

**Planning Policy  
Committee reports**

to the  
**Planning &  
Development  
Committee**  
in

**2011**

relevant to the

**Local Development  
Framework**

**RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL  
REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: THURSDAY, 3rd FEBRUARY 2011  
title: MINERALS AND WASTE DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – CONSULTATION  
ON SUBMISSION VERSION OF THE SITE ALLOCATIONS AND  
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES DPD  
submitted by STEWART BAILEY - DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES  
principal author PHIL DAGNALL

**1 PURPOSE**

1.1 To inform the Council of a consultation by Lancashire County Council and associated authorities concerning potential future minerals consultation policy and sites for future waste facilities within the Borough.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- Council Ambitions – The location of future waste treatment facilities will have relevance to the following Council ambitions: to make people's lives safer and healthier and protecting and enhancing the existing environmental quality of the area by guiding the development of necessary waste facilities into sites which will minimise their impact on the local environment.
- Community Objectives – Maintain, protect and enhance the natural and built features that contribute to the quality of the environment. Promote waste minimisation and reduction through recycling and reducing waste generation.
- Corporate Priorities – To provide a high quality environment, to conserve our countryside, the natural beauty of the area and enhance our built environment.
- Other Considerations – Lancashire County, Blackpool and Blackburn with Darwen Councils have a statutory duty to prepare a Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework. Ribble Valley Borough Council has the opportunity through this process to make its views known on important planning policy documents.

**2 BACKGROUND AND PREVIOUS CONSULTATIONS IN 2010 ON THIS ISSUE**

2.1 Lancashire County, Blackpool and Blackburn with Darwen Councils (the Joint Authorities) are jointly developing a series of strategic waste and minerals plans for their joint areas which will be major influences on the future location of such facilities in the Borough to 2021. A Core Strategy, setting overall policies, has already been adopted and now the Joint Authorities are moving to produce a site allocations plan and a series of development management policies that will finalise actual locations for future waste and mineral use and which will become a part of the Borough's development plan.

2.2 In February and June 2010 the Joint Authorities consulted on a variety of site allocation and development management policy issues within a Preferred Options version of the Development Plan Document (DPD), which were reported to Members in February and July 2010. Formal responses to these Preferred Options consultations were sent to the

Joint Authorities in February and June 2010. These responses are included in Appendix 1 to this report. The Joint Authorities have now, having considered the results of these consultations, produced the next stage of this DPD, the "Submission Version" to be commented on through this consultation. After this consultation the Joint Authorities intend to take the finalised version to an examination by the Planning Inspectorate later this year and ultimately to adoption.

- 2.3 In the earlier Preferred Options consultation responses of February and June of 2010 we raised questions relating to proposed Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) and the potential allocation of a commercial and industrial waste facility at either Pendle Trading Estate or Salthill Industrial Estate. These, and the Joint Authorities' responses, are discussed in Section 3 below.
- 2.4 These earlier consultations also proposed Peat Safeguarding Areas, (mostly lying within upland parts of the Mineral Safeguarding Areas mentioned above) within some parts of the Borough. This designation places restrictions on development (as does the MSA designation mentioned above) but in this case the underlying rationale is to prevent the degradation of the peat, which would then release locked carbon into the atmosphere. The Council did not raise any objection to the Peat Safeguarding Area designation.
- 2.5 The 2010 consultations also proposed that the rail sidings at Ribblesdale Cement Works be safeguarded from inappropriate development to preserve them as a possible mineral or waste rail depot. Such depots are designated to reduce waste and mineral road transportation. While there was no detailed discussion of the possible implications of such facilities within the 2010 consultation documentation Joint Authorities' staff, when questioned, regarded this designation as relating to preservation of the site for current cement related traffic and not to draw further road based traffic from a wider catchment, which we then reported to Committee in our report of 4 February 2010. As such the Council did not raise any objection to this proposal.
- 2.6 The 2010 consultations also did not propose any new mineral sites allocations, such as quarries, within the Borough.

### 3 PROPOSED SUBMISSION VERSION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR RIBBLE VALLEY - MINERALS RELATED ISSUES

- 3.1 The Submission Version of the document comes in several parts, all of which are listed at the end of this report within background papers. All are available in the Members' Room. The main documents are: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Part 1 (which deals with policy issues and referred to below as Part 1); Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Part 2 Site Plans (which deals with site allocations and contains detailed site plans and is referred to below as Part 2) and a series of Proposals Maps on a much smaller scale. Proposals Maps 1 and 2 show the whole of Lancashire in relation to site allocations and Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs), and District Map 3 specifically shows Ribble Valley.

#### Minerals Sites

- 3.2 The Submission Version of the document reiterates the earlier consultation position (see 2.6) ie that there are no new site allocations for mineral sites, such as quarries, in the Borough for the life of the plan.

### **Ribblesdale Cement Works Rail Sidings**

- 3.3 The Submission Version includes the earlier consultation proposal (see 2.5 above) to allocate the Ribblesdale Cement Works Sidings (see Part 2 Page 72 and Page 75 map MRT4) as a site for minerals or waste transport. This also relates to proposed policy SA1 – Safeguarding Rail Sidings and its associated justification (see Part 1 Page 28-9).

### **Minerals and Peat Safeguarding Areas (MSAs)**

- 3.4 Part 1 policy MR2 (Part 1 Page 32–33) deals with the designation of Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs), on which we commented in the 2010 Preferred Options consultations (see 2.3 above). MSAs include both areas relating to peat and to deposits of minerals (specifically limestone, sand and gravel, sandstone, shallow coal, brickshales and salt). The areas of these MSAs in this Submission version appear to be identical to those in the earlier Preferred Options consultations of February 2010 and cover extensive parts of the borough and could relate to many possible future development sites. Around all MSAs a Mineral Consultation Area (MCA) will be drawn. Within these MCAs it will be obligatory for RVBC, as the local planning authority, to consult with the Joint Authorities on any planning application received. Should the MSAs and MCAs be adopted they will have to be indicated on RVBC's LDF Proposals Map.
- 3.5 In our February 2010 consultation response we raised a series of points about the extensive nature of the MSAs/MCAs and the many potential sites that they could cover within the borough. We were also concerned about the uncertainty within associated policy text referring to a presumption against development within MSAs and what that implied for possible developers and the allocation of land. We were also concerned at the possible delays such MSA - related consultation might impose on the processing of planning applications.
- 3.6 The Joint Authorities summarise the main points raised by all respondents to this issue in these 2010 consultations and give their own brief responses to them within the Consultation Statement document, another part of this consultation's documentation (see Consultation Statement page 5 – 6). Their responses to Ribble Valley's specific points are within another associated document – the Preferred Options Outcomes Report (see Page 11.)
- 3.7 The Joint Authorities' response to both the general points, and Ribble Valley's questions, seemed to reiterate that there will be a presumption against development within MSAs, though built up areas within MSAs will be excluded from this provision. It should be emphasised, as mentioned below (see 3.10), that RVBC would treat any comments made by the Joint Authorities using such a presumption, as a material consideration in coming to a final decision on any relevant planning application together with any other relevant considerations. The Joint Authorities go on to respond in the Preferred Options Outcomes Report (page 11, ref MSA12) to our question about this matter that:
- “in responding to consultations on planning applications that fall within an MSA/MCA that the Mineral Planning Authority will consider proposed development by balancing the competing land uses and finding a pragmatic solution where possible”
- 3.8 Their response to our other MSA related concern, that potential increased Minerals consultation brought about through the MSA designations would cause delay in

processing applications, can be found in their response in the Preferred Options report (Page 11, ref MSA14) in which they state that,

"The Minerals Planning Authority will respond to all consultations within the prescribed time frames unless a prior time extension is agreed".

- 3.9 Given the above exchanges and previous consultations the Submission Version position on MSAs now presented to us is contained within policy MR2 – Safeguarding Minerals in the Part 1 document. In summary it seems to re-state the essence of the previous position, that within MSAs,

"planning permission will not be supported for any form of development that is incompatible by reason of scale, proximity and permanence with working the minerals."

This position can only be overcome if an applicant can satisfy one or other of a series of criteria, which the Joint Authorities would use to inform their response to a planning application. It also goes on to state that there is no set definition of what might comprise "incompatible development." The Joint Authorities assert that this position complies with National Minerals Planning policy.

- 3.10 However, again, it should be borne in mind that any recommendations by the Joint Authorities using such a policy in relation to a planning application submitted to them by RVBC for comment are to be treated as material considerations that RVBC planning officers may need to take into account, alongside any other material considerations, in coming to a final decision.

- 3.11 The above would indicate that RVBC may be consulting the Joint Authorities more frequently over mineral resource issues relating to planning applications than it has done in the past and that the Joint Authorities do not feel that this will cause any delay in processing applications. It is not easy, given the mapping scale of the information within this consultation, to see whether these proposed MSAs could affect any potential housing or other land allocations in our emerging LDF and therefore clearer mapping would be useful. We will need to be aware of this issue in the future development of our Core Strategy and other LDF documents.

#### 4. POTENTIAL WASTE RELATED ISSUES – SALTHILL BUILT WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITY

- 4.1 The only waste related issue for the borough within the Submission Version is the proposed allocation of land at the Salthill Industrial Estate for what is termed a Local Built Waste Management Facility. Initial consultations did also propose an alternative site at the Pendle Trading Estate but this site has now been judged to be less appropriate. The Salthill site is described, together with a map, in the Submission Version Part 2 Site Plans document of this consultation (see pages 52 – 53).

- 4.2 Consultations in 2010 on earlier Preferred Options versions of the document asserted that a range of new facilities would be needed over the period of the plan to deal with the industrial and commercial waste stream within the Blackburn with Darwen and Ribble Valley sub-area. The land take for such facilities for the whole sub area (ie Blackburn and Ribble Valley combined) has been reduced from earlier estimates of 3.5 ha to 2.5 ha in this Submission Version.

- 4.3 However the relevant policy (Policy WM3 – Local Built Waste Management Facilities) now in the Submission version relating to sites such as the Salthill site no longer makes specific mention of the site dealing exclusively with commercial and industrial waste, to which it had been linked in earlier consultations. In fact it does not specifically mention which types of waste will be dealt with on such sites. Clarification on this matter was sought from the Joint Authorities and their response is quoted in full below (see 4.4).
- 4.4 "Policy WM3 covers all Directive wastes (that is all wastes covered by the Waste Framework Directive, consequently it excludes radioactive wastes). Policy WM1 describes these wastes as Municipal, Commercial and Industrial, and Construction, Demolition and Excavation Wastes. This does not exclude hazardous wastes. It may be that at the planning application stage the specific type of waste would be made explicit in conditions, and definitely at the pollution control permit application stage, when the appropriateness of any particular proposal will be considered. As defined by the documents glossary, commercial waste comes from premises used for trade, sport, recreation or entertainment; industrial waste is generated by factories and industrial plant. Restrictions on the size of facility appropriate for Salthill (50,000 tonnes/year), and its location within the Plan area, mean that it is likely to only be handling wastes generated by businesses and industry from Clitheroe and its surrounding towns and villages, and consequently is unlikely to be handling hazardous wastes, however this could not be ruled out."

This emergence of the potential use of the site to deal with hazardous wastes, not mentioned in earlier consultations, is a matter of concern.

- 4.5 The plan proposes to allocate two sites within the sub-region to house facilities to deal with the wastes mentioned above; one within Blackburn with Darwen at Roman Road Estate and the other at Salthill. Each site is intended to deal with a capacity of not more than 50,000 tonnes of waste per year.
- 4.6 In earlier consultations (see our responses in Appendix 1) we raised concerns over which technologies might be applied to waste treatment on such sites, as Preferred Options versions of the document were unclear on this point. In particular we were concerned that there was the possibility of controversial thermal treatment processes being used.
- 4.7 The Joint Authorities' responses to all our questions on this allocation are within the Preferred Options Outcomes Report. (Pages 157 – 161), together with responses from other bodies and individuals contacted by the Joint Authorities. The responses BWF 208, 209 and 210 (page 159) relate to the thermal treatment issue. The Joint Authorities indicate that such uses would be directed towards the larger strategic waste management facilities, none of which are proposed for Ribbles Valley, rather than the Salthill facility, which they consider to be "smaller scale" and dealing with locally produced waste. They also confirm in comment reference BWF 210 that the site will not be used for the management of municipal waste.
- 4.8 In our responses to earlier consultations we also raised the issue of the proximity of the Salthill site to residential areas. In the Preferred Options Outcomes Report (see Page 160 comment reference BWF211) the Joint Authorities reply that this issue would be considered within the Sustainability Report and also at any planning application stage, should an application come forward. As mentioned below (see 4.10.3 below) the Sustainability Report does mention the proximity issue but does not recommend any action on this matter.

4.9 In the Development Management Part 1 document of the Submission Version policy WM3- Local Built Waste Facilities (page 19) gives further clarity on the type of facility and the technologies deemed appropriate for such sites as Salthill. The policy states that the site will be used for "the recycling, transfer, and materials recovery (excluding thermal treatment)" of waste. It also goes on to define the particular technologies that could be used on such sites in the document's Appendix C (page viii). These are:

- Waste Transfer Station
- Material Recovery Facility
- In Vessel Composting Plant
- Anaerobic Digestion

4.10 These technologies and their associated health and sustainability issues are described in more detail in other documents associated with this consultation. All are available in the Member's Room and at Planning Reception. Briefly they are:

4.10.1 **Indicative Waste Site Profiles;** this briefly outlines the characteristics for the 4 types of site mentioned as appropriate to the Salthill site in 4.9 above. These include: the expected lifetime of such facilities; the typical site areas, building footprints and building heights associated with them and the number of vehicle movements they may generate.

4.10.2 **Health and Equality Impact Assessment:** this describes the current knowledge relating to the use of technologies that may be used at the Salthill site, such as In Vessel Composting (see Appendix B of the document) and also examines the implications of the Salthill Site in a Site Specific Health File (see Pages A62 – A64) and the also within a Health and Equalities Profile (see Pages 95 –97).

4.10.3 **Sustainability Appraisal report:** this points out the environmental issues associated with the Submission document and its policies and site allocations, including Salthill; suggests any alternatives and, if it deems it necessary, makes recommendations needed to improve sustainability. Salthill is discussed on pages 22 – 23. This document had no recommendations to suggest regarding the Salthill site.

4.11 The above matters were discussed with the Council's Director of Community Services and the Waste Management Officer and it was felt that there were no issues to raise in objection to the Salthill allocation in relation to the types and scale of the technologies that could be used on the site; and that there was a welcome exclusion of thermal processing on the site. However, as mentioned above in 4.3 and 4.4, the newly expressed possibility of the site being used to deal with hazardous waste is a matter for concern and that this concern should be expressed to the Joint Authorities.

## 5 RISK ASSESSMENT

5.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- Resources – No immediate implications.

- Technical, Environmental and Legal – The Minerals and Waste Development Framework is a statutory requirement of the planning process. The consultation exercise will enable the council to inform the final policy document within the constraints of the statutory process.
- Political - No direct political implications.
- Reputation – The Council would wish to contribute its views to an important long term planning document.

## **6 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE**

- 6.1 Instruct the Director of Development Services to advise the Joint Authorities of the views expressed in paragraphs 3.11 and 4.11 and to clarify the concerns regarding possible hazardous waste, and if necessary to protect the Council's position through submitting a formal representation as a part of the statutory process.
- 6.2 Ask that the Director of Development Services keep this Committee informed as appropriate.

## **DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

All documents relate to the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Development Framework (Submission Version) Consultation.

1. Site Allocation and Development Management Policies DPD – Part One
2. Site Allocation and Development Management Policies DPD – Part Two. Site Plans
3. Proposals Map
4. Consultation Statement. Publication Version
5. Preferred Options Outcomes Report
6. Sustainability Appraisal Report
7. Health and Equality Impact Assessment. December 2010
8. Site Allocations DPD. Indicative Waste Site Profiles
9. Habitat Regulations Screening Report
10. Position Statement

All the above documents are available in the Members' Room.

Also the documentation is available on the Lancashire County Council website at:

<http://lancashire-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal>

For further information please ask for Phil Dagnall, extension 4570.



## Appendix 1

### Ribble Valley Borough Council

#### Formal Response to Consultation on Possible Minerals and Waste Site Allocations and Development Management Policies. (17-2-10)

After discussing the issues raised within this document the Council has the following comments to make.

#### 1. Extent of Mineral Safeguarding/Consultation Areas

The selection of Option MSA1 as the favoured option in defining such areas takes a very geographically extensive approach which will potentially bring many development sites within the Borough into an MSA/MCA. Taken together with the statement in para 5.1.1 that within these very extensive MSA/MCAs there will be "a presumption against any development that could prejudice the future working of those minerals" we are concerned about the potential impact this could have on future development.

We do not feel that there is sufficient clarity regarding the above position as the statement setting out the presumption against development is immediately followed by the statement that an MSA does not in itself preclude other forms of development, but merely provides "an alert". We feel that this creates an unnecessary degree of uncertainty and possible delay about the prospects for development within these areas, which you acknowledge within the drawbacks of this option as stated in the consultation document. In the current economic climate this added uncertainty is not helpful.

While we understand the need to provide for future mineral needs and the need for consultation with regard to mineral resources we feel that this combination of policies is excessive. We also feel that the large number of consultation requests that such a policy will generate may place a burden on the relevant Minerals and Waste Authority which could further delay decision making on planning applications.

We would wish therefore to see a better balance struck between the needs of minerals availability and that of other necessary and important development. Also we would value clarity regarding what the blanket presumption against development actually means in practice, for instance in relation to significant housing development.

#### 2. Commercial and Industrial Waste Stream Site Allocation

In dealing with future commercial and industrial waste streams the document states that a range of new facilities will be needed throughout Lancashire. Table 11 of the document gives an indicative list of the facilities required to handle this waste stream which states that the Blackburn/Ribble Valley sub-area will require a total of 3.5 hectares of land to house a materials recycling facility, a composting plant and a "small treatment facility", not necessarily all on the same site.

The favoured option is to locate facilities to handle these waste types on existing or planned industrial land and that chosen allocations will not be technology specific in order not to stifle new or emerging technologies. One potential method of treatment which could be located on such sites, thermal processing, is acknowledged in the document as engendering public concern while, the document goes on to say, scientific evidence suggests that the risks are

"small". This potential issue is a concern to the authority given the allocation of a site within the Borough for the processing of this waste stream.

One site allocated for a non-strategic facility is identified within the Borough at Pendle Trading Estate (Map 28, page 94 of document). Sites such as this are defined as "not...expected to accommodate larger waste users, and would instead provide for a more modest size of waste user across these catchment area". Given the selection of a local site for such a facility and the lack of detail regarding both the exact size of potential development and the type of treatment process mentioned above, which could include controversial techniques, further clarity is needed here to allow us to understand the exact implications of this allocation. While such an approach gives some certainty to the waste processing industry it does not, as you acknowledge, create certainty among local communities.

Comments made during stakeholder consultation also recommended that these facilities should be located away from residential development and while we appreciate that sites have been considered that are primarily industrial there is no overt statement within the policy that recommends that residential areas be avoided.

Philip Dagnall, Assistant Planning Officer, Forward Plans, Ribble Valley Borough Council  
(17-2-2010)

### **Ribble Valley Borough Council**

#### **Formal Response to the Addendum to Consultation on Possible Minerals and Waste Site Allocations and Development Management Policies – Additional Sites (15-6-10)**

#### **Land at Salthill Industrial Estate**

After considering this document we have the following comments to make.

1. We note the inclusion (within section 4.6 of the document) of a site at Salthill Industrial Estate as an additional site to those sites already identified as preferred options for the location of smaller new build waste facilities within consultations held earlier this year (Jan – Feb 2010).
2. Within these earlier consultations we made comments regarding another preferred site for an apparently similar facility at Pendle Trading Estate that we feel have equal relevance to the Salthill site. These are mentioned below.
3. We note that in 4.5.8 it is stated that these sites are not intended to accommodate larger treatment facilities for commercial and industrial waste or municipal waste but for "smaller and more modest" facilities such as material recycling or composting facilities. However this does not make clear which waste streams will be dealt with on such a site, will it be for industrial and commercial only, municipal only or a mixture of both streams? We would value some further clarity here.
4. This document also re-iterates (section 4.5) the Favoured Option for the allocation of built waste facilities mentioned within the earlier consultation. This states that, "allocations will not be technology specific" in order that new and emerging technologies will not be stifled. This statement could indicate that a wide variety of existing treatment technologies may be used on the Salthill site.

5. Material sent to us associated with the consultation held earlier this year included background outlines of the wide variety of possible technologies available in treating waste (within a document entitled Indicative Waste Site Profiles). This material appears to be equally relevant to this consultation. It described both Thermal Treatment and Advanced Thermal Treatment technologies as potential options for waste management.
6. Given this and given our consultation comments made earlier this year regarding the Pendle Trading Estate site, we would like to express our grave concern regarding the potential use of such controversial technologies as Thermal Treatment and other incineration technologies on the Salthill site. We feel that these technologies would not be compatible with such a site.
7. We also note that in "Rubbish to Resources" - the Waste Management Strategy for Lancashire 2008 - 2020 (page 14) the County Council states its opposition to the siting of any proposal for mass burn incineration of municipal waste within the County.
8. We also wish to re-iterate our previous consultation comment that built waste facilities should be located away from residential development. We note that housing lies within 100 metres of the site whilst a school and hospital are also within 300 metres, which we feel is too close given the possible uses of such a site and their effects on residential and other legitimate amenity.

Should you have any questions regarding this matter please contact:

Philip Dagnall, Assistant Planning Officer, Forward Plans, Ribble Valley Borough Council

## RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: THURSDAY, 24 FEBRUARY 2011  
title: LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – PROPOSED REVISION  
submitted by: CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
principal author: COLIN HIRST

### 1 PURPOSE

1.1 To consider and agree an update to the Council's adopted Local Development Scheme.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities

- Council Ambitions – The Local Development Scheme is fundamental to the delivery of planning policy and will help in protecting and enhancing environmental quality. Planning policies will help deliver the Council's ambitions relating to the supply of affordable homes in the area.
- Community Objectives – As the management tool for the planning policy preparation, it provides a basis by which to identify how, in particular, issues relating to the objectives of a sustainable economy, thriving market towns and housing will be addressed through the planning system.
- Corporate Priorities – The scheme will provide a management tool for resource planning and will aid performance and consistency. The scheme will help deliver community involvement.
- Other Considerations – The Council has a statutory duty to prepare and keep up to date a Local Development Scheme for the area.

### 2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The Local Development Scheme (LDS) is a statutory document that the Council has to have in place. It is a public statement of the documents and the policy areas that the Council intend to produce that will comprise the Local Development Framework (LDF) for the area. The published scheme is available on the Council's web site or can be viewed at Level D reception.

2.2 The current LDS was formally adopted in April 2007 and was to cover a 3 year period. It is a requirement of the LDF process that the Council reviews the document. Although not governed by the same public consultation and timetabling as the preparation of the original LDS; revisions need to be confirmed with Government Office and subsequently brought into effect and published in accord with the Regulations. Members previously considered an update in May 2009, however, following discussions with Government Office and uncertainties on delivery of the scheme, it was not formally published. Government Office advised that it would be more appropriate to publish a revision when the Council had carried out the Regulation 25 stages of consultation and was looking towards the Regulation 27 stage.

### **3 ISSUES**

- 3.1 As Members are aware, a significant amount of work has been undertaken to support the production of the Core Strategy, issues and options consultations. Consultation has been undertaken the results of which are being drawn together to inform the next steps. It is anticipated that the outcome of the consultation will be reported to Members at the next Planning and Development Committee.
- 3.2 The timetable proposed in Appendix 1 sets out the key stages and milestones for the Core Strategy, leading to adoption together with the proposed housing and economic development DPD that will deal with allocations. This provides an indication of the time frame expected which will assist in resource planning. The programme if agreed, will need to be agreed with Government Office and the Planning Inspectorate before it is formally published.

### **4 RISK ASSESSMENT**

- 4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications
- Resources – Provision is included in current budgets for work on the Core Strategy, supplemented by PDG. However, provision will need to be made in the 2012/13 budget for the later stages of the process.
  - Technical, Environmental and Legal – The Local Development Scheme is a statutory requirement of the new development plan process. Up to date, timely and relevant planning policies are important in maintaining and improving the environment of the borough.
  - Political – There are no direct political implications, however, the LDS does establish a programme of priority for policy work.
  - Reputation – The Council's decision on how to proceed could affect its reputation for example, if the LDS is not kept up to date, the Council will not meet the requirements of legislation.

### **5 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE**

- 5.1 Authorise the Chief Executive to update and publish the Local Development Scheme as appropriate in consultation with Government Office and the Planning Inspectorate.

#### **CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

#### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- 1 Adopted Local Development Scheme, March 2007.
- 2 LDS File.
- 3 Planning Policy Statement 12 Development Plans.

For further information please ask for Colin Hirst, extension 4503.

**Proposed Documents and Key Milestones**

<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>Date for issues &amp; options consultations (Regulation 25)</b>	<b>Public participation on preferred options (Regulation 26)</b>	<b>Date for submission to Secretary of State (Regulation 28)</b>	<b>Pre-Examination meeting</b>	<b>Target Date for Formal Examination</b>	<b>Anticipated receipt of Inspectors Report</b>	<b>Date for proposed adoption</b>
<b>Core Strategy</b>	<b>Published August 2010</b>	<b>October 2011</b>	<b>March 2012</b>	<b>April 2012</b>	<b>June 2012</b>	<b>October 2012</b>	<b>November 2012</b>
<b>Housing and Economic Development DPD</b>	<b>July 2011</b>	<b>March 2012</b>	<b>November 2012</b>	<b>February 2013</b>	<b>May 2013</b>	<b>Sept 2013</b>	<b>October 2013</b>

## RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda item No.

meeting date: THURSDAY, 24 FEBRUARY 2011  
title: REVIEWING HOUSING REQUIREMENTS FOR RIBBLE VALLEY  
submitted by: MARSHAL SCOTT – CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
principal author: COLIN HIRST – HEAD OF REGENERATION AND HOUSING

### 1 PURPOSE

1.1 To consider information relating to housing requirements in the Ribble Valley and the option of commissioning a local review.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- Council Ambitions – To match the supply of homes in our area with the identified housing needs.
- Community Objectives – To protect and enhance the existing environmental quality of our area.
- Corporate Priorities – To be a well-managed Council, providing efficient services based on identified customer needs.
- Other Considerations – None.

### 2 BACKGROUND

2.1 Members will be aware of the concern being generated around the provisions of housing across Ribble Valley, driven by the existing policy framework established through the Regional Plan (RSS). This is a matter that has an important impact upon plan making and determining a development strategy for the area; it is fundamental to the determination of planning applications.

2.2 The nature and origin of the housing requirement has been a key issue raised in response to the Core Strategy consultation with many respondents questioning whether the figure was appropriate. It has also been identified by many respondents as an issue to revisit given the Government's stated intention to abolish regional strategies, leaving Local Authorities to determine housing requirements locally rather than being set at a regional level.

2.3 Undoubtedly the position has been in a state of flux as a consequence of the publication of the Secretary of State's intentions and the subsequent High Court challenges to the Government's position. This, coupled with responses to the Core Strategy consultation and the level of developer activity taking place across the borough, raises important considerations for the Council and the need to review how housing requirements are taken forward. It has also been recently reaffirmed that the Secretary of State's position that the intention to abolish should be treated as a material consideration when determining planning applications.

### 3 THE HOUSING REQUIREMENT – CURRENT POSITION

- 3.1 Ribble Valley currently uses the housing numbers set out in the adopted Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). This requires 2,898 additional housing units to be provided over the RSS plan period 2003 – 2021, equating to 161 units per year. This figure is the basis upon which the Council's five-year housing land supply is calculated which is the underpinning factor for determining planning applications. It should be noted that in preparing the Core Strategy, the Council will be required to make a provision for housing over a 15 year period from the point at which the Core Strategy is adopted. It is anticipated adoption would take place in 2012, therefore a housing requirement would need to be established for the period up to at least 2027, beyond the current regional plan figure in any event.
- 3.2 In 2005, Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners produced a report which set out the proposed future housing distribution for each Local Planning Authority to be included as part of the RSS for the north west. Subsequent amendments were made prior to the final figures being adopted in the RSS following the Examination of the Public. The adopted figure for the Ribble Valley was the figure given above. This was of course based on a series of policy assumptions, demographic projections and economic aspirations relevant at the time.
- 3.3 When the RSS was adopted in September 2008, the housing numbers element went into an immediate review. Work on this review formed part of the RS2010, which Members have previously considered reports on. The RS2010 attempted to bring together the spatial, economic and environmental strategies affecting the region and to build a new long-term vision part of which would involve revising the housing figures. This was to utilize a revised series of projections and modelling assumptions. As a consequence of the coalition Government's published intention to abolish regional strategies and the regional level of plan making no further work was carried out on the housing figures and the review consequently stopped.
- 3.4 Having announced after the election in May the Government's intention to abolish regional strategies and consequently do away with the need for Local Authorities to use a regionally derived figure, the Secretary of State proposed that Local Authorities could establish their own figures. Alternatively if it was held to be appropriate they could adopt the regional based figure if considered applicable to the local area. Members consequently agreed to adopt the regional figure as the most relevant requirement for plan making and determining a five-year land supply in June 2010. For this Council there has been no change to the actual housing requirement it uses as we had adopted the RSS figure, pending further review.
- 3.5 Following the publication of and pending Royal Assent for the forthcoming Localism Bill which will introduce changes to the planning system the current system of regional strategies and local plans forming the Development Plan for the area will continue. Recent monitoring of the housing supply demonstrates that the Council cannot identify a five-year supply as required and will have to have regard to national policies set out in PPS3 which favours residential development. The Council can currently only demonstrate a three-year availability and would need to have in place relatively significant number of residential permissions in order to attain a five-year supply which would then trigger the determination of applications against the development plan. At that point the Council would have greater control over development in the area through locally determined policy.



## 4 UNDERTAKING A REVIEW

- 4.1 Whilst the Regional Strategy remains relevant, it is clear that the Council will be in a position where it will be appropriate and necessary to undertake a review of the housing requirements. Particularly in response to concerns over revised population, migration and economic projections. Members should also be aware that the current Strategic Housing Market Assessment (adopted 2008) indicated that to address identified affordable needs in the area we would need to deliver in the order of 240 units per year, higher than the housing requirement being worked to. There are clearly a number of revised circumstances and important factors that will influence the housing figures that warrant a local review to establish what the level of housing requirement should be for the borough.
- 4.2 Any review of the housing requirement should be undertaken to establish an appropriate housing figure based on more up to date information, it should not simply be seen as an exercise to reduce the amount of development to be undertaken in the area. The outcome of a local review would have to be robust enough to withstand scrutiny at Public Inquiry or Public Examination. Any results would have to be carefully considered with the Council needing to be satisfied that the housing requirement is both relevant to the area and sound before it adopted any revised position. It would also have to be aware that the development plan would still prevail unless the outcome of the review was able to demonstrate such a change in circumstances that it should be treated as a material consideration with some weight. The relevant weight would only be tested at appeal or in time through its application to the Core Strategy and the Examination in Public. In any event to undertake a review would take time to progress.
- 4.3 Due to the specialised nature of work and the benefit of having an independent review it is proposed that specialist consultants be instructed to advise the Council. The costs for this could be met from the Planning Delivery Grant (PDG) and is anticipated to be approximately £8,000 to £10,000 dependent upon the work commissioned. It should be noted however that no specific provision has been made for this work and using PDG would reduce the funding available to other areas of work, with money. It is anticipated that a series of model runs will be required, based on different assumptions. This will enable the Council to determine against a number of scenarios the relevant housing requirement and to understand any implications of different assumptions. Information on suggested assumptions and modelling scenarios is set out at Appendix 1 for discussion.
- 4.4 If Members agree to undertake a review, it is likely that the work would take place between January and March 2011. Consideration will need to be given to consultation and consequently a final report that could be adopted for operational purposes would be expected around June. Members will need to be aware that pending the formal abolition of the Regional Strategy, any alternative housing requirement would not have the same status as the Regional Strategy which is of course part of the statutory Development Plan. This would be a matter of material consideration when dealing with any planning application or subsequent planning Inquiry.

## 5 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 The announcement by the Secretary of State of the intention to abolish Regional Strategies and leave the determination of housing requirements to the Local Authority, brings with it the need for the Council to review its position. The Council has determined to continue to apply the regionally based housing figure as the most appropriate. For the time being any change must be informed by a review. The area is however experiencing significant pressure to develop and concerns amongst residents about the level of such

pressures and the basis against which housing requirements are determined, should be subject to further review. The review by way of the RS2010 was stopped but the fact that it was taking place should be noted.

- 5.2 The confirmation of the need to take account of Regional Strategies as a result of various legal challenges does reinforce the current application of the regionally based housing figures adopted by the Council. However, it is clear that the changed circumstances that apply could alter the housing requirements for the area. Whilst it is not anticipated that requirements would drastically alter, it is important that the housing requirement is seen to be correct and in any event a housing requirement needs to be established for the ongoing work on the Core Strategy. It is clear that the Government does intend to give responsibility to the Local Planning Authority to determine its own housing requirements. The Council needs to be aware how this might affect both planning applications and the preparation of the Core Strategy. The research and preparation of a new housing requirement will take time and it is considered important to undertake this work now to enable the Council to be fully informed and to progress this issue.

## 6 RISK ASSESSMENT

- 6.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- Resources – The costs of engaging consultancy support is contained within existing budgets for the Local Development Framework.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – It is important that planning decisions are made on up-to-date and tested information.
- Political – Housing requirements are a significant issue affecting the borough.
- Reputation – The Council is responding to the Government's published intention and high levels of concern from the community relating to development pressures in the area enabling the Council to make informed decisions.

## 7 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE

- 7.1 Agree to undertake a review of housing requirements and instruct the Chief Executive to commission consultancy support as appropriate.

### CHIEF EXECUTIVE

For further information please ask for Colin Hirst, extension 4503.

(24021102)

**SUGGESTED MODEL RUNS AND ASSUMPTIONS**

In modelling the population and household projections the following scenarios should be considered to inform housing requirements.

- A baseline projection looking at natural demographic change and migration based on past trends.
- Household requirements based on natural change and assuming no planned housing growth to meet migration demands.
- Household requirements based on natural change and trend migration but no planned provision resulting from employment growth in the Ribble Valley.
- Household requirements based on natural change and local, trend based employment growth but no planned growth to accommodate needs of economic growth outside the borough.
- Model runs should provide differing scenarios in relation to dealing with local affordable needs on the basis of requirements to address 100% of SHMA needs (@240 dwellings), 50% of SHMA needs (@120 dwellings) and 25% (@60 dwellings).

In all cases the implications and effect of the assumptions should be identified as part of the report.

## **RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: THURSDAY, 17 MARCH 2011  
title: LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK CORE STRATEGY – SUMMARY OF  
CONSULTATION RESPONSES  
submitted by: CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
principal author: DIANE CAFFERTY- SENIOR PLANNING OFFICER

### **1. PURPOSE**

1.1 To agree the publication of the Summary of Representations document of the Core Strategy Regulation 25 consultation report for information.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- Council Ambitions – The Core Strategy is the central strategy of the Local Development Framework. It will help in the delivery of housing, employment and the protection and enhancement of the environment, ultimately presenting the delivery strategy for implementing the vision for the Ribble Valley for the next 15 years.
- Community Objectives – As a tool for delivering spatial policy, it identifies how a range of issues relating to the objectives of a sustainable economy, thriving market towns and housing provision will be addressed through the planning system.
- Corporate Priorities - The Core Strategy is the central document of the LDF and sets the overall vision and approach to future planning policy, which will aid performance and consistency.
- Other Considerations – The Council has a duty to prepare spatial policy under the Local Development Framework system and make consultation responses available for public viewing.

### **2. BACKGROUND**

2.1 The current approach to development plans introduced by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the Council to develop a new suite of documents known as the Local Development Framework (LDF) that will replace the adopted Districtwide Local Plan. The policies within the LDF must be informed by a strong, robust evidence base and therefore over the past few years, Officers have been working on creating the LDF baseline. Work continues on keeping this up to date, however the central document of the LDF, the Core Strategy, has now been formulated from this baseline.

2.2 Members will recall consultation on the first stage of production of the Core Strategy document took place between the 25<sup>th</sup> August and 20<sup>th</sup> October 2010. This consultation represented the Regulation 25 stage of the legislative regulations. The level of response to this consultation was encouraging, with just under 4000 comments, or

representations, submitted into the consultation process by just under 750 bodies/consultees.

### 3. RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

- 3.1 Each of the representations has been inputted into the Council's LDF database for storage and analysis and the responses to the consultation are presented in the attached Summary of Representations document. The report provides an initial analysis of the issues raised and identifies key issues to address as the Core Strategy is progressed.
- 3.2 An aim of the consultation on the Core Strategy was to identify which of the Development Strategy options was the preferred approach to development across Ribble Valley over the next 15 years. However, the consultation results have highlighted that further work should be undertaken to present additional, alternative, Development Strategy options. As a result, further analysis and generation of these alternative options will be necessary and therefore a further report will be presented to Members, detailing these alternative options, prior to any Sustainability Appraisal testing being undertaken.
- 3.3 As previously discussed with Members, following the generation of these alternative options and sustainability testing of these (along with the original 3 options presented during the consultation) the preferred Development Strategy option will be taken forward in the Regulation 27, Publication version of the Core Strategy. This will be subject to further public consultation on the chosen Development Strategy. The Submission stage Core Strategy will be developed from that and submitted to the Secretary of State prior to independent Examination and subsequent adoption. Until the full LDF is adopted however, the Districtwide Local Plan will continue to be used by RVBC as the adopted Development Plan for the borough, against which planning applications will be determined taking account of any relevant material considerations, including national planning policies.
- 3.4 Subsequent to Member approval, the Summary of Representations document will be made available under the Forward Planning section on the Council's website and copies will be made available for inspection at Planning Reception. The document itself is not published for consultation.

### 4. RISK ASSESSMENT

- 4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- Resources – None.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal –The Summary of Representations document satisfies Regulation 30 (1) (d) (iii) and (iv) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, which requires a statements setting out a summary of the main issues raised by the representations made pursuant to Regulation 25 and how any representations made pursuant to Regulation 25 have been taken into account. The requirement to publish a Summary of Representations of the Regulation 25 Core Strategy is therefore a statutory requirement of the LDF.

- Political – None.
- Reputation – The Council's desire on how to proceed may affect its reputation. Without approval, the Core Strategy would not meet the requirements of legislation.

**5. RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE**

Agree the publication of the Summary of Representations document of the Core Strategy Regulation 25 consultation report for information.

**DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

For further information please ask for Diane Cafferty, extension 4551 or Colin Hirst, extension 4503.

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Spatial Planning, [www.communities.gov.uk](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004

Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008.

**RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL  
REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

Agenda Item No. 8

meeting date: THURSDAY, 17 MARCH 2011  
title: PENNINE LANCASHIRE SPATIAL GUIDE  
submitted by: MARSHAL SCOTT- CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
principal author: COLIN HIRST – HEAD OF REGENERATION & HOUSING

**1 PURPOSE**

- 1.1 To agree the Pennine Lancashire Spatial Guide which is intended to provide high-level strategic guidance for planning and investment in Pennine Lancashire.
- 1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:
- Council Ambitions – The matters covered in this report relate to the ambition of protecting and enhancing the existing environmental quality of our area.
  - Community Objectives – To maintain vibrant and thriving communities.
  - Corporate Priorities – To contribute to joint working as appropriate.
  - Other Considerations – None.

**2 BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The PLACE Partnership brings together the district of Blackburn with Darwen, Burnley, Hyndburn, Pendle, Ribble Valley and Rossendale, who jointly work on a range of strategic economic housing and planning initiatives in order to deliver overall economic change across Pennine Lancashire. A number of projects have been carried out to produce high level strategies for housing investment, particularly related to the housing market renewal areas, but also having regard to the affordable housing requirements for Ribble Valley. Similarly, work has been undertaken to prepare joint investment programmes relating to the Pennine Lancashire Integrated Economic Strategy.
- 2.2 PLACE has also been taking forward the preparation of the Spatial Guide for Pennine Lancashire which is intended to provide a high level planning framework for the area to help inform the development and in the longer term the closer alignment of core strategies across the area.
- 2.3 Members are invited to review the revised document a copy of which has been placed in Level D Members Room for reference and can be viewed on the councils website in the Forward Planning area.
- 2.4 Members have previously considered a draft when a number of concerns were raised and members resolved to reject the document in the form presented. The report to Planning and development committee on the 4 November 2011 refers. Subsequent discussions have taken place to revise the document with other Pennine Lancs authorities. The revised document has addressed the key concerns raised by this and other Pennine Lancashire authorities and has been endorsed by the PLACE authority Chief Executives in the light of the changes made.

### 3 THE SPATIAL GUIDE

3.1 The Spatial Guide is a non-statutory document and as such will not be subject to the same statutory process as a Local Development Framework Document for example. It is based on a series of different areas of work being carried out across Pennine Lancashire. Once adopted it would however be anticipated that authorities would have regard to it when drawing up their core strategy and other relevant planning documents.

3.2 Its aim is to support a joined up sub-regional approach by:

- setting out a spatial interpretation of other strategies in Pennine Lancashire, most notably the MAA, focusing on the area's geography and the roles of places, and setting key strategic priorities in their sub-regional context;
- complementing the economic focus of the MAA by considering sub-regional environmental issues; and
- providing a framework for future activity in the sub-region, including the development of individual authorities' Local Development Framework Core Strategies and other Development Plan Documents.

3.3 The document provides a picture of the area and as such seeks to focus on the issues where a consistent approach is needed across Pennine Lancashire essentially to support and deliver the visions of the Multi Area Agreement (MAA) signed up to by all the districts in 2009. Whilst there are still some issues around presentation and style to a greater and acceptable extent the issues of concern previously raised have been addressed.

3.4 As a high level strategic guide, mapping is intended to be illustrative. The previous draft included details that it was not appropriate to support. The accompanying key diagram now illustrates main features only, and does not identify proposals as previously. This change is one of the key issues that needed to be addressed.

3.5 The guide includes information that will support our LDF evidence base and guidance that can be used to inform the Council's LDF. Critically the elements of the previous draft that were viewed as reducing local flexibility have been removed and it is considered that in the form proposed, accepting some differences of view on style and approach given that it is a document looking across Pennine Lancashire the spatial guide can be supported. The intention of the Chief Executives group is that the document should be used to support a bottom up approach with issues being addressed through district LDF's.

### 4 RISK ASSESSMENT

4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- Resources – No immediate implications.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – The Spatial Guide is a non-statutory document.
- Political – No direct implications.
- Reputation – The Council would wish to contribute its view to any document that may impact upon future planning decisions.



**5 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE**

**5.1 Endorse the Spatial Guide.**

**CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

**1 The Draft Pennine Lancashire Spatial Guide – October 2010.**

**For further information please ask for Colin Hirst, extension 4503.**

## RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No. ...

meeting date: THURSDAY 16th JUNE, 2011  
title: CORE STRATEGY- KEY STATEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT  
POLICIES – PROPOSED REVISIONS  
submitted by CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
principal author PHIL DAGNALL

### 1 PURPOSE

1.1 To inform the Council regarding the outcomes of the recent consultations on the Core Strategy, and how they are influencing the development of the document. The Core Strategy is a fundamental part of the Local Development Framework (LDF) which will ultimately become a part of the Borough's statutory plan and guide the location of future development.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- Council Ambitions – The document that is the subject of this report, as part of the LDF Core Strategy, relates to Council ambitions of making people's lives safer and healthier and also helping to protect and enhance the local environment.
- Community Objectives – The matters covered in this report will contribute to the objectives of building safer communities, and ensuring that there is a suitable supply of sites for employment and appropriate housing
- Corporate Priorities – This paper will help improve the evidence base of the Local Development Framework thereby assisting performance and consistency.
- Other Considerations – None.

### 2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The Core Strategy is a central planning document within the Local Development Framework (LDF) that will ultimately replace the current District Wide Local Plan and become part of the statutory plan for the Borough into the future. It is produced following a prescribed series of consultations related to relevant regulations within government legislation. This document concerns some of the responses to the Regulation 25 consultation stage (also termed as the "Issues and Options" stage) that was held in the latter half of 2010 and how they have affected the development of parts of the document.

2.2 The Issues and Options version of Core Strategy contained a Vision for the area, a series of Strategic Objectives, a set of "Key Statements" on a variety of themes such as sustainability, housing, the local economy and others, a set of Development Strategy Options and finally a series of Development Management (DM) policies that elaborate on the Key Statements. These Development Management policies will eventually replace the current detailed policies in the District Wide Local Plan that are used at

present by RVBC planning management staff. They will thus become the new guidelines in the local assessment of future planning applications once the Core Strategy is formally adopted.

- 2.3 Following the 2010 consultation, which was widely consulted on, just under 750 individual responses were received from a wide variety of sources including local residents, local and national organisations, local authorities and national agencies on different parts of the document. These were all entered into our LDF database.
- 2.4 As an initial part of the assessment of these responses a Schedule has been drawn up listing, underneath each of the Key Statements, and then each of the Development Management policies, each of the responses made, including the organisations of the respondent and a summary of the response, including any specific changes proposed. Then, for each Key Statement and Development Management Policy there is a discussion of each point made and a recommendation as to which responses should be taken into the document as potential amendments and why. Below this discussion, for each of the Key Statements, and any associated explanatory text considered to need amending is the original version of the text followed by the amended version underlined. For the Development Management (DM) policies the same overall format is followed except that the amendments are underlined within the overall the original text. This detailed Schedule is available in hard copy in the Members' Room.
- 2.5 This report deals solely with how these responses have influenced two parts of the Core Strategy. These parts are the Key Statements and their associated explanatory text and the Development Management (DM) policies (the latter within Appendix 4 of the Regulation 25 Core Strategy document). How the consultation has affected other elements of the Core Strategy will be reported on elsewhere in other documents.
- 3 Appendix 1 of this report includes in Section 3 below just the amended versions of the Key Statements drawn from the detailed schedule and those DM policies that have been amended, with underlined amendments. Some DM policies either have not been amended or received no consultation responses. These policies have therefore been retained unamended and only referred to by their title.
- 3.1 In general terms many of the Key Statements have been amended to varying degrees with perhaps the most changes to the Sustainability Key Statement. In addition there have been changes to many of the DM policies, some minor though there are significant changes to DME5 Renewable Energy and a proposal for completely new DME6 Water Management policy. Also the DME1 Trees policy has received more clarification and DMH1 Affordable Housing Criteria has had additions made reflecting recent changes to policy
- 3.2 The original Regulation 25 consultation version of the Core Strategy on which the comments below were based is available as a hard copy in the Members Room, together with a hard copy of the Appendix 1 Schedule of this report. In addition the original Core Strategy consultation document is available through a link on the council's website at:

[http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk/info/200180/planning\\_policy/429/welcome\\_to\\_planning\\_policy/13](http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk/info/200180/planning_policy/429/welcome_to_planning_policy/13)

#### **4 RISK ASSESSMENT**

##### **4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:**

- **Resources – No immediate implications.**
- **Technical, Environmental and Legal – The Core Strategy is a statutory requirement of the planning process.**
- **Political – No direct political implications.**
- **Reputation – The Council would wish to be seen to take note of the consultation responses to this important planning document and amend the draft in light of relevant comment as a part of its long term planning development.**

#### **5 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE**

##### **5.1 Agree the proposed changes and that the changes are subject to a period of consultation.**

##### **5.2 That the Chief Executive is asked to report the outcome of the consultation before the policies are incorporated into the Core Strategy.**

#### **CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

For further information please ask for Phil Dagnall, extension 4570.

## RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: THURSDAY, 16 JUNE 2011  
title: CORE STRATEGY – ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY OPTIONS  
submitted by: CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
principal author: DIANE CAFFERTY- SENIOR PLANNING OFFICER

### 1. PURPOSE

1.1 To agree the publication of the Core Strategy: Generation of alternative Development Strategy Options report for comment.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- Council Ambitions – The Core Strategy is the central strategy of the Local Development Framework. It will help in the delivery of housing, employment and the protection and enhancement of the environment, ultimately presenting the delivery strategy for implementing the vision for the Ribble Valley for the next 15 years.
- Community Objectives – As a tool for delivering spatial policy, it identifies how a range of issues relating to the objectives of a sustainable economy, thriving market towns and housing provision will be addressed through the planning system.
- Corporate Priorities - The Core Strategy is the central document of the LDF and sets the overall vision and approach to future planning policy, which will aid performance and consistency.
- Other Considerations – The Council has a duty to prepare spatial policy under the Local Development Framework system and make consultation responses available for public viewing.

### 2. BACKGROUND

2.1 The current approach to development plans introduced by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the Council to develop a new suite of documents known as the Local Development Framework (LDF) that will replace the adopted Districtwide Local Plan. The policies within the LDF must be informed by a strong, robust evidence base and therefore over the past few years, Officers have been working on creating the LDF baseline. Work continues on keeping this up to date, however the central document of the LDF, the Core Strategy, has now been formulated from this baseline.

2.2 Members will recall consultation on the first stage of production of the Core Strategy document took place between the 25<sup>th</sup> August and 20<sup>th</sup> October 2010. This consultation represented the Regulation 25 stage of the legislative regulations. The level of response to this consultation was encouraging, with just under 4000 comments, or representations, submitted into the consultation process. A summary of these representations was presented to Members of Planning and Development Committee in

March 2011 and the report published for information on the Council's website and made available at the Council Offices. Members will recall that this report highlighted that further work on generating some additional, alternative Development Strategy options was necessary.

### 3. GENERATION OF ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 3.1 This report presents five additional, alternative Development Strategy options, presented as options A, B, C, D and E. Letters are being used rather than numbers to distinguish the options from each of the two consultations. The reason for presenting each of these options is evidenced within the report. Options 1, 2 and 3, which were presented at the Regulation 25 stage (between August and October last year) also remain as potential options and will be tested for their sustainability alongside the new, alternative options prior to progressing to the next stage of the Core Strategy, Regulation 27.
- 3.2 To summarise the new alternative options, option A and B allow for the spread of development across the borough proportioned on the population distribution of the whole borough, but with option A setting out a slightly smaller amount of housing development in the smaller settlements than option B. It is felt that this approach appropriately reflects the request for development to be spread more equally and proportionately across the borough. Alternative option C approaches the spread of development in a similar way to the current Districtwide Local Plan. Under this option, the distribution of the housing requirements across the borough is not determined; instead only development proposals that can demonstrate an appropriate scale of development will be permitted. In terms of alternative Development Strategy options D and E, development will be focused towards specific strategic sites. Under option D this is land located to the south of Clitheroe, towards the A59 and under option E, this strategic location located at Barrow. Under these options development will only be permitted at other locations in the borough to meet identified needs and will be distributed in accordance with option C, where only development proposals that can demonstrate an appropriate scale of development will be permitted.
- 3.3 For each of the Development Strategy options, option 1, 2, 3, A, B, C, D and E, a breakdown is included in the report, which sets out the percentage of development in each area and how this translates into dwelling numbers. This dwelling requirement remains at 161 units per annum, however they will appear higher than those that were set out in the Regulation 25 stage consultation document. This is because it has now become necessary to set a timeframe for the lifetime of the Core Strategy. Previously this was set by the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and covered 2003-2021, but given the Government's intention to abolish RSS there is now a requirement for the Core Strategy to cover a 15-year period from date of adoption (anticipated to be 2012). Therefore the Core Strategy plan period has now been set at 2008-2028.
- 3.4 Information on how to comment on the options and the relevant dates for doing so are included in the report, along with a comment submission form.

### 4. RISK ASSESSMENT

- 4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- Resources – None.

- **Technical, Environmental and Legal** –The Core Strategy is a statutory requirement of the LDF. It is the central document of the LDF and contains future planning policy considerations. The requirement to identify and present a preferred Development Strategy option, along with reasonable alternative options, is a requirement of the Regulation 27 stage of the legislative regulations of Core Strategy production. This requirement can only be achieved by publishing this report for comment.
- **Political** – None.
- **Reputation** – The Council's desire on how to proceed may affect its reputation. Without approval, the Core Strategy would not meet the requirements of legislation.

## 5. **RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE**

- 5.1 **Agree the publication of the Core Strategy: Generation of alternative Development Strategy Options report for comment for a six-week period.**
- 5.2 **Endorse the proposed plan period as that which will cover the period 2008-2028.**

### **CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

For further information please ask for Diane Cafferty, extension 4551 or Colin Hirst, extension 4503

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Spatial Planning, [www.communities.gov.uk](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004

Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008.

## **RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

Agenda Item No. 9

meeting date: THURSDAY, 16 JUNE 2011  
title: CORE STRATEGY – SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL  
submitted by: CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
principal author: COLIN HIRST – HEAD OF REGENERATION AND PLANNING

### **1 PURPOSE**

1.1 To confirm the approach to Sustainability Appraisal for the Core Strategy to comply with statutory requirements.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- Council Ambitions – The matters dealt with in this report relate to the production of the Council's Local Development Framework, and the ambition of helping to protect and enhance the local environment.
- Community Objectives – The matters covered in this report will contribute to the objectives of creating a sustainable local economy and ensuring that there is a suitable supply of sites for employment and housing.
- Corporate Priorities – This paper supports the plan-making process and will assist the performance of the Council as a well-managed authority.
- Other Considerations – None.

### **2 BACKGROUND**

2.1 Work on the delivery of the Council's Core Strategy is reaching a key point in the process where alternative options for managing development have been published and tested through public consultation and we are now moving towards determining a preferred option for the Strategy. To comply with the statutory requirements of the plan-making process, the proposals have to be subject to formal sustainability appraisal to inform the process and ensure that in moving to the Council's preferred option the Council is able to draw on formal appraisal testing. To meet the legislative requirements this work now needs to be undertaken and will include the further alternatives currently being proposed.

2.2 Sustainability Appraisal is a formalised series of steps, of which the Council has already commenced work through the preparation of its Scoping Report, published in August 2010. This work also built on an earlier piece of work undertaken at the formative stage of the Core Strategy under a joint working arrangement with 5 local authorities (Hyndburn, Blackpool, Wyre, Fylde and Ribble Valley). Both pieces of work were undertaken by a specialist consultancy due to the nature and expertise required for the work and the extent of work involved.



- 2.3 The next stage of the appraisal process is to assess the alternative options proposed against a framework to determine sustainability strengths and weaknesses of each option. This process will then inform the Council's decision on the preferred spatial option for the Core Strategy and ensure that the Council can take forward, ideally, the most sustainable approach. Whilst the appraisal process is carried out within a framework it is still complex and relatively lengthy. It has to include elements of consultation and a "workshop" approach to key elements of the testing. Practice guidance also promotes an independent approach using external services in preference to those resources involved in drawing together the proposals. If the appraisal process is not in accord with the robust legislative requirements the Council will be unable to demonstrate to the Examination Inspector that the plan is sound. In order to meet the current programme for the Core Strategy and to establish a preferred option by the autumn, work needs to commence on the appraisal work.

### 3 CONSULTANCY

- 3.1 Both the early, joint approach and the more recent scoping report were undertaken by Hyder Consulting on behalf of the Council. However, given the nature of the work quotes have been sought from suitable firms to undertake the necessary work for the next stages. Fee proposals were invited based on the testing of the development option scenarios that formed the basis of the consultation last year at regulation 25 stage. Pricing ranged from just over £21,000 to just under £13,000 with prices received from all three firms namely Entec, WS Atkins and Hyder Consulting. Of the three firms Hyder provided the lowest cost. All firms provided a fee proposal based upon the same brief and provided slightly different options and approaches to the delivery of the brief. From the proposals received all would be capable of meeting the Council's requirements however Hyder provided the lowest price. Given the nature of their experience of working in the area and established background data they can also offer benefits of continuity.
- 3.2 The cost of the work would be contained within existing budgets currently derived from Planning Delivery Grant and money set aside in reserves for the LDF. Given the importance of the work to the delivery of the Core Strategy and that the document has a relationship with securing the economic growth and regeneration, it is also proposed to via some money between budgets to support the delivery of the Core Strategy. As Members are aware, additional option scenarios are to be published and there is therefore an additional element of testing that will be required. Consequently a further contingency should be allowed to accommodate this additional work within the budget.
- 3.3 It is therefore proposed that a budget provision of £15,000 be identified for the sustainability work and that Hyder Consulting be instructed to progress the appraisal subject to confirmation of requirements and costs.

### 4 RISK ASSESSMENT

- 4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- Resources – The cost of the work will be contained within existing budgets, however Members need to be aware that future budget provision will be required to meet the costs of the Public Examination which are currently included in the Planning Delivery Grant allocations. Members have had information previously about the need to

secure additional funding to meet the full costs of the LDF. The additional costs for the Examination and further LDF work will need to be considered in preparation of the 2012/2013 budget process.

- Technical, Environmental and Legal – Sustainability Appraisal is a statutory requirement of the LDF process.
- Political – Delivery of the Core Strategy is a priority for the Council.
- Reputation – The Sustainability Appraisal will inform the Council's decision-making and demonstrate how the Council can deliver sustainable development.

## **5 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE**

- 5.1 Agree to commission specialist consultancy support to undertake the Sustainability Appraisal for the Core Strategy and that Hyder Consulting be the selected provider.

### **CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

#### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- 1 PPS12 – Local Spatial Planning 2008.
- 2 Local Development Framework Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report August 2010.
- 3 SA Regulations – various.

For further information please ask for Colin Hirst, extension 4503.

## **RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: 16<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2011

title: CORE STRATEGY - EMPLOYMENT LAND POSITION STATEMENT

submitted by: CHIEF EXECUTIVE

principal author: CRAIG MATTHEWS

### **1. PURPOSE**

1.1 To receive an update on employment land in Ribble Valley.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities

- Council Ambitions - In addition to Ribble Valley Borough Council striving to meet its three ambitions, it also recognises the importance of securing a diverse, sustainable economic base for the Borough.
- Community Objectives – The issues highlighted in this report will contribute to objectives of a sustainable economy and thriving market towns.
- Corporate Priorities - Delivery of services to all
- Other Considerations - None

### **2 INFORMATION**

- 2.1 In 2008 the BE Group were engaged to produce the Ribble Valley Employment Land and Retail Study (BE Group 2008), providing an evidence base to inform the Local Development Framework process and in order to maintain up to date information on key aspects of the social, economic and environmental characteristics of the area as part of this process. In looking at employment land and premises, the document focused on B1, B2 and B8 uses, examining the supply and demand position and made estimates of future need.
- 2.2 The piece of work provided an economic context for the Borough, a review of employment land, a retail study and health check for each of the three service centres (Longridge, Whalley and Clitheroe) in Ribble Valley and also informs the Council's regeneration and economic development work and delivery of the community strategy objectives. Particular recommendations from the consultants that were identified as particularly important were the provision of office premises on the A59 and facilitation and delivery of land for future employment uses.
- 2.3 The report identified that there is a need to bring forward employment land and that provision will need to be made for additional land of an appropriate type. An update building on the work previously undertaken to inform future strategic economic and employment land requirements for the Borough is attached as Appendix 1 identifying existing take up trends, measuring requirements and providing a buffer in terms of supply and choice.

- 2.4 The original study also identified that whilst overall, the local economy in Ribble Valley remains comparatively strong and reasonably vibrant there remains a number of issues and risks that need to be addressed to ensure that the area does not lose that inherent strength and that, perhaps more importantly, is able to deliver growth and further strengthening of the local economy particularly in the current economic climate and recovery period.
- 2.5 The sites in existing use, or with a recognised employment commitment, are facing pressure for the development of other uses, in particular residential. Sites in existing employment use are seen as particularly vulnerable and it is recommended that the Council will need to ensure that where redevelopment is to be allowed, that this should be treated as an exception delivering justifiable benefits and providing the loss of land in employment use can be accommodated overall. This is especially so when the Council is facing significant pressure to deliver on its housing requirements in the shorter term whilst pressure for employment land provision has a longer time frame.
- 2.6 Therefore, it is appropriate to update the Study's findings to inform the Core Strategy and act as a guide to allocating future employment land needs and for considering the use of current employment sites, given their potential other uses in the light of the still relatively high demand for housing land in the Borough.

### 3 RISK ASSESSMENT

- 3.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:
- Resources – No immediate implications.
  - Technical, Environmental and Legal – The Core Strategy is a statutory requirement of the planning process.
  - Political – No direct political implications.
  - Reputation – The position statement helps to demonstrate how the Council is seeking to take account of the local economy in its activities.

### 4 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE

- 4.1 Agree that the Employment Land Position Statement is published as part of the evidence base and used to inform the Core Strategy.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE

BACKGROUND PAPERS: -

Ribble Valley Employment Land & Retail Study 2008

For further information please ask for Phil Dagnall (ext 4570) or Craig Matthews (ext 4531)

## RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: THURSDAY, 16 JUNE 2011  
title: FORTHCOMING CONSULTATION- PROGRAMME OUTLINE  
submitted by: CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
principal author: DIANE CAFFERTY- SENIOR PLANNING OFFICER

### 1. PURPOSE

1.1 To inform Members of the forthcoming consultation on various LDF documents.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- Council Ambitions – Production of the Local Development Framework is a statutory requirement and will help in the delivery of housing, employment and the protection and enhancement of the environment, ultimately presenting the delivery strategy for implementing the vision for the Ribble Valley for the next 15 years.
- Community Objectives – As a tool for delivering spatial policy, the LDF identifies how a range of issues relating to the objectives of a sustainable economy, thriving market towns and housing provision will be addressed through the planning system.
- Corporate Priorities – Work on the LDF, in particular the Core Strategy, which is the central document of the LDF and sets the overall vision and approach to future planning policy, will aid performance and consistency.
- Other Considerations – The Council has a duty to prepare spatial policy under the Local Development Framework system and make consultation responses available for public viewing.

### 2. BACKGROUND

2.1 As Members are aware, the current approach to development plans introduced by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the Council to develop a new suite of documents known as the Local Development Framework (LDF) that will replace the adopted Districtwide Local Plan. The policies within the LDF must be informed by a strong, robust evidence base and work is continuing on producing both these evidence base documents to ensure an up to date and thorough baseline, as well as the actual LDF documents, chiefly the Core Strategy.

2.2 Recent work has been concentrated on preparing for a six-week consultation exercise on the following documents that will begin at the end of June, throughout July and into early August, subject to agreement by Committee.

Core Strategy Alternative Development Strategy Options

Core Strategy Key Statements and Development Management Policies- Proposed Revisions

Employment Land Position Statement

The following two documents have been previously agreed for consultation and will be published for consultation as part of the same programme.

G6 (Essential Open Space) Audit  
Meeting Housing Needs in Ribble Valley

2.3 A brief summary of these consultation documents is set out below.

### 3. DOCUMENTS BEING CONSULTED UPON

#### 3.1 Core Strategy Alternative Development Strategy Options

3.2 During the Regulation 25 stage consultation on the Core Strategy between August and October 2010, 4000 representations were submitted into the consultation process. In response to these representations, work has been undertaken on generating five additional, alternative Development Strategy options.

3.3 For each of the 5 additional Development Strategy options (options A, B, C, D and E) as well as the previously presented options (options 1, 2 and 3) a breakdown is included in the consultation report, which sets out the percentage of development in each area and how this translates into dwelling numbers.

3.4 Information on how to comment on the options and the relevant dates for doing so are included in the report, along with a comment submission form.

#### 3.5 Core Strategy Key Statements and Development Management Policies- Proposed Revisions

3.6 As with the above consultation document, following the regulation 25 Core Strategy consultation work has been undertaken on analysing the responses and this consultation paper deals with how these responses have influenced two specific parts of the Core Strategy. These parts are the Key Statements and their associated explanatory text and the Development Management (DM) policies (the latter within Appendix 4 of the Regulation 25 Core Strategy document).

3.7 The report includes an appendix that sets out just the amended versions of the Key Statements drawn from a more detailed schedule and those DM policies that have been amended, with amendments underlined. Some of the DM policies have either not been amended or received no consultation responses and therefore remain un-amended and are only referred to by their title.

3.8 The more 'detailed schedule' is available in hard copy at planning reception and in the Members room, as well as on the Forward Planning pages of the Council's website, and sets out the comments made by respondents during the consultation the Key Statements and DM policies and includes a section called 'discussion and suggested changes to policy' for each. This section explains the decision making process in terms of where and why changes are now suggested to the Key Statements and DM policies.

**3.9 Employment Land Position Statement**

3.10 This paper provides an up to date position in terms of the current employment land situation in the borough. It updates the work undertaken by the BE Group in 2008 on the Ribble Valley Employment Land and Retail Study and acts as a guide to allocating future employment land needs and for considering the use of current employment sites, given their potential other uses in the light of the still relatively high demand for housing land in the Borough.

3.11 It is intended that this Employment Land Position Statement will be used as an evidence base for future land needs for employment uses and as a means to inform the Core Strategy.

**3.12 G6 (Essential Open Space) Audit**

3.13 As part of this round of consultation we are also inviting comments on a review of Policy G6 – Essential Open Space. Policy G6 is a policy in the existing local plan dating from 1998 that seeks to protect areas identified as 'essential open space'. These can be areas of undeveloped land, car parks, play areas and such like. Generally, these sites were designated in the plan to protect recreation areas or areas that had some visual quality at the time the plan was made and it was important to control development on these sites. In preparing the new Local Development Framework, it was considered important to undertake a review of this designation as a number of sites were being put forward for development and the Council has to ensure it has a sound basis on which to continue their protection where appropriate. It is also important to enable suitable sites to come forward to help meet requirements for development if circumstances have changed since that plan was made.

3.14 The review does not in itself remove the formal designation as shown on the Districtwide Local Plan. However the outcome of the review could be taken into account when deciding planning applications and could mean land being granted planning permission that previously may not have been. The consultation paper, together with plans showing sites where the designation was no longer seen as appropriate as a result of the review are available on the Council's website.

**3.15 Addressing Housing Need in Ribble Valley**

3.16 This document is a revision of the previously published Affordable Housing Memorandum of Understanding. Following recently proposed changes to social housing, which will have significant implications on delivery, particularly tenure type for future schemes, the memorandum has been amended to reflect these.

3.17 It also seeks to address not only the issue of affordability in the borough but in addressing the identified housing need, the needs of the elderly. Ribble Valley has an ageing population that is projected to increase by 49% in the next 15 years. The market has failed to meet the housing needs of this age group and therefore it is proposed that accommodation appropriate for the elderly will be secured through a policy requirement.

This change is now reflected within the memorandum consultations document that will now be titled 'Addressing Housing Need in Ribble Valley'.

- 3.18 Other significant changes to the document are that all sites of over 30 units would have to provide 15% of the site for over 60 year olds. 50% of this is to be affordable and to be included within the 30% affordable housing offer. The remaining 50% would be at market sale or rent.
- 3.19 The document will be used to inform housing and planning policy and used as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. It has been prepared as a Health and Housing Committee policy and that Committee will consider the response and if appropriate, formally adopt the document as Council Policy.

#### 4. CONSULTATION PROCEDURE AND FURTHER STAGES

- 4.1 All comments on all the consultation documents will be acknowledged following the end of the consultation period and will be held within our Local Development Framework (LDF) database. It is important to note that responses will be available for public viewing and will be held on our LDF database in accord with the requirements of the Data Protection Act.
- 4.2 Following the consultation period, all comments will be considered. Where necessary amendments will be made and work will continue on the Publication stage version of the Core Strategy. Further detail of the future programme is set out in appendix 1.

#### CHIEF EXECUTIVE

For further information please ask for Colin Hirst, extension 4503, Diane Cafferty, extension 4551 or Phil Dagnall, extension 4570.



**CORE STRATEGY WORK PROGRAMME**

<b>KEY STAGE</b>	<b>DATES</b>	<b>STATUS</b>
Regulation 25 consultation period.	August-October 2010	Achieved
Publication of Summary of Reg 25 Representations.	March 2011	Achieved
Present to Members Core Strategy Alternative Options, Revisions to Key Statements & DM Policies, Employment Land Position Statement.	June 2011	Achieved
Six-week consultation period on Core Strategy Alternative Options, Revisions to Key Statements & DM Policies, Employment Land Position Statement, G6 designation review & Meeting Housing Needs in Ribble Valley document.	June - August 2011	Anticipated date
Consideration of responses on Core Strategy Alternative Options, Revisions to Key Statements & DM Policies, Employment Land Position Statement, G6 designation review & Meeting Housing Needs in Ribble Valley document and writing of Infrastructure Plan and Regulation 27 stage Core Strategy	August-September 2011	Anticipated date
Present Regulation 27 stage Core Strategy to Members	September 2011	Anticipated date
Consultation on Regulation 27 stage Core Strategy and associated SA/SEA	October-December 2011	Anticipated date
Consideration of Reg 27 consultation Reps received and writing of submission Core Strategy document (Regulation 30)	January- March 2012	Anticipated date
Submission of Core Strategy (regulation 30) to Secretary of State.	March 2012	Anticipated date
Examination in Public (assessment of Core Strategy by a Planning Inspector)	June 2012.	Anticipated date
Receipt of Inspectors report and decision on Soundness	October 2012	Anticipated date
Formal adoption of Core Strategy	November 2012.	Anticipated date

## CORE STRATEGY WORK PROGRAMME

	Aug-10	Sep-10	Oct-10	Nov-10	Dec-10	Jan-11	Feb-11	Mar-11	Apr-11	May-11	Jun-11	Jul-11	Aug-11	Sep-11	Oct-11	Nov-11	Dec-11	Jan-12	Feb-12	Mar-12	Apr-12	May-12	Jun-12	Jul-12	Aug-12	Sep-12	Oct-12	Nov-12	
Regulation 25 consultation period.																													
Consideration of regulation 25 representations																													
Publication of Summary of Reg 25 Representations document.																													
Work on writing Core Strategy Alternative Options, Revisions to Key Statements & DM Policies, Employment Land Position Statement.																													
Present to Members Core Strategy Alternative Options, Revisions to Key Statements & DM Policies, Employment Land Position Statement.																													
Six-week consultation period on Core Strategy Alternative Options, Revisions to Key Statements & DM Policies, Employment Land Position Statement, G6 designation review & Meeting Housing Needs in Ribble Valley document.																													
Consideration of responses on Core Strategy Alternative Options, Revisions to Key Statements & DM Policies, Employment Land Position Statement, G6 designation review & Meeting Housing Needs in Ribble Valley document and writing of Infrastructure Plan and Regulation 27 stage Core Strategy																													
Present Regulation 27 stage Core Strategy to Members																													
Consultation on Regulation 27 stage Core Strategy and associated SA/SEA																													
Consideration of Reg 27 consultation Reps received and writing of submission Core Strategy document (Regulation 30)																													
Submission of Core Strategy (regulation 30) to Secretary of State.																													
Examination in Public (assessment of Core Strategy by a Planning Inspector)																													
Receipt of Inspector's report and decision on Soundness																													
Formal adoption of Core Strategy																													

# RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

## REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: THURSDAY, 16 JUNE 2011  
title: HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY  
submitted by: DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES  
principal author: COLIN HIRST

### 1 PURPOSE

1.1 To provide Members with information on the most recent results of the Housing Land Availability Survey.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities

- Council Ambitions – Understanding the housing position is key to the delivery of the Council's ambition to match the supply of homes in our area to identify needs.
- Community Objectives – The information in this report relates to a number of community objectives but is particularly relevant to the broad objective of conserving our countryside and enhancing the local environment.
- Corporate Priorities - This information is relevant to the local development framework which is the spatial expression of the Community Strategy.
- Other Consideration – None.

### 2 INFORMATION

2.1 The Council monitors housing land availability twice a year and produces a housing land availability report. This document provides the information with which to monitor housing development across the Borough. Monitoring continues to be critical to the process of determining planning applications and the Council's duty to ensure a 5 year supply of developable land.

2.2 The report provides detailed information on sites with planning permission, sites under construction and enables the Council to create a picture of construction trends and activity rates together with base line evidence on the amount of land that is available to be brought forward. Copies of the full report are available for reference at Planning Reception and the members room on Level D.

2.3 Members will be aware that the relevant strategic basis against which housing land supply is monitored is the Regional Spatial Plan (RSS). The Council continues to monitor against the provision of 2900 homes between 2003 and 2021 to provide for a strategic provision of some 161 units per year. Work is continuing on a review of the strategic requirement as a consequence of the stated intention by Government to abolish the RSS and the need to provide a strategic position for housing delivery going forward.

2.4 The supply position for dwelling units as at March 2011 is summarised as follows:

• Units with full planning permission	164
• Units with outline planning permission	131
• Sites commenced, units remaining but not started	62
• Units under construction	128
• Conversions - not started	49
• Conversions –under construction	38
<b>Total</b>	<b>572</b>

26 Affordable housing units have permission (not started) and are included in the housing land supply once they commence.

The table at appendix 1 sets out a 5-year statement, as at March 2011 taking account of the necessary adjustments and smoothing to reflect activity over the monitoring period. Given that we currently plan for 161 units per year this shows that the Council cannot demonstrate an ongoing 5 - year supply of housing land as required by Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3) Housing.

2.5 PPS 3 is clear in terms of the guidance to apply when determining applications in the absence of a 5-year supply. Paragraph 71 indicates that;

“Where Local Planning Authorities cannot demonstrate an up-to-date five year supply of deliverable sites, for example where Local Development Documents have not been reviewed to take into account policies in this PPS (pps3) or there is less than five years supply of deliverable sites, they should consider favourably planning applications for housing, having regard to the policies in this PPS including the consideration in paragraph 69.”

2.6 The fact that an authority is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply and consequently must have regard to the implications of paragraph 71, also has to be balanced with the need to apply paragraph 69. This retains the need in effect to ensure that in approving a residential development a number of key principles have to be considered. The saved local plan policies will be key-factors when determining applications albeit having regard to what material considerations need to be taken into account due to changing circumstances since those policies were formulated.

2.7 The requirement to consider applications favourably in the absence of a 5 year supply does not mean that there are to be no other policy or development control considerations, that could lead to a refusal. It should be noted that in most cases there would need to be clear and sound reasons for refusal where it does not harm policy considerations particularly as set out in paragraph 69. In addition PPS3 is also clear in that it states that authorities should not be refusing applications solely on the grounds of prematurity. The need for infrastructure to be in place to support the development would however be seen as a fundamental consideration and development ahead of any actual or programmed infrastructure may be seen as premature in that context.

2.8 Paragraph 69 establishes that

in general, in deciding planning applications, Local Planning Authorities should have regard to:

- Achieving high quality housing.
- Ensuring developments achieve a good mix of housing reflecting accommodation requirements of specific groups, in particular, families and older people.

- The suitability of a site for housing, including its environmental sustainability.
- Using land effectively and efficiently.
- Ensuring the proposed development is in line with planning for housing objectives, reflecting the need and demand for housing in, and the spatial vision for, the area and does not undermine wider policy objectives eg. addressing housing market renewal issues.

2.9 The ongoing work being undertaken on the Core strategy will have regard to the issue of underlying housing numbers and further work on the strategic housing position will be reported in due course. Any changes to housing provision will need to be supported through evidence and analysis to ensure that the planned requirements are capable of justification and can be defended. This will include the need for consultation as part of the Core Strategy process. At this stage it is important to re-affirm for planning purposes the Council currently will continue to manage supply against the RSS provision.

## CHIEF EXECUTIVE

### BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 1 Housing Land Availability Survey files
- 2 Planning Policy Statement 3 Housing – CLG - November 2006
- 3 North West of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021 – GONW- Sept 2008

For details of the Housing Land Availability Schedule contact Sharon O'Neill extension 4506.

For further information on housing and strategic policy issues please ask for Colin Hirst, extension 4503.

## APPENDIX 1

Five year supply (2011-2016) based on previously adopted RSS figures and including permissions and completions up until 1<sup>st</sup> April 2011.

**Planned Provision**

a) Housing provision 2003/2021	2900	161/yr
b) Net dwellings completed 2003-2011 (8yrs)	1031	128 (1031/8)
c) Net dwellings required 2011-2021 (10 years) (adjusted to a revised annual rate)	1869/10	187/yr
d) Adjusted Net 5 yr requirement 2011-2016 (5yrs)	935	187*5 (annual equivalent smoothed over plan period)
e) Adjusted Net 5 yr requirement minus 20% strategic tolerance (PPS3)	745	(187 minus 20% = 149) 149*5

- a) Strategic housing provision based on previously adopted RSS figures  
 b) Actual completions in monitoring period divided by number of years  
 c) Residual requirements based on completions and plan period remaining. This figure gives the annualised requirement to attain planned figure.  
 d) Five year requirements based on the revised/adjusted annualised rate.  
 e) This figure demonstrates the effect of reducing the requirement to within a 20% range as indicated within PPS3 as acceptable strategic tolerance. This would indicate a **3.7yrs supply** against measured requirements.

**Identified Supply**

Supply of deliverable sites over 5 years (Housing Land Availability Survey April 2011)	
<b>Sites under construction</b>	<b>166</b>
<b>Deliverable permissions</b>	<b>(432)</b>
(discounted by 10% slippage allowance but including affordable units)	<b>389</b>
<b>Total Supply</b>	<b>555</b>
Equates to <b>2.9yrs supply</b> at 5 year adjusted rate at 01.04.11	

Actual supply: 2.9yrs supply (555/187)  
 20% strategic tolerance supply: 3.7yrs supply (555/149)

## RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: THURSDAY, 16 JUNE 2011  
title: PLANNING FOR TRAVELLER SITES - CONSULTATION  
submitted by: CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
principal author: PHIL DAGNALL

### 1 PURPOSE

1.1 To inform the Council regarding this Government consultation on a revision to national planning guidance relating to traveller accommodation.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- Council Ambitions – The document that is the subject of this report, will, following the results of this consultation, become national guidance on the location of traveller sites within the Borough and therefore assist in delivering the Council ambitions of making people's lives safer and healthier and also helping to protect and enhance the local environment.
- Community Objectives – The matters covered in this report will contribute to the objectives of building safer communities, and ensuring that there is a suitable supply of sites for housing
- Corporate Priorities – The report seeks to contribute to the current priorities of improving housing in the borough.
- Other Considerations – RVBC has the opportunity through this process to make its views known on an important planning policy document.

### 2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The Government intends to replace current planning policy guidance relating to both "Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites" and "Travelling Showpeople", which are currently dealt with in two separate planning circulars, with one streamlined and amended document. The current position regarding provision for these two groups within the Borough is briefly outlined in 2.3 to 2.5 below. The Government considers that some of the current policies have been ineffective and also wishes to return decision making on the accommodation of these groups to a local level. It also considers that this matter needs urgent attention and has therefore moved to consultation ahead of developing a more general and simplified National Planning Policy Framework covering the whole planning system. This new consultation document now collectively refers to both Gypsy and Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople, as Travellers.

2.2 The full consultation document, which contains the Government's views on the matter together with the proposed new policies and the questions it wishes responses to focus on, is available in the members room for reference. A copy has also been e-mailed to members of the Planning and Development committee. In addition the document can be viewed online at:

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/travellersitesconsultation?view=Standard>

The deadline for a response to the Communities and Local Government Department is 6 July.

- 2.3 While this report concerns a response to a consultation on a new government policy it should be borne in mind that the Council already has in place a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (GTANA, see 3.2 below) within its LDF evidence base, which it considers to remain robust evidence and which underpins relevant Core Strategy draft policies that have recently been consulted on by the Council. Also this Core Strategy consultation revealed no significant comment in relation to these policies nor has wider LDF consultation revealed the traveller accommodation issue to be a significant issue within the Borough.
- 2.4 The current position with regard to Travelling Showpeople accommodation is that there is currently no provision in the borough for this group. The Borough has no formal evidence as to need and the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) did not place any accommodation target on the Borough. The most recent consideration of this issue, within the now abandoned Partial Review of the RSS (which was reported to members in October 2009), did not indicate that the Borough needed to make any further provision for this group.
- 2.5 As regards Gypsy and Traveller accommodation the current level of provision in the Borough (as of 2007) is a private site with permission for 4 pitches. The GTANA states that the Authority should make provision for 6 additional residential pitches from 2007 to 2016. It also states that there is a need for 6 transit pitches in the form of designated stopping places rather than purpose built transit sites.
- 2.6 To return to the new government proposals, the stated aims of the new policy are to:
- enable local planning authorities to make their own assessment of the needs of travellers for planning purposes and thereby set their own targets for provision;
  - facilitate planning authorities in planning for sites over a reasonable timescale;
  - ensure that planning authorities develop fair and effective strategies, promoting more private provision, while recognising that there will always be those travellers who cannot provide their own sites;
  - increase the number of traveller sites, in appropriate locations with planning permission, to address under provision and maintain an appropriate level of supply;
  - reduce the number of unauthorised encampments and make enforcement more effective;
  - protect the green belt from inappropriate development;
  - reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities;



- streamline current advice and align it more closely with planning for housing policy; and
- enable provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment opportunities.

2.7 Some of these aims are contained within existing policies but the following the Government consider to be either different to current policy or objectives that the Government believes will be achieved better through this proposed new, shorter and updated guidance and it is these new elements that this report concentrates on.

### 3. NEW ELEMENTS TO POLICY

#### 3.1 **Enable local planning authorities (LPAs) to make their own assessment of need and use this evidence to set their own targets for pitch/plot provision.**

Currently the Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS), which are soon to be abolished, contain targets for the provision of traveller accommodation. These targets are currently informed by evidence gathered through Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessments (GTANAs), the form of which are also laid out in current guidance. The government wishes to emphasise that local authorities should continue to plan for traveller accommodation but that now it will be up to them to set their own targets, provided that they can justify them with robust evidence that will be examined by the Planning Inspectorate. How they gather that evidence will now be up to them as they will not be bound to use the GTANA model but use any other methods that they feel are appropriate providing that they deliver robust results.

#### 3.2 **Facilitating local authorities in planning for sites over a reasonable timescale**

The Government considers that nationally the current system has not delivered the appropriate number of traveller sites to address an identified national under supply. To do this it is proposing to ask local authorities to plan for a five year supply of traveller pitches/plots. This places the provision in line with the current housing policies that stipulate a five year supply position for more conventional housing. This five year supply will be based on the evidence gathered above and local authorities will be given a reasonable time to put this in place. After this time, if there is not a five year supply, then applications for traveller sites should be treated favourably.

#### 3.3 **Deliver fairness in relation to protection of the Green Belt from development.**

The Government considers that a phrase within current policy that states that new traveller sites within the Green Belt are "normally inappropriate development" has led to a perception that it has become easier to place a traveller site in the green belt than a conventional dwelling. To address that perception of unfairness the Government propose to remove the word "normally" from guidance and therefore harmonise the position with the national Planning Policy Guidance (PPG2) Green Belts.

#### 3.4 **Reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities in relation to the planning system.**

As mentioned above, the Government considers that there is a perception that travellers are treated more favourably within the current system than members of the settled community, with the Green belt issue mentioned above being an example of this. Also,

again mentioned above, it proposes to harmonise the position in relation to unmet traveller need with the housing policies within Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3 on Housing. In addition it proposes a requirement on local authorities to "pay particular attention to early and effective community engagement with settled and traveller communities when formulating their plans and determining planning applications". This addresses a Government concern that nationally there has been a lack of meaningful engagement.

3.5 In general the government considers that the new streamlined guidance will be more effective and reduce costs and describes these savings within the consultation document.

3.6 Members are invited to consider the consultation questions set out at appendix 1 to this report and to consider any issues that they wish to raise a response to.

#### **4 RISK ASSESSMENT**

4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- Resources – No immediate implications.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – None.
- Political – No direct political implications.
- Reputation – The Council would wish to be seen to take note of this consultation to this important planning document and contribute relevant comment as a part of influencing national planning legislation..

#### **5 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE**

5.1 Authorise the Chief Executive to make as appropriate, the relevant response on behalf of the Council to the questions posed within the Consultation document.

#### **CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

For further information please ask for Phil Dagnall, extension 4570.

Background papers: Planning for Traveller Sites – Consultation Document. CLG2011

## APPENDIX 1

### THE CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

1. Do you agree that the current definitions of "gypsies and travellers" and "travelling showpeople" should be retained in the new policy?
2. Do you support the proposal to remove specific reference to *Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessments* in the new policy and instead refer to a "robust evidence base"?
3. do you agree that where need has been identified, local planning authorities should set targets for the provision of sites in their local planning policies.
4. Do you think that local planning authorities should plan for "local need in the context of historical demand"?
5. Do you agree with the proposal to require local planning authority to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots?
6. Do you agree that the proposed wording of Policy E (in the draft policy) should be included to ensure consistency with Planning Policy Guidance 2: *Green Belts*?
7. Do you agree with the general principle of aligning planning policy on traveller sites more closely with that on other forms of housing?
8. Do you agree with the new emphasis on local planning authorities consulting with settled communities as well as traveller communities when formulating their plans and determining individual planning applications to help improve relations between the communities?
9. Do you agree with the proposal in the transitional arrangements policy (paragraph 26 in the draft policy) for local planning authorities to "consider favourably" planning applications for the grant of temporary permission if they cannot demonstrate an up-to-date five-year supply of deliverable traveller sites, to ensure consistency with Planning Policy Statement 3: *Housing*?
10. Under the transitional arrangements, do you think that six months is the right time local planning authorities should be given to put in place their five-year land supply before the consequences of not having done so come into force?
11. do you have any other comments on the transitional arrangements?
12. Are there any other ways in which the policy can be made clearer, shorter or more accessible?
13. Do you think that the proposals in this draft statement will have a differential impact, either positive or negative, on people because of age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation? If so, how in your view should be respond? We are particularly interested in any impacts on (Romany) Gypsies and (Irish) Travellers and welcome the view of organisations and individuals with specific relevant expertise. (A draft Equalities Impact Assessment can be found at Annex C).

**RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL  
REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

Agenda Item No. 11

meeting date: 16 JUNE 2011  
title: FORMER RIDINGS DEPOT AND LAND NORTH AND SOUTH OF  
WHITTINGHAM LANE, LONGRIDGE – CONSULTATION FROM  
NEIGHBOURING AUTHORITY  
submitted by: CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
principal author: COLIN HIRST – HEAD OF REGENERATION AND HOUSING

**1 PURPOSE**

- 1.1 To consider the Council's response to a proposed development in a neighbouring authority.
- 1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities
  - Council Ambitions – the matters dealt with in this report relate to the ambition of helping to protect and enhance the local environment, it also has relevance to the Council's Local Development Framework.
  - Community Objectives – the matters covered in this report relate to objectives of creating a sustainable local economy and ensuring that there is a suitable supply of sites for employment and housing.
  - Corporate Priorities – the paper supports the performance of the Council as a well managed authority.
  - Other Considerations – none.

**2 BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The Council has been consulted by Preston City Council on a planning application for a significant mixed use development adjacent to the borough boundary at Longridge. Officers have advised Preston City Council that the matter is being considered as part of this agenda and that our formal response will be submitted after consideration by Members.
- 2.2 The application may be viewed on Preston City Council's website ([www.preston.gov.uk](http://www.preston.gov.uk)) using the planning application search facility and entering the application number 06/2011/0344.

A copy of the application summary including a site plan and indicative layouts are attached as an appendix to this report.
- 2.3 Members are reminded that the site was previously considered by Committee when it was included as a potential site in the City Council's site allocations Development Plan Document on which the Council was previously consulted. A report was considered at the meeting held on 13 January 2011 (minute 582 refers). The resolution sought the

creation of a joint working arrangement with Preston City Council to discuss key housing regeneration and planning matters pertinent to the Longridge area. The duly formed advisory group has met on two occasions to discuss key issues relating to development pressures, highway and infrastructure issues. In the light of the site allocations options, concerns that were seen as being key to address for the area are the scale and impact of any development proposals around Longridge, and in particular highway impacts upon the centre of Longridge, Grimsargh, Goosnargh and Whittingham. It was also recognised that it was important to consider the cumulative impacts of any schemes and proposals in formulating each area's development plan or when considering planning applications.

- 2.4 It is anticipated that the planning application will be considered by Preston City Council's Planning Committee in July 2011.

### 3 THE PROPOSAL AND KEY ISSUES

- 3.1 As the information in the appendix shows the proposal is for a mixed use scheme including up to 200 residential units, office space, leisure uses, residential apartments with care and open space. The site lies adjacent to the Ribble Valley boundary to the west of Longridge on land that comprises areas of previously developed land with established employment uses and Greenfield land. The application sits in part to the south of Whittingham Lane but it is predominantly on land to the north. It does not extend over the full extent of land put forward as part of the site allocations proposals published earlier.
- 3.2 The site will have impacts upon Longridge which would be anticipated to provide the service facilities for residents. Capacity of infrastructure would need to be considered with the statutory providers and it should be borne in mind that Ribble Valley is currently in the process of establishing its Core Strategy and seeking to determine appropriate scales of development. The area within Ribble Valley is experiencing significant development pressures. Regard should be given to the broader impacts of the site in that context when determining any application. Members need to be aware however, that in terms of this Council's accounting for the provision of a five year housing land supply, the development would not count in our supply. It would be appropriate however to consider in this wider context the impact of any development on the overall patterns of need in Ribble Valley, including affordable housing and delivering market choice. Approval of the development would not lead to the situation where no further development would be required within Longridge. It would however, be a factor in judging scale.
- 3.3 It is considered important, given a current lack of readily available employment land in the Ribble Valley to serve Longridge to be satisfied that the proposed employment provision is adequate to mitigate against loss of the existing employment uses on the site and the future opportunity to develop or redevelop these sites further, including the need to serve the Ribble Valley element of Longridge. A careful assessment of the employment opportunity should be undertaken.
- 3.4 It is a matter for Preston City to consider their position in regard to their need for housing land and their delivery of a five year housing land supply. Preston City are unable to demonstrate a five year supply. The consideration of this would need to take account of their wider planning strategies and proposals being pursued in the Central Lancashire

Core Strategy. In general terms, the scale of this proposal is not in conflict with the general policies of that proposed strategy. It is understood that in terms of saved local plan policies, the site lies within a location that has no specific land designation and consequently any application would be considered on its merits. Primarily, the application falls to be determined against national planning policies set out in PPS3 – Housing which, as Members are aware, promotes a favourable approach on suitable sites where the authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply. In that regard the underlying policy position is very much that which faces this Council on a number of locations across the borough.

- 3.5 Members should be aware that the application is in outline and that the indicative layout included with the scheme provides an illustration of how the overall form of development could take place. It is not intended to be a detailed representation of how any final scheme would actually turn out. However, it is worth considering a number of issues that have been raised by residents in response to pre-application consultation undertaken by the developer with regard to the relationship between open space areas and existing residential properties in Ribble Valley. As this application is not a matter of detail, it is difficult to offer other than general comments on these issues and to ask that the City Council have regard to residents' concerns about the relationship between existing houses and the design that could ultimately take shape on this site.

#### 4 CONCLUSION

- 4.1 There are a number of key issues to review with this proposal. Clearly, it has an impact upon Longridge and consequently any decision will impact upon this Council's development of its Core Strategy. However, whilst the decision will influence, potentially, the outcome of Ribble Valley's deliberations on its Core Strategy, there are no substantive prematurity grounds that could be raised as a reason for refusal in my view. As a Council, Ribble Valley will need to take account of the decision as it progresses its Core Strategy in due course.
- 4.2 The impact of the scheme on infrastructure must be taken into account. Members have previously and consistently raised concerns about highway impacts upon both the local and wider networks in this location. These issues must be adequately addressed as should the wider implications of infrastructure capacity. Where measures are proposed to mitigate impacts or create additional capacity, it is important to ensure they are deliverable and that any implementation programme is both clear and understood.
- 4.3 It is also important to have regard to the employment implications of developing the site as proposed. However, it must be recognised that this mixed use scheme makes provision to support and enhance employment opportunities as part of its proposals.
- 4.4 In overall policy terms there are no matters that warrant this Council raising an objection to the proposed development on policy grounds. Clearly, there are a number of important issues that Preston City, in determining the application, would need to address and it is suggested that they are mindful of the wider cumulative impacts of schemes within the area. It is important that the concerns regarding highway matters and infrastructure are addressed to the satisfaction of the relevant agencies, however that is part of the normal development management process. Whilst it may seem frustrating that development proposals are considered in parallel to the Local Development

Framework process, that it is inevitable in the current planning system where there is a duty and responsibility to deal with applications on their merits.

**5 RISK ASSESSMENT**

**5.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications**

- Resources – none.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – none.
- Political – it is important that the Council takes the opportunity to contribute to matters of local concern.
- Reputation – none.

**6 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE**

- 6.1 Agree that the Chief Executive advises Preston City Council that this Council raises no policy objection to the proposal but that the matters set out in section 3 and 4 of this report are taken into consideration when determining the application.**

**CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- 1 Preston City Council Planning Application 06/2011/0344 – Neighbouring Authority consultation.**

**For further information please ask for Colin Hirst, extension 4501.**

## RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: 14 JULY 2011  
title: ADDRESSING HOUSING NEEDS IN RIBBLE VALLEY – CONSULTATION  
submitted by: CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
principal author: RACHAEL STOTT

### 1 PURPOSE

- 1.1 To consider the revised housing policy which incorporates proposed changes to the Affordable Housing Memorandum of Understanding (AHMU) and includes a broadening of the scope to address wider needs issues.
- 1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:
- Council Ambitions – To seek to balance the housing market by matching the supply of affordable homes with identified needs.
  - Community Objectives – To meet the identified housing needs in the borough and ensure fair access to services.
  - Corporate Priorities – To be a well managed Council.
  - Other Considerations – None.

### 2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Affordable Housing Memorandum of Understanding was originally agreed in 2009 and since that date has been used as a material planning consideration in securing affordable units on any site over the specified thresholds. As a result of its use in practice, changing circumstances and a need to broaden its scope the policy has now been revised and re-titled.

### 3 ISSUES

- 3.1 The recent funding changes for affordable housing, mainly the shift from capital grant to revenue funding has had significant implications on delivery, particularly tenure type for future schemes. These changes are reflected within the proposed revision.
- 3.2 This document also seeks to address not only the issue of affordability in the borough but in addressing the identified housing need, the needs of the elderly also take priority within the document.
- 3.3 Ribble Valley has an ageing population, which is projected to increase by 49% in the next 15 years. The market has failed to meet the housing needs of this age group and therefore it is proposed that accommodation appropriate for the elderly will be secured through policy requirement. All elderly accommodation would remain as affordable through a Section 106 Agreement, which would also require units to be sold to households with a member over 60 years old and with a local connection.
- 3.4 Providing housing for the elderly has been a priority within the Housing Strategy for many years. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment also identified the need for housing for the elderly. However, very little accommodation has been developed by



the market. After consultation with the Ribble Valley Older Persons Action Group the following proposal was agreed:

"All Sites over 30 units would require 15% of the site to be for over 60 year olds. 50% of this is to be affordable and to be included within the 30% affordable housing offer. The remaining 50% would be at market sale or rent but would require a local connection for each unit. For example on a site of 60 units, 30% of the site would have to be affordable and this would be equal to 18 units. Of the 18 units, 14 of those would be affordable properties for general needs and 4 would be affordable bungalows for the elderly. In addition to this, there would be a requirement of an additional 4 units for over 60 year olds that could be sold at market value to households with a local connection. The remaining 38 units on the site would be for market sale."

- 3.5 Member's attention is drawn to the fact that amendments proposed in the last review (Spring 2010) have not been incorporated into this revision. This is because they were originally proposed to make a stronger link between the AHMU and the policies of the North West Regional Strategy (RSS). As Members will be aware the Government has published its intention to formally abolish RSS and the relevance to the AHMU no longer warrants their inclusion in this proposed revision.
- 3.6 Following consultation the document and all relevant comments will be considered by the Housing Committee who will, if appropriate adopt the document as a housing policy tool. The document will then be used as the basis of the Council's requirements to inform negotiations on development sites. Planning and Development Committee would be in a position to treat the Policy as a material consideration, and the document will be used to inform the Local Development Framework and its key statements and development management policies.
- 3.7 Copies of the proposed revised document have been sent electronically to each Member of this Committee, and reference copies are also available in the Members' Room on Level D. The document is also available via the Council's website. Members are asked to bring a copy to the meeting.

#### **4 RISK ASSESSMENT**

4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- Resources – None.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – Elderly accommodation with a local connection would be secured through the Section 106 Agreement.
- Political – Addressing housing needs of the elderly is an agreed priority within the Housing Strategy.
- Reputation – Approval of the amendments to the housing policy would result in requesting more from developers in the borough.

#### **5 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE**

- 5.1 Endorse the broadening of the scope of the policy to encompass housing needs in general rather than just affordable housing needs.
- 5.2 Note that after the consultation period of 6 weeks all comments will be considered and reported to Health and Housing Committee and where necessary amendments made, prior to adoption of the document by the Council.

- 5.3 Acknowledge that the document will form part of the Local Framework Evidence Base, and once adopted will be treated as a material condition for the purposes of determining Planning applications.

**CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

For further information please ask for Rachael Stott, extension 4567.

**RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL  
REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: THURSDAY, 11 AUGUST 2011  
title: CORE STRATEGY – SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL  
submitted by: CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
principal author: COLIN HIRST – HEAD OF REGENERATION AND PLANNING

**1 PURPOSE**

1.1 To consider commissioning additional work as part of the approach to Sustainability Appraisal for the Core Strategy.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- Council Ambitions – The matters dealt with in this report relate to the production of the Council's Local Development Framework, and the ambition of helping to protect and enhance the local environment.
- Community Objectives – The matters covered in this report will contribute to the objectives of creating a sustainable local economy and ensuring that there is a suitable supply of sites for employment and housing.
- Corporate Priorities – This paper supports the plan-making process and will assist the performance of the Council as a well-managed authority.
- Other Considerations – None.

**2 BACKGROUND**

2.1 Members will recall a previous report considered by this Committee at its meeting on the 16 June 2011. At that meeting it was resolved to commission specialist consultancy to support the delivery of the Sustainability Appraisal for the Core Strategy. As agreed Hyder Consulting have been appointed and have commenced work on the appraisal.

2.2 The cost of the work is contained within existing budgets currently derived from Planning Delivery Grant and money set aside in reserves for the LDF. Given the importance of the work to the delivery of the Core Strategy and that the document has a relationship with securing economic growth and regeneration, it is also proposed to via some money between budgets to support the delivery of the Core Strategy. As Members are aware, additional option scenarios have been published and there is therefore an additional element of testing required. Consequently a contingency was allowed to accommodate this additional work within the budget and an initial budget provision of £15,000 was identified.

**3 PROPOSED EXTENSION TO PROJECT**

3.1 In commissioning the work a programme has been established to co-ordinate the appraisal timetable with that of the Core Strategy. However an additional stage has been discussed with the consultants that would require an extension to the budget provision which, combined with the potential for additional work on the "Appropriate Assessment" element if required, would lead to further expenditure of around £3,000.

For reference the consultation element is costed at £1280 and the Appropriate Assessment at £2795.

- 3.2 Appropriate Assessment is a separate statutory assessment that is required by the regulations if there are impacts identified in the sustainability appraisal on sensitive sites such as sites of Special Scientific Interest or Special Interest, Special Protection Areas (we have SPA's within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty). We will only be able to determine the extent of this requirement once the initial assessment due.
- 3.3 The additional element now proposed is to hold a specific consultation event when the findings of the SA and the implications for the Core Strategy can be discussed in an open day format. In addition on the same day a separate briefing and meeting for Members to discuss the appraisal would be held. This would incur an additional cost of just under £1,300. Given the importance of the process and views expressed by Members regarding the need to promote public engagement I consider this additional step will bring benefits to the process and would provide a robust approach that will assist in satisfying the Inspector's tests of soundness at Public Examination. The additional cost can be identified within existing budgets, however it is an additional cost to be found or addressed through future savings in later stages of the Core Strategy process.

#### 4 RISK ASSESSMENT

4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- Resources –Including the additional consultation will exceed the identified budget of £15000 by £100. However if the Appropriate Assessment work is required this will add a further cost of £2800. In effect the additional contingency to allow for the testing of the alternative options has been used.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – Sustainability Appraisal is a statutory requirement of the LDF process.
- Political – Delivery of the Core Strategy is a priority for the Council.
- Reputation – The Sustainability Appraisal will inform the Council's decision-making and demonstrate how the Council can deliver sustainable development.

#### 5 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE

5.1 Agree to extend the project commission to include the additional consultation element and note the overall budget implications.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE.

#### BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 1 SA Project file
- 2 SA Regulations – various.

For further information please ask for Colin Hirst, extension 4503.

**RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL  
REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: THURSDAY, 11 AUGUST 2011  
title: REVIEWING HOUSING REQUIREMENTS FOR RIBBLE VALLEY  
submitted by: MARSHAL SCOTT – CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
principal author: COLIN HIRST – HEAD OF REGENERATION AND HOUSING

**1 PURPOSE**

- 1.1 To receive the consultant's report relating to housing requirements in the Ribble Valley.
- 1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:
- Council Ambitions – To match the supply of homes in our area with the identified housing needs.
  - Community Objectives – To protect and enhance the existing environmental quality of our area.
  - Corporate Priorities – To be a well-managed Council, providing efficient services based on identified customer needs.
  - Other Considerations – None.

**2 BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 Members will be aware of the concern being generated around the provision of housing across Ribble Valley and the recent commission of consultants to undertake a review of housing requirements.
- 2.2 The nature and origin of the housing requirement has been a key issue raised in response to the Core Strategy consultation with many respondents questioning whether the figure was appropriate. It was also identified by many respondents as an issue to revisit given the Government's stated intention to abolish regional strategies, leaving Local Authorities to determine housing requirements locally rather than being set at a regional level.
- 2.3 Ribble Valley currently uses the housing numbers set out in the adopted Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). This requires 2,898 additional housing units to be provided over the RSS plan period 2003 – 2021, equating to 161 units per year. This figure is the basis upon which the Council's five-year housing land supply is calculated which is the underpinning factor for determining planning applications. It should be noted that in preparing the Core Strategy, the Council will be required to make a provision for housing over a 15 year period from the point at which the Core Strategy is adopted. It is anticipated adoption would take place in 2012, therefore a housing requirement would need to be established for the period up to 2027, beyond the current regional plan figure. Members have previously agreed to establish a plan period of 2008 – 2028 to accommodate this and the consultants have prepared their advice against this plan period. The existing RSS figure has been rolled forward, pending this review, for the purposes of progressing the Core Strategy.

### 3 THE HOUSING REQUIREMENT REVIEW – NEXT STEPS

- 3.1 Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners were commissioned to undertake the housing requirement review and a copy of their report and advice is attached for Members of the Planning and Development Committee as an appendix to this Agenda. A reference copy is available in the Level D Members' Room and the report can also be viewed on the Council's website. A member of the consultancy team will provide a short presentation to the Committee and will be available to discuss their findings as Members consider the item.
- 3.2 The approach and methodology undertaken is set out in the report that presents a series of scenarios and findings based upon the model runs and assumptions agreed with Members when the report was commissioned. The scenarios generated a wide range of housing requirements based upon a number of different indicators. Across the scenarios the housing requirement ranges from 43 dwellings per annum to some 559 dwellings per annum dependant upon the modelling assumptions applied.
- 3.3 The report goes into some detail to analyse each of the respective scenarios and highlights areas of concern and caution. The analysis identifies where circumstances or assumptions that lead to unrealistic or unsustainable requirements should be taken into account ultimately informing the consultant's advice. The conclusion drawn overall by the consultancy team is that the Borough's housing requirement will lie within a range of between 190 and 220 dwellings per annum in order to address the underlying requirement.
- 3.4 Whilst the indicated range exceeds the current strategic housing figure of 161 units per year used to plan for housing it does not take into account as the consultants identify wider policy considerations which will be a matter for the Council. Further work will be undertaken to refine the recommendations to inform the level of housing requirement that in turn will be incorporated into the Core Strategy and decisions on planning applications. It should be noted however that the RSS figure continues to be the relevant development plan figure for the purposes of deciding planning applications. At this stage the housing requirement review is not sufficiently advanced to apply its findings. This further work will need to be undertaken without delay in order to support the progression of the Core Strategy at its next stages.
- 3.5 Having received the consultants report and in order to inform the Council's deliberations on housing requirement it is considered important to publish the report and invite comments from the public and wider stakeholders. Consultation would take place as soon as possible if agreed and would provide an opportunity for people to contribute to the process over a six-week consultation period. The report would be published on the Council's website and its availability advertised using our normal methods of press release and direct mailing as appropriate.
- 3.6 Given the importance of this work, it is proposed that the Chief Executive establishes a small working group to contribute to the housing requirement review informed by the proposed consultation.
- 3.7 As indicated the consultant's study provides the modelling and information in order to help the Council as Local Planning Authority determine the most appropriate level of housing. The creation of the working group will provide a vehicle by which the detailed consideration of the issues concerned can be looked at in order to present the Committee with a recommendation in relation to future housing requirements.

- 3.8 A number of factors will need to be considered as the review progresses. This will include the implications of the recently published Draft National Planning Framework intended to replace existing national policies. The draft framework for example introduces a presumption in favour of sustainable development as well as a need to allow for an additional 20% on the identified five-year supply of housing land. Other considerations include the opportunity that the Localism Bill may present for local communities to propose additional housing through Neighbourhood plans. Together this indicates the potential for an increase in the housing requirement that local authorities will need to identify through the planning system. A separate report will be presented to Members as part of the consultation on the Government's draft proposals however it is clear that policy is leaning much more towards supporting housing delivery and growth and this will require careful consideration when determining the housing requirement for the borough.

#### **4 RISK ASSESSMENT**

- 4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- Resources – The costs of public consultation is contained within existing budgets for the Local Development Framework.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – It is important that planning decisions are made on up-to-date and tested information.
- Political – Housing requirements are a significant issue affecting the borough.
- Reputation – The Council is responding to the Government's published intention and high levels of concern from the community relating to development pressures in the area enabling the Council to make informed decisions.

#### **5 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE**

- 5.1 Agree to publish the findings of the review of housing requirements for a 6 week period of consultation and instruct the Chief Executive to establish a working group to consider housing requirements further in the light of the consultation response.

**CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

For further information please ask for Colin Hirst, extension 4503.

(11081104)

# RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

## REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: 13 OCTOBER 2011  
title: NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK CONSULTATION  
submitted by: CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
principal authors: COLIN HIRST & JOHN MACHOLC

### 1 MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

1.1 The response to the government's recent consultation paper on a proposed new national planning framework.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- Council Ambitions – to protect and enhance the existing environmental qualities of our area.
- Community Objectives – to strive for the highest quality environment with quality of life for all.
- Corporate Priorities – to finalise our Core Strategy.
- Other Considerations – none.

### 2 BACKGROUND

2.1 In December 2010, the government announced its intention to create a National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The NPPF was intended to replace the extensive National Planning Policy Guidance (some 47 existing documents), a variety of circulars, Minerals Planning Guidance and Government letters to Chief Planning Officers. Collectively, this provides essentially through Planning Policy Statement (PPS) and Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPGs) the central government's policies for local planning authorities to take into account. The new NPPF cuts what amounts to more than 1000 pages of guidance to some 58. It is intended to be shorter, less bureaucratic and to enable more local discretion in policy formulation.

2.2 Copies of the NPPF draft can be viewed at the following website:

[www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/195181.pdf](http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/195181.pdf)

A copy, together with information from the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) and the Planning Inspectorate have also been placed in the Members Room on Level D. Copies of the above information have also been emailed to Members of the Committee for reference.

2.3 The closing date for responses to the consultation is 17 October 2011.

### 3 THE DRAFT NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

3.1 As Members will be aware, the publication of the draft framework has generated widespread national interest with considerable press and media coverage. In some regards, this highlights the importance of the proposed changes to planning policy. However, it is important to bear in mind that whilst there are some changes to the way in which the planning system operates, and implications for much greater local input,



through for example the proposed measures within the Localism Bill, the fundamentals of the planning system will continue. The new framework emphasises further the existing role of a plan led system, continues to require planning applications to be the mechanism of detailed consideration and of course the system continues to operate within a framework prescribed by UK legislation and EU regulation. Given the fragmented, complex and sometimes over prescriptive nature of the existing national planning framework, the principle of consolidating the guidance, policy statements, circulars and so on into a single, shorter document should be generally supported. What is important however, is how the underlying policy approach alters both planning making and development management decisions by apparently removing perceived constraints on development.

3.2 The primary purpose of the NPPF is to achieve sustainable development by delivering three principles:

- Planning for prosperity – this is the use of the planning system to build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type and in the right places is available to allow growth and innovation. Economic growth is a key component of the new guidance.
- Planning for people – the planning system should be used to promote strong vibrant and healthy communities by providing an increased supply of housing to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a good quality built environment where local services are accessible and reflect the communities needs whilst supporting its health and wellbeing.
- Planning for places – use the planning system to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, to use natural resources prudently and to mitigate and adapt to climate change, including moving to a low-carbon economy.

3.3 There are a number of key changes that underpin the Government's intended approach to planning. The primary purpose of the NPPF is to achieve sustainable development. It should be noted that in terms of the framework, sustainable means not making things worse for future generations, development means economic growth. There is an emphasis on a pro-growth approach throughout. Indeed, the premise of the policy framework is one whereby local planning authorities should plan positively for new development and approve proposals wherever possible. The framework clarifies this presumption insofar as development should be approved unless adverse impacts (where they are identified) 'would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits'. Significantly the framework also promotes that where a local plan is absent, silent, indeterminate or out of date, planning permission should be granted. To a great extent much of the concern raised around the government's policy rallies around what this actually means. Certainly it signals an approach that would clearly favour development proposals in many circumstances. There are two key aspects however that should be considered. Firstly, the guidance still supports the premise that identified needs are at the core of making planning decisions and preparing plans. The shift towards locally determined requirements does not do away with the need for local planning authorities to determine what levels of development are required for the needs of the area. Secondly, the approach as mentioned, continues to rely on a plan led system. The plan making process is a vehicle through which local planning authorities will establish requirements and policy to manage development, thereby avoiding the feared development free for all once plans are in place.

3.4 However, although the plan led system remains, there continues to be a very strong emphasis on enabling development to go ahead. The critical aspect being the so called

default position of saying 'yes' to development, especially where plans are not up to date or in place. A further issue to be aware of is that the framework and the Localism Bill intend to introduce important changes including streamlining the existing system, and a return to single local plans (which many would welcome) as opposed to the collection of documents that is the basis of the current LDF system. What is vital to ensure is that suitable transitional arrangements are in place to enable work currently undertaken to be carried forward and adequate timeframes for the transition to occur. Little regard is given to this in the draft guidance, albeit it would essentially be a matter for separate regulations. The real risk for many authorities will otherwise be a need to redirect plan making, further delays in putting plans in place and inevitably much less local control on development in the interim.

3.5 Overall, Members may wish to express a view on the extent to which the pro-growth approach is supported. In general growth will occur in response to natural change, population and business needs for example. Similarly to support the Council's aims of supporting and encouraging a vibrant local economy, development will need to be planned for. The question of course is to what extent and how this is delivered. A concern perhaps is the manner in which the proposed guidance promotes the presumption in favour of sustainable development, in that it may, as drafted, move too far towards an approach of universal approval that is likely to be difficult for local planning authorities to balance.

3.6 Whilst retaining an emphasis on a plan-led system, the NPPF will introduce some important changes to plan making. It envisages a single plan approach, with less reliance on additional documents. Given that for many, the existing system of Local Development Frameworks has been nigh-on impossible for the public to understand, is seen as slow to produce and inevitably costly; these proposed changes should be generally welcomed.

3.7 In more detail, the draft NPPF envisages that local plans should:

- set out strategic priorities for housing, economic and commercial development, infrastructure, community infrastructure, climate change and the natural and historic environment;
- operate on a 15 year time horizon;
- indicate broad locations for strategic development on a key diagram, and land use designations on a proposals map;
- allocate sites for development, and identify areas where development should be controlled;
- be in conformity with the NPPF; and
- reflect a collective, community vision for the area.

3.8 Development Management (essentially the process of dealing with planning applications) is given a primary objective of fostering the delivery of sustainable development, not to hinder or prevent development. Although expressed in the guidance as such it is not necessarily a reflective statement on how the system operates. As expressed, the reference sends a strong signal to Local Planning Authorities but does not perhaps indicate sufficient regard to what the planning system has to balance. In part it indicates a presumption that the customer of the system is business and the drivers of economic growth. In fact there also needs to be a reflection of the local communities aspirations as a customer of the system if the guidance is to

reflect the wider role expected from Development Management. Consideration of this needs to be reflected in the drafting of the guidance if it is to offer a more balanced approach perhaps. What is of particular concern from a Development Management viewpoint is that the guidance lacks any references to enforcement matters.

The guidance emphasises that local planning authorities need to:

- approach development management decisions positively – looking for solutions rather than problems, so that applications can be approved wherever it is practical to do so;
- attach significant weight to the benefits of economic and housing growth;
- influence development proposals to achieve high quality outcomes; and
- enable the delivery of sustainable development proposals.

3.9 The system will also need to embrace the approach of Neighbourhood Planning including the proposed Neighbourhood Development and Community Right to Build Orders which allow neighbourhoods and communities to specify classes of development that will not require further planning permission. Potentially this could introduce additional demands on resources to put them in place although there would be less casework in the longer term as a result. However monitoring would be required including potential enforcement to ensure compliance which would be unlikely to draw any direct fee income and therefore could have implications for the service. There is a risk of some conflict arising from the proposals as drafted where neighbourhood plans would have to be in conformity with local plans yet neighbourhood plan policies may take precedence. The drafting of this aspect in the framework does need to be clarified and the overall approach and intention given greater explanation. There is certainly anecdotal evidence of growing concern amongst our local communities regarding what neighbourhood planning actually means and from a parish viewpoint the resource implications for it to be put in place.

3.10 As discussed the new framework strips away a considerable amount of national policies and presents a greatly condensed series of statements reflecting the themes outlined above. In most areas there is not a great deal of difference between the policy contained in the framework and that of the previous guidance. There is simply less of it.

3.11 Within the theme of Planning for Prosperity the issues addressed relate to:

- business;
- retail and leisure;
- the rural economy;
- transport;
- community infrastructure; and
- minerals.

3.12 The most significant change relates to the removal of the sequential test in relation to office development. While this could be an issue for some authorities in terms of supporting town centre uses and regeneration aspirations, it is perhaps less of an issue for this Council.

3.13 Planning for People addresses current national policy in relation to:

- housing;
- design;
- sustainable communities; and
- greenbelt.

- 3.14 The most noteworthy changes relate to housing policies which may be a concern for this Council. Whilst there is still a requirement to meet a five-year housing requirement, the framework also requires an additional 20% should be provided for within the five-year calculation to ensure supply is maintained and choice and market competition can be provided for. It is important to note that the allowance does not mean an additional 20% over and above the overall requirement but rather it is to be set against the five-year requirement. In effect it frontloads provision across the plan period. In practice it is likely that given the way in which the development industry operates in reality to attain a true five-year supply, Local Planning Authorities would have to have in place the equivalent of six-seven years in any event and certainly in order to defend a five-year supply position robustly.
- 3.15 A further important consideration that the NPPF brings in for rural areas is that Local Planning Authorities should consider allowing some market housing to facilitate delivery of additional affordable housing to meet local needs. This moves towards a significant relaxation of the existing emphasis on exception sites. Whilst this approach is currently taken in many areas including Ribbles Valley, where appropriate, it is not universally applied and will need careful policy crafting to balance the pressures for new housing, the desire to suitably distribute development and having in place a mechanism to deliver affordable housing. Another important change worth noting is the removal of density requirements (which would now be locally set) and targets for both brown field use and affordable housing. Overall the changes will provide more flexibility to respond to local circumstances, and should be welcomed.
- 3.16 The third principle promoted is that of Planning for Places. Essentially covering climate changes and flooding, the natural environment and the historic environment. As with other themes, the general thrust remains the same however there is a risk that local plans will be looked upon as a means of providing much more detailed policies, especially where the guidance is emphasising fewer planning policy documents. Care will need to be taken to ensure this does not translate in overlong or prescriptive local plans which may try and anticipate every circumstance.
- 3.14 Overall many of the changes place greater emphasis on locally evidenced and locally determined policies. The radical streamlining of national policies could provide problems when assessing future planning applications and in the period where Local Planning Authorities are putting in place new development plans, there is likely to be significant pressures for development and consequent challenges to decisions through appeals and in some instances legal challenges as the development industry seeks to establish what the policies actually mean.

#### 4 NATIONAL APPLICATION OF DRAFT OF THE NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

- 4.1 It is important to bear in mind that the draft NPPF is a consultation document. As discussed it has attracted a lot of interest and response, and the Government has indicated recently its intention to redraft the guidance to address concerns about meaning and interpretation. However it would appear likely that the underlying intention and themes will continue which should be taken into account as the Council progresses its development plan and determines planning applications. The latter is an important issue as whilst as a point of law the saved policies of the Districtwide Local Plan and (for the present) the Regional Spatial Strategy, remain the development plan for the area and provide the starting point for determining applications, the key matter becomes one of weight to be attached in the context of whether the plans are up to date. Clearly in relation to many of the saved policies of the Districtwide Local Plan, where they refer to

detailed aspects of policy, they will remain relevant however others that relate to strategy and development scale will be increasingly less relevant.

- 4.2 Appendix 1 to this report includes the most recent guidance issued by the Planning Inspectorate in relation to the NPPF and provides advice on how Inspectors should consider the draft. What is important to note is that the NPPF is capable of being a material consideration and regard must therefore be given to what weight it has relevant to the matter being considered.
- 4.3 In preparing the Core Strategy, as it moves to the next key stage the proposals will be reviewed to establish if there are any aspects that could conflict with NPPF as currently drafted and Members will be advised accordingly. Meanwhile it is important to note the emphasis on the plan-led system as the key measure for Local Planning Authorities to manage development across their areas to address identified needs and requirements.

## 5 RISK ASSESSMENT

5.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- Resources – None.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – None.
- Political – There is significant community interest in strategic planning matters.
- Reputation – The opportunity to make a response to consultation is important.

## 6 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE

- 6.1 Note the contents of this report.
- 6.2 Advise the Chief Executive of any additional views to be expressed and that he be authorised to submit a response in line with the comments set out in Section 3 of this report, supplemented by Members' comments to the Secretary of State.

## CHIEF EXECUTIVE

### BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 1 Draft National Planning Policy Framework CLG, July 2011.
- 2 Draft Local Plan Regulations CLG, July 2011.
- 3 Localism and the National Planning Policy Framework LGG/PAS, September 2011.
- 4 Advice Note for Planning Inspectors PINS, September 2011.
- 5 General file on NPPF held in regeneration.

For further information please ask for Colin Hirst, extension 4503.

## **RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

Agenda Item No. 7

meeting date: THURSDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2011  
title: HOUSING NUMBER REVIEW – TERMS OF REFERENCE  
submitted by: CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
principal author: COLIN HIRST – HEAD OF REGENERATION AND HOUSING

### **1 MATTER FOR CONSIDERATION**

1.1 The proposed terms of reference for the housing requirements working sub-group.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- Council Ambitions – To match the supply of homes in our area with identified housing needs.
- Community Objectives – To progress the Core Strategy.
- Corporate Priorities – To be a well-managed Council.
- Other Considerations – None.

### **2 BACKGROUND**

2.1 Members will recall that the consideration is being given to the issue of housing requirements in the Ribble Valley and the work undertaken by Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners to inform the Council's deliberations. As previously agreed a period of consultation has commenced in relation to the evidence report which is due to close in December. The intentions of the consultation is to provide a formal opportunity for people to comment on the published report and to enable matters of relevance to be taken onboard in reviewing the existing housing requirement.

2.3 To assist that process it was agreed to form a working sub-group of this Committee to review any comments and to contribute to the work of the Committee in relation to establishing housing requirements. It was resolved that terms of reference would be agreed by this Committee.

### **3 TERMS OF REFERENCE**

3.1 The group will have a key role in giving detailed consideration to the review of housing requirements and providing guidance on how the review is progressed and ultimately provide a steer on the proposed housing requirement to Committee. It is not anticipated that the group would undertake any detailed work on the technical aspects of the review.

3.2 The suggested terms of reference are presented for discussion and endorsement and are attached in draft form as Appendix 1 to this report.

### **4 RISK ASSESSMENT**

4.1 The matters dealt with in this report may have the following risks:

- Resources – No direct implications.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – The proposed abolition of the Regional Spatial Strategy places a requirement on the Council to establish housing numbers as part of the Core Strategy. The Council's decisions must be evidence based.
- Political – There is a particular public interest in this area of the Council's work.
- Reputation – None.

## **5 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE**

- 5.1 The proposed Terms of Reference are agreed and that the Working Sub-Group is now established.

### **CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

#### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- 1 None.

For further information please ask for Colin Hirst, extension 4503.

## Appendix 1

### **Planning & Development Committee Housing Review Working Sub-Group Terms of Reference**

1. STRUCTURE AND REPORTING
  - 1.1 The Group will be known as the Housing Review Working Sub-Group of the Planning and Development Committee.
  - 1.2 The Group will be chaired by the Chairman of Planning and Development Committee.
  - 1.3 The minutes of the meeting will be reported to the Planning and Development Committee.
2. AIMS
  - 2.1 The aim of the Sub-Group is:
    - To match the supply of homes in our area with the identified housing needs and to support progress on the Core Strategy.
3. OBJECTIVES
  - 3.1 To provide a forum to discuss the findings of the consultant's report and the implications for the proper planning of the borough.
  - 3.2 To consider the consultation response to the Housing Requirements Review Report and identify any key matters of concern.
  - 3.3 In the light of the consultation response to consider the recommendations in the Council's report and contribute advice to the Planning and Development Committee on an appropriate level of housing provision.



# RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

## REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: THURSDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2011  
title: LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK CORE STRATEGY – SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES ON ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS  
submitted by: CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
principal author: DIANE CAFFERTY- SENIOR PLANNING OFFICER

### 1. PURPOSE

1.1 To inform Members of the publication of the Summary of Representations document of the Core Strategy Alternative Options stage consultation (Regulation 25) report for information.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- Council Ambitions – The Core Strategy is the central strategy of the Local Development Framework. It will help in the delivery of housing, employment and the protection and enhancement of the environment, ultimately presenting the delivery strategy for implementing the vision for the Ribble Valley up to 2028.
- Community Objectives – As a tool for delivering spatial policy, it identifies how a range of issues relating to the objectives of a sustainable economy, thriving market towns and housing provision will be addressed through the planning system.
- Corporate Priorities – The Core Strategy is the central document of the LDF and sets the overall vision and approach to future planning policy, which will aid performance and consistency.
- Other Considerations – The Council has a duty to prepare spatial policy under the Local Development Framework system and make consultation responses available for public viewing.

### 2. INFORMATION

2.1 The current approach to development plans introduced by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the Council to develop a new suite of documents known as the Local Development Framework (LDF) that will replace the adopted Districtwide Local Plan. The policies within the LDF must be informed by a strong, robust evidence base and therefore over the past few years, Officers have been working on creating the LDF baseline. Work continues on keeping this up to date, however the central document of the LDF, the Core Strategy, has now been formulated from this baseline.

2.2 Members will recall that consultation on the first stage of production of the Core Strategy document took place between the 25<sup>th</sup> August and 20<sup>th</sup> October 2010. This consultation represented the Regulation 25 stage of the legislative regulations. The level of response to this consultation was encouraging, with just under 4000 comments, or representations, submitted into the consultation process. A summary of these representations was presented to Members of Planning and Development Committee in March 2011 and the report published for information on the Council's website and made available at the Council Offices. Members will recall that this report highlighted that

further work on generating some additional, alternative Development Strategy options was necessary.

- 2.3 Subsequently, five additional alternative Development Strategy options, presented as options A, B, C, D and E were developed, with letters being used rather than numbers to distinguish the options from each of the two consultations. Options 1, 2 and 3, which were presented at the Regulation 25 stage (between August and October 2010) also remained as potential options, creating 8 potential Development Strategy options in total.
- 2.4 As with the 2010 consultation, interest and involvement in the Core Strategy consultation process is extremely encouraging. Formal representations were received from 1150 bodies/individuals, containing a total of 2807 representations. When compared to the 2010 consultation it is evident that although around 400 more individual letters/response forms were submitted at this alternative options stage, this generated 1113 fewer separate representations or 'issues'. This is an average of 2.4 reps per respondent compared with 5.2 reps per respondent at the 2010 consultation. It is considered that this reduction in reps or 'issues' relates to a high number of people submitting a highlighted preferred option only rather than listing why no development should happen in the borough at all, which was a significant outcome of the 2010 consultation.
- 2.5 Each of the representations received during the six-week consultation has been inputted into the Council's LDF database for storage and analysis and the responses to the consultation are presented in the attached Summary of Representations document. The report provides an initial analysis of the issues raised and identifies key issues to address as the Core Strategy is progressed.
- 2.6 An aim of the consultation on the Core Strategy was to identify which of the Development Strategy options was the preferred approach to development across Ribble Valley up to 2028. It is considered that unlike the 2010 consultation stage, the results of the consultation mean that it will be possible to progress to selecting a preferred option. This will form the central strategy of the Core Strategy report and will be subject to a further round of public consultation, which will form the Regulation 27 stage of the Core Strategy process also referred to as the publication version or the preferred option report. The Submission stage Core Strategy will be developed from that and submitted to the Secretary of State prior to independent Examination and subsequent adoption. Until the full LDF is adopted however, the Districtwide Local Plan will continue to be used by RVBC as the adopted Development Plan for the borough, against which planning applications will be determined taking account of any relevant material considerations, including national planning policies.
- 2.7 The Summary of Representations document will be made available under the Forward Planning section on the Council's website and copies will be made available for inspection at Planning Reception. The document itself is not published for consultation.

#### CHIEF EXECUTIVE

For further information please ask for Diane Cafferty, extension 4551 or Colin Hirst, extension 4503.

## **RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: THURSDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2011  
title: HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY  
submitted by: CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
principal author: COLIN HIRST – HEAD OF REGENERATION AND HOUSING

### **1 PURPOSE**

- 1.1 To provide Members with information on the most recent results of the Housing Land Availability Survey.
- 1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities
  - Council Ambitions – Understanding the housing position is key to the delivery of the Council's ambition to match the supply of homes in our area to identify needs.
  - Community Objectives – The information in this report relates to a number of community objectives but is particularly relevant to the broad objective of conserving our countryside and enhancing the local environment.
  - Corporate Priorities - This information is relevant to the local development framework which is the spatial expression of the Community Strategy.
  - Other Consideration – None.

### **2 INFORMATION**

- 2.1 The Council monitors housing land availability twice a year and produces a housing land availability report. This document provides the information with which to monitor housing development across the Borough. Monitoring continues to be critical to the process of determining planning applications and the Council's duty to ensure a 5 year supply of developable land.
- 2.2 The report provides detailed information on sites with planning permission, sites under construction and enables the Council to create a picture of construction trends and activity rates together with base line evidence on the amount of land that is available to be brought forward. Copies of the full report are available for reference at Planning Reception and the members room on Level D.
- 2.3 Members will be aware that the relevant strategic basis against which housing land supply is monitored is the Regional Spatial Plan (RSS). The Council continues to monitor against the provision of 2900 homes between 2003 and 2021 to provide for a strategic provision of some 161 units per year. Work is continuing on a review of the strategic requirement as a consequence of the stated intention by Government to abolish the RSS and the need to provide a strategic position for housing delivery going forward.
- 2.4 The supply position for dwelling units as at October 2011 is summarised as follows:

• Units with full planning permission	163
• Units with outline planning permission	211
• Sites commenced, units remaining but not started	48
• Units under construction	114
• Conversions - not started	56
• Conversions –under construction	42
<b>Total</b>	<b>634</b>

60 Affordable housing units have permission (not started) and are included in the housing land supply once they commence.

The table at appendix 1 sets out a 5-year statement, as at October 2011 taking account of the necessary adjustments and smoothing to reflect activity over the monitoring period. Given that we currently plan for 161 units per year this shows that the Council cannot demonstrate an ongoing 5 - year supply of housing land as required by Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3) Housing.

2.5 PPS 3 is clear in terms of the guidance to apply when determining applications in the absence of a 5-year supply. Paragraph 71 indicates that;

“ Where Local Planning Authorities cannot demonstrate an up-to-date five year supply of deliverable sites, for example where Local Development Documents have not been reviewed to take into account policies in this PPS (pps3) or there is less than five years supply of deliverable sites, they should consider favourably planning applications for housing, having regard to the policies in this PPS including the consideration in paragraph 69.”

2.6 The fact that an authority is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply and consequently must have regard to the implications of paragraph 71, also has to be balanced with the need to apply paragraph 69. This retains the need in effect to ensure that in approving a residential development a number of key principles have to be considered. The saved local plan policies will be key-factors when determining applications albeit having regard to what material considerations need to be taken into account due to changing circumstances since those policies were formulated.

2.7 The requirement to consider applications favourably in the absence of a 5 year supply does not mean that there are to be no other policy or development control considerations, that could lead to a refusal. It should be noted that in most cases there would need to be clear and sound reasons for refusal where it does not harm policy considerations particularly as set out in paragraph 69. In addition PPS3 is also clear in that it states that authorities should not be refusing applications solely on the grounds of prematurity. The need for infrastructure to be in place to support the development would however be seen as a fundamental consideration and development ahead of any actual or programmed infrastructure may be seen as premature in that context.

2.8 Paragraph 69 establishes that

In general, in deciding planning applications, Local Planning Authorities should have regard to:

- Achieving high quality housing.
- Ensuring developments achieve a good mix of housing reflecting accommodation requirements of specific groups, in particular, families and older people.

- The suitability of a site for housing, including its environmental sustainability.
  - Using land effectively and efficiently.
  - Ensuring the proposed development is in line with planning for housing objectives, reflecting the need and demand for housing in, and the spatial vision for, the area and does not undermine wider policy objectives eg. addressing housing market renewal issues.
- 2.9 The ongoing work being undertaken on the Core strategy will have regard to the issue of underlying housing numbers and further work on the strategic housing position will be reported in due course. Any changes to housing provision will need to be supported through evidence and analysis to ensure that the planned requirements are capable of justification and can be defended. This will include the need for consultation as part of the Core Strategy process. At this stage it is important to re-affirm for planning purposes the Council currently will continue to manage supply against the RSS provision.
- 2.10 Members will recall the approach introduced at the previous Planning and Development Committee to address the situation where applicants were not completing negotiations on Section 106 Agreements as a matter of urgency. This has given rise to a number of applications where formal approval awaits the completion of the Section 106, often on applications that would make a significant contribution to the supply of housing in the borough. These cannot be taken account of within the land supply calculations.
- 2.11 By way of illustration, there are currently a number of applications that are awaiting completion of the Section 106 for a variety of reasons and consequently do not feature in the supply calculation. In total, these represent some 263 dwellings that are not accounted for. Although 91 dwellings relate to recently considered applications, the remainder relate to older schemes. This highlights the concerns raised by the Head of Planning Services and the need to adopt a firm stance with applicants if we are to avoid a risk of over supply within the five-year accounting period.

## CHIEF EXECUTIVE

### BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 1 Housing Land Availability Survey files
- 2 Planning Policy Statement 3 Housing – CLG - November 2006
- 3 North West of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021 – GONW- Sept 2008

For details of the Housing Land Availability Schedule contact Sharon O'Neill extension 4506.

For further information on housing and strategic policy issues please ask for Colin Hirst, extension 4503.

**APPENDIX 1**

**Five year supply (2011-2016) based on previously adopted RSS figures and including permissions and completions up until 1<sup>st</sup> October 2011.**

**Planned Provision**

a) Housing provision 2003/2021	2900	161/yr
b) Net dwellings completed 2003-2011 (8yrs)	1098	129 (1098/8.5)
c) Net dwellings required 2011-2021 (9.5 years) (adjusted to a revised annual rate)	1802/9.5	190/yr
d) Adjusted Net 5 yr requirement 2011-2016 (5yrs)	950	190*5 (annual equivalent smoothed over plan period)

- a) Strategic housing provision based on previously adopted RSS figures.
- b) Actual completions in monitoring period divided by number of years.
- c) Residual requirements based on completions and plan period remaining. This figure gives the annualised requirement to attain planned figure.
- d) Five year requirements based on the revised/adjusted annualised rate.

**Identified Supply**

Supply of deliverable sites over 5 years (Housing Land Availability Survey April 2011)	
<b>Sites under construction</b>	<b>156</b>
<b>Deliverable permissions</b>	<b>(538)</b>
(discounted by 10% slippage allowance but including affordable units)	484
<b>Total Supply</b>	<b>640</b>
Equates to <b>3.3 yrs supply</b> at 5 year adjusted rate at 01.10.11	

Actual supply: 3.3 yrs supply (640/190)

## **RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: THURSDAY, 8 DECEMBER 2011  
title: LDF CORE STRATEGY – OUTLINE APPROACH  
submitted by: CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
principal author: COLIN HIRST – HEAD OF REGENERATION & HOUSING

### **1 PURPOSE**

- 1.1 To consider the outline approach to the preferred option and agree a direction of travel.
- 1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:
  - Council Ambitions – The Core Strategy is the central strategy of the Local Development Framework. It will help in the delivery of housing employment and the protection and enhancement of the environment, ultimately presenting the delivery strategy for implementing the vision for the Ribble Valley for the next 15-20 years.
  - Community Objectives – As a tool for delivering spatial policy the Core Strategy identifies how a range of issues relating to the objectives of a sustainable economy, thriving market towns and housing provision will be addressed through the planning system.
  - Corporate Priorities – The Core Strategy is the central document of the LDF and sets the overall vision and approach to future planning policy which will aid performance and consistency.
  - Other Considerations – The Council has a duty to prepare spatial policy under the Local Development Framework system.

### **2 BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The current approach to development plans introduced by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the Council to develop a new suite of documents known as the Local Development Framework (LDF) that will replace the adopted Districtwide Local Plan. The policies within the LDF must be informed by a strong, robust evidence base and therefore over the past few years, officers have been working on creating the LDF baseline. Work continues on keeping this up to date, however the central document of the LDF, the Core Strategy is now being formulated from this baseline.
- 2.2 In progressing the plan a number of consultations have been undertaken on a range of options and evidence to inform the preparation of the strategy. Information relating to this work is available on the Council's website or for reference in the Level D Members' Room. The Council now needs to progress towards considering the preferred option from managing development over the plan period. It is anticipated that the preferred option document will be presented to Members ahead of a further round of public consultation at a meeting early in the New Year. In order to take the work forward and to

inform that work a paper has been prepared for discussion. A copy of the paper is attached as Appendix 1.

### 3 OUTLINE APPROACH

- 3.1 Members will recall from early option drafts that the Core Strategy will comprise a central high level approach to the distribution and scale of development proposed over the plan period up to 2028. This is then to be supported by a series of Key Statements to set the broad policy directions and relevant themes and then as part of the implementation and delivery mechanism a series of Development Management policies. A separate report is included on the Agenda for this meeting that will deal with the proposed Key Statements and Development Management policies.
- 3.2 The proposals for the preferred option are being developed within a framework of Sustainability Appraisal that will test the proposed policies against sustainability considerations and a report, presented in parallel to the proposed preferred option will be available alongside the draft option. The work is being undertaken by consultants and is feeding into the ongoing work. The approach set out in the discussion document has taken into consideration early information from the Sustainability Appraisal work.
- 3.3 Members will note from the attached paper the direction of travel that has emerged from the work so far and the implications in terms of planning for housing and economic development overall and the emerging approach to development distribution.
- 3.4 The document reflects a hybrid approach developed from the previous options consulted on including a distribution based on existing scale but of significance a proposed strategic growth point at Clitheroe, recognition of the proposed Lancashire Enterprise Zone and the opportunity to support local needs in terms of housing, economic development and community facilities reflecting the overall outcome of the consultation.
- 3.5 Members are invited to consider and discuss the proposals set out in the paper and are asked to provide feedback on the direction of travel. It is important to note that this document does not in itself have any statutory weight for the purposes of determining planning applications but does provide an opportunity for Members to confirm at an early stage the Council's position with regard to the approach being developed and to enable the preferred option to be developed to reflect Member preferences.

### 4 RISK ASSESSMENT

- 4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:
- Resources – None directly, however this resolution will provide a steer to officers on how existing resources will be focussed and managed in the production of the preferred strategy document.
  - Technical, Environmental and Legal – None.
  - Political – The preparation of the Core Strategy has widespread public interest.



- Reputation – The Council's decision on how to proceed may affect its reputation, consideration of the report will support the Council's aim of being a well run authority.

**5 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE**

- 5.1 Confirm the approach to the emerging Development Strategy as set out in Appendix 1 and that the preferred option be formulated to reflect the framework outlined.

**CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

For further information please ask for Colin Hirst, extension 4503.

## **RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: THURSDAY 8th, DECEMBER, 2011  
title: CORE STRATEGY- KEY STATEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT  
POLICIES – PROPOSED REVISIONS  
submitted by: MARSHALL SCOTT, CHIEF EXECUTIVES DEPARTMENT  
principal author: PHIL DAGNALL

### **1 PURPOSE**

1.1 To inform the Council regarding the outcomes of the recent consultations on the Core Strategy, and how they are influencing the development of the document. The Core Strategy is a fundamental part of the Local Development Framework (LDF) which will ultimately become a part of the Borough's statutory plan and guide the location of future development.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- Council Ambitions – The document that is the subject of this report, as part of the LDF Core Strategy, relates to Council ambitions of making people's lives safer and healthier and also helping to protect and enhance the local environment.
- Community Objectives – The matters covered in this report will contribute to the objectives of building safer communities, and ensuring that there is a suitable supply of sites for employment and appropriate housing
- Corporate Priorities – This paper will help improve the evidence base of the Local Development Framework thereby assisting performance and consistency.
- Other Considerations – None.

### **2 BACKGROUND**

2.1 The Core Strategy is a central planning document within the Local Development Framework (LDF) that will ultimately replace the current District Wide Local Plan and become part of the statutory plan for the Borough into the future. It is produced following a prescribed series of consultations related to relevant regulations within government legislation. This document concerns relevant responses to the Regulation 25 consultation stage (also termed a the "Issues and Options" stage) that relate to both the Key Statements and the Development Management Policies sections of the Strategy and proposes a series of amendments to some of the Statements and Policies.

2.2 The Issues and Options version of Core Strategy contained a Vision for the area, a Series of Strategic Objectives, a set of "Key Statements" on a variety of themes such as sustainability, housing, the local economy and others, a set of Development Strategy Options and finally a series of Development Management (DM) policies that elaborate on the Key Statements. These Development Management policies will eventually replace

the current detailed policies in the District Wide Plan that are used at present by RVBC planning management staff. They will thus become the new guidelines in the local assessment of future planning applications once the Core Strategy is formally adopted.

- 2.3 The Regulation 25 stage has involved two major and wide ranging public consultations, the first in 2010, which was reported to members, and the second and earlier this year. Both consultations received a significant amount of responses from a wide variety of sources including local residents, statutory authorities and agencies; representatives of landowners and from the development industry. Following the 2010 consultation a Schedule of proposed amendments to the Key Statements and Development Management (DM) Policies resulting from relevant responses was drawn up and reported to members in June. These proposed amendments were then circulated for further consultation (as a document entitled Core Strategy – Proposed Revisions to Key Statements and Development Management Policies), together with other planning and housing related documents, earlier this year. All the responses from both consultations have been entered into our consultation database. The detailed Proposed Revisions document is available in hard copy in the Members' Room together with the original August 2010 Core Strategy Consultation document to which the Revisions document relates.
- 2.4 The 2011 consultation has produced further responses to the Key Statements and Development Management Policies (as set out in the Proposed Revisions consultation Document) and some of these have resulted in further amendments.
- 2.5 In addition, and in parallel to the above public consultations, the consultancy firm Hyder has been engaged to produce a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Core Strategy, again as a part of the legal process of plan formation. As a part of developing the SA they have considered the Key Statements and Development Management policies from a sustainability standpoint and have suggested amendments and clarifications.
- 2.6 This report deals solely with how the various responses from the consultations and Hyder have influenced the Key Statements and DM policies as originally laid out in the August 2010 Core Strategy consultation document.
- 2.7 In general terms most of the Key Statements have been amended to varying degrees with perhaps the most changes to the Sustainability, Landscape, Biodiversity, Heritage Assets and Business and Employment Statements. In addition there have been changes to many of the DM policies, some minor. There are significant changes to DMG1 General Considerations, DME1 Trees and Woodland, DME 4 Protecting Heritage Assets, DMH1 Affordable Housing and DME 5 Renewable Energy and a proposal for a completely new policy, DME6 Water Management.
- 2.8 The original consultation version of the Core Strategy, on which the 2010 comments were based, is available as a hard copy in the Members Room, together with a hard copy of the Revisions Schedule which outlined the changes that flowed from that consultation. In addition the original Core Strategy consultation document is available through a link on the council's website at:

[http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk/info/200180/planning\\_policy/1358/local\\_development\\_framework/](http://www.ribblevalley.gov.uk/info/200180/planning_policy/1358/local_development_framework/)  
6

- 2.9 As the various changes indicated above spring from several different sources it was felt that the most coherent way to illustrate them is to bring all the amendments into the Key Statements and Development Management Policies sections of the original August 2010 document as underlined text. This document is appended to this report as Appendix 1. It can be compared to the original document, which is available through the weblink above or via the hard copy in the Members' room.

### 3 RISK ASSESSMENT

#### 3.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- Resources – No immediate implications.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – The Core Strategy is a statutory requirement of the planning process.
- Political – No direct political implications.
- Reputation – The Council would wish to be seen to take note of the consultation responses to this important planning document and amend the document in light of relevant comment as a part of its long term planning development.

### 4 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE

- 4.1 Agree the proposed changes and that the revised text be incorporated into the Core Strategy Preferred Option draft.

### CHIEF EXECUTIVE

### BACKGROUND PAPERS

1. Core Strategy Consultation – Regulation 25 Report, Draft for Consultation, August 2010
2. Core Strategy – Proposed Revisions to Key Statements and Development Management Policies, June 2011

for further information please ask for Phil Dagnall, extension 4570.

**APPENDIX 1**

**REVISIONS TO CORE STRATEGY KEY STATEMENTS AND  
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES FOLLOWING 2010 AND 2011  
ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATIONS AND HYDER CONSULTANCY  
COMMENTS**

**Note: All amendments are underlined**

**RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL  
REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: THURSDAY, 8 DECEMBER 2011  
title: LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK EVIDENCE BASE –  
REVIEW OF POLICY G6  
submitted by: CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
principal author: COLIN HIRST – HEAD OF REGENERATION & HOUSING

**1 PURPOSE**

1.1 To consider matters raised from the consultation on the review paper.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- Council Ambitions – The report relates to the ambition to protect and enhance the existing environmental quality of the area.
- Community Objectives – Delivery of LDF supports the objective of attaining a sustainable economy, thriving market towns and safeguarding the environment through the planning system.
- Corporate Priorities – The Essential Open Space Audit will inform future policy and will aid performance and consistency.
- Other Considerations – None.

**2 BACKGROUND**

2.1 The approach to Development Plans introduced by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the Council to develop a new suite of documents known as The Local Development Framework (LDF) that will replace the adopted Districtwide Local Plan. The Policies within the LDF should be informed by a strong and robust baseline.

2.2 Members will be aware of Policy G6: Essential Open Space within the Districtwide Local Plan which identifies the sites that have significant amenity value either visually or through their recreational value, which protects them from unnecessary development in order to preserve the characteristics of the plan area. Due to the fact that these sites were identified in the previous plan making process it was necessary to consider whether the designation remained relevant and to identify issues where circumstances had changed or other considerations needed to be taken into account.

2.3 The Policy in the Districtwide Local Plan is as follows:

"Development will not be permitted on land which is designated as essential open space on the proposals map unless it does not compromise the visual quality of the value of general openness or the recreational value of the site or unless warranted by overriding material considerations in the public interest".

- 2.4 In carrying out a strategic review of the designation, the Council used a list of criteria which consisted of an evaluation of the visual quality of the site, an assessment of the contribution the site makes to the townscape of the area, or enhancement of the setting of important buildings and its importance as an area of recreational open space. The G6 designated sites were visited where accessible or viewed within their locational context. The same assessment criteria were used; each site was given a reference number to enable the site to be mapped electronically; mapping and aerial photography was also used to supplement the site work
- 2.5 Members will recall that it was previously resolved by the Committee to undertake consultation on the findings of the review and if no issues of concern were raised, to adopt the review in consultation with the Chairman as part of the LDF Evidence Base and to treat the review as a material consideration when determining planning applications. The consultation raised a number of issues warranting further consideration and consequently the findings of the original audit are not adopted.

### 3 CONSULTATION & ISSUES

- 3.1 The review was the subject of public consultation which included neighbour notices being sent to properties adjacent to the boundaries of identified sites, press releases and direct mailing to people on the LDF database.
- 3.2 In all the Council received over 350 responses, the majority of which focussed around a limited number of sites. Some of the responses received were derived from standardised letters as well as a petition in relation to developments at Longridge. (114 signatories were contained on that petition.) Many of the responses were individual letters of objection from a range of sites across the borough. The responses included a small number that supported the review process and the proposal to give less weight to the designation. Three sites not identified within the initial review were promoted as sites where the existing designation was no longer viewed as appropriate; all representations were made available to view in redacted form as part of the process and are still available to view as part of the background information.
- 3.3 Members will be aware that the initial review was the subject of criticism by a number of parties who did not wish to see the designation removed or given less consideration in deciding planning applications. It is however important to bear in mind that the purpose of the review was to undertake a broad based review of the existing designation to establish some baseline information to support the LDF work. The audit so far has identified many of the existing G6 sites that can readily be justified for inclusion such as those relating to public open spaces, playing fields and so on, which were not proposed as part of the review list. Indeed some 140 of the original 178 sites came within that category and no change was proposed.
- 3.4 The review work has also highlighted that some areas of public open space or playing fields were not included within the original designation either because they did not exist or were not developed sufficiently enough to be included in the original Local Plan. These will need to be addressed in future policy work for consistency. Similarly sites that had not been identified within the review were highlighted, such as Site 35 Littlemoor, Clitheroe, for example. This site falls within the overall extent of a designated area including playing fields, however in itself the designated area includes a large area of land whilst undeveloped it is not part of the sports provision. In the context of the original designation it would be a site to be excluded from development to prevent an oversupply of housing sites coming forward, however within the current context of

meeting housing requirements may not be a site for which an absolute exclusion from considering development would be maintained. The site would warrant further detailed consideration.

- 3.5 Many of the responses identified information that would justify the continuation of the existing designation. Examples include representations relating to land that whilst not formal public open space, provided maintained recreational land capable of public access or informal use. Sites such as that identified at Hayhurst Road, Whalley or Church Close, Waddington, and the existing allotments at Clitheroe Road, Sabden are examples of such sites. These sites are more straightforward in their consideration and more readily defensible due to the nature of their use and public benefit and should continue to be safeguarded in the light of the consultation.
- 3.6 By far the more difficult sites to appraise are those that tend to seek to control development within the settlement boundary often comprising existing residential curtilages. Some may have been designated because of a contribution to the Conservation Area or setting of listed building. From the information held by the Council, in many cases, some sites appear simply to have been designated in order to prevent additional development that could arise as a result of settlement policies and the approach to defining settlement boundaries taken at that time. Without a more detailed fundamental review, it is difficult to determine the extent to which sites could or should come forward. A number of the sites fell into this category.
- 3.7 In some instances development is capable of control by individuals due to their existing landownership patterns in other cases there are clearly differing options to develop parts of the site. This would be a matter to look at more closely as the Local Development Framework is progressed beyond the Core Strategy when settlement boundaries will be reviewed and if necessary specific allocations are considered through the preparation of the Housing and Economic Development Plan document. Given that the Council is currently focussing on the preparation of its Core Strategy whose Development Strategy is set as a strategic overview, at this stage no further work is proposed as part of the current Core Strategy programme beyond identifying areas of formal/informal public open space.
- 3.8 In terms of dealing with planning applications there are some important considerations that the original review would have fed into and was part of the recommendation of the previous report. This situation has changed. The Districtwide Plan and Saved Policies form the Statutory Development Plan for the Borough and is the starting point from which to consider applications. The issue that then has to be determined is the degree of weight that is attached to the Saved Policies given the datedness and context of the Plans formulation when measured against the considerations of recent policy. The principal material consideration being that of the Council's position relative to the housing land supply and the test contained in Planning Policy Guidance Note 3 - Housing. Once the position is attained where a clear 5-year supply exists then the basis of decision taking is different and greater regard can be given to the relevance of the Saved Policies. In effect we have situation for the time being where each case will be looked at upon its merits and the G6 Policy designation will be one of a number of considerations going forward. What is clear from the outcome of the consultation is that the considerations in individual cases can be very complex and need detailed appraisal relevant to the proposal under scrutiny.



## **4 CONCLUSIONS**

- 4.1 The consultation has raised a number of considerations, strong support for most of the designations and a general concern about how the identified areas would lead to areas being developed for housing which was seen by most respondents as undesirable. Ongoing work will now be focused upon the confirmation of the areas that contribute towards public open space provision either formal or informal and will be part of the supporting work to underpin the open space policies proposed in the Core Strategy that will supersede the policies of the Local Plan. Members will recall that a working group to look at open space policy in terms of provision and management has been established under the auspices of the Council's Community Committee, the work of which will be drawn upon to inform the LDF. In the longer term a view may need to be taken on whether a specific policy document is prepared in the future as part of the LDF.
- 4.2 Individual applications will continue to be looked at on a case-by-case basis dependent upon circumstances and relevant materials considerations. No further detailed work will be progressed on the audit pending work commencing on the housing and Economic DPD whilst resources focus upon the Core Strategy. It is also important to clarify that the review in itself does not remove the designation as this still exists within the Saved Local Plan Policies; what will become the issue is how those Saved Local Plan Policies are considered in terms of their weight relative to other material considerations.

## **5 RISK ASSESSMENT**

- 5.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:
- Resources – None, resource requirements will be contained within the existing LDF budget provisions.
  - Technical, Environmental and Legal – None.
  - Political – No direct political implications.
  - Reputation – The consultation generated widespread public interest.

## **6 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE**

- 6.1 Note the issues raised and agree the approach set out in paragraph 4.1 and 4.2 of this report.
- 6.2 Confirm that the audit will not be considered as a material consideration for the purposes of determining planning applications.

## **CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- 1 G6 Audit Files

For further information please ask for Colin Hirst, extension 4503.

## RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

meeting date: 8<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2011  
title: CORE STRATEGY - EMPLOYMENT LAND REVIEW  
submitted by: CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
principal author: CRAIG MATTHEWS

Agenda Item No.

### 1 PURPOSE

1.1 To receive an update on employment land in Ribble Valley.

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities

- Council Ambitions - In addition to Ribble Valley Borough Council striving to meet its three ambitions, it also recognises the importance of securing a diverse, sustainable economic base for the Borough.
- Community Objectives – The issues highlighted in this report will contribute to objectives of a sustainable economy and thriving market towns.
- Corporate Priorities - Delivery of services to all
- Other Considerations - None

### 2 BACKGROUND

2.1 As part of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy consultation process an Employment Land Position Statement was produced to provide an up to date position in terms of the current employment land situation in the Borough, updating the work undertaken by the BE Group in 2008 on the Ribble Valley Employment Land and Retail Study as a guide to allocating future employment land needs and for considering the use and viability of existing sites allocated for employment needs in light of the still relatively high demand for new housing causing pressure for existing employment sites to be redeveloped for alternative land uses in the Borough.

2.2 Since the original study in 2008, the wider economy has continued to change as the effects of the economic downturn have progressed. Since this time also, a change of government has brought with it new policy directions including the proposed abolition of the Regional Spatial Strategy. It is intended that the Employment Land Position Statement be used in future, as an evidence base for future land needs for employment uses and as a means to inform the Core Strategy. The statement identifies that there is a need to bring forward employment land and that provision will need to be made for additional land of an appropriate type in future years.

2.3 A copy of the statement has been emailed to members of this committee and a reference copy is available in the members' room on level D of the Council Offices. It can also be viewed on the Council's website. Whilst overall, the local economy in Ribble Valley remains comparatively strong and reasonably vibrant there remains a number of issues and risks that need to be addressed to ensure that the area does not lose that inherent strength and that, perhaps more importantly, is able to deliver

growth and further strengthening of the local economy particularly in the current economic climate and recovery period.

- 2.4 As stated, the sites in existing use, or with a recognised employment commitment, are facing pressure for the development of other uses, in particular residential. Sites in existing employment use are seen as particularly vulnerable and it is recommended that the Council will need to ensure that where redevelopment is to be allowed, that this should be treated as an exception delivering justifiable benefits and providing the loss of land in employment use can be accommodated elsewhere in the Borough. This is especially so when the Council is facing significant pressure to deliver on its housing requirements in the shorter term whilst pressure for employment land provision, whilst within a longer time frame, will increase and the Borough will need to make provision for future investment.
- 2.5 Also, during the production of the Employment Land Position Statement, a number of communications took place with land agents in order to ascertain their own views as to the future market viability of various existing and potential new or expanding sites within the Borough specifically for their employment uses. Part of the statement was then produced using their views, which broadly agreed with the approach being taken by the Council on future employment land provision.

### 3 INFORMATION

- 3.1 In overview, members will be unsurprised to find that by far the greatest number of responses received across this latest Core Strategy consultation were in relation to potential new housing development within the Borough rather than the provision of sites for future employment needs. Whilst this is the case, however, it is acknowledged generally that the Borough needs to make provision for future employment needs, and the following provides an overview of the responses received in relation to the Ribble Valley Employment Land Provision Statement: -

#### 3.2 Employment Land Provision

All respondents supported the general approach being taken to support future employment land requirements and the need to identify more land and suitable sites to respond to changing economic sectors and their requirements. Some, including discussions with agents, suggested being more ambitious above the additional 6ha of employment land requirement threshold identified, however this figure has been suggested as a minimum requirement and took account, for example, of the BAE Systems strategic site at Samlesbury. Furthermore, other sites and opportunities for additional employment growth, where appropriate, will continue to be identified. Although the Employment Land Provision Statement concentrated on growth and development in B1, B2 & B8 planning class uses, the importance was emphasised of other employers outside these uses across the wider rural area as significant employers in the Borough, which is acknowledged but does not fall within the context of the statements intent of identifying industrial sites for employment.

#### 3.3 Locations

In relation to the locations for future provision of land and sites being concentrated adjacent to the A59 corridor and key service centres, general agreement to this approach is acknowledged. Also, it is pointed out that whilst the A59 is the most suitable location for employment growth in the main, consideration should be given to settlements north of the River Ribble such as Longridge, Chipping, and other

settlements to the north of Ribble Valley, to serve the future employment needs of these communities.

More recognition should be made with reference to areas further south of the A59 is suggested also, such as the key industrial sites located in and around Simonstone, their proximity to the M65 motorway and future growth and development potential and serving communities south of the Borough. It was also suggested that by highlighting the A59 corridor for future employment development also strengthened the case for additional housing growth also near to the A59.

#### 3.4 Town & Key Service Centres

There is general support for promoting town centre regeneration, although there was a concern about impacting on the character of Clitheroe, as an example, and the risk of becoming a clone town with the influx of national retailers (many of which started as small independent businesses) potentially affecting the attraction of the town centre's independent retail offer.

- 3.5 Finally, it is appropriate to review the Employment Land Position Statement regularly to monitor economic activity and act as a guide to allocating future employment land needs to contribute to a sustainable economic future in the Borough.

#### 4 RISK ASSESSMENT

- 4.1 The approval of this report may have the following implications:

- Resources – No immediate implications.
- Technical, Environmental and Legal – The Core Strategy is a statutory requirement of the planning process.
- Political – No direct political implications.
- Reputation – The position statement helps to demonstrate how the Council is seeking to take account of the local economy in its activities.

#### 5 RECOMMENDED THAT COMMITTEE

- 5.1 Agree that the Employment Land Position Statement is published as part of the evidence base and used to inform the Core Strategy.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE

BACKGROUND PAPERS: -

Ribble Valley Employment Land & Retail Study 2008

For further information please ask for Craig Matthews (ext 4531)

## RIBBLE VALLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL REPORT TO PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Agenda Item No.

meeting date: THURSDAY, 8<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2011  
title: LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK - ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT  
submitted by: CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
principal author: DIANE CAFFERTY – SENIOR PLANNING OFFICER

### 1 PURPOSE

1.1 To confirm the Annual Monitoring Report

1.2 Relevance to the Council's ambitions and priorities:

- Council Ambitions – The Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) will inform the delivery and measure the success of the Council's planning policies. It will help in protecting and enhancing the quality of the environment and delivery of affordable housing.
- Community Objectives – As a monitoring tool for spatial policy, it will provide a basis with which to identify how a range of issues relating to the objectives of a sustainable economy, thriving market towns and housing will be addressed through the planning system.
- Corporate Priorities - The AMR will provide a management tool to monitor progress and will aid performance and consistency.
- Other Considerations – None

### 2 BACKGROUND

2.1 The approach to development plans introduced by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the Council to develop monitoring systems to assess both the effectiveness of its local development documents and progress in meeting the Local Development Scheme (LDS). The intention is that progressively the AMR process will identify if policies are working, how policies may need to be adjusted or deleted and if new policies need to be introduced. The AMR reports on the Local Development Scheme (LDS) that assists in identifying areas where resources may need to be diverted to meet targets or the timeframe be adjusted.

2.2 Until the Localism Bill was enacted on 15<sup>th</sup> November 2011, legislation had required that an AMR report be submitted to Government Office by the 31<sup>st</sup> December each year. It has also been necessary for the Council to monitor against a set of Core Output Indicators, set by the department of Communities and Local Government (CLG) as well as a set of local indicators established in the Council's first AMR. Information received from CLG in March 2011 however removed this requirement in preparation for the Localism Act. Legislation now states that it is a matter for each local Council to decide what to include in its monitoring report. Although no longer required by legislation, Ribble Valley Borough Council has chosen to continue with this approach of monitoring core output and local indicators for this AMR. This allows for the maintenance of year on year comparisons. It is anticipated that the Core Strategy will have been submitted and

examined by the time of writing of the next AMR therefore it is considered timely that this will be the last AMR of its type. It is anticipated that the next AMR will therefore be much more locally relevant and amended to accurately monitor the Core Strategy policies submitted as part of the Development Plan.

- 2.3 This report however, which is the seventh AMR to be produced, covers the period 1<sup>st</sup> April 2010 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2011 and continues to present the information in thematic chapters. A copy of the report is attached in the Appendix. A full colour version can be viewed on the Ribble Valley website.
- 2.4 The AMR has shown that good progress has been made on progressing the Core Strategy, the central document of LDF, with an additional alternative options consultation (under Regulation 25) having taken place. Good progress has also been made on the LDF evidence base, with public consultation having taken place on a number of documents including: -
- The policy G6 (Essential Open Space) review
  - An employment land position statement
  - The addressing housing need in Ribble Valley report
  - The review of the housing requirement
- 2.5 The AMR indicators have also shown that data is both up to date across the borough and being used to the best means to inform the LDF.

## CHIEF EXECUTIVE

### BACKGROUND PAPERS

1. Ribble Valley Borough Council - Annual Monitoring Report's 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010.

For further information please ask for Diane Cafferty, extension 4551.