park complex.
- Focus on development in the urban core away from rural or remote areas, mixed use development in high densities where services and infrastructure are well established.
- High-risk or frequent flooding from river systems and water run-off is common to many areas, ensure Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDs) are planned into new development or avoid building in Flood Zones.
- Plan for place sensitive design in new or re-development, accounting for local heritage, street scene character, existing footpaths or bridleways, architectural vernacular, wildlife corridors and assets) and ensure development is at an appropriate scope and scale for the area, not creating dormitory towns that takes jobs, investment and community away from the area.
- Ensure sufficient capacity water, gas, electric and broadband coverage to cover demand at peak times to enable an efficient remote industry and consumer sectors to operate.
- There has historically been overdevelopment in Central Lancashire, there should be a moratorium on house building.
- Identify areas where new settlements can be established, along with all appropriate amenities, supporting infrastructure and services.
- Housing should be better distributed across Central Lancashire through single plots or small-scale developments, rather than large estates (which dramatically increase an area's population) and maintain Areas of Separation between settlements.

- Developers should be held to account; ensuring land with permission is built out and not banked, for Section 106 contributions/for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) that is unpaid, or for planning conditions broken or unfulfilled.

1.5.   Issues relating to or in response to the environment, biodiversity and climate change suggested the need to address the following:

- Protection of trees, hedgerows and woodland area, Green Belt, open space and local wildlife from development, provide new green/open spaces to establish green networks and deliver Biodiversity Net Gain.
- Promote a Circular Economy and encourage greater engagement with the environment by including climate change into local teaching and activities for schools.
- Provide land/spaces for communities to grow, maintain and forage vegetables sustainably.
- Encouragement for renewable energy investment.

1.6.   Issues around the standard, supply and make-up of future developments included:

- Promote carbon efficient, active or free design in development by solar panels, SUDs, water storage, wind turbines, ground source heat pumps and insulation to recognised standards such as 'PassivHaus'.
- Provide opportunities for multigenerational living, allowing families to support each other.
- Ensure a variety of mixed housing tenures, including over 50s living, bungalows, starter homes, affordable homes and meeting local housing needs.
- Make more self-build plots available.
- Make use of existing assets that are vacant or empty, transform these into public housing stock i.e. for Social Housing.

1.7.   Issues around ensuring the plan or development delivers for vulnerable or minority groups and the health and well-being of residents included:

- Improve and implement accessibility criteria for the elderly and vulnerable in new home, public spaces and public transport design (dementia friendly, safe spaces).
- Commitment to tackling inequality of race or gender and promote inclusive policies that seek to strengthen equality on both fronts.
- Designated spaces for people to walk their dogs, for example: dog parks.

- Improve, plan for, and allocate land towards more leisure facilities and green space such as sports clubs, youth centres, gyms, outdoor pitches, pools and tracks and Pocket Parks.
- Provision for a short-stay, last-minute traveller transit site.
- Conserve and improve the cultural institutions/offer of city, town and village centres that make up its 'Cultural Heritage' (National Planning Policy Framework - NPPF); museums, galleries, places of worship, entertainment.
- Enhancement and investment into blue infrastructure (BI), including rivers, canals and their access, slipways, recognising the health and well-being benefits these spaces offer to residents.
- Provide more social housing.
- Expand Accident and Emergency services at Chorley Hospital.
- Support local businesses and institutions through, targeted regeneration, provision of office space and procuring and contracting locally service providers via the Preston Model.

2.   Delivering Homes

Question 3

2.1.   Question 3 of the consultation asked, '*How can we make sure the homes we plan for meet the needs of everybody?*'. A total of 606 responses were received to this question. The majority of responses were from individuals. The key themes arising from the responses received for this question are outlined below.

- The Local Plan should prioritise the use of brownfield land and make better use of existing empty properties to reduce/remove the need to look at green areas.
- If development is needed in/around small villages this should be kept to a minimum and the style should be in keeping with the surrounding area with homes specifically aimed at meeting the needs of the people living in those locations.
- Infrastructure needs to be in place to enable new development to take place, it should not be planned retrospectively. Infrastructure has not been able to meet the needs of areas already built and is already stretched.
- The Plan needs to ensure the right mix of good quality sustainable homes and mix tenures of homes that are needed are being planned for and meet the needs of those living in the area already. This includes planning for all sectors of society including needs of elderly (incorporating bungalows into new developments), those in need of adaptable homes, multigenerational family units and those needing truly affordable housing.
- High quality well designed sustainable/green homes should be the priority in all developments. New homes should only be built in sustainable locations with good public transport/cycling/walking links.
- High quality city centre living should be provided in Preston and other town centres as appropriate. Denser development through high rise should be considered where possible but must incorporate green spaces. Also look to see if student accommodation which is not needed can be modified to meet the needs of families. Need to repurpose the city/town centres.
- There is a need for more evidence to support the use of the standard method numbers. There is concern from existing residents that numbers are too high, and from developers that the numbers do not account for growth aspirations of the area specifically delivering City Deal.
- Using Green Belt land to meet future need should be avoided.
- Areas of flood risk should be avoided and need to consider impact of development on the wider environment.

- Smaller developments should be considered.

Question 4

2.2.   Question 4 asked '*How does the Local Plan ensure enough homes are provided so everyone has somewhere to live?'*. A total of 435 responses where received to this question. Again, the majority of responses were from individuals. The key themes arising from the responses received for this question are outlined below.

- Need to understand what the actual need is that we are planning for – standard method or higher to meet City Deal?
- Where is this need required across the Plan area? Also need to understand how existing allocations/sites with planning permission will be developed. Reduce land banking.
- The Plan needs to provide a wider range of homes which match the needs of the area in order to reduce homelessness and enable people to buy and stay in their homes longer. Housing needs survey required to understand this better.
- We need to address the issue of empty homes/buildings/retail units etc. and bring them back into use and make use of existing brownfield land. Avoid development in Green Belt/green areas.
- More large-scale developments like Buckshaw – consider redevelopment of Camelot site. Need to identify a variety of land to meet differing needs and ensure developer interest.
- More opportunities to be identified for self-build/cooperative style living.
- Need to identify sustainable locations where infrastructure is in place to support the developments and near to existing/planned employment.
- Focus around existing urban areas and build the right type of housing that is needed in that location.
- Ensure policy compliant, deliverable homes are provided.
- May need to consider selective Green Belt release to deliver the number of homes required. Standard method requirement is a starting point, actual need is likely to be higher.
- Housing need should be planned to match economic growth aspirations and should not be unevenly distributed.

Question 5

2.3.   Question 5 sought views on the following question '*Do you think the councils should plan for the minimum number of homes needed, but should aim to deliver?'*. A total of 611 responses were received to this question, 292 people (48%) felt that we should only be planning for the minimum number, 94 people

(15%) felt that plan for the minimum but aim to deliver more, whilst 225 people (37%) felt we should plan for less than the minimum. Those that suggested minimum or less came from those respondents who currently live within Central Lancashire, whilst the majority of those suggesting minimum but deliver more came from land owners, agents and/or developers with an interest in development options within the plan area. Qualification on the points made are covered in question 4 above.

Question 6

2.4.   The last general issue discussed in this section is Question 6, this asked *'Where do you think new homes should be provided in Central Lancashire?'*. There were 646 responses received to this question. The key themes arising from the responses received for this question are outlined below.

- New development should be avoided in the Green Belt/green areas and away from rural settlements. If needed in rural areas it should be limited to small scale development/infill within the area and be planned to meet a localised need only.
- Need to ensure new housing is affordable and we are planning for the homes that are actually needed to meet that requirement.
- Brownfield sites should be prioritised. These should be well located sites near to transport hubs/employment opportunities and close to existing amenities. Access to public transport should be a key in all new developments identified.
- Need a better strategy for bringing back empty homes/buildings which are likely to be close to amenities and have good infrastructure links. For city/urban centres, need to provide high quality living to encourage people to live and work and spend spare time there to reinvent our town centres.
- Need to ensure green spaces are planned into new developments. Where canal frontage is available, look at opportunities to regenerate land alongside the canals.
- Need more large-scale developments like Buckshaw which build in provision of new infrastructure needed to support them. Areas such as the old Camelot site should be considered.
- Need to ensure planning for the future – need green homes which are planned away from areas at risk of flooding and designed to cope with future environment challenges – urban heating etc. Should be planning in sustainable and suitable locations only.
- Developments should be close to the urban centres where public transport and infrastructure is sufficient and better access to employment.

- Need an even distribution across the plan area to ensure each area can meet their needs.
- In Preston, can we consider changing unused student areas into family housing?
- Concern that we do not need any more housing, and any that is planned should be kept to a minimum and not all be 4/5 bed detached housing which is not meeting local need. Look to see if neighboring areas can accommodate housing instead.
- The Plan needs to identify a range of locations to meet the differing needs of the area. Development next to existing settlements should be considered to ensure the continued viability of these areas for maintaining schools and other amenities where there is an ageing population. Need to enable young families to stay in these areas.
- Distribution needs to align to planned infrastructure and growth ambitions (City Deal).
- Concentrate on existing safeguarded areas first and protect Green Belt/protected open land. Avoid ribbon developments which join towns together.
- Need a flexible approach to allocations to allow for changes in need over the plan period. A variety of site types and sizes are also needed to enable small/specialist builders into the market alongside large scale sites. For sites to be viable, locations other than brownfield sites need to be considered. Need sites free of constraints.
- Consider development of a garden village.
- New sites need to ensure infrastructure delivery does not delay delivery of sites, particular issues for remote/disconnected areas in the Green Belt.

Student Accommodation

2.5. There were 3 questions specifically focusing on student accommodation provision within Preston, Questions 7 to 9 of the Issues and Options consultation. Additional information on Questions 7-9 to that in the main report is provided below.

Question 7

2.6. Question 7 asked '*Do you think there should be no new purpose-built student accommodation in Preston?'.* A total of 530 respondents chose to answer this question. 204 People (38%) agreed with this question, that Preston does not need any new purpose-built student accommodation, whilst 326 people (62%) did not agree.

2.7.   One respondent provided a statement in support of their response. Their points focused on a concern that demand and need for different types of development can change and the Local Plan should therefore not rule out certain types of development through the strategy developed and risk an unsound plan.

Question 8

2.8.   Question 8 asked 'Do you think we should identify a student zone, centred around the University of Central Lancashire (UCLAN) campus, where new purpose-built student accommodation could be built and resist it elsewhere?'. A total of 528 people responded to this question, 418 people (79%) said yes there should be a student zone, whilst 110 people (21%) said no there should not be.

2.9.   Further detailed comments were provided from 2 respondents. One respondent felt that a policy restricting student accommodation to a zone around UCLAN fails to reflect that there are other educational establishments elsewhere which may have a need and would be overlooked by a policy such as this, and that other sites may become available which offer a better opportunity for student accommodation.

2.10.   Further comments by another respondent said that student accommodation should be located where there are good sustainable transport links if they are not located in close proximity to the campus.

Question 9

2.11.   The final question on student accommodation is Question 9. This seeks to expand on peoples' reasoning for their response to Question 8. Question 9 asks '*Or do you think there is another way this can be dealt with?*' in relation to establishment or not of a student zone. A total of 254 responses were received to this question, a summary of the key themes presented below.

- Majority of respondents felt there was enough accommodation already. We would need to know future numbers will increase before providing more homes, not the other way around. The university should also seek to work with landlords to make better use of existing accommodation first.
- The Local Plan needs to look at regenerating areas of the town centre near the university itself and improve transport links from there to enable students to access college easily. Look at converting disused office blocks and other buildings in the city centre to meet their needs.
- The majority of responses felt accommodation should be provided close to the university, with both high and low rise options considered. The plan should

consider building a student village. Students need safe accommodation close to their place of study. A high quality, well designed student village should be provided.

- It was felt that there is a need to integrate students into Preston as they bring a lot to the economy. Should not concentrate them on the outskirts as need them to improve the city centre itself.
- Outlying areas that are well connected by public transport should be also considered to reduce areas becoming empty when university is out for summer.
- Consider rooms for families/non-students in private rented sites.
- Prioritise student village for 1st and 2nd year students, with 3rd year/post graduates encouraged off site to settle in the area longer term, so we benefit from the successes of the students graduating from UCLAN.
- A lot of recognition of the value UCLAN brings to the area and need to capitalise on this to improve Preston City Centre.

2.12. There is still some concern that there is a need to limit the growth of UCLAN as it is taking over the area around it. The responses to the questions on student accommodation highlight the recognition of the important role of the university in the wider economy of Preston, and a desire to maximise the benefits of this. There is a wish to integrate students into the City to ensure they have a safe place to live and study, whilst also reflecting on the needs of those living there.

Gypsies and Travellers

2.13. There were 3 questions specifically focusing on meeting the needs of Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople within Central Lancashire, Questions 10 to 12 of the Issues and Options consultation.

2.14. A Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showperson Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) was undertaken by consultants ARC4 on behalf of the Central Lancashire authorities, which analysed the latest available evidence to identify the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople across the study area. This was published in July 2019.

2.15. The GTAA identified the current need for provision across Central Lancashire, reviewing existing sites and identifying the need for future provision in the area, including transit provision. The study concluded that the majority of provision can be catered for by the progression of existing sites. It also identified a need for a replacement site for the unauthorised site at Rosemary Lane, Preston. If this site

were to be authorised, a replacement site elsewhere in Preston would be able to be much smaller.

2.16. To help deliver this need, the Issues and Options consultation asked a number of questions around how we should be planning to meet this provision.

Question 10

2.17. Question 10 of the consultation asked 'Should the existing unauthorised Gypsy and Traveller site at Rosemary Lane in Preston be authorised for use by Gypsies and Travellers, or should a larger site be found somewhere else?'.

2.18. A total of 254 responses were received for this question, the majority of which were from individuals. The key themes arising from the responses received for this question are outlined below.

- No overall consensus on normalising this site. Recognition that a site is needed but not all those who responded felt this was the correct location or supported provision being made in the Local Plan, instead they felt that this should be dealt with through the planning application process. Some people felt that no site should be authorised specifically for one particular group of people, but others recognised that a permanent site could lead to fewer illegal sites. No responses were received from the community living at the site. Authorising this site would set a precedent. Planning consent should have been secured before occupying the site.

2.19. Those who responded identified the factors which need to be taken into consideration in relation to this particular site and in finding alternative sites, including a site for a transit facility (specific site suggestions for a larger site are referred to under question 11). These included:

- Establish the need, including consultation with the travellers, and local residents. Is the site in a suitable and accessible location, with appropriate land, access and infrastructure (including access to amenities and facilities, such as water and electric points, effective drainage and waste disposal / sewage facilities) and minimal social and environmental impacts?
- The travelling community would need to be aware it is available to use.
- Management and funding – the site would need to be effectively managed/supervised by the Council. It should be self-funding/enable revenue – to include site fee/rent, taxes, service charges, fines, etc.

- The site and its occupants should be well integrated into the local community. A larger site would better enable them to be a 'community' but would be harder to manage and create potentially more impact/detriment to existing communities, and be more problematic for local agencies. A smaller site should offer travellers a safer place.
- Concerns about access and facilities were raised by the Planning Inspector when the site was granted temporary consent, and these need to be addressed.

2.20.   Other general comments included:

- Suggest the same approach to new build developments with a portion of social/affordable homes to be used only for travellers.
- Need to follow government guidance.
- Need to distinguish between gypsies and travellers. The GTAA 2019 doesn't appear to understand the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) definition correctly and also uses an astonishingly high rate for future household formation which appears to forget about dissolutions.
- Need additional support and help for local residents.
- Ensure infrastructure is in place to ensure effective management of the site and its acceptance in the local area.
- They are a group who have been routinely discriminated against, and this community should be protected, respected, and treated with dignity. They should have access to safe, clean dedicated sites.

2.21.   Some comments received were more relevant to transit site provision and are therefore covered in that section, at question 12.

Question 11

2.22.   Question 11 asked 'If a larger site should be found, where do you think it should be?'. A total of 126 responses gave an opinion on this question. The majority of responses were from individuals. General comments received to this question have been incorporated into question 10 above. Specific site suggestions from question 11 are set out below.

- Preston: Rosemary Lane, Preston Garrison; Preston city centre / PR1 area, Deepdale / outskirts, north/north-west side of Preston, near Preston docks / Trax, the obsolete East Preston park & ride area / Blue Bell Way, Leighton Street Preston (which should be enhanced and extended), Ribbleton, the defunct railway site near to the station; Redscar industrial estate, Junction 30/31 or 31a of the M6.

- South Ribble: Walton Summit, near the Capitol Centre the old vacant railway yard in Lostock Hall, Land off Cuerdale Lane, Clayton Brook / Bamber Bridge, brownfield sites at the end of the M65, close to motorway links.
- Chorley: junction 9 of the M61, Hut Lane, Camelot.
- Various types of sites were suggested as being unsuitable to the needs of travellers or local communities. These included:

   Rosemary Lane (it is privately owned and in use - so even if it is authorised, it will not provide any additional pitches for travellers), in / near villages or in rural area, Green Belt / greenfield sites, away from any urban / built up / residential areas, and where there would be minimal impact socially and environmentally.

2.23.   General suggestions of the types of sites that should be considered included:

- A suitable sustainable location, brownfield sites in keeping with brownfield first policy for housing, accessible, and with access to amenities and infrastructure.

2.24.   Other comments included:

- Sites should also come forward from the private sector. Travellers should be consulted, and sites should be identified after analysis of the evidence.

2.25.   The GTTA also identified a need for a transit site for communities travelling through the area, and who could stay for up to 3 months.

Question 12

2.26.   Question 12 asked 'Where could a transit site be located?'

2.27.   A total of 126 responses gave an opinion on this question. The majority of responses were from individuals. The key themes arising from the responses received for this question are outlined below.

- Many stated they did not understand the topic sufficiently to give an informed opinion.
- Many responses referred back to the same response as had been given for question 11, meaning respondents tended to equate and combine the proposed location for a larger gypsy or traveller site with the need for a traveller transit site. With calls for a single site that provided for all gypsy, traveller and transit communities, providing facilities suited to both, with some suggesting this could be provided at the Rosemary Lane site. Whilst others said only existing sites should be retained and some stating that no further facility should be provided.

- Alternatively, many felt no facility should be made for these communities anywhere in Central Lancashire or that if provided, costs should be charged to the communities utilising it. It was also suggested that travellers will set up camp anywhere, and that a permanent transit site will make no difference - especially if they have to pay to use it. Others suggested that employers using traveller labour could provide pitches on their land for the season.

- Many felt the decision should lie with the communities themselves following direct consultation with them, with a site chosen that is most suited to their needs as identified by themselves, or, in the place considered most suitable based on the evidence in the supporting GTAA paper.

- Suggested locations for development were wide ranging, including the Green Belt/not on Green Belt, brownfield, near industrial/commercial/retail areas or away from settlements and villages. This included a wish for sites to be self-contained and well managed to minimise impact on the local area and for prospective sites, consultation with local residents to be undertaken and a preference toward smaller sites with controlled numbers to reduce impact on the surrounding area.

- Specific sites suggested included Preston; Deepdale, North of Preston, city centre, docklands. In Chorley; Cowling Farm, Charnock Richard, Camelot, Asda Clayton-Green. In South Ribble; Capitol Centre, Farington as well as accessible sites in proximity to major roads and motorway junctions or services, including Red Scar and Bluebell Way.

3. Economic Growth, Employment, Education and Skills

3.1. This section of the consultation included 15 questions looking at issues around economic growth and employment land provision, education and skills, the role of town centres and policies to protect them, and leisure and cultural needs of the area.

3.2. Questions 13-15 focused on the types, location and distribution of growth/jobs in the area.

Question 13

3.3. Question 13 asked '*Are there any other types of economic growth the plan should be planning for?*'. A total of 261 responses expressed an opinion to this question. The key themes which came from Question 13 are summarised below:

- Positively and proactively encourage sustainable economic growth. Fully understand what the economic needs are, including meeting local need locally, and ensuring business is sustainable. Build on the strengths and successes of local and existing industry, such as light industry, the service sector, tourism, the public sector & government, health & medical. It should also support social enterprise, and the volunteers, community and faiths (VCF) sector, with strong support for small and medium-sized enterprises (SME's) / micro-businesses.
- Identify new employment sites to address shortfalls of provision for all B-use classes, including strategic, higher profile and accessible employment land, as well as mid-size premises and businesses. The relationship to the Local Industrial Strategy is key. Need to link key economic assets and opportunities in Central Lancashire to other areas of Lancashire and beyond.
- Promote and support the green economy / green energy and environmental expertise, including climate change and emerging technologies and business development opportunities. Consider the circular economy, recycling & renewables and ethical businesses, and promote the growth of natural capital.
- Education, upskilling the workforce, training/apprenticeships, and providing opportunities and access to jobs for all, including attracting and retaining graduates. In particular it should promote the provision of high skilled jobs, technology and enterprise, the digital economy, hi-tech engineering and manufacturing.
- Focus on online shopping, local manufacturing and distribution.
- Support the rural economy, including local agriculture / horticulture and local food produce / products.

- The employment distribution across Central Lancashire should be aligned with the distribution of new housing to maximise the potential for active travel and use of public transport. Ensure sustainable accessible sites with transport infrastructure, including flexibility to adapt to future change, and links to strategic sites, hubs and infrastructure both in Central Lancashire and throughout the north. Also need to ensure the growth and infrastructure associated with the City Deal and the relationship with the Local Industrial Strategy is taken into account.

- Adequate communication infrastructure to support digital business, home working, co-working, live/work space, flexible employment space to adapt to an ever-changing marketplace etc. High quality office space, co-working office space, and exhibition space.

- Ensure town centres / the high street is healthy, make the most of the historic environment, and encourage a range of uses and markets / independent traders. In particular it should promote the night-time economy, including sport/leisure, food & drink, retail, creative industries, culture and the arts / entertainment, and media sectors.

- Specific locations referred to included recognising the district of Preston, in particular Preston city centre and Inner East Preston as key drivers of the Central Lancashire economy. The area surrounding the Railway Station being an employment opportunity, commercial quarter and strategic gateway is supported. A masterplan should be developed for that site. Cuerden and the Samlesbury Aerospace Enterprise Zone are strategic locations distinct from local supply. The proposed Garden Village at Cuerdale is well-placed as a key economic growth corridor. Longridge is a key service centre for both Preston and Ribble Valley. There are employment opportunities needed north and north west of the M55. Botany Bay and north east of Junction 8 of M61 should be considered.

Question 14

3.4. Question 14 of the consultation asked '*Where should the distribution and priority locations for economic growth be in Central Lancashire?'.* A total of 276 responses expressed an opinion to this question. The key themes are summarised below:

- Focus should be on brownfield sites and occupying vacant units, and the expansion of existing economic centres/industrial estates/business parks in accessible and sustainable locations, with substantial infrastructure networks already in place.

- New sites should be in accessible, sustainable and deliverable locations, close to cycling links and existing/planned public transport hubs, and other strategic transport infrastructure (such as motorway junctions, railway stations, including potential for HS2, and the Preston Western Distributor road (PWDR)) and maximise

the economic benefits of waterways/canals. Near to existing residential and areas of expected residential growth. Sites should also be close to amenities and have sufficient parking. Recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different economic sectors. Employment and education sites of a specified size should have travel plans.

- Ensure evidence of demand is robust and take account of office space being converted into residential use. Supply should be determined by demand, and availability of sites. Need to recognise the specific locational requirements of different economic sectors. It depends on the type of business/industry/niche - locate according to type/specific need/required links e.g. independent & artisan traders in the city/town centres, and local employment sites to meet local demand. A flexible approach which is reactive to change/market signals. Policies should not be too restrictive. Modern business has different needs to traditional employment.

- Distribution should be more widespread/even. Different areas could offer different types of alternative uses so not in direct competition. Build on existing areas of industry including co-located SMEs. Accessible to / in deprived areas. Avoid areas of high flood risk, make more use of heritage assets, multi company office space, and promote / facilitate home working. Promote / assist SMEs in their local communities. Green energy sources should be maximised, and the impact on the environment minimised. Help the delivery of the retention and expansion of Central Lancashire's natural capital.

- Rural areas if in sustainable locations / diversification of agriculture etc. Some small scale development in villages where appropriate, and ensure SMEs are catered for. Support rural business, including sustainable rural tourism and leisure.

3.5. Specific sites suggested include:

- Preston (the economic driver of the sub region): The City centre, near Preston station, Preston East / Red Scar, The Docks, Fulwood, Ribbleton, Church St /Stoneygate / Queens retail park area of Preston, North Preston, West of Broughton & North of the M55 / near the PWDR. Strand Road, close to UCLAN (and promote links to businesses and retention of graduates).
- South Ribble (good accessibility to transport infrastructure, and identified need in the ELS): Samlesbury enterprise zone, Bamber Bridge/Walton Summit/Leyland/Farington/Lancashire Business park/ Penwortham/ South Rings and the Cuerden Strategic site (end of M65) / Global Renewables site at Farington Moss, Capitol Centre.
- Chorley: Town centre, Adlington, Buckshaw/Botany Bay.

3.6. Question 15 of the consultation asked '*What kind of jobs would you like to see created in Central Lancashire*'. A total of 295 responses expressed an opinion to this question, the key themes arising are set out below:

- A diverse and inclusive range of jobs/sectors including for all skill levels such as graduates/skilled workers/professionals, semi-skilled workers, and unskilled workers. Need to offer flexible working patterns, including working from home, and a good mix of higher and lower value employment, close to local hubs. Should be inclusive, including jobs for all demographics including older people, young people, those out of work, people with disabilities. Well paid, sustainable / full time permanent local jobs for local people/skills.
- Opportunities for graduates. Centres of excellence for upskilling and becoming self employed. As well as more opportunities for training & apprenticeships.
- Reduce reliance on the large local employers.
- Build on strength of UCLAN and BAE key and public sector (government / health etc.) who are key local employers, and jobs complimentary to those in adjacent cities like Manchester and Liverpool as part of a larger Northern Hub.

3.7. Sectors/jobs specifically referred to included:

- Education, Medical, social/health care, community, and people services.
- Green / environment / climate change / alternative energy / renewables / circular economy.
- Rural economy / agriculture / farming / local food produce / horticultural
- Cultural / Arts/craft / creative / media.
- Skilled manual labour / trades / traditional / practical jobs – e.g. manufacturing / building/construction, engineering, plumbing, joinery, etc.
- Digital sector / IT / internet / High Tech / telecommunications / AI / Science / forward looking / future thinking / evolving technologies & sectors.
- Service sector - customer service / call centres, retail.
- Manufacturing & distribution. Advanced technical engineering/design/ manufacturing.
- Public and private sector.
- Professional, legal & financial services.
- Tourism, sport and leisure, food and drink.
- Encourage SMEs/self-employed.
- Community development.

- Refer to the findings of the Employment Land Study (ELS). There is a need in South Ribble, including gaps in provision for larger B2, B8 and B1(a) offices.

3.8.   Questions 16-17 focused on school provision, apprenticeships and graduates.

Question 16

3.9.   Question 16 of the consultation asked '*Do you have any views about school provision in Central Lancashire?*'. A total of 348 responses expressed an opinion to this question.

- Existing school provision and choice is insufficient and full to capacity, particularly in rural areas. Need for quality, inclusive community schools, accessible to all, regardless of wealth or faith. Investment needed to increase capacity and quality, meet local need (including siblings attending the same school), retain choice, and increase accessibility & reduce the distances children need to travel. Need to have more smaller local schools and reduce class sizes.
- There are insufficient safe, sustainable and affordable travel options (school buses too expensive, etc.). Better, safer transport links/routes are needed, including walking and cycling. Address congestion/parking problems. Opening hours should be staggered to reduce congestion at peak times.
- School infrastructure needs to come before or alongside new development, there needs to be a co-ordinated approach to provision. Ensure developers contribute to school places when building new developments. School provision should be supported through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)/Section 106 monies and contributions should be spent within a close radius of the development approved. Greater transparency needed on where CIL/Section 106 monies are spent. Funds should align with where growth is planned.
- School provision should be more pro-active rather than re-active. The way school provision is decided needs a re-think, e.g. Finnish model. All schools should be brought back under Lancashire County Council control.
- Improve provision for Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) pupils.
- More higher education needed dedicated to vocational courses that reflect the needs of businesses e.g. technical colleges. More emphasis on apprenticeships. Provision for more grammar schools, technical/vocational high schools. Offer a broad balanced curriculum rather than specialism in secondary schools.
- School buildings should be multi-use community facilities. Increased community use of schools outside of office hours.
- Primary and secondary schools should be on the same site.
- Protect school playing fields.

- School provision lacking in Chorley, South Ribble, Leyland, Croston, Brinscall, Withnell, Abbey Village, Adlington, Euxton, Buckshaw Village, Clayton le Woods north, Much Hoole, Whittle-le-Woods, Ashton, Lostock Hall, Warton, Freckleton.

Question 17

3.10. Question 17 of the consultation asked '*How can the plan help deliver enough job opportunities for apprenticeships and graduates*?'. A total of 254 responses expressed an opinion to this question. The key these provided are summarised below:

- Planning policy should incentivise/require employers to hire apprentices and local graduates, similar to the German system. There should also be more internships, skills centres and community involvement, better publicity/information about sponsorship and Government initiatives, as well as financial incentives such as low business rates and rents to encourage SMEs and co-operative venture.
- Planning policy should require local labour for new development, including financial incentives and support.
- Build on the strengths of existing business by working in partnership with employers and Higher Education establishments and universities e.g. UCLAN & Edge Hill to ensure skills and specific commercial enterprise align with opportunities and expected sectors of growth. Integrated education/employment zones would help to secure affordable accommodation for postgraduates where work is available. Ensure graduates are high quality by providing high quality education.
- Boost the economy and attract large sustainable business. Support the growth of sectors with a good track record of apprenticeships, such as Aerospace and Defence, Research & development, Manufacturing & engineering, Education, and I.T. (e.g. Leyland Trucks, BAE Systems, UCLAN, etc.). To enable these sectors to grow there also needs to be appropriate infrastructure in place, particularly better accessibility (better transport/public transport links).

3.11. Questions 18-24 focused on how to make our town and district centres better, revisions to boundaries, types of uses, and thresholds.

Question 18

3.12. Question 18 of the consultation asked '*How do you think we can make our town centres better?*'. A total of 374 responses expressed an opinion to this question.

- Town centres need investment. They should have a unique identity to increase footfall, adapt to the rise of online shopping, and be flexible to react rapidly to future change. More diversity of retail outlets, including small independent businesses, local craft, quality food/ goods, thriving market, and big department store.

- Diversify away from being mainly retail/office led, to include more residential (within town centres and on the fringe), food & drink, culture and leisure offer, including events/markets etc. Preston in particular should have more venues and events, with a focus on the Guild Hall. Ensure vitality and viability outside office hours and promote the evening/night-time economy. However, there should be restrictions on the number of fast food outlets/takeaways.

- Make them a more attractive and enjoyable 'destination' (green, clean, safe and secure, well-lit public realm with more open spaces, trees, directional signage, street art, free wifi, and appropriate facilities such as toilets, seating, bins, etc.). For example, regenerate Church Street and the area around the bus station in Preston, make the city centre more compact (remove secondary shopping frontages), and monitor the amount/need for purpose-built student accommodation. Need to be accessible to all, including more places for young people, e.g. youth centre and play areas/creche, and foster a community spirit through projects and community spaces for events, etc. and help the homeless and restrict pavement charity collectors, etc.

- Focus on brownfield land / regeneration and bringing empty properties back into use. Have less peripheral centres and restrict out of town shopping complexes / retail parks / supermarkets. Move away from the need to have one town centre through sustainable new development.

- Be more accessible for all, through a better transport infrastructure, including greener, more reliable & affordable public transport options/hubs (e.g. a transport hub near Preston railway station), improved cycling routes and facilities, reduce car use/congestion and improve traffic flow (including being safer and easier to navigate, and implementing access/vehicle restrictions, pedestrianised areas etc. including better connections with UCLAN), provide more free/cheap parking (including electric charging points), park & rides, trams and shuttle buses.

- Protect and make the best use of heritage assets.

- Fiscal incentives – need for direct council intervention. Help upstarts/ small local independent businesses and shops with reduced rent/business rates/tax reliefs, and the availability of business advisers.

Question 19

3.13. Question 19 asked '*Do you have any comments to make on the proposed revisions to town centre boundaries in Annex 6*?'. Annex 6 includes local centres as well as town centres. There were 170 responses who expressed an opinion. There was general support for the proposals.

- Increasing boundaries should not be considered. Existing Town Centres might need reducing in size to help reduce shop vacancy rates. Also have to be mindful of negative impact of other major developments/strategic sites, and supermarkets. Move away from having one town centre by ensuring new development is sustainable. Regeneration/improvements are needed to centres, including improving accessibility (parking, traffic calming, public transport, etc.).
- Boundaries and the application of policy should be less rigid and more flexible.

Preston

- Support for the contraction of Preston/decommissioning Church St from the Primary shopping area. There is a need to regenerate Church Street. The reduction in Preston city centre is welcomed, but it could be taken further – for example removing the part of Friargate between Ringway and UCLAN, and the Market cinema development. Queens Retail Park should also be reconsidered. The area facing the bus station (Tithebarn Street) should be included.
- The area of Fulwood along Garstang Road / Lytham Road needs more of a retail element.
- Cottam Village Centre (Cottam Brickworks) / North West Preston needs adding.

Chorley

- Keep Chorley concentrated. Cannot support more commerce over a wider area. Also, the introduction of national and multi-national stores will reduce the popularity and 'difference' that currently exists.
- The Chorley Whittle-Le-Woods local centre should not be deallocated. If anything, it should be extended. Suggest extending the boundary from Chorley Old Road to Preston Road to capture the relocation of the Post-Office, Chemist and local Co-op Store. Losing the local centre will harm its identity.
- Lancaster Lane proposal, further expansion will be difficult in this area without changes to the junction.
- Do not remove the Asda store from Chorley Town Centre Boundary – the increased footfall and wider spin offs benefit the town. It is also important for Chorley town

centre to maintain its share of retail expenditure to perform its role as a Tier 2 town centre.

- Extend the Walton-le-Dale local centre to include the petrol station on Victoria Road, the White Bull pub at the end of Cuerdale Lane, and the shops at the end of Chorley Road opposite.
- No increase in retail development around School Lane/Chapel Lane/Liverpool Rd.
- Proposed retail boundaries in Longton would be unnecessary.
- Add Moss Side and Midge Hall.

Question 20

3.14. Question 20 asked '*Do you have any comments to make on the proposed retail hierarchy?*' There were 164 responses who expressed an opinion on this. Most of the comments were generally supportive.

- Support Preston as the principal centre in Central Lancashire. Should reflect the context of the region (Manchester and Liverpool etc.) in the hierarchy too.
- Bamber Bridge should be Tier 2, not 3.
- Leyland should be Tier 3 not 2, and/or needs investment.
- Clayton Green should be Tier 4 not 3.
- There needs to be a policy around encouraging retail/service/leisure opportunities in the rural areas. Many village centres are not mentioned in this report but are important locally – e.g. Adlington, Euxton, Eccleston, Whittle le Woods, Carrington, Croston, Wheelton, Gregson Lane, Moss Side, Midge Hall, Heskin Hall and Snaffles developments?
- No mention of out of town retail parks. There is a need to restrict the growth of out of town retail centres and consider their impact on the hierarchy.
- Question the benefit of a hierarchy, whether it should be left to commercial demand, or whether it should be turned upside down, or that investment / incentives should be spread out across all tiers. The hierarchy is too simplified an approach as it just considers retail establishments - other facilities and accessibility should be considered. Anything that promotes spending locally rather than online and keeping money locally is to be encouraged. Some local centres require investment and regeneration and better accessibility / parking etc. Suggest more independent, better quality and/or niche shops to keep local centres viable. Suggest each local centre having a defined service to maintain a diversity of services.

Question 21

3.15. Question 21 refers to the opportunity for the site surrounding the railway station in Preston, potentially as a commercial quarter. Question 21 asked '*What kind of uses would you like to come forward in this area of the city centre*?'. There were 160 responses who expressed an opinion on this. Many expressed support for a commercial quarter, and support anything that makes this area more attractive to businesses and individuals. Various potential uses were suggested.

- Mixed uses, flexible and adaptable to change.
- Diverse employment uses. Packaging free dry goods centre. Quality office space and conference facilities, banking.
- Residential.
- Transport hub, including linking the train station to the bus station and other parts of the city – trams/shuttle bus? Also affordable green bike hire, etc – especially for students. Car parking.
- Community space, tourism, culture/arts & crafts, music, events/festivals/markets, recreation and green open space.
- Sport/leisure/recreation, gym/swimming pool, theatre/cinema, night-time economy.
- Food and drink, small boutiques, restaurants, café culture, etc.
- Youth zone, family friendly areas, play areas.
- Voluntary sector including health support centre.
- Retail, including small local independent/niche retail, creative businesses, and/or a large anchor store, and a traditional market. There will need to be a 'proportionate' level of retail, so as not to detrimentally affect the vitality and viability of the existing retail core/primary retail frontage. Expanding rather than contracting the city centre primary shopping area would result in displacement of existing business and increasing vacancy rates. It could also contribute to the existing discrepancy in footfall between the east & west of the city centre.

Question 22

3.16. Question 22 of the consultation asked '*Do you agree that these distance thresholds will protect our town centres?*'. A total of 179 responses expressed an opinion to this question.

3.17. The split was 121 for 'Yes' (68% of the responses to this question) and 58 for 'No' (32%). The majority of people therefore were in support these thresholds.

Question 23

3.18.   Question 23 of the consultation asked '*If not, how should the thresholds be amended?'.* A total of 89 responses expressed an opinion to this question.

- Restrict retail parks and suggest no new retail development within 2 miles of existing retail areas.
- All the thresholds are too small - this would be counterproductive to attracting jobs and business.
- The NPPF states that any impact assessment should be appropriate in scale to what is proposed. The test should be amended by reference to 'appropriate assessment'. Using the amount of floor space as a black and white cut off point for assessing when an impact assessment is required is contrary to that approach. What constitutes a catchment area, and thus what type of assessment is needed, is a grey area and should not just be a decision for the Local Planning Authority (LPA) - all parties in the development management process (including the LPA) need to act reasonably when applying planning policies.
- The issue is less about specific thresholds and more about accessibility/public transport/infrastructure, the type of retail use, and the quality. Thresholds will not protect town centres because of the dramatic change happening to them. We need to have sustainable development that reflects current needs.

Question 24

3.19.   Question 24 of the consultation asked '*Are there any improvements required for specific centres?'.* Of the 299 responses to the first part of this question, the split for specific centres identified as needing improvement was:

- 100 respondents (33.5%) identified Preston as needing improvement.
- 85 (28.5%) identified Chorley.
- 62 (20.7%) identified Leyland.
- 52 (17.3%) identified any other district/local centre.

3.20.   There were 214 responses who went on to give general comments about specific improvements needed, including:

- Reduce business which attract anti-social behaviour such as gambling outlets and fast food chains.
- Improve the overall appearance of the town centres and empty units. Make areas feel safer by improving lighting and repairing pavements and provide more support for homeless in the area.

- Encourage SMEs/local business/independents into the area – café culture etc. Need more community identity/separation between areas. Centres should be mobility friendly and encourage active travel into the town centres through improved accessibility and infrastructure such a cycle paths and storage etc.
- Need a flexible approach rather than restrictive approach to town centres to retain their vibrancy.
- Parks, childrens play areas, regeneration, more residential/affordable, more trees, disabled facilities, improved access/free parking, empty shops, recreation, more bins/recycling bins, environment, community events.

3.21. Specific improvements suggested in relation to specific centres were as follows:

Preston

- Improve safety and accessibility to/from and within the city centre (including walking and cycling and public transport infrastructure), improve traffic flow, reconsider the amount, quality and location of parking provision, restrict vehicular access/more pedestrianisation, and introduce trams. Improve the environment, including regeneration of Fishergate Hill, Church St, the Harris area, and the Horrocks/Stoneygate quarter. Improve the shopping experience, e.g. make the shopping area more compact, have more covered shopping areas, and better digital accessibility. Suggest clusters of shops, narrowing of uses/different offerings e.g. Fishergate and Friargate. Reduce the number of empty units, and have a better range of different shop types, e.g. small independents and large retailers. Move away from retail, and instead focus on culture, recreation, entertainment and heritage, e.g. the evening economy, improve the market, more restaurants, theatres, music venues, and re-open the Guild Hall.

Chorley

- Easier access to and within the town centre, including parking and footpaths, and addressing the bottleneck at the Hartwood roundabout. Make the centre more compact, introduce a better range of shops, including more independent retailers, food and beverage provision, leisure facilities, and a conference centre, and improve the appearance of the town centre and create a focal point for the Market.

Leyland

- Traffic management/restrictions, disabled parking, a safer environment, reduce through-traffic, re-occupy empty units and provide a better choice of shops, and more green space.

3.22. Other specific suggestions for other centres included the following:

- Adlington/Lower Adlington – more shops, better/safer accessibility, and more parking.
- Ashton – more variety of shops.
- Bamber Bridge – more seating areas and trees.
- Bretherton – better transport infrastructure, amenities, and improve drainage/flooding.
- Broughton - regard should be given to the Broughton neighbourhood development Plan.
- Buckshaw - more parking at Buckshaw Parkway station.
- Capitol centre - better infrastructure.
- Croston – improve traffic and parking, introduce traffic restrictions (e.g a one-way system), and provide more sporting facilities.
- Eccleston – needs more shops.
- Euxton – cleaner and reduce antisocial behaviour.
- Gregson Lane - tidy up land and provide parking area.
- Higher Walton - litter bins.
- Lane Ends – highway/pedestrian safety, cycle storage.
- Lostock Hall/Tardy Gate - restrict fast food outlets, longer free parking, better pavements, shop fronts, more variety of shops.
- New Hall Lane - Improve the environment, cleaner.
- North West Preston/Cottam – infrastructure needs to come forward for all the new development in the masterplan area.
- Penwortham - footpath maintenance, cycleways, trees.
- Samlesbury - improve accessibility, more local shops, bus routes.
- Whittle-le-Woods - retain existing retail uses, better footpaths, better accessibility, traffic flow, local bus services.

3.23. Questions 25-27 referred to what defines the area as a place, and what leisure and cultural opportunities are needed.

Question 25

3.24. Question 25 of the consultation asked two questions. Firstly, '*What do you feel defines Central Lancashire as a place*?'. There were a total of 252 responses to this question.

- Its diversity: a mix of urban/rural/semi-rural; distinct towns and villages and communities, each with their own character/identity, interspersed with attractive

and varied green open spaces/areas of separation. Wildlife and the natural environment.

- Heritage: Strong industrial and cultural heritage/historic buildings/architecture. Mix of old meets new.
- Central location. Access to other areas, including transport links to surrounding areas of beauty, tourist attractions, and major cities. Attractive to commuters, and tourism, but suffers from congestion. Waterways/canals/docks.
- Its people. Strong communities, hardworking and friendly, with a skilled & diverse workforce/employment opportunities. A slower pace of life. A good place to live and work. A place with potential and the opportunity to lead.
- Local business and produce, and the markets. A Fairtrade city/area. Arts and crafts, unique goods.
- Sport and leisure.
- Preston: Heritage and culture. Preston Guild. University city (UCLAN). Commercial centre of Lancashire. Preston North End (PNE) FC.
- Chorley: Market town. Chorley FC.

3.25. The second part of Question 25 asked: 'What is special and unique about Preston city centre and the towns within Central Lancashire that we can focus on to be the blueprint for future generations?'. There were 223 responses to this question.

- Accessibility, sustainable development, and communities. Transport infrastructure, particularly for active travel.
- History/industrial & cultural heritage. The historic core/industrial heritage, the built environment/architecture, good design and retention of character of buildings and areas.
- Diversity. Retain a strong sense of community through areas of separation & maintaining the unique character/identity/distinctiveness of individual towns/villages/settlements, and the character of the countryside in-between them.
- The natural environment, Green space, rural landscape, parks & rivers & canals, public buildings, and community spaces.
- The markets, local goods/produce, and support for SMEs, local independent businesses. The high street, café culture, micro-breweries, etc.
- Skilled workforce, technology, and manufacturing. Employment and enterprise hubs. UCLAN/Education.
- Tourism, recreation/leisure and sport (including PNE FC/Chorley FC).
- Green & emerging technology - leaders of a green revolution. A Fairtrade city/area. Agriculture/food production.
- The Arts, events. A unique offering that makes it different to other towns and cities and a destination in its own right.

- Preston - Culture. University city. Heritage/Winkley Sq./Harris Museum and Library/Preston bus station/the docks/the River Ribble & parks. The 'Preston model'/community wealth. Preston Guild, Guild Wheel. Commercial centre. Events and entertainment.
- Chorley – Market town. Leisure, local events.

Question 26

3.26.   No further information is provided in respect of this question, Full response is set out in the main report.

Question 27

3.27.   Question 27 of the consultation asked '*What cultural and leisure opportunities do you feel are missing in Central Lancashire*?'. A total of 255 responses expressed an opinion to this question.

- All opportunities should be affordable and accessible to all - children and families, older people etc. Youth provision e.g. youth zone/centres, green/outdoor gyms, and play areas for younger children are important and needed as well as meeting places for older people. Need to encourage different cultures to mix and ensure the changing needs of the population are met.
- Improve the public realm. Public art/sculptures/floral displays. Improve publicity and accessibility to information about the area. Work in partnership with UCLAN to improve the public realm and promote the university. Make more use of historic / heritage assets, heritage walks, local history and traditions, have 'Quarters' (like in Manchester). Re-open the former Art College building in Avenham.
- Entertainment venues - more quality/large venues and events – e.g. theatre, live music, concert, creative, arts & crafts & literature venues (re-open Guild Hall and 53 Degrees), and ability to host music and other festivals. More conference, events and exhibition centres (e.g. in Preston). Cinemas and museums (e.g. reopen the Museum of Lancashire), art galleries, libraries etc.
- More sport and leisure facilities (indoor and outdoor), and make better use of existing parks, green spaces, and waterways (e.g. canals, rivers, and the Docks) to be more imaginative and encourage greater participation in outdoor events, sport, leisure and recreation. This should be aligned with greater accessibility, including better links to the Guild Wheel, for example.
- Become more of a 'destination'. Create a niche to have a different offer than Manchester and Liverpool. Support independent businesses such as shops with artisan products, and restaurants, street entertainment/café culture, food

outlets/farmers markets. Light up the parks at night. Tourist attractions – e.g. zip wire across the Ribble.

- Community centres/well-being services, social venues which don't serve alcohol, science and education hubs, more community use opportunities through Chorley FC and PNE FC.

4.   Transport and How we Travel

4.1.   This chapter of the issues and options document included 11 questions covering active travel, reducing the number of vehicles on the roads, public transport and infrastructure. The questions are looking at how people currently travel, what needs to happen to encourage people to use their cars less and what infrastructure improvements are needed to achieve this.

4.2.   Questions 28-30 looked specifically at making travelling better and safer, encouraging people to walk and cycle more and reduce car use.

Question 28

4.3.   Question 28 of the consultation asked '*How can we make travelling around Central Lancashire better and safer*'. A total of 446 responses were received to this question, and the key themes are outlined below.

- The Local Plan should reduce the need to travel (especially the private car), encourage home & flexible working, and car sharing etc. It should restrict inappropriate development & ensure new development is located in sustainable accessible locations with appropriate infrastructure and amenities, and sufficient parking to avoid parking on roads and pavements.
- More secure and affordable parking options in Preston.
- Promote active travel (cycling and walking), with dedicated, safe, accessible/connected/continuous well lit & maintained cycle routes, signage, segregated from, and with priority over, vehicular traffic. There need to be more cycle (including e-bikes) hire facilities, safe storage, and better links to public transport. Also more pedestrianised areas /shared spaces in Preston.
- Promote a sustainable, joined up/connected and integrated public transport system (including better links between bus and rail hubs – particularly in Preston, and to UCLAN), accessible for all (including those with disabilities), affordable, safe, more reliable, fit for purpose (quality & capacity), frequent, efficient, and accessible (particularly in rural areas), and with public information easily accessible. Better rail links to Manchester and Liverpool, and better facilities and stations and stops, and more free/affordable & convenient parking provision, including at stations/park and rides.
- Promote green transport infrastructure, including public transport, and consider innovative solutions such as trams, monorails and cable cars, and access to electric car hire & charging points, and more bus lanes and park & rides.

- Investment in the road and rail infrastructure, including highway safety and maintenance, improving traffic flow and reducing congestion (particularly in Preston), better traffic control (such as speed restrictions, traffic calming, regulation & enforcement, clearer signage, reducing HGV access etc). Specific road and rail infrastructure schemes, such as a new road crossing across the Ribble, a replacement for the Old Tramway bridge, a new motorway junction at Charnock Richard, and Barton Grange. New rail stations (e.g. Midge Hall, Farington, Vernons, Cottam, Coppull, Cuerden, and Samlesbury), line extensions (e.g. Ormskirk/Preston line - Burscough curve / Tarleton / Preston), trams in Preston, and more parking at Buckshaw Parkway.

Question 29

4.4.   Question 29 of the consultation asked '*How can the Local Plan encourage people to walk or cycle more?*'. A total of 442 responses were received to this question, and the key themes are outlined below.

- Reduce the need to travel by sustainable development, prioritising brownfield sites, and directing growth to the most accessible locations, close to amenities, housing, employment, schools and local centres etc.

- Active travel infrastructure needs to be at the heart of planning policy and there needs to be real incentives to make active travel the mode of choice for shorter journeys (e.g. between residential and employment). However, there is a need for infrastructure and facilities to be in place first, and to work in partnership with schools and businesses and all stakeholders. All new developments should be designed to reduce reliance on cars, and developers should contribute to active travel infrastructure (cycleway improvements, new routes, etc. - including e-bike infrastructure/charging points). All new development should also link to existing footpaths and cycleways, and Travel Plans should be required through planning policies that encourage active travel specifically.

- Secure and covered cycle storage and changing/showering / locker facilities are needed at all key destinations (e.g. schools, employment, shops, etc.) and at regular intervals along well used cycle routes. Also the availability of cheap bike / scooter hire (including e-bikes/scooters and charging points). A more comprehensive and connected cycling infrastructure is required, particularly at transport hubs and other key destinations, including better provision for cycle storage on public transport.

- Cycling needs to be made more affordable (e.g. ride to work schemes, grants for electric bikes, etc.), safer, quicker and easier. The hierarchy should be pedestrian first, cyclist second and drivers last. There is a need for more dedicated cycling routes, segregated from vehicular traffic, and safer road crossing points

(consideration also needs to be given to removing side-road priority over footpaths and cycleways). Routes should be continuous, connected, cleaner, more attractive, well-lit, well surfaced & well maintained (e.g. repairing potholes & removing debris/cutting back overgrown vegetation).

- Other suggestions include improving the surfacing and lighting of canal tow paths, improved signage/better publicity of routes, traffic calming, vehicle/parking restrictions in town centres and stronger enforcement of illegal parking on cycle lanes, upgrading rural routes, and reducing pollution & improving air quality, particularly along the main commuter routes. It was also suggested that more purpose-built cycling facilities are needed, e.g. a velodrome/cycle track for community use. Specific improvements suggested included having more links to the Guild Wheel and repairing the Old Tramway bridge over the River Ribble.

- More pedestrianisation of town centres was suggested, including making them more accessible to all, including the mobility impaired. Also making the public realm more attractive (e.g. trees/bins/benches, and more accessible green links/spaces, public footpaths/rights of way).

- It is clear that more people would engage in active travel if it was safer, quicker, and a more enjoyable and convenient experience, with secure cycle storage and facilities (showers/lockers etc.) available at key destinations.

Question 30

4.5.   Question 30 of the consultation asked '*How can the Local Plan reduce the number of cars on the roads?*'. A total of 439 responses were received to this question, and the key themes are outlined below.

- Give people an incentive/viable alternative to change the way they travel. Promote the benefits of active travel – and invest in a better, quicker and safer cycling and pedestrian infrastructure and facilities. Encourage and invest in infrastructure for green travel / electric cars. Consider trams and combined railways/tramways. Transition towards a movement hierarchy that priorities sustainable modes of transport such as cycling, walking and public transport for shorter journeys, whilst also providing for the transport needs of those who are physically inactive due to disability or illness.

- Improve public transport - needs to be an integrated system, greener, more accessible (to all people, and to all areas - including rural areas in particular), affordable, frequent, reliable, and more affordable with sufficient capacity, including more park and rides. Also improve inter-modal travel and link active travel infrastructure to public transport.

- Restrict development. Sustainable development – focus on brownfield land and urban areas. New development needs to be in sustainable and accessible locations with or close to amenities and facilities (schools, education, recreation, retail etc.) and transport hubs. Linked to existing active travel infrastructure & public transport links. Ensure infrastructure keeps up with new development. Ensure local centres are promoted above out of town retail and leisure. Provide local jobs for local people, and encourage working from home, improve online access / broadband.

- Reduce congestion and improve traffic flow. Improve highway safety, parking provision, and highway infrastructure/capacity. Traffic restrictions – including restricting access to, and parking in, town centres (e.g. only electric cars in town centres, restrict HGV access, congestion charge/low emissions zones, enforcement of parking regulations, less parking/increased charges, traffic calming, pedestrianised zones etc). Make more use of the canal infrastructure/towpaths.

- Education - emphasise the benefits of reduced car travel to climate change, run campaigns etc. to promote alternative methods of travel. Including walking buses etc. to schools.

- Encourage working from home, car sharing, communal car parks, travel plans, etc.

4.6. Questions 31-33 focused specifically on car parking provision.

Question 31

4.7. Question 31 asked: 'Do you think there is too much car parking in Preston city centre, not enough or about the right amount?'.

4.8. 427 people chose to respond to this question. Options to answer and their respective responses included 'too much' (2.5%), 'about the right amount' (63.4%), 'not enough' (26.%) or 'N/A'.

4.9. Many responses referred to specific wishes around the provision of parking in the city and how this could and should be altered, depending on their primary response (for example, a person noting that there is 'not enough' parking in the centre was also likely to suggest that parking should be made cheaper').

4.10. Most responses addressed concerns, ideas or opinions around the type, levels or state of provision of parking in the centre. Respondents noted that the cost of parking should be increased or decreased (depending on their perception of its necessity) or that car parking should be free.

34

4.11. Ideas around the availability of parking included feelings that current capacity should be reduced to disincentivise car use and promote alternatives and that more levies should be aimed at city-centre drivers. Some felt parking was sufficient in the centre and that it should not be reduced nor increased, though more thought that it was insufficient, especially around Fishergate and Avenham.

4.12. Suggestions that more on-street parking, short-stay capacity or family designated bays could be made available were noted. Greater disabled parking was supported with the note that access centrally to shops and services was important for these and other vulnerable groups.

4.13. Historic reductions in capacity in Preston had received mixed feedback, with some saying the loss of spaces at Market Street had not affected them, while others felt it had made finding a space harder. There was general agreement that capacity should be improved during peak times (rush hours or Saturdays) or seasonal peaks (Christmas) and that an evening provision should be made available to improve footfall to the night-time economy in the centre. Parking distribution throughout the city was noted as both poor and good by different respondents.

4.14. The quality of parking was a key theme. Spaces being too tight and car parks being poorly lit, uncovered by CCTV and unguarded were concerns, while the overall quality was felt to be poor. Lastly, some felt that private car parks should be taken into public ownership to better control pricing and quality.

4.15. Many responses highlighted the negative impacts caused by parking in the centre, including air, noise and light pollution, health and safety risk to pedestrians, congestion in and around the city centre (especially in St Georges and Fishergate) and car parks as a blight on the urban landscape.

4.16. Alternative transport methods to cars were a key theme that respondents felt should be encouraged or altered to provide sustainable alternatives to the option of parking a conventionally fuelled car. Many felt that people should be encouraged to use buses, trains, park and ride or cycling as alternatives, of the latter, people felt more cycle storage was required and priority lanes or access given to cycles in order to achieve this. Support for the improvement of public transport was wide, including its affordability, reliability, flexibility and integration (for example, opportunities to 'Park & Rail' at nearby stations) and that public transport should be free across the city.

4.17. 'Park & Ride' facilities services were thought to be already good, but more should be made available (especially in the North of Preston, Midge Hall and Hospital). It was felt that more parking capacity was needed (especially at Preston Docks), while the buses should operate more frequently (especially on the weekend) and that double decker buses could be used to improve transit capacity.

4.18. It was highlighted that more electric vehicles (EVs) were expected to replace conventionally fuelled cars, so more spaces should be provided with electric charging points. Measures to incentivise electric vehicle use should be encouraged with a clean-air policy in the centre of the city and priority access for EVs.

4.19. Ideas for the displacement or replacement of parking in favour of other uses included further pedestrianisation of the city centre, or called for the reallocation of parking land to better uses, such as sustainable city-centre housing. Control measures could include a levy applied to all petrol/diesel vehicles. Others noted that the declining retail offer and changing shopping habits reduced demand.

4.20. Some responses highlighted the function of parking as an economic driver, integral to the economic health of the cities retail and service-based business and is essential component of competitiveness versus out-of-town outlets like Deepdale Retail Park/The Capitol Centre, or rival cities Manchester/Liverpool.

Question 32

4.21. No additional information presented above what is shown in the main report.

Question 33

4.22. No additional information presented above what is shown in the main report.

Question 34

4.23. Questions 34-38 focused on what needs improving most in the area, and how public transport, electric vehicles, cycling facilities, and where additional park and ride facilities are needed.

4.24. Question 34 of the consultation asked 'How can we improve public transport and encourage more people to use it?'. A total of 313 responses were given.

- Need incentives – carrot not just stick – e.g. don't just cut parking without giving a viable/convenient alternative. Reconsider the approach to town centre parking (amount/location/quality/cost) and restricting car access into town centres.

- Sustainable development, making journeys smaller and popular destinations more accessible.
- A fully integrated and affordable transport system, with a quality service; safer, cleaner, reliable, efficient, direct (reduce journey times to be quicker than the car), more availability/choice/routes, frequent services, greater ease of use, passenger capacity, improved facilities at stations/shelters, and better publicity/availability of information.
- More park and rides e.g. at Junction 31 of the M6.
- More parking capacity at transport hubs, including stations and park and rides e.g. at Buckshaw parkway. Park and rides should be further away from the town centres and have a rapid shuttle service which is quicker than the car.
- Accessibility, particularly rural areas, and for the mobility impaired.
- Better links to other transport hubs/modes of travel. Improve East-West connections.
- Green transport fleet / electric vehicles / smaller buses.
- Alternative options such as trams/cable cars, call-on-demand buses, request stops.
- Secure travel plans for new developments need to be secured through Section 106 agreements through appropriate planning conditions.
- Secure Developer Contributions for public transport infrastructure.

Question 35

4.25. No additional information presented above what is shown in the main report.

Question 36

4.26. Question 36 of the consultation asked '*What needs to be in place to encourage the move towards electric vehicles?*'. A total of 414 responses were received to this question.

- A combination of adequate infrastructure being in place, alongside a range of other incentives, is needed to change the culture. There also needs to be a consistency of government policy, with more information/education/publicity.
- Infrastructure should include the availability/accessibility of substantially more free/cheaper, universal/uniform electric charging points (including rapid charging), in various accessible locations, including in all car parks. Planning policy should require new developments to contribute to this infrastructure, including installing charging points & battery storage facilities in all new developments (commercial and residential). In particular, charging points need to be at supermarkets/retail, town/local centres, all car parks, and at transport hubs/park and rides etc. Community charging points will be required where properties have no driveway/off

road parking e.g. terraced houses/apartments etc. Consider use of street furniture for charging points.

- Consider viability issues for developers when considering Section 106 contributions for new developments. For domestic policy, instead of charging points there should be the flexibility/ability to design properties so as to be easily able to retrofit charging points or have a communal point nearby. Additional planning guidance, including design guidance to better facilitate retrofitting, should be provided, e.g. in a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Also need to make it quicker/easier for charging points to be incorporated into heritage assets.

- Incentives – e.g. better technology and affordability (e.g. lower cost price and car running costs & longer battery life/running distances), better choice/range of vehicles, local grants, incentives for self-generating renewable energy for households to charge cars, subsidies/zero tax.

- Highway led incentives, including priority lanes to reduce journey times, and priority/reserved and free/cheaper parking for electric vehicles. Also, stricter enforcement of unauthorised vehicles parking in electric charging spots, traffic restrictions for non-electric vehicles in town centres, etc., including tariffs/emissions zones/charges.

- Reduce the need to travel and reduce the number of cars on the road instead – e.g. promote home working, active travel etc. Public transport and delivery vehicles need to be electric. Travel plans to prioritise electric vehicles. Car share initiatives. Availability of electric vehicles for hire at transport hubs, etc.

- Questions were raised about whether electric vehicles are sustainable /environmentally friendly/viable. Can enough electricity be generated to accommodate a move to electric cars? The existing infrastructure cannot support a move to electric vehicles. Need to look into alternative energy sources/generation. Electric cars are not environmentally friendly – e.g. disposal of batteries, and where the electricity comes from. Hydrogen fuelled vehicles should be promoted instead. Failing that, all charging points should be from renewable sources/green electricity.

Question 37

4.27. Question 37 of the consultation asked 'In addition to cycleways, what cycle facilities does Central Lancashire need, and where should these be located?'. A total of 282 responses were received to this question.

- Secure, well-lit, covered cycle storage, lockers, and shower and changing facilities, at all frequently visited destinations (including transport hubs, and on public transport itself e.g. trains/buses), places of employment, public buildings, town centres/shops, employment, education, community/health and leisure facilities, etc. It should also

be made easier to cross between modes of travel (e.g. bus and train) on public transport etc. and improved availability of bike & helmet hire, including e-bikes. Promote 'Park and cycle' schemes instead of/alongside park and rides.

- There should be bike stores in all new residential development, and/or communal cycling storage areas for domestic properties where storage is limited, e.g. in flats.
- Facilities en-route, e.g. rest points/WC facilities, parking areas, cafes and cycle shops/repair service centres, e-bike charging points and other facilities, particularly along the main commuting/well used routes.
- More purpose-built cycling facilities for sport/leisure/recreation – e.g. velodrome, mountain bike track, enclosed cycle track for community use.
- Need to consider Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans. Make better use/upgrade existing routes (such as canal tow paths and riverbanks) and improve signage and publicity of routes. Improve the Guild Wheel and create more links to it and replicate this elsewhere. Improve the whole infrastructure - not just safe attractive routes, but also more direct. Give cyclists priority over motor vehicles, including at road junctions. Need well lit & well maintained continuous inter-linked routes, off-road/segregated from vehicular traffic. Also, safer/pedestrianised town centres, with more cycle crossing points on main roads, and more rural/semi-rural cycle lanes and along main commuter routes, including the PWDR. Specific suggestions referred to include a cycle path from Mawdesley to Croston, and better links to/from UCLAN.

Question 38

4.28. Question 38 of the consultation asked '*Where is there a need for more park and ride facilities?*'. A total of 264 responses were received to this question, and the specific sites referred to are outlined below. Various locations were suggested, whilst some also suggested there was no need for any.

- To serve all large new housing developments, large employment areas, education establishments (e.g. UCLAN) and hospitals (e.g. Royal Preston and Chorley hospitals).
- Should serve all town centres, from all sides/suburbs/popular routes in. Research evidence of need and consult commuters. Make sure they are fit for purpose and also serve commuters who work outside normal office hours / shifts. Make park and rides quicker and more convenient to use. Buses need clear routes into town free from other traffic to serve their purpose. Generally, park and rides need to be further away from the town centres to avoid congestion en-route to the park and ride. Also need better/warmer shelters/waiting facilities.
- Should be on brownfield sites, and on new major roads (e.g. the new PWDR).

- At transport hubs/intersections, along the main bus routes and train stations, at motorway junctions, etc. e.g. end of the M55 at Broughton, at the new M55 PWDR junction, Cuerden strategic site – end of the M65, junctions 29,30,31 of the M6 (or the dis-used park and ride site at 31a), Samlesbury enterprise zone, M61 e.g. Botany Bay. Also at the planned new Cottam station.
- Increase parking capacity (and options – e.g. buses and trains) at existing park and ride sites e.g. Chorley, Buckshaw village, Portway, Leyland. Each ride should include various destinations. In Preston, link the 2 park and ride car parks, Preston City Centre, the bus and rail stations and UCLAN. There should also be 'car sharing' car parks, and additional smaller car parks on established routes.

4.29. Other suggestions of routes included:

- From Ribbleton (linked to a tram system), from Fulwood to the hospital, from Penwortham, Leyland, Chorley and surrounding areas. Samlesbury, Hutton, Walton le Dale, Lostock Hall, Bamber Bridge motorway junctions area, Preston East, North Preston (Fulwood, Broughton, Eastway), Lea, Longridge, Adlington, Clayton/Whittle-le-Woods, Fylde, Warton, Tarleton, Euxton, Coppull.
- Leyland to Walton summit and Buckshaw village.
- Routes to Manchester/Bolton/Liverpool, Southport, etc.

5. Improving Health and Well-being

5.1. This section of the report contained 12 questions on a number of topics around health and well-being. The questions covered issues around obesity, active design of areas and providing healthy neighbourhoods. It also sought views on provision of community facilities, employment and income and living conditions, and the effect of these issues on health and well-being.

Question 39

5.2. Question 39 asked *'How can planning improve health and reduce health inequalities?'*. A total of 337 responses were received. The main themes arising were:

- Implement the recommendations of the Marmot Review. This recommended action around six policy areas:
  o Give every child the best start in life.
  o Enable all children, young people and adults to maximise their capabilities and have control over their lives.
  o Create fair employment and good work for all.
  o Ensure healthy standard of living for all.
  o Create and develop healthy and sustainable places and communities.
  o Strengthen the role and impact of ill-health prevention.
- Protect and improve the full range of social and healthcare provision including Chorley hospital Accident & Emergency (A&E).
- Don't develop housing due to it increasing pressure on healthcare.
- Protect and improve the whole range of green areas to protect health, well-being and to improve air quality.
- Improve air quality and combat the climate crisis, by planting trees, locating housing away from main routes and reducing travel/encouraging sustainable and active travel instead of car use.
- Provide a range of community facilities and outdoor spaces to encourage exercise, recreation, food growing and building skills.
- Foster community cohesion, collaboration and social inclusiveness to help give people a sense of pride about their area.
- Provide education about healthy living and a range of other subjects, especially to children.
- Support local fresh food and limit uses such as like food outlets / supermarkets / vape shops / betting shops / pubs.
- Consider the location of retail facilities, so that they are easily accessible by sustainable transport modes.

- High quality design, environments and housing including affordable.
- Improve deprived areas to improve residents' health by providing more facilities including accessible healthcare.
- Provide good employment opportunities in accessible locations and incentivise work.

Question 40

5.3. No additional information presented above what is shown in the main report.

Question 41

5.4. Question 41 was a supplementary question to this and asked *'If you do, what would you suggest a policy contains?'.* 241 responses were made. The main issues raised were:

- Require policy to consider need for new establishments in an areas when permitting new outlets, but ensure fair competition and not stifling this sector of the economy. Also consider appearance of outlets when permitted. Look at existing policy in Preston.
- Restriction on outlets near education establishments and/or in areas with high level of obesity and deprived areas.
- Restrict changes of use to fast food outlets and consider using venues for housing
- Encourage businesses which offer healthier options as well as better options for non-meat eaters and incentives for those using local produce. Consider tax/restrictions on outlets not offering this.
- Consider tax of plastics and waste originating from outlets and require better control on litter.
- Require nutritional information on menus/calory levels and restrict age of customers allowed in.
- Ensure all outlets comply with required regulations including high hygiene & safety standards, and if not licensed for seating, ensure this is not provided.
- Where possible ensure parking is available for customers especially for eat in and utilise use of buildings better i.e. make use of floor space in building for seating.

Question 42

5.5. Question 42 asked 'Would you support policies that require implementation of the ability for people to grow their own food – such as allotments, community food growing areas, orchards, etc.?'. Of the 464 people who answered this 442 or 95%

supported it. Some respondents made comments supporting community food growing because of its environmental and social benefits.

Question 43

5.6. No additional information presented above what is shown in the main report.

Question 44

5.7. Question 44 asked '*How can the Local Plan improve our existing homes*?'. There were 300 responses. The main themes were:

- Ensure all homes (including existing) are made energy efficient and are adapted to climate change and promote the benefits of this. They need to incorporate renewable energy and green initiatives such as rainwater harvesting and soft landscaping. Where possible also require charging points for electric vehicles. Consider use of grants, Section 106 monies/CIL etc. to support this. Retrofitting of could also be a requirement when people apply for planning permission for minor works.
- Incentivise and standardise the build of low energy and low carbon or carbon neutral homes such as PassivHaus.
- Identify 'opportunity sites' where development will be permitted subject to stringent requirements on the technologies, they use.
- Ensure homes are built to a good standard as they will be existing homes in the future, and there is major cost-effectiveness compared to retrofitting items.
- Ensure energy to heat homes is affordable for all and target the homes that need particular help through surveying them and support new developments that can provide these benefits to the wider area where they can improve existing homes (such as neighbourhood/district energy schemes).
- Provide adaptable homes to enable people to stay in homes longer and provide better opportunities for provision of annexes for caring for relatives.
- Improve education, health and income so people can improve their homes and prevent disrepair.
- Encourage more home ownership because this encourages people to maintain their homes and areas.
- Make better use of empty homes/buildings but also stop overcrowding of homes.
- Design areas to include sufficient parking and provide green space/green infrastructure (GI) and waste recycling. Improve green areas in existing housing areas and provide support to homeowners as needed for improvements where required.
- Improve skills for tradespeople including through apprenticeships.

- Establish community owned and co-operative models of housing and electricity generation and develop more Council housing because these can be built and maintained more efficiently.
- Make sure new developments do not have a negative impact on existing, established homes.
- Consider more than just existing homes - consider how people live beyond their own homes, and how they can improve them.

5.8. Some responses made comments that related to the wider environment instead of existing homes. These included comments such as:

- Connect homes via well-lit walking and cycling routes.
- Better transport.
- Less intrusive street lighting.
- Provide fibre broadband connections.
- Improve surrounding environment.
- Improve access to and provide more/preserve green and recreation space, allotments, and shared gardens.
- Safe places for children to play.
- Do not build on green space families use.

5.9. Some respondents felt that the Local Plan can't improve existing homes.

Question 45

5.10. Question 45 asked '*What can the Local Plan do to promote healthy neighbourhoods*?'. 331 responses were received which raised the following key points:

- Some respondents felt that centralised facilities like Youth Zones were good whereas others felt keeping things local and accessible worked.
- Tackle social isolation and build community hubs/centres to support and publicise community projects and engagement through classes/activities, including for groups. Activities like these have been identified: youth clubs, Scouts, Guides, Duke of Edinburgh Award, walking, bike skills, volunteer taxi services, walk/cycle to work and school schemes, clean up schemes, forest schools, food projects, meal sharing, dance, pilates, events, education about health, the environment and our impact.
- Employ Community Development workers/walk champions/wardens and encourage community centres to work together.

- Provide linked green spaces, parks, skate parks, areas for dogs to walk off the lead, nature trails, community woodlands, gardens, allotments, farms, orchards, areas for community growing and selling, markets, village gyms, lit footpaths including green links, towpaths and public footpaths, public toilets, play areas, leisure facilities, access to sports opportunities for free, cycle tracks and infrastructure. Make them accessible for all and advertise them.
- Fund co-operatives to buy land to grow food for the local area.
- Improve walking and cycling and stop on pavement parking and provide cycle training at work.
- Utilise the waterways and blue spaces like the River Ribble and Preston Docks, which are a missed tourist attraction.
- Ensure physical activity and the Ten Principles of Active Design are a golden thread running throughout the plan, and ensure high standards of design.
- Make historic villages places to retreat to.
- Provide infrastructure and more services, like emergency services and healthcare facilities (including for mental health) and focus on preventative work including around drugs. Support people with dementia by designing simple housing layouts and signage.
- Give every child the best start in life, ensure children maximise their capabilities, create fair employment, ensure a health standard of living for all.
- Provide local shops, schools and sports activities close to new housing and in accessible locations and enforce no stop zones to improve zones around schools.
- Provide more social housing.
- Limit bookmakers and fast food outlets but promote healthy takeaways and locally produced food. Provide meals in school holidays.
- Encourage a sense of pride and happy outlook by keeping areas clean and litter-free.
- Implement a policy of no drinking on street.
- Implement zero carbon energy and transport and improved public transport to reduce traffic and pollution, and manage traffic better.
- Improve air quality and implement smoke free zones.
- Plant trees including fruit trees and provide larger gardens.
- Integrate nature into development by embedding them with green infrastructure, bird boxes, spaces for nature, etc.
- Provide beautiful spaces for people to exercise in and provide them with access to nature/wildlife, wild spaces and provide space for animals and wildlife corridors.
- More Parish Councils.
- Enable local amateur sports clubs to have a reasonable chance of developing through having their own plots of land.

- Encourage community wealth building across the region to make places more resilient.
- Build away from major roads and industry.
- Provide clear guidance about the amount of open space required in developments/commuted sums and maintenance requirements to provide certainty for developers.
- Allocate sites in sustainable locations.
- St George's shopping centre contributes to the promotion of a healthy city centre and centrally located neighbourhoods and should be recognised and protected.
- The Cuerden Strategic Site presents the opportunity for new healthy community resources. The site must be promoted on a masterplan led basis.
- Don't overdevelop and destroy countryside/the Green Belt and greenfield sites/open areas/spaces or rural, semi-rural areas and villages so they retain their character. Develop brownfield sites instead.
- Building more houses won't promote healthy neighbourhoods.
- The Local Plan won't promote healthy neighbourhoods / it will only drain local health services.
- It is up to individuals.

Question 46

5.11. No additional information presented above what is shown in the main report.

Question 47

5.12. Question 47 was a supplementary question and asked 'If not, how do you think we could attract more and where should they go?'. 233 responses were received which raised the following key points:

- Should be driven by neighbourhood plans.
- Protect and utilise existing facilities, could use Assets of Community Value/Local Listings to do this, and lobby government about forced closures.
- All new housing sites need to provide a range of facilities.
- Residential allocations help to support local facilities and make them attractive to investors.
- Build community cohesion and inclusiveness by providing facilities that bring people together through social groups/activities, or even where people can just pop in for a chat, in every community, starting with the most deprived. Ensure places are family friendly and not just orientated around alcohol.

- Invest in libraries especially, Youth Zones/clubs, Sure Start Centres and exhibition spaces and use co-operatives and the voluntary, community and faith sectors. Ask young people what they want.
- Don't just rely on volunteers. Instead employ a tidy task force and encourage support for tidy street campaigns and volunteering opportunities.
- Provide indoor leisure facilities as useable in poor weather, and sports facilities/clubs.
- Co-ordinate, advertise and promote facilities.
- If you provide a secure premises, community ventures will happen.
- Use buildings that are not available in the day in the evening for community use and encourage cafés to open in the evening. Provide mixed use/joint use spaces/facilities.
- Investigate the need of faith and black and ethnic minority communities, as some are underserved and provide what is needed in neighbourhoods.
- Control national chains and supermarkets that threaten small businesses, and levy parking charges on them, but an alternative view was to encourage satellite outlets in smaller retail areas with cheap parking.
- Encouraging small developments close to existing settlement centres will reverse the decline in local facilities.
- Stop creating dormitories which are empty during the day (like Buckshaw) and ensure that local shops will benefit from passing trade.
- More cultural facilities are needed which should be free and could be grouped together to create a critical mass to appeal to visitors.
- Regenerate town centres to encourage facilities to open in smaller neighbourhoods and support attractive shop frontage improvements.
- Reuse unused and abandoned buildings/refurbish facilities using CIL and protect old buildings and make them landmark and heritage sites.
- Support facilities through encouraging entrepreneurism, reducing rents and rates and providing grants and subsidies.
- If it was easy to do, it would already be happening, or they are not required.

5.13. Where not already referred to people mentioned requirements for the following types of facilities:

- Concert hall, music venues and theatres (in Preston including a medium sized one as the Guild Hall is too big). Plan what is to happen with the Guild Hall.
- Local shops (convenience stores, butchers, fishmongers) and delivery services, pop ups, banks, post offices, pubs/restaurants, schools, GP/dental surgeries, meeting halls, small galleries, community and religious centres, cafes,

gyms/classes, health centres, dentists, schools, markets and food festivals and local produce outlets near Park & ride sites.

5.14. People gave comments about where facilities are needed. These included the following:

- In accessible places.
- Post office & food sales from spaces/community hubs in local pubs.
- Cultural buildings in town/city centres, other facilities where needed
- Where homes are being planned.
- Where people live not just the city centre.
- Use docks as focus for cultural activities.
- Locate facilities in places where people can walk to them or get the bus.
- If it's necessary to drive to facilities, provide dedicated car parking.
- Protect agricultural land and use it for re-wilding and to create interactive opportunities e.g. touch farms, games.
- In Euxton North or South - Fully knock down either Talbot Row or Runshaw Lane row of shops, bring a square where local traditional festivals can go on, local independent shops, etc.
- A community centre could be built on CLCFS00332 as promised.
- Local service centres.
- Central locations.
- Don't centralise facilities.
- In community areas.
- Provide them in rural areas/villages.
- Barton.
- Adlington & Lower Adlington.
- Villages to the North East of Chorley.
- Lostock Hall.
- Rufford.
- Gregson Lane.
- Bretherton.
- Moss Side & Farington.
- Preston City Centre and all facilities should have good public transport links.
- Central areas like Station Rd in Bamber Bridge.
- In the city centre to attract visitors.
- More in Winkley square, flag market and near Avenham park.
- Chorley town centre/town centres.
- City/town and local and village centres.

- High streets.
- Proposed Cuerdale garden village.

5.15. Some responses said that there are enough facilities in specific areas like Adlington/Anderton and Croston, whereas others disagreed.

5.16. There were a variety of views about pubs with respondents making the following comments:

- Don't promote/restrict pubs.
- Prevent local pubs being redeveloped.
- More micro pubs.
- So many pubs have closed down.
- Provide more support for traditional pubs.

Question 48

5.17. Question 48 asked: '*How can the Local Plan provide employment opportunities to all in society, to improve health and well-being*?'. There were 865 responses. 171 of which had an issue or opinion to raise, while 694 stated 'N/A' or had no comment or opinion, similarly, 14 stated they did not know enough to comment.

5.18. Some stated that the Local Plan could not deliver this at all, with commercial organisations or central government cited as the key drivers behind this. Some felt that if the Local Plan was able to then it would only deliver it with a clear approach and effective ideas to implement it.

5.19. Ideas around empowering employers and employees to improve health and well-being included:

- Co-locate offices and industry alongside housing to reduce commuting times and unemployment and avoid areas becoming dormitory towns to larger areas.
- Targeted local and central government funding is needed for employers in this sector.
- Source and provide premises for employers to operate in.
- Provide council tax incentives with reductions or freezes for employers.
- Provide reduced rates or rents on employer's premises, especially in the city of Preston.
- Promote opportunities for home working and encourage employers to empower their workers to do so.

- Promote and invest in local businesses/SMEs and locally sourced employees (as opposed to larger, national or international ones).
- Promote industries and careers in the high-skilled technology, advanced production/manufacturing/construction and science sectors.
- Allocate land specifically for health and well-being employers.
- Establish more publicly supported schemes and units like the Strawberry Fields Digital Hub.
- More amenities and services are needed in and around the BAE Enterprise Zone.
- Provide training and apprenticeships as routes into work.
- Invest and procure from local employers only in-line with the 'Preston Model'.
- Establish the 'Preston Bank'/'Lancashire Investment Bank' to invest in employers.
- Support local manufacturing employers.
- Improve links between leisure and sports providers and employers.
- Provide employment through the rollout of green energy and the promotion of green jobs.
- Recognise the link between meaningful employment and well-being.
- Offer retraining and reskilling opportunities to empower older workers to change sectors.
- Improve accessibility in public spaces and employer premises for the disabled.
- Incentivise employers to improve and modernise older workspaces with better lighting, air flow, heating and high-quality materials.
- Promote jobs with higher salaries to allow people more money to spend on leisure activities.
- Promote job sharing roles among private businesses and offer this for roles in the local public sector.
- Improve public transport links between homes and workplaces to better connect employers to residents.
- Promote active travel schemes like Cycle2Work and support employers to install showers in their premises.
- Support start-up/pop-up businesses (like cycle hire vans along cycle routes, outdoor fitness trainers on local parks, healthy food trucks) and a variety of alternative employer models by easing planning consents and licenses.
- Promote steps toward a work/life balance with employers such as a four-day working week or home working and championing employers who do this well.
- Encourage locally grown food providers, healthy produce outlets and promote healthy diets.
- Provide a mix of housing tenures for a wide range of groups, especially key workers (i.e. shared ownership, affordable housing).

- Allocate space for less restrictive mixed use to co-locate offices / warehousing / SMEs / services together to provide a range of services to any area.
- Maintain a dialogue through forums or focus groups with employers and residents as to their area-specific needs.
- Make the compilation and submission of 'Employment and Skills Plans' mandatory for any major development.
- Review Green Belt land in order to unlock previously unavailable employment sites in the areas of most need.

5.20. Ideas around improving the health and well-being of residents more directly included:

- Ensure community centres or hubs lie at the heart of every area.
- Improve and expand health services, expand Chorley hospital/re-establish a 24 hours A&E, open more GPs and health centres in oversubscribed areas.
- Ensure allotments, orchards and opportunities for foraging are available in every area to improve access to and understanding of healthy food.
- Build more dedicated cycleways, through green areas and segregated from roads.
- Improve access to, map and signpost better to the countryside through new green links and existing Public Rights of Way (PROWs).
- Provide work experience/shadowing for vulnerable or poorer groups, as well as CV writing support.
- Eliminate zero hours contracts and instead promote job security and permanence.
- Promote inclusivity and equality as a Council and as a champion for local employers.
- Provide opportunities for adult education in creative courses; languages, well-being, mental health and exercise.
- Target planning obligations (Section 106 and CIL monies) to improving health and well-being schemes in new development through cycleways/public transport/green spaces.
- Offer students, pupils and school leavers opportunities in work and opportunities in engagement i.e. youth groups.
- Promote social enterprises/community trusts/workshops/co-operatives.
- Focus on regeneration of vacant and empty units to improve these areas and provide housing.
- Expand and improve on elderly care services.
- Offer services in support of and promoting volunteers and champion them i.e. football coaches, scouts leaders.
- Refocus the Local Plan away from delivering housing needs and economic growth/expansion and toward improving health and well-being.

- Improve public transport; make it cheaper (perhaps through subsidies), more flexible and reliable.
- Ensure a wide range of employment is available not just to the highly skilled, but to people with families, the disabled, those with learning difficulties, the elderly, those on low-incomes, those not in education, employment or training (NEETs) and the homeless.
- Support local social care and carers.
- Foster a sense of ownership and input within communities.
- Take leisure and sports centres back into public control.
- Offer cheaper leisure and sports facilities, i.e. discounts for over 50s, off-peak discounts.
- Open and improve access to leisure and sports facilities i.e. at the UCLAN Sports Campus or on primary, high school and college campuses.
- Expand leisure and sport facilities across Central Lancashire.
- Provide early intervention in the poorest areas to avoid generational problems (joblessness etc.) i.e. Sure Start centres.
- Promote cultural and arts venues in every area.
- Make sure the local plan delivers for all groups and across the demographic.
- Block the proliferation of betting shops, tanning shops and off licenses.
- Promote opportunities for eco-tourism across Central Lancashire.
- Reward volunteers who regularly clean graffiti, tend to communal gardens and litter pick.
- Promote free press such as The Chorley Citizen that promotes local services.
- Promote social activities i.e. rambler's association, couch to 5k etc, park run, 'friends of' groups.
- Employ a Community Engagement/Development Officer that whose duty is to improve localised health and well-being.
- Employ a footpaths officer to survey and monitor the maintenance local footpaths and PROWs.
- Promote ways to reduce screen time and promote face-to-face interaction and real-world engagement with nature, especially in schools for young children.
- Make sure the right education facilities and settings are available, teaching life skills, healthy eating, money management, careers advice, etc.
- Extend measures to reduce noise, air and light pollution in residential areas.
- Place sensitive development that is at the appropriate scale and meets the needs of every area.
- Greater greenspace protection and a prioritisation of development on brownfield sites.

- Find opportunities for afforestation/reforestation and improve planting schemes in spaces between buildings.
- Promote car sharing via a new platform available through Local Council websites.
- Offer free public transport for the poorest/new employees/students/young people.
- Have publicly funded hireable equipment for healthy activities, climbing, kayaking, camping, etc.
- Plan pedestrianised and traffic free neighbourhoods which reduces pollution, improves safety and creates new leisure space for residents, even if short-term, such as curfews on heavy goods traffic in residential areas.
- Have a policy target for a Central Lancashire employment rate (i.e. 95% over the plan period).

Question 49

5.21. No additional information presented above what is shown in the main report.

Question 50

5.22. Question 50 was a supplementary question and asked: '*If so, how can the Local Plan support them so that they flourish*?' (Co-operatives in Central Lancashire). There 140 responses to this question. A summary of the key themes and issues within these is outlined below.

5.23. Respondents commented on a range of Social Enterprise (SE) ventures in their responses, not only Co-operatives. Social Enterprises covers Co-operatives, Community Investment Companies, Voluntary Organisations and Worker-Owned Companies:

- Halt and avoid the loss of local SEs in Central Lancashire and support all forms of social enterprise and not-for-profit organisations and ventures.
- Business rates should be subsidised or lowered or Council Tax incentives/relief offered for a set period.
- Free or Low cost vacant or variable units should be made available to let.
- Simplify the planning application process or help with the granting of planning permission/planning consent and provide an easier, fast-tracked process for SE licensing.
- Provide seed/start-up funding/grants, continual funding, offer financial advisors, encourage long-term self-sufficiency, provide expertise and resources.

- Publicise and promote the SE model, champion organisations using it and help them to market and sell their products/services, encourage investment into them through the 'Preston Model'.
- Establish apprenticeships or recognised training in the sector to train and equip volunteers.
- Ensure SEs are accessible and near public transport routes and stops.
- Encourage a circular economy through the SE model and its organisations.
- Promote the co-location of SEs together with co-housing solutions, affordable housing, allotments etc. to encourage continuing community involvement and usage.
- Have regular meetings between SE representatives and council officers, counselling the public too on their opinions, encourage cross-boundary networking, contacts, best practice, and talent pools.
- Establish the proposed 'Lancashire Investment Bank'/'Preston Bank' and use for SE funding, or a community trust company.
- Promote the use of electric vehicles in this sector.
- Foster trust among SE communities to avoid practices of greed or self-interest.
- Promote SEs in rural areas or villages where they can be most impactful.
- Establish a 'Co-operative Zone' akin to an 'Enterprise Zone'.
- SEs need more resources and support around opportunities for self-build housing.
- Work with the Preston Co-operative Development Network to support SE policy and include third sector (charities) involvement.

5.24. Ideas around recognising the wider impact of co-operatives and social enterprises included:

- SEs promote sustainable values of green living and local produce, i.e. allotments on farmland or orchards in urban areas, use them as a vehicle for climate change goals.
- SEs promote healthy food and strengthen community resilience, use them as a vehicle for Health and Well-being goals.
- Recognise the positive benefits of collective operation to a community and get them involved, allow SEs to meet local needs and combat social isolation.
- Recognise that a range of services can be delivered by SEs, housing & construction, child care, community transport, social care and retail.

6. Climate Change & Resource Management

6.1. This section of the consultation document covers the issues of climate change, waste management and sustainability, air quality, natural assets, design and the built environment. There are 10 questions covering the potential issues for the Local Plan around these topics.

6.2. The first question in this section set out a number of ways the Local Plan can play a part in addressing Climate Change, these are set out again below:

- Effective master planning of new large-scale development areas, to combat future climate change issues.
- Having better policies on design of new buildings/extensions/places which support the use of low carbon design approaches which can make places more energy efficient, and consider the importance of passive solar design, which is about the direction a building faces to maximise the use of the sun's energy for heating and cooling.
- Consider the use of decentralised energy networks where new facilities are being planned close to housing or employment uses, and how to design development to maximise the use of this energy and heating source.
- Work with Lancashire County Council to provide more sustainable transport options; including provision for electric charging points in all new developments and in all existing and planned car parks to ease the move away from conventional fuel vehicles.
- Requiring energy performance standards for new housing or the adaptation of buildings to provide dwellings, that are higher than the building regulations.
- Design all developments to reduce the need to travel by providing green infrastructure which connects to wider cycling and walking networks and other open spaces.

Question 51

6.3. Question 51 asked of the above *Is there anything else that the Local Plan can do to address Climate Change?* A total of 349 responses were received to this and the key issues raised are summarised below.

- Clear need to design areas to reduce reliance on car use, this includes consideration for suitable locations and placing jobs and homes in close proximity to each other. To supplement this investment is needed in improving existing public transport provision across the area, including a move to clean buses and trains and widening

the area served. It was also recognised that public transport needs to be affordable and reliable. Again linked to this issue is the need for sustainable transport to be promoted and putting walking and cycling at the top of the hierarchy, with dedicated continuous cycle lanes and improved pathway which helped to connect areas better.

- Embrace ideal of the circular economy and reduce waste and recycle better. We need better recycling options for homes and businesses and need to incentivise people to recycle more. Also need to consider impact of controls on Recycling and recovery Centre's (RRC's) and how this has led to increase in fly tipping

- Climate change issues are far reaching and to deliver change we will need to work collaboratively with other authorities in the area and with relevant organisations. Climate change will need to be embedded throughout the plan to ensure due consideration is given to this issue. Need to look at guidance prepared on this such as that of the Town and Country Planning Association and the Royal Town Planning Institute.

- There is a need to protect green areas for the role they play in carbon storage and supporting clean air.

- Need to reduce energy use – consider reducing street lighting. Promote move to renewable energy for all new developments and retrofit existing where feasible. Also look at options for ground source heating and water harvesting.

- Promote the green economy and green businesses moving into the area. Ensure all new development is carbon neutral.

- Need to build less and avoid development on any green areas and protect all tree and hedgerows, with loss of these avoided of minimised where necessary for development to take place. Where housing is promoted on agricultural sites, consider tree/wildflower planting instead to improve biodiversity.

- Lead by example and install green solutions on public buildings including solar/wind for power and water harvesting. Consider changing street lights to LED. All council vehicles should also be green/electric vehicles.

- Need for creation of more green space across the plan area, and specifically in new developments. They should be required to provide a minimum amount of green space and also look at options for improving green and blue infrastructure on site such as green walls/roofs. Tree planting should also be required on new developments and considered alongside main roads.

- Support for a clean emissions zone for Central Lancashire.

- Recognised need for all homes and buildings to be energy efficient (including existing stock) and built to at least BREEAM standards, and to support move away from gas heating in new homes.

- Avoid areas of flood risk and consider impact of hard services creating surface water flooding and design areas to address this. SUDs needed for all new developments as well as efficient drainage systems.
- Support the move to electric vehicles with charging points provided for new homes where possible and in car parks etc. Also need to consider how provision can be provided in areas where there is no driveway – incorporating charging points in street furniture for example.
- Support for creation of more allotments and community growing spaces.
- Recognition of the impact of food takeaways on plastic waste and how to reduce this.
- Plan needs to be clear on what its expectations are in regard to delivering biodiversity net gain in all new developments.
- Consider impact of agricultural practices on carbon dioxide emissions and how the plan can change this.
- Need to invest in road infrastructure to reduce congestion points and carbon dioxide emissions.
- Educate people on the issue of climate change and highlight changes needed to address this and reduce our carbon footprint. Also look at opportunities for carbon capture, and make sure climate change a key consideration in all decision making.
- Need to invest in better communication systems to enable more home working.
- United Utilties (UU) recognise need for climate change to be factored in to master planning of all large-scale developments and ensure effects climate change considered at the earliest stage. UU also suggest inclusion of specific policies for floor risk and surface water management.
- Local Plan needs to recognise the role of building control in reducing emissions from new homes as part of the Future Homes Standard and should not seek to duplicate this role. Need to ensure comply with the requirements of NPPF/National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG).
- The historic environment can play a role in tackling climate change and environmental issues. Need to carefully consider how the Plan can protect and enhance the historic environment. Historic England have specific guidance available on risk and the impact on the historic environment which the Local Plan needs to consider.

6.4. The issues raised cover a number of areas in which policies will need to be developed for the Local Plan. The importance of tackling this issue through the Local Plan is understood by the councils, as well as through wider initiatives being delivered locally.

Question 52

6.5. Question 52 asked 'How can the Local Plan help to increase tree and woodland planting?'.

6.6. There was a total of 393 responses to this question. The key themes emerging from this response are outlined below.

- Many felt that more trees should generally be planted wherever possible, some provided detail as to the best types of planting, including the need to plant the right type, age, scale and species of tree for the location, especially native varieties to support local biodiversity.
- Suggestions also came forward to support species-rich grassland/semi-improved grassland/wet grassland/blanket bog/moss land to promote biodiversity and carbon capture and storage.

6.7. In terms of the best areas for planting, suggestions included:

- In towns/cities/residential areas (to reduce pollution), including 'living walls'.
- On flood plains (to absorb/alleviate the impact of flooding).
- At the edge of existing woodlands and improve green corridors between woodlands.
- Along parish or local authority boundaries.
- Along cycle routes.
- In rural areas or around rural villages.
- On brownfield land/derelict land or scrubland.
- In greenfield or on open spaces.
- Alongside roadside verges (in particular; A585 / A59 /A6 / Penwortham Bypass / Western Distributor / new roads).
- In 'Pocket Parks' or small planting schemes in built-up areas with little space.
- On Glebe Land or land owned by parish councils.
- On council-owned public land (and designate new land for this use).

6.8. Specific areas cited where reforestation could be targeted included Rans Wood, Greenside Wood, Larches Wood and Cuerden Valley Park. Areas for afforestation included community planting land in Croston, around New Longton, Hutton East and Clayton Quarry. Local Plan sites cited included 19P006, 19C277x, 19C041c 19C005, 19C038, 19C063, 19C132 and 19C276.

6.9. There were many suggestions as to how the Local Authority (LA) could directly deliver or support tree planting, including:

- The employment of a specialist tree officer/arboriculturist or a dedicated tree department.
- Work with voluntary/environmental groups to plant and maintain woodlands.
- Maintain beehives to encourage plant pollination.
- Seek wider engagement with the Woodland Trust or Lancashire Wildlife Trust.
- Inform, enable and empower local communities/parish councils to establish and maintain community orchards/allotments and involve them in tree planting to foster local ownership, using local knowledge to steer the process and provision.
- Incorporation of tree planting into policies for health and well-being, acknowledging the link between trees and positive health outcomes.
- A commitment to reduce carbon emissions to which tree planting would contribute.
- Source and offer resource and advice, free trees or grants to encourage planting, sponsor tree planting schemes by private firms, incentivise landowners to conserve and plant hedgerows or meadows and/or allowing land to lie fallow.
- Avoiding the loss of existing trees.

6.10. Ideas for development control policies to shape the future provision of trees in the area included:

- Requiring trees to be planted in every new-build house garden or a quota across the site and like-for-like replacement of trees felled for development.
- Conditions that forbid the removal of mature trees or hedgerows in new development, landscaping schemes as a prerequisite, replacement of on-site trees that die within a year of planting, carbon neutral targets or off-site carbon sequestration.
- Encourage sustainable design through green walls/roofing/living pathways or driveways and discourage paving/AstroTurf.
- Policy commitment to a stated target number of trees or a period of planting.
- Not permitting development in areas with existing woodland/grassland/Green Belt/recreation.
- Protection/active management and expansion of existing woodlands within protective designations and fencing off areas for natural regrowth and regeneration elsewhere.
- A wider rollout of Tree Protection Orders (TPOs) and a strengthening of their enforcement.

6.11. There is clear support for managed planting to take place across Lancashire. The species chosen need to be carefully considered to ensure they marry well with the existing woodlands and enhance the biodiversity of an area.

6.12. Questions 53 to 55 looked specifically at the provision and delivery of waste and recycling containers to new developments and how these should be provided.

Question 53

6.13. No additional information presented above what is shown in the main report.

Question 54

6.14. No additional information presented above what is shown in the main report.

Question 55

6.15. Question 55 asked '*If you disagree, please explain why'.* There were 122 responses to this question and the key points raised have been summarised below.

- Many felt that developers would simply pass the charges back to the houseowner and it would be a disincentive.
- Householders already pay council tax, therefore cost should come from this. It was also felt that it was better left managed by councils as they have the control over this.
- Developers should provide more to the communities in which they build, not just those who choose to buy a house.
- Councils should work with developers and buy in bulk to ensure all new homes provided with bins when they move in.
- New homes should not be treated any differently from existing householders who have to buy their own, why should our council tax pay for their bin? People should take responsibility for their own waste.
- It is the councils' responsibility, not the developer to provide bins and not the role of the Local Plan.

6.16. There is a mixed view on how provision for bins in new developments should be provided. These responses will be shared with colleagues in waste management.

Question 56

6.17. Questions 56 to 58 look at the issue of air pollution across Central Lancashire and what the Local Plan can do to tackle this. Question 56 asked '*How can the Local Plan help improve air quality?'.* A total of 350 responses were received to these questions, and the key themes identified have been summarised below.

- The Local Plan need to support the move the Electric vehicle and should provide more charging options in town centre and new developments and put forward

solutions for charging in areas with terraced housing for example where there is no driveway.

- Less development overall to reduce emissions from road users and that generated through construction and operation of business or from homes.
- Need to create more green spaces in urban areas and protect loss of existing green areas through development. Consider tree planting rather than building on land.
- Consider traffic restrictions on local roads to reduce HGV traffic and car free days as well as introducing pedestrian only zones in town centres. Also look at redesigning existing traffic management systems to minimise congestion at peak times and lowering speed limits in built up areas. Also look at improving existing road infrastructure.
- Invest in clean/green public transport and make it a viable alternative to the car. Also look at providing more park and ride facilities.
- Avoid development in AQMAs and housing adjacent to main roads.
- Better planning/designing of areas to design out reliance on cars to encourage move towards sustainable travel. New developments must have designated percentage assigned to provision of green/community spaces and include tree planting.
- Create continuous cycle lanes and safer cycle/paths ways to encourage walking and cycling. Need a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan.
- Incentivise the use of renewable energy in all new developments and encourage a more towards green energy providers for the area and invest in delivery of this. Ban the use of wood burning in the new developments.
- Introduce clean air zones and monitor emissions better.
- Tree and wildflower planting on road sides and central reservations, and protect existing trees and hedgerows from loss due to development.
- Protect Green Belt and woodland areas for their role in flood alleviation and carbon absorption.
- Council to lead by example and use electric vehicles for council fleets and power all buildings with renewable energy.
- Monitor local taxis to ensure vehicles are better maintained and encourage licensing to promote use of electric vehicles.
- Educate people on the benefits of reducing car usage for short journeys, particularly schools. Consider car free zones around schools and no idling of cars.
- Air quality crosses boundaries, therefore work with others to address this issue.
- Make all homes and building energy efficient and provide new homes and employment areas close together to reduce travel. New development required to provide carbon offsetting in the local area.
- Development should be designed to minimise or prevent increased air pollution. A positive approach to air quality should be achieved through large scale

developments and all development must comply with the relevant regulations and best practice guidance. Air Quality Assessments should be submitted with all major applications. Where the assessment identifies issues, improvements should be delivered on site unless it can be demonstrated it can deliver improvements off site.

- New development should only take place on brownfield sites close to public transport links. City deal highways improvements should help increase capacity and improve flow of traffic.
- No energy from waste developments and less reliance on fossil fuels.

Question 57

6.18. Question 57 asked '*How should the Local Plan seek contributions from new development to improve air quality?'*. A total of 253 responses were received in respect of this question and the key issues raised are summarised below.

- Developer contributions should be identified as part of the planning process and required before permission is granted. A levy/tax was also suggested based on the size of the development/number of units built. Contributions received should be used locally to the development and contribute to mitigating the detrimental effects caused during construction and through occupation of the completed site.
- Provision of green infrastructure – walls/roofs in new developments.
- Developers should be required to provide electric vehicle charging points and renewable energy options for powering/heating homes and buildings. All homes should be built to be energy efficient and use sustainable construction methods development aiming to be carbon neutral.
- Developers should be required to provide a specified amount of green space and tree planting in all developments with soft landscaping. Developments should also incorporate designated cycle paths and associated infrastructure.
- Developers should be required to design in sustainable transport options and provide funds to deliver/support local services operating in the area. Developments should only be allowed where they are linked to improving sustainable travel.
- Provide funds for tree/shrub/wildflower planting along roadside.
- Consider a green tax for new properties payable by developers. The greener the development, the lower the tax.
- The only to improve air quality is to not allow any more development.
- Consider use of section 278 agreements on highways.
- Consider developing a Low Emissions and Air Quality Advisory Note, to be adopted as an SPD, as in the case of Lancaster.
- Biodiversity Net Gain requirements should assist with this.

- CIL/Section 106 should only be sought in line with requirements set out in NPPF. Air Quality would not meet these tests as it is not the role of the developer to solve existing issues. The level of contributions required should also not affect the viability of the development.

Question 58

6.19. Question 58 looks specifically at smoke emissions and asked '*How can the Local Plan reduce smoke emissions?*'. There were 207 responses to this question and the key issues raised are set out below.

- This is not the role of the Plan and is dealt with through existing regulations.
- Ban the sale of non-compliant stoves and their fuel (require all sellers to only sell approved fuel), and do not allow them in new homes. For rural areas where there are no alternatives for heating options, look at grants to install renewable options and consider cooperative for cheap local renewable energy.
- Consider use of clean air zone and invest in research for clean fuels. Look at specific tax for houses with wood burners. Do not build incinerators.
- Offer better recycling options and change criteria for access to RRC's to reduce burning of waste illegally – ban bonfires.
- Monitor emission levels from chimneys etc. better and install scrubbers / filters to reduce emissions.
- Incentive the move to electric vehicles and renewable energy and require clean/green public transport. We should also consider car free days and more pedestrian only zones in town/city centres. Promote and deliver sustainable travel options.
- Particulates are a huge issue and the councils need to monitor and address this better.
- All new builds to be built to PassivHaus standards/sustainable homes to ensure energy efficient. Low carbon construction and sustainable building materials should be required.
- Protect green areas, tree and hedgerows being lost through development, and provide more green spaces. Do not build any more houses.
- Develop employment and housing opportunities close together to reduce the need for travel.

Question 59

6.20. Question 59 was looking at issues regarding the wider environment and asked '*Are there any specific issues that the Local Plan needs to address regarding the*

environment?'. There were 274 responses received for this question and the key themes identified are summarised below.

- The local Plan needs to design areas to reduce reliance on cars and promote the use of sustainable travel modes. Investment in better and greener public transport needed and provision of safe, dedicated cycling and walking routes.
- Discourage litter and incentivise people to recycle more.
- Less development and instead protect the green areas, trees and hedgerows and habitats they provide for supporting local biodiversity. Were development must take place, this should only be on brownfield sites.
- New development should not adversely affect air quality and should be carbon neutral.
- Need to provide better alleviation for flood risk areas and design areas better to prevent future instances of flooding – do no build in areas of flood risk.
- Promote a move towards renewable energy and electric vehicles.
- Ensure importance local heritage is considered and protect the character of areas when considering new development.
- Consider traffic routing issues for new development and use these to provide solutions to existing problems.
- Recognise the value of waterways in the areas to improve local biodiversity. Canal and rivers trust provide specific examples of how their assets can be used to help improve this.
- Provide more green space through the Local Plan to enable healthier lifestyle.
- Need specific policy in the Plan for sports provision alongside Green Infrastructure provision and require developer contributions to deliver this.
- Protect and introduce more ponds and require biodiversity net gain.
- Consider involving youth better and establishing a youth committee.
- Require driveways and paved areas to be permeable material to reduce runoff and encourage green walls/roofs.
- United Utilities are concerned about large allocations in multiple ownerships with interconnecting infrastructure issues.
- Natural England highlight a number of issues to be considered in the Local Plan for protection, conservation and enhancement of natural assets.
- The Environment Agency raised the need to acknowledge health benefits of the environment and improvements needed to both Green Infrastructure and Blue Infrastructure. Need to establish a Nature Recovery Strategy to ensure biodiversity net gain can be delivered.

Question 60

6.21. The last question in this section looks at design and built and historic environment. Question 60 asked '*How can the Local Plan achieve high quality design?'*. A total of 255 responses were received and a summary of the key issues identified is presented below.

- The Local Plan needs to set out required design standards and condition application to deliver this. Needs to cover all elements of the development, including street furniture. Make refence to MHCLG National Design Guide 2019 and the Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission.
- Need to build requirements for nature conservation into good design and sustainable building practices.
- Need to consider how infrastructure needs can be delivered when designing areas. Need to ensure areas effectively master planned from the outset to allow them to connect better and adapt to use of renewable technologies and sustainable building materials – BREEAM.
- Consider need to achieve equivalent to Code 6 – zero carbon housing from the UK code for Sustainable Homes and PassivHaus design.
- Make sure that monitoring delivery of good design is carried out through the Local Plan.
- Use experts to help define good design.
- Support innovative design and design areas to create local character/distinctiveness.
- Only allow reputable builders to develop in the plan area and require high quality build.
- Train planners and members on good design.
- Ensure the existing character of an area is maintained and make use of local materials in keeping with the area.
- Ensure consultation with the local area so they can be involved in how developments will look.
- Provide more outdoor space and adequate internal space.
- Building regulations should do this.
- Need transparent and achievable design parameters. Policies must recognise local character and location when designing plans. Accord with best practice and be flexible to adapt to changes in national design guidance.
- Only allow small developments.
- Need specific policy for canal and waterside development.
- Site design policy needs to incorporate multiple benefits within overall design and be clear about what is expected of developers so they can cost builds accordingly.

7. Locations for Future Development

7.1. The final section of the issues and option document looked locations for future development. There were 8 questions posed, with 4 of those looking specifically at site suggestions which the three councils had received. There are also some more general locational question asked which looked at the existing approach to locating developing in the Adopted Core Strategy. The methodology to be used to assess sites is also discussed as is the approach to identifying safeguarded sites in the new Local Plan.

Question 61

7.2. The first question in this section is question 61, this asked '*Is the Core Strategy approach (set out in paragraphs 8.6 &8.7 above) providing the homes, jobs and facilities that are needed?*'. Of the 384 people that responded to this question, 64% said no it doesn't and 36% said yes. Some respondents submitted further comments in relation to this question, and they are summarised below:

- Support the Plan being flexible in areas where development will take place to help sustain existing communities and meet their needs. Sustainable locations for development which may emerge over the Plan period should also be considered favourably to ensure the right development is delivered in the right locations.

- Flexibility needs to be more specific to support applications for a variety of uses where they depart from those defined in the Plan but can be justified in that location. This will allow the Plan to be responsive to changing needs.

- The Core Strategy does not provide the best locations. The Local Plan provides an opportunity to readdress this and identify the most appropriate locations for growth and development.

- Existing Core Strategy approach is broadly acceptable however, housing requirements (policy on distribution) cannot be determined until true aggregated housing need (policy off) has been determined. Consider a good supply of unconstrained land exists and will provide a number of potential sites. There are major and smaller greenfield opportunities (countryside, safeguarded land and Green Belt) also available in each on the 3 districts.

- It is important to recognise the contribution that sites in smaller settlements or in rural locations can make to housing supply, in particular benefits from edge of settlement boundary sites. The Local Plan needs to recognise the role of such sites. The NPPF emphasises need to boost housing supply and support economic growth and productivity. The Plan should not place undue restrictions on locations for new development which could stifle development and investment in the area. Protection

of the environment needs to be balanced with the social and economic needs of the area.

- The NPPF emphasises the need for planning policies to create conditions in which businesses can grow. Employment land needs to be secured in suitable and highly accessible locations. Land will be needed outside settlement boundaries if insufficient land is unavailable within to support economic growth and productivity. The Plan should not place undue restrictions on locations for new development which could stifle development and investment in the area.
- The Core Strategy is not reflective of growth aspirations of Central Lancashire. The Local Plan provides an opportunity to look at economic needs and land supply requirements over the long term, including opportunities in the Green Belt. There are clear deficiencies in the supply of quality employment land and the Plan needs to meet the shortfall in supply left over by the Core Strategy.
- The North West Preston Strategic Location for New Development has the potential for significant additional growth, to be delivered through the Local Plan, particularly around Broughton, Bartle, Catforth and Woodplumpton making best use of the new M55 junction Broughton Bypass and PWDR and related roads which will link with them.
- The Local Plan needs to consider City Deal requirements which means that housing needs figures will be higher than Standard Method.

Question 62

7.3.   Question 62 asked '*Where would you like to see the Local Plan focus new homes and jobs in the future?* There were 506 responses received to this question with the key points raised summarised below:

- Development should be focused on brownfield land, with green fields and Green Belt land protected from development to support well-being. Avoid development on sports pitches.
- Rural/small villages should be avoided to protect their character and reflect the lack of sufficient infrastructure to support growth.
- Development should only be allowed in areas where the infrastructure is, or can be made, sufficient to meet future needs.
- We should look to regenerating existing buildings first and make use of redundant commercial buildings. Also need to consider changes required to city and town centres to make them viable and make use of the existing infrastructure in those areas first. Need to repurpose our town and city centres.

- Development should be within or close to, the main towns and large urban areas where infrastructure is in place and reduces the need to travel. Locations need to be close to transport links and employment.

- Need more large scale sites like Buckshaw – consider redevelopment of the Camelot site.

- There needs to be a fair distribution across the area. Need to make sure employment is also delivered alongside housing to prevent areas becoming commuter towns.

- Development around existing Enterprise Zones and strategic sites such as Cuerden supported for employment.

- Avoid areas where recent high level of development has taken place and put a strain on local infrastructure.

- Need to maintain separation between towns.

- No more development is needed, the area is already overcrowded.

- Need to focus on developing sites with planning permission and those identified in the existing Plan first. Stop land banking.

- Development should be specific to the needs of the area to support continued viability of the town and provide affordable accommodation.

- Need to avoid areas of flood risk.

- Small sites over large sites in existing villages in keeping with the area. Look at developing carbon neutral homes. Consider infill sites in small towns/villages.

- Look at areas that did not perform in current Plan and identify issues which meant they did not deliver on employment.

- Use guidance set out in the NPPF – new homes and jobs should be focused on the edge of village settlements.

- Need high value jobs. Look at expanding existing commercial and employment sites to deliver this need.

- Prioritise areas delivering the City Deal.

- Need to be in areas where infrastructure needs can be met – need to liaise with key bodies in order to assess this.

- Brownfield land is insufficient to meet needs, therefore will need to consider a range of land options including the Green Belt.

- Government objective to bolster housing supply and support economic growth should be at the forefront of the spatial strategy.

- Need to ensure consideration is given to protecting and enhancing the historic and natural environment.

- Need robust transport evidence and modelling for the whole Plan area and allocations should focus on delivering sustainable travel. Any highway improvements should be identified in the Local Plan.

Question 63

7.4. Question 63 of the consultation asked 'Do you have any comments to make about the SHELAA methodology set out in the Report in Annex 7?'. There were 197 responses to this question.

7.5. Many of the responses commented specifically about the methodology itself, whilst others focused more on the process of how the methodology has been applied so far (i.e. the exclusion of various sites in Chorley from Annex 5 which are shown in Annex 1). The main points raised are summarised below:

- The recommended minimum site threshold for sites to be included in the SHELAA should be 5 dwellings or more, as recommended in Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).
- There should be a specific requirement to deliver at least 10% of the requirement on small and medium sized sites. Also widen it to sites over 1 hectare as these too can provide a boost to supply.
- The SHELAA methodology is flawed as it does not follow national policy and guidance, and there is an absence of any justification for this.
- The assessments should be 'Policy off'. Decisions on the spatial distribution of future housing needs and on the exclusion of potential sites have been made prematurely in advance of the full evidence base. The SHELAA assessment should not determine whether a site should be allocated for development – it should just provide information on the range of sites which are available. No sites should have been parked/excluded at this stage, other than those with national policy/designations/constraints - e.g. those referenced in Footnote 6 of the NPPF. The methodology should be amended to reflect this.
- 'Other open countryside' (known as 'open countryside' in Preston, and 'protected open land' in South Ribble) is not a national policy or designation, so this should not have been applied to the Chorley site sieving. Sites located on the fringe of the urban area and not affected by national policy/designations should also not have been excluded, or Safeguarded land. Development should also not have been excluded in rural areas. There is a need to increase the level of rural development, to allow for economic growth of rural services and facilities, enable villages to grow and thrive, and increase choice/local housing supply.
- The current approach is contrary to NPPG policy for protecting Green Belts. A Green Belt review should not take place until all other reasonable options for meeting identified development needs have first been considered (i.e. all 'policy off' sites)

and Green Belt boundaries should only be changed where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified/demonstrated.

- The SHELAA is internally inconsistent. For example, parts of the methodology fully recognise and require the assessment of greenfield sites adjoining the main urban areas. The SHELAA should also contain an additional caveat explaining that further consideration of such sites may be subject to additional assessment through separate studies (e.g. Green Belt Review) to determine the suitability of development potential of land available.

- No criteria has been provided to explain how sites considered will be assessed in a consistent manner. Clarity is needed for how Annex 5 was reduced to Annex 1. This was premature, given it was prior to the current consultation exercise. Matters are being pre-judged and the sites being suggested by Chorley Council reflect existing commitments and allocations. Regard should also be given to all relevant evidence submitted by relevant stakeholders, including engaging with stakeholders through a Development Forum, to overcome constraints. The approach is not appropriate or in accordance with national guidance. The over reliance on small residential sites and the exclusion of sites which have current policy restrictions is not a suitable site assessment process.

- The assessment is too mechanistic and not strategic enough - a more considered Plan-led approach is needed. It relies too heavily on sites submitted rather than an overall strategy for development and particular areas, and/or the needs of communities. The housing need should be established first, before sites are assessed. Should identify where and what type of housing is needed first, and then seek sites in those areas. Need to consider the impact on existing settlements and look at cumulative impacts.

- The councils must appreciate the role larger sites play in meeting housing needs as they are generally more viable and deliverable. Build a new large settlement rather than expand existing ones, as they don't have sufficient infrastructure. Over-development would destroy their character and identity and open countryside/areas of separation need to be retained.

- Support the methodology - including the use of safeguarded land, urban areas/brownfield sites and key regeneration areas. Discard Green Belt sites and greenfield sites and areas of separation.

- Too complex/confusing/jargon – not plain English.

- Sustainability of the site and immediate area should be a key component of the sieving process, with a matrix which scores the site.

- Don't agree with a shared methodology for all of Central Lancashire (Preston is very different to Chorley for example). Chorley are catering for too much development.

- Need more emphasis on employment, recreation and other uses. Also need to consider flood risk, geological and ecological/biological impacts, health and well-being etc., and the current layout of area, e.g. existing main road infrastructure. Infrastructure & services need to go in place before new development/housing.
- All sites should be consistent with Sport England's Playing Fields Policy.
- The assessment needs to be an independent and transparent assessment. How this will be done, and the next stages/consultation need to be made clearer in the methodology. Communities should have more say on which sites come forward.

Questions 64, 65 and 67

7.6. Questions 64, 65 and 67 sought comments in relation to all the locations for development in Central Lancashire across the four Annexes dedicated to the presentation of site proposals. All sites were mapped in Annexes 3, 4 and 5 to the Issues and Options consultation document; Annex 5 related to sites for Chorley, Annex 4 for South Ribble, and Annex 3 for Preston, with Annex 1 providing a refined list of site suggestions for consideration by Chorley Council (but only from those presented in Annex 5).

7.7. The responses can be broken down as follows:

Question	Annex	Area	No. Responses*		% Share of Overall Responses	
Q64	1	Chorley	1302		53%	
Q65	5	Chorley	308		12%	
Q67	3	South Ribble	859	767	35%	31%
	4	Preston		92		4%

*When omitting invalid responses such as 'N/A', '.', 'no comment', 'don't know' etc.

Further detail regarding responses regarding sites can be found in Appendix 3.

7.8. The responses to all the site suggestions, regardless of specific site or local area to which they specifically related, were in general against development and focused mainly on the housing proposals. However, there were contrasting comments from developers in support of development and through provision in some cases, of detailed documents in support of specific site suggestions.

7.9. The key issues and concerns raised against the development of specific sites included:

- Increased demand for amenities, private and public services in areas that are already stretched, at capacity or have historic undersupply of service (i.e. doctors, schools, hospitals, banking, retail).

- Loss of greenfield land and/or erosion of the Green Belt will lead to a permanent loss of amenity, habitat, rurality and reduce the areas ability to mitigate climate change.

- Problematic access, which compounds issues around narrow roads already suffering from congestion, highway and pedestrian safety, or sites are landlocked and dependent on another proposal coming forward to access the site.

- Many areas already at risk of flash or seasonal flooding, development will worsen this and create a knock-on effect in nearby areas due to surface water run-off.

- Proposals may only offer larger, luxury units for wealthier families. Local needs should be met, particularly for affordable/social/specialist or sheltered housing.

- Place insensitive, not at an appropriate scale, location or style for the area and set to unduly increase its population.

- Rural character and civic identity of villages and towns may be harmed, including erosion/removal of areas of separation between settlements.

- Loss of environmental assets and impact on local habitats, biodiversity hotspots or endangered species or seasonal/migratory species.

- Some areas have had historic overdevelopment locally, and a moratorium on further builds should be considered.

- Loss of agricultural land, leading to the loss of healthy, local produce, rural jobs and impact on rural economy and farmland habitats for wildlife.

- Disruption or destruction of pedestrian/non-vehicular movement or routes, including rural quiet ways, dog walking paths, bridleways, Public Rights of Way, unmapped 'desire paths', cycling routes and green links.

- Sites are unsustainably outside/at a distance from any settlement, services or public transport links, forcing car dependency and immobility for poorer families.

- Disruption to a water course/collection area/underground spring.

- Increased road journeys, roadside parking and traffic - worsening health and safety issues for residents due to reduced visibility, increased speeds, more congestion, poor air quality (emissions/exhaust pollution), car accidents and collisions with pedestrians or cycles.

- Increased light, air, noise or contaminant pollution, negatively impacting residents and nature.

- Pressure on already overstretched or at capacity road, rail or blue infrastructure, including issues around road condition, width restrictions, visibility splays, busy junctions, poor signage, 'rat-runs', congestion, impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN), canal towpath quality and bottlenecks, such as narrow bridges or level crossings.

- Brownfield alternatives should be considered e.g. Camelot, Botany Bay, in-line with brownfield targets.

- Residential amenity - Impact on resident well-being with the loss of greenspace or community amenity and views, and/or concerns about loss of light or privacy.
- Pressure on already overstretched utilities, including gas, water, broadband, electricity, drainage, sewers/foul drainage and fire hydrants.
- Fragmentation of wildlife corridors and connected greenspaces, reducing the mobility of deer, squirrels, badgers, foxes and hedgehogs.
- Harm or removal of a vital community asset (band stands, greens, sports facilities, allotments, recreational spaces).
- Phasing should be included to mitigate development impact, accounting for recent built-out schemes and with future development being in increments or timed stages.
- Opportunities for afforestation/reforestation as an alternative use for some sites.
- Increased carbon footprint of the local area and failure to achieve carbon neutrality targets set by the local planning authorities.
- Infill or settlement boundary sites will unlock adjacent land and lead to ribbon development, further eroding greenspace.
- Alternatives to new housing should be explored, including accounting for the number of live sales and lettings in the area, opportunities for regeneration of empty units or the conversion of vacant commercial or office units to housing.
- Constraints affecting suitability including topography, irregular shape, sink holes, proximity to motorway, unneighborly uses or abnormal costs.
- Harm or destruction of a locally/nationally listed building or heritage asset.
- Land with ground contamination (i.e. waste dumping, refuse, asbestos, methane).
- Land with hazardous installations (i.e. gas pipes, pylons).
- Land with significant natural features that should be saved and planned around.
- Significant mid-development disruption to residents and nature (heavy goods vehicles, noise, road restrictions, diverted PROWs, materials overspill, site litter/mess).
- Impact on the marketability of nearby resident's property.
- Contravention of a historic planning condition or land covenants for the site, or a previous refusal of planning permission / planning appeal for a similar scheme.
- Planning Officers should undertake site visits, to understand the facts-on-the-ground.
- Demolition of existing housing stock that is in residential use.
- Harm to an on-site or nearby ancient woodland or protected trees (TPOs).
- Loss of Safeguarded Land which residents perceived to be 'safeguarded from development' (the policy is in fact that this land is safeguarded *for* development in the next Local Plan, but to remain undeveloped at the time of the last Local Plan).

7.10. Many comments were however, in favour of development where it could be shown that needs were fulfilled, impact could be mitigated, or the benefits were clear.

7.11. The key issues and ideas raised in favour of development of specific sites included:

- Infrastructure improvements, including transport, greater diversity of shops, services and restaurants in the area. This can boost rural areas for example and help make smaller settlements/villages more sustainable.
- Meeting local housing needs and offering choice for affordable units, mixed tenures, sheltered units for the homeless and specialist housing.
- Major development allows a cohesive masterplan to be presented and managed comprehensively, with associated infrastructure.
- Co-located housing and employment opportunities will avoid dormitory towns and future residents commuting away from the area, avoiding rush hour congestion, a weak local economy and reduced community engagement.
- Low quality grazing or agricultural land may be better suited for alternative uses.
- New sports and leisure facilities.
- Sites on Safeguarded Land provide opportunities for future growth and are preferred over greenfield or Green Belt locations.
- Accessible - within walking distance of local amenities, transport modes, infrastructure and services, especially in and around the urban core.
- Increased council tax revenue for the local authorities and a subsequent improvement in services in the long-term for residents.
- Availability of housing stock will be improved where demand outstrips supply or under delivery of housing requirements represents a significant local need.
- Deliverability on the basis of a single, supportive owning party.
- New or improved routes for pedestrian/non-vehicular accessibility, including green links, bridleways, Public Rights of Way and green corridors for nature.

Question 66

7.12. Question 66 asked 'Do you agree that Chorley should not have a policy for safeguarded land in the new Local Plan?'

7.13. Of the 382 respondents expressed an opinion for this question, the majority of these (75%) answered 'no' (i.e. that there should be a safeguarded land policy in the new Local Plan, whilst a minority (25% answered 'yes' (i.e. that there should not be a safeguarded land policy in the new Local Plan. Additional comments made in relation to the response were also received and are summarised below.

- Safeguarded policies are there for a reason to ensure a future pipeline of available land can be identified in future plans, but should also be considered for early release if needed, to meet localised need.
- Safeguarded land allows the Councils to be responsive to future development pressures in meeting land supply targets.
- Sites already identified as safeguarded should be released for development from the Green Belt and it will be necessary to identify additional safeguarded Land to provide assurance of longer term ability to meet needs beyond the end of the plan period.
- The Council should have a policy for Safeguarding Land to protect areas of conservation value and Green Belt from development.

Question 68

7.14. Question 68 asked 'Do you have any further comments that you wish to make?'

7.15. There were 314 responses to this question covering a number of policy ideas, key issues and Local Plan associated themes emerged which have been summarised below.

7.16. Given the breadth of the final question and the final opportunity to comment on the survey, responses varied significantly in length, scope and topic, and ranged across all issue themes covered in Questions 1 to 67. As such, many were repeat suggestions and are not duplicated here. Responses that presented unique concerns, issues and opinions not covered earlier in the report are summarised below.

7.17. Issues specific to this Issues and Options consultation included:

- The consultation process was not advertised widely enough/did not provide enough notice to residents/was too short a period/was poorly distributed among more rural areas and/or did not appear receptive to residents' concerns, while the online form (Citizen Space) was not clearly advertised and signposted/poorly compiled/difficult to complete/inaccessible to non-digitally able residents and/or contained confusing double negative questions (e.g. Question 66).
- The consultation documents were of good quality in presentation and content, while the face-to-face sessions were well distributed around Central Lancashire and attended by informed staff.
- The consultation form (Citizen Space) was well designed, intuitive, and allowed for wide-ranging engagement on a breadth of topics.

7.18. Issues around future consultation and the Local Plan process more widely included:

- Lack of faith in the aims of the plan and the ability of the partnership Local Authorities to deliver on their objectives or that more detail is needed on the site proposals (extent, density, use etc.) and policies (focus, indicators etc.).

- Proposals within the Green Belt in South Ribble and Preston should have been screened out and not been consulted upon, as was the case with Chorley's Annex 1.

- Land supply restrictions that may necessitate the need to undertake a Green Belt review during later stages should be done with full transparency, in compliance with central policy and consulted on widely.

- Make clear in the Integrated Appraisal (IA) why some policy options have been progressed and others have been rejected. Undertaking a comparative and equal assessment of each reasonable alternative. The Council's decision making, and scoring should be robust, justified and transparent.

- Take account of wider regional spatial strategy, e.g. Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF).

- Give greater weight to residents and communities against the well-funded developers/consultants and their legal teams.

- Greater face-to-face engagement within local communities throughout the planning processes.

- Consultations should be meaningful, responsive and simplified, with reduced planning jargon.

- Citizens Assemblies should be established to review planning strategy.

- Recognise the needs of the growing Black Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) community in Preston, especially in creating space for Places of Worship.

- The consultation process should actively seek and demonstrate how contributions and concerns from stakeholders will be addressed.

7.19. Issues around locating development included:

- Recognise that increased housing delivery without the services to support it leads to increased crime rates in the affected areas.

- The proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on distribution of housing numbers would lead to overdevelopment/inappropriate development in many areas.

- Plan for ambitious growth, to both exceed minimum housing targets and strive for economic parity with Merseyside and Greater Manchester.

- Ensure full compliance with the Duty to Cooperate.

7.20. Residents and stakeholders' issues related to the economy and growth included:

- Adapt centres toward vibrant, integrated centres for retail, services, culture, leisure, housing and transport hubs.

- Identify/allocate land for future education development to unlock expansion of these settings.

- Support, build and retain and promote the local skills and education assets in the area to drive a globally connected economy.

- Acknowledge the presence and value of colleges and the roles they play within the area.

- Work with Lancashire County Council to ensure sufficient and suitable education and training provision for all young people who are over compulsory school and under 19 or aged 19 to 25.

- Include a specific policy against which proposals by Colleges/providers of Further Education will be assessed.

- Expand Policy 14 to include further education/higher education providers, or have separate policies for different levels of education development. A criteria-based policy would be helpful for further education, setting out a clear presumption in favour of development where certain tests are met.

- Any policy on student accommodation should be carefully worded and differentiate between accommodation for students under 18 and over 18 in order to ensure that other forms of student accommodation and boarding are not prevented from coming forward in parts of Central Lancashire.

7.21. Ideas around improving and controlling the scale and scope of infrastructure and transport included:

- A tram system should be established in Preston, with stations at Broughton, Fulwood, Deepdale, Fishergate and The Docklands.

- Road improvement schemes to the M55 Junction 1 and M6 Junction 31a, extending the M65 directly to Flensburg Way/Penwortham Bypass (leaving A582 Lostock Lane free for local traffic only), add capacity to the SRN and its junctions and ensure an improved level of commercial freight provision for lorry parking and associated facilities, whilst seeking to mitigate traffic noise and air quality issues.

- The structural integrity of BI (rivers and canals) are affected by nearby development and should be mitigated. Blue areas have many issues including: drugs/alcohol use, fly tipping enforcement, poor Tree management, bridge graffiti, poor access points, motorbike trespass, dog fouling, waymarking and poorly maintained boundaries.

7.22. Issues that focused on land, climate, trees and quality of life for residents included:

- Recognise trees classed as 'ancient' or 'veteran' are irreplaceable and important for wildlife, soils, recreation, cultural value, history and contribution to landscapes.

- Deep-rooted shrubs/trees should not be planted in the vicinity of public sewers and water mains.

- Give farmland over to renewable energy generation.
- Co-location of health services within new developments.

7.23. Issues around the siting and controlling the scale and scope of development and site proposals included:

- Where land supply is insufficient, undertake a Green Belt review to provide enough future homes and meet demand in semi-rural areas, and note where exceptional circumstances exist to do so.
- Identify new areas of safeguarded land between the urban area and the Green Belt to meet future development needs into the next plan period.
- The allocation of a Garden Village would enable the Central Lancashire Authorities (CLA's) to create a bespoke settlement that provides a range of community facilities suitable to fully meet the needs of proposed residents.
- Recent changes in the local economy and the way in which people are working supports a more dispersed approach to locating future growth; removing pressure from the central spine which was generally the focus of development as part of the Core Strategy. Reduce strain on this area.

7.24. General comments on the mitigation of the impact of development around specific constraints included:

- Site easements and rights of access may have restrictive covenants that must be adhered to for the purposes of maintenance and inspection of United Utilities assets.
- Development easements around National Grid assets should be 15 metres either side of any electricity assets; and 12 metres either side of gas assets.
- A buffer zone/area between the ancient woodland and development boundaries should apply, containing semi-natural habitat between the development and the ancient woodland or tree, a minimum of 15 metres.